

Division 3: Premier and Cabinet (except Office of Native Title), \$173 963 000 —

Mr M.W. Sutherland, Chairman.

Mr C.J. Barnett, Premier.

Mr P.F. Conran, Director General.

Mr D.R.M. Smith, Deputy Director General, Coordination.

Mr G.J. Moore, Assistant Director General, State Administration and Corporate Support.

Mr G. Hay, Assistant Director General, State Security and Emergency Coordination.

Ms K.H. Andrews, Director, State Administration.

Mrs R.A. Brown, Acting Deputy Director General, Strategic.

Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup, Adviser, Office of the Premier.

The CHAIRMAN: I advise members that the Speaker has approved the presence of a photographer in the public gallery from 2.00 pm today for a period of 10 minutes.

[Witnesses introduced.]

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

Members may raise questions about matters relating to the operations and budget of the off-budget authority. Off-budget authority officers are recognised as ministerial advisers. It is the intention of the Chair to ensure that as many questions as possible are asked and answered and that both questions and answers are short and to the point. The Premier may agree to provide supplementary information to the committee, rather than asking that the question be put on notice for the next sitting week. I ask the Premier to clearly indicate what supplementary information he agrees to provide and I will then allocate a reference number. If supplementary information is to be provided, I seek the Premier's cooperation in ensuring that it is delivered to the committee clerk by Friday, 8 June 2012. I caution members that if the Premier asks that a matter be put on notice, it is up to the member to lodge the question on notice with the Clerk's office.

I give the first question to the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr M. McGOWAN: Premier, my question relates to page 77 of the *Budget Statements*. I refer to two things mentioned at the bottom of that page; namely, "Efficiency Dividend" and "\$300 Million Savings Measures". I am interested in what cuts will be made to the Department of the Premier and Cabinet to meet the efficiency dividend and to meet the \$300 million in savings measures mentioned on page 77. Will there be any delays in filling full-time equivalent positions? Lastly, is the Premier introducing any revenue measures to meet any of those cuts under the efficiency dividend or the \$300 million savings measures?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: The budget of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet tends to be quite volatile. A number of flowthrough items occur—native title is one example; also in several commonwealth–state areas. However, the efficiency dividend will be applied across the department. As the Leader of the Opposition knows, it is two per cent, then one plus one plus one. The actual areas within which those savings will be made are yet to be determined. They will be determined over the coming weeks for the start of the financial year. There are no revenue measures in the department.

Mr M. McGOWAN: Obviously, over a significant period, the Premier is looking at cutting significant millions of dollars out of the department, but he does not know exactly where those savings measures will be at the moment. The Premier said he will decide them in coming weeks—is that up to 30 June that those will be decided?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: Yes. I would imagine by the start of the financial year the department will have identified where it will make those efficiency gains or savings. Perhaps less use of consultants, less legal work and the like might be part of it. I am confident those savings can be made.

Mr M. McGOWAN: Will the Premier table advice on what those savings might be?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: They have not been determined, as I just said.

Mr M. McGOWAN: At the time?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: The Leader of the Opposition can ask a question at the time, if he likes.

Chairman; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mr Bill Johnston; Dr
Mike Nahan; Mr Ian Blayney

Mr B.S. WYATT: I refer the Premier to “Efficiency Indicators” and “Average Operating Cost per Ministerial Office” on page 81 of the *Budget Statements*. The figure of \$2.389 million has increased over 20 per cent from the 2008–09 budget. I am curious about what has driven that increase—that is, whether it is wages or the number of staff. What has been the driver for that increase in the average operating cost?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I would imagine it is probably salary levels, but I will ask the director general to summarise staffing numbers in ministerial offices. While he looks for that piece of paper, I can confirm that the staffing number in ministerial offices is below that of the previous government. The number of term-of-government employees is significantly below that of the previous government. Indeed, we operate a leaner ship. I will let the director general provide the numbers.

Mr P.F. Conran: In relation to the \$2.389 million figure, as is obvious, this is an efficiency indicator including all costs associated with the day-to-day operation of ministerial offices, including the Premier’s office and the Leader of the Opposition’s office. The increase in the cost of services is principally the result of salary and cost escalation—CPI increases. In terms of the number of FTEs in ministers’ offices, the number of FTEs as at April 2012 in the Premier’s office and other ministers’ offices was 221.8. In relation to the previous government, as at August 2008, that figure was 246.1.

Mr B.S. WYATT: Can I confirm, through the Premier, whether that includes the Leader of the Opposition’s office?

Mr P.F. Conran: The information I have before me does not seem to include the Leader of the Opposition’s office, but I can say that currently the Leader of the Opposition’s office has 14 FTEs. I think the previous Leader of the Opposition’s office was also 14. The previous government was a lesser figure because there was a split in relation to the FTEs.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: The other issue, director general, was the number of term-of-government employees between the two governments.

Mr P.F. Conran: The number of term-of-government employees in the previous government was 143.8. The number of term-of-government employees as at April 2012 in the current government is 92.4.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: In other words, more public servants work in ministerial offices than was the case under the previous government.

Mr B.S. WYATT: Premier, this question may be for the director general: what is the FTE freeze or the number for DPC as at 2011–12? That will therefore apply for the next two years.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I will ask the director general to provide that answer.

Mr P.F. Conran: I think it is 701, but I will clarify that in the course of these proceedings and come back to the member.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: As the member for Victoria Park is aware, that includes all electorate offices. Electorate office staff are included within the staffing level of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet.

[2.10 pm]

Mr M. McGOWAN: Premier, in the answer given by the director general he talked about the various staffing levels. Is the Premier including in that number all the people who work part time or are allocated out of departments into ministers’ offices, including those people who might be employed as companies? I note that some people are not included in the document about staffing levels that is tabled every three months or six months. For instance, Mr Wedgwood, who works in the Premier’s office, is not included in that document. I am just wondering about the other people who are not included in the figures provided.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: It is all people in ministerial offices. With respect to Geoff Wedgwood, I would imagine he is included; he is employed through his consultancy business, if the member likes, or as a company structure. I can also add that, unlike the previous government, there is no Government Media Office, and there is no community liaison group, which had about 20 staff. This government abolished both of those. There is a government secretariat, which is probably not going to survive all that long, but only two people currently work in that. The figures quoted compare ministerial offices, but bear in mind that, as the member would recall, the previous government also had two other organisations—namely, the GMO and the community secretariat. A large number of those positions have been abolished; they no longer exist under this government. In answer to the question, Mr Wedgwood was not included in those figures; he works as a 0.3—three days a week.

Mr M. McGOWAN: Are there other people of that nature?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: Not to my knowledge.

Chairman; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mr Bill Johnston; Dr
Mike Nahan; Mr Ian Blayney

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: I refer to “Completed Works” on page 83 of budget paper No 2, and the fit-out of the Leader of the Opposition’s office at a cost of \$500 000. Can the Premier outline the works that included and how many staff the fit-out provides for?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: As I think was just said, the Leader of the Opposition’s office has 14 staff. The member will recall that about two years ago this government actually put in place set criteria for opposition and minor parties—that was the first time that had been done—so that can no longer be manipulated politically, if the member likes. With respect to the fit-out of the additional office space for the Leader of the Opposition—when the “Summer Palace” has been demolished—the budget was \$500 000. I will ask the director general to detail the money that has been spent; I think about half of that amount has been spent. As I understand it, the opposition opted not to have a lift, which was its choice.

Mr P.F. Conran: The fit-out costs so far—this includes relocation rental figures in anticipation—are approximately \$251 000. We expect some increase in relation to that over the next few months as contracts et cetera come in. We had set aside, I think, a figure of around \$180 000 for a lift that would have enabled disabled access from the back of the premises. I think a decision was taken—I think it is a reasonable decision of the Leader of the Opposition’s office—that it would not seek to put in the lift at this stage. There is disabled access through the front; however, I think the view was as well that the parliamentary offices could be accessed by disabled people, if need be. We expect the cost will be around \$251 000 to \$300 000. I cannot be precise, but that is the figure at this stage.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: And there is no doubt that it is better than the “Summer Palace” accommodation.

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: Does that include total lease costs, parking, audio visual and media, and any other upgrades that have been done?

Mr P.F. Conran: My understanding is yes.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: I refer to page 82 of budget paper No 2, which has a table in the middle with a line item of “Employees (Full Time Equivalents)”. The FTEs go from 94 in 2010–11, to a proposed 140 in 2012–13, and there is a note that relates to the increase for the coming financial year of two FTEs for increased policy management. That is a nearly 40 per cent increase in staffing over two years, and I am just wondering whether there is any particular reason for that?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: Yes; 37 staff, I think, were transferred from the Department of the Attorney General into the Department of the Premier and Cabinet. Responsibility for native title, in a policy sense, rests with the Attorney General, but the staff are in the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, and indeed the payments pass through the Department of the Premier and Cabinet. As the member would be aware, the two major issues have been the negotiations over the Browse natural gas precinct, and also over the work that has been going on in trying to find an overall settlement for the south west native title claim by the Nyoongah people.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: What does note 2, regarding the two additional FTEs for increased policy management, relate to?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I can advise the member that six approved FTEs have been allocated to the following areas: four FTEs to support the Browse LNG native title agreement; and two FTEs to build policy capacity and to deliver improved policy advice to Premier and Cabinet. I think the state spends something like \$60 million a year on native title issues, so it is a major area of expenditure and it requires staff who are both experienced and professional.

Mr M. McGOWAN: So does that explain why on page 78—going to “Service Summary”—government policy management has gone from a 2011–12 budget of \$49 million, to a budget for the coming financial year of \$82 million, which is not quite but nearly a doubling in the cost of policy management? Why is another \$33 million being spent on those issues?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I think that is primarily native title, but I will get the director general to comment if he can.

Mr P.F. Conran: Yes, it is native title related. I think that figure is probably best explained by saying that in a later entry on page 82 there is a payment in respect of Browse of \$30 million. That has had a significant impact on the budget of the department. Money will flow in and out of the Browse amounts, and the member will see the drop in our budget over the forward estimates period. If, for example, we go to page 77, the total appropriations for this year are \$173 million, and going out to 2015–16 they drop to \$149 million. That is the impact of money coming in in relation to Browse, and flowing out. The member will also see some impacts in relation to the south west native title claim over a period of time as well.

Mr M. McGOWAN: When the director general says “coming in and flowing out”, what does that mean?

Chairman; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mr Bill Johnston; Dr
Mike Nahan; Mr Ian Blayney

Mr P.F. Conran: We have put \$10 million in for economic development, and \$20 million into community housing. Once certain time frames and requirements are met as per the Browse agreements, those moneys will be paid to the group that has responsibility for the Browse native title groups for it to allocate that money out.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: If I can just add, native title payments are channelled through Premier and Cabinet; they may go directly to claimant groups as part of the settlement or negotiation, or they may be channelled through other government agencies. But Premier and Cabinet, if the member likes, is the clearing house for those payments.

Mr M. McGOWAN: Just on that point, although it also comes under the Department of State Development part of the budget, I am interested in knowing the total cost to the state of that project, particularly if the joint venture partners do not elect to construct their project at James Price Point?

[2.20 pm]

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I take an optimistic view, and I think the total cost of the state's share of the, if you like, compensation package is around \$250 million over the life of the project.

Mr M. McGOWAN: Is that payable if the liquefied natural gas plant does not go ahead at James Price Point?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: If the project does not go ahead, that native title compensation, both from the companies and from the state, will not apply—although, money will have already been paid out and that obviously will be a past event.

Mr M. McGOWAN: It is difficult, because there are a range of agencies involved, but what will be the total cost of the project to the state across all agencies if the project does not go ahead?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: That is a hypothetical; we are working on the basis that the project will go ahead. Therefore, we have committed \$250 million over the life of the project—or a sum thereabouts.

Mr M. McGOWAN: But the Premier said that the \$250 million will not be paid; the advice I have had from people in the Kimberley who are closely involved is that it will be paid, irrespective of whether —

Mr C.J. BARNETT: No, the payment of that compensation, both by the companies and by the state, is tied to the project proceeding at James Price Point.

Mr M. McGOWAN: In relation to that, there must be a figure that the state will be responsible for in total over the period if the project does not go ahead at that point.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: If the project does not proceed, all the state will be responsible for will be that amount already expended, which is a considerable amount of money, in terms of payments to the Kimberley Land Council and some of the social components that have already been provided or are being provided.

Mr M. McGOWAN: But the land will have been acquired, so the cost of the land is part of that. When the Premier says, “a considerable amount”, what will that be across the Department of Regional Development and Lands, the Department of State Development and the Department of the Premier and Cabinet?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: As I say, we are working on the basis that the project is going ahead.

Mr M. McGOWAN: It is a fair question, Premier.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: It is a hypothetical question.

Mr M. McGOWAN: It is hypothetical that it will go ahead. As the Premier knows, there is some considerable disquiet among the joint venture partners as to whether the project will go ahead, and I suspect that a final decision on that will not come until after 9 March next year. All I am asking the Premier is what the cost will be to the state.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I am prepared to provide information on what has been expended to this point by way of supplementary information, and that will mainly include payments to the KLC.

[*Supplementary Information No A5.*]

Dr M.D. NAHAN: I refer to the fifth dot point on page 79 under “Significant Issues Impacting the Agency”. What will be the effect of a declining share of goods and services tax revenue from the commonwealth government to Western Australia?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: As most members, and most people in this state, I hope, are fully aware, this is the most significant financial issue facing the state. The state's share of GST revenue continues to decline. As members are aware, there was an absolute cut of \$662 million for the coming financial year. The state's share of GST has fallen to 55 per cent for 2012–13, and it could continue to fall, on current projections, to 25 per cent by 2015–16. For the interest of members, Western Australia will receive 55c in the dollar in 2012–13, compared with 98c for

Chairman; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mr Bill Johnston; Dr
Mike Nahan; Mr Ian Blayney

Queensland; 92c for Victoria and 95c for New South Wales. That is manifestly unfair. It is all very well for the federal government to say, “You receive money in capital grants or national partnership agreements.” That is true, but so does every other state—generally to a greater proportion than Western Australia. I will continue to fight for Western Australia getting a legitimate share of money—not commonwealth money, but GST money that is collected for the states. Western Australia is not in any sense being stingy about that: we recognise that this state is more prosperous, and we argue that we should at least get 75c in the dollar. That debate goes on. If that is not corrected, the rate of growth of projects in this state will decline, and the national economy will be smaller than it otherwise would be. This penalises not only this state, but also national growth. Members should remember that the big financial winner from the big resources projects is the commonwealth government, not by any means the state government. The rate of the development of projects will slow unless that is corrected.

Mr M. McGOWAN: I go back to what we were discussing before. I refer to page 81 and administrative support to the Premier. The Premier spoke before about the abolition of the government secretariat. Can the Premier advise why that is being abolished and what will happen to the current staff or staff who have worked there before? Secondly, I note that the Premier is bringing all government media monitoring in house; I am also interested in that. How many extra staff will that involve; who will they work for; where will they be located; and was a business case prepared for that decision?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: Media monitoring is located within the Department of the Premier and Cabinet. What is being done and is not yet completed is seeing whether there can be better use of media monitoring across government—in other words, sharing a single service rather than having multiple services in multiple departments. That is an efficiency exercise that has been undertaken by the Department of the Premier and Cabinet. With respect to what has been loosely called the government secretariat, there are to my knowledge only three individuals now working within that. It has been reduced and my preference is that support for ministers should be essentially based in ministerial offices, but at the moment there are only three people in it; it is a small group of people who work, for example, on information on the budget and the presentation of budget information and the like.

Mr M. McGOWAN: Just to go back to my original question, what will happen to the people who worked there and who currently work there? When the Premier says he is going to bring media monitoring into the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, what is the cost?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: It is there now.

Mr M. McGOWAN: In his answer a moment ago, the Premier said that it was still being decided upon.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: No, it has always been in the Department of the Premier and Cabinet.

Mr M. McGOWAN: But the Premier is going to bring in house all media monitoring, so that will naturally mean more people and more staff.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: No, media monitoring has for a long time, over successive governments, been in the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, and we are trying to use it to provide that service across other government departments. Some agencies have their own media monitoring arrangements for whatever reasons, and it seems to me that that is unnecessary expenditure. That is simply an administrative saving across government. With regard to the three staff in the government secretariat, the other staff have left for various reasons, and the existing staff, if they stay on, may work from a ministerial office, for example.

Mr M. McGOWAN: Just to finalise my point on that—I think the member for Victoria Park might have a question as well—did the Premier not recently award a tender for \$312 000 to Broadcast Management Services in order to provide media monitoring services; if so, what happened to that?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: Which contract?

Mr M. McGOWAN: It is DPC1517—provision of broadcasting managed services, awarded to AAP for \$312 000, issued by the Premier’s agency. If that was awarded recently, what has happened to it?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: Media monitoring has been around, I would think, since the Burke government, but I will ask the director general to comment on that. Obviously, that work goes out to tender and we always look for the best price and try to make use of one service across government instead of different agencies paying individually for services.

Mr P.F. Conran: Through you, Mr Chairman, we are undertaking an upgrade in relation to existing television, radio and print media monitoring systems. The current system is 12 years old, and, as the Leader of the Opposition will be familiar with, these systems have developed significantly in that 12-year period. I am advised that the hardware is outdated and malfunctioning, with regular service disruptions. The software is not supported and maintenance contracts have expired, so we have to upgrade that equipment. That upgrade is taking place in conjunction with the move to Dumas House. As part of that process, we are also looking to see how we can

Chairman; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mr Bill Johnston; Dr
Mike Nahan; Mr Ian Blayney

potentially provide a better service across agencies, noting, as the Premier has indicated, that a number of departments have their own media monitoring contracts with groups like Media Monitors Australia. I am told that their contracts are also expiring, so we are examining, as part of that process, how we may provide a service to other agencies as well.

[2.30 pm]

It may be that some agencies will need to keep a discrete part of media monitoring. We are not satisfied that that is yet the case, but that is one of the issues that we want to look at.

Mr M. McGOWAN: Can you provide us with an estimate of the cost of these upgrades?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: The member has to ask the question of me.

Mr M. McGOWAN: Sorry; can the Premier provide an estimate of the cost of the upgrades to which the director general referred?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: It has not been picked up yet.

Mr M. McGOWAN: There must be an estimate, surely —

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I am not going to talk about estimates. When it is complete, I will be happy to answer the question.

Mr M. McGOWAN: So the Premier is not going to provide the supplementary information.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: It is not complete. We do not know yet.

Mr M. McGOWAN: But there must be a budget.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: When the process is complete, I will be happy to provide the member with all the information.

Mr B.S. WYATT: A minute ago the Premier referred to staff who have left the government secretariat. In the past, the opposition has asked questions in Parliament about the payouts of Mr James Larsson and Mr Jake Smith. The Premier's answers instructed the opposition to use the freedom of information process. We have done that and the Premier has still refused to provide that information. Will the Premier provide that information through the estimates process today?

The CHAIRMAN: To what line is the member referring?

Mr B.S. WYATT: It is the total appropriations on page 77 of the *Budget Statements*, and the payouts to staff—James Larsson and Jake Smith. Just a few minutes ago the Premier said that that still exists under the government secretariat, but I am sure it did not exist for staff who had previously left. In respect of Mr Larsson and Mr Smith, who had previously left the government secretariat —

Mr C.J. BARNETT: No, Mr Larsson worked in my office.

Mr B.S. WYATT: Mr Larsson and Mr Smith had previously left the employ of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet. The opposition has asked in Parliament for their payout figures. The Premier instructed the opposition to use FOI, and it did, and the Premier still refused to provide that information. Will the Premier provide that information to the opposition today?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I will provide further information on the payouts to Mr Larsson and Mr Smith—is it Jake Smith; I do not know him?—as supplementary information.

[*Supplementary Information No A6.*]

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: I refer to page 85 and subsequent pages, which show the income and expenditure statements for the department. Was the \$1.6 million that was spent on the “Big Aussie Barbecue” appropriated out of the department's expenditure?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: Yes, it would have been part of the overall budget for the state contribution towards the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting, and the state contribution towards the royal visit.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: In answer to questions on notice, the Premier has said that people were invited to tender for this project on 8 September, but the scale of the project changed after tenders were invited. What was the original cost expectation of the project compared with the \$1.6 million that was expended?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: From memory, the original expectation was somewhere between \$30 000 and \$50 000. Some market research was done. At the time I questioned whether that should be done, but that research demonstrated that the likely crowd size would be more than 100 000, which proved to be accurate. Everything had to be scaled up to cater for the larger crowd.

Chairman; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mr Bill Johnston; Dr
Mike Nahan; Mr Ian Blayney

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: Is the Premier suggesting that the original budget was about \$400 000 and it was scaled up to \$1.6 million —

Mr C.J. BARNETT: No, I did not suggest that at all.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: What is the Premier saying then, because I asked what was the original expectation for expenditure?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: The original expectation, I am told, was for a crowd of about 50 000 —

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: But that refers to the number of people. I am asking about the budget.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: The member just needs to listen. Most of the costs are for overheads such as security and fencing. The member might recall that most of the variables were largely donated by Coles and Bunnings —

MR W.J. JOHNSTON: That is not the answer to the question.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: What I am saying is that most of the costs were, by their nature, for overheads such as the stage set-up, security and other aspects. There was also a cost for television coverage, which the state supported. More television cameras were put in place so we could gain a live international broadcast to multiple countries. Obviously, there was a hire cost increase, but not all that great.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: What was the original estimate?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I do not know what the original estimate was.

MR W.J. JOHNSTON: Could the Premier please ask —

Mr C.J. BARNETT: No, I am not going to answer that —

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: This is the purpose of estimates —

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I will provide the cost of what was actually spent. There were various iterations in the planning process, and we must bear in mind that this event was put together in a four or five-week period. It was relatively late that we got confirmation of the Queen's itinerary.

Mr B.S. WYATT: To clarify, the Premier said that there was a cost to the state for the TV coverage; who was that paid to?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: From memory, I think it was paid to the ABC to provide additional cameras so that the quality of the broadcast would reach the standard required for international television.

Mr M. McGOWAN: What was that cost?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: Who is asking the question, Mr Chairman? I am not having a random debate. The member can ask a separate question on that if he wants—there is no secret about that cost.

Mr B.S. WYATT: How much did it cost to pay the ABC to ensure the quality of the coverage?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: It was quite a lot of money. It cost \$150 000 for television coverage. It is important for people to understand that to get international coverage the television pictures have to be of a high quality, and a number of different deployments and positioning of cameras is required, otherwise we would have had nothing more than a news broadcast. I am trying to get some information on how many countries the event was broadcast to and the estimated audience of the barbecue. The audiovisual cost was \$130 000. I will get that information while we are continuing because members need to know how many millions of people around the world watched that event.

Mr B.S. WYATT: Will that be as supplementary information?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: No; we will find the information as we go along.

Mr B.S. WYATT: While the Premier's staff are checking that, was the money spent on more cameras or better cameras?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: Principally both, but I think the money was spent on improving the quality of the broadcast—more positions were used so it could be a better broadcast. If that had not been done, there would have been no live international broadcast. There may not have been even a live broadcast across Australia.

MR B.S. WYATT: So all the live broadcasting was done solely by the ABC?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: They established the cameras and the set-up. They managed it, and broadcast to other channels.

Chairman; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mr Bill Johnston; Dr
Mike Nahan; Mr Ian Blayney

Dr M.D. NAHAN: On page 80 it states, under “Outcomes and Key Effectiveness Indicators” —

The Premier and Ministers received high quality, rigorous and timely policy advice:

...

Proportion of Commonwealth recurrent core services funding allocated to Western Australia over time

Can the Premier describe what that is and does this indicate that the amount of special purpose grants to the state has declined significantly?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: It is the commonwealth funding received in the financial year for core state services of health, education, skills development and training, housing and Indigenous services, compared with the \$2.267 billion received in 2008–09. The estimated actual for 2010–11 is 9.8 per cent, representing a 17 per cent reduction in funding from the 27 per cent received in 2010–11. This reduction is primarily due to the winding down of the Building the Education Revolution program and also a reduction in funding for social housing as well as regional road and rail funding.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Is that basically working through the stimulus package?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: Certainly in the BER, but other funding areas were also cut back, along with the GST share.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Does that indicate that not only the GST share, but also other commonwealth payments—specific purpose payments—are declining?

[2.40 pm]

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: So is the Premier saying that this is a demonstration of the falling efficiency of the department?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: No, I did not say that at all.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: Is it not a key effectiveness indicator? So I am not quite sure. Why is it a key effectiveness indicator if it does not measure effectiveness?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I am not voicing opinions. It does not reflect that at all.

Mr M. McGOWAN: I refer to page 81, the first dot point under the heading, “Administration of Executive Government Services”, administrative support to the Premier. I refer also to page 79, the fourth dot point from the bottom, which states in part —

... support and advice on the management of strategic infrastructure projects transforming the State and the Perth metropolitan area ...

I have a couple of questions in relation to that. I want to ask about the Perth Waterfront project. I also want to ask about the Hale House redevelopment and the Dumas House redevelopment. I will start with the waterfront project.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: Point of order, Mr Chairman. I am happy to answer the questions, but to me they are two distinct topics.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes. We will deal with the Waterfront project first.

Mr M. McGOWAN: This is more just out of interest, Premier. I am interested to know—I do not know if I have seen it in any of the press reporting—how the naming of the waterfront project came about; whose idea it was; what consultation was gone into; and did the Premier get advice from the agency; and those sorts of issues. I am just interested in that.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not know whether that is a budget question.

Mr M. McGOWAN: There is a dot point about strategic infrastructure projects. I assume that the Waterfront project is a strategic infrastructure project.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: It is a bit of a stretch, but I do not mind answering it, Mr Chairman, with your indulgence. The name just emerged as one of the possibilities. As I have said publicly, when I visited the Queen in London, at about this time last year, I mentioned to her the waterfront project and I discussed that one of the proposals was to call it Elizabeth Quay. She seemed to be quite accepting of that. There was subsequently some correspondence between the state government and Buckingham Palace, and that was confirmed, and then state cabinet considered the issue over a couple of weeks and a decision was made to name it Elizabeth Quay. The reason for making the announcement now was obviously to coincide with the Diamond Jubilee, and also the fact that Western Australia Day is approaching—it seemed an appropriate time to do it.

Chairman; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mr Bill Johnston; Dr
Mike Nahan; Mr Ian Blayney

Mr M. McGOWAN: The Premier said that the name just emerged. Where did it emerge from?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: Names were thrown around, and that is one of the names that sort of rose to the top in my and other people's minds.

Mr M. McGOWAN: So it was the Premier's idea?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I did not say it was my idea, no.

Mr M. McGOWAN: So whose idea was it?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I am not going to go back into that. Names emerge; we discuss it.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: If I can follow that up, the Premier also said that there was a range of other names. What were some of the other names?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I am not speculating on other names.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not think this is a budget question, member for Cannington.

Mr M. McGOWAN: Mr Chairman, I had further questions on infrastructure projects in Western Australia, in particular, at the top of page 81, administrative support to the Premier. I am referring to the Premier's new office complex. Can the Premier provide us with the latest cost estimates for that project, and have they changed on the most recent \$25 million, or so, estimate? Has there been an increase; and, if so, what is it; and what is the current cost estimate for that new office?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: That project is not being handled by the Department of the Premier and Cabinet; it is being handled by Minister O'Brien's agency, but I can give the Leader of the Opposition some comment. The latest reports I have had is that the project is operating on time and probably under budget. Although the Leader of the Opposition says the Premier's "complex", or whatever expression he uses, I remind him that there is only one room in that building that will be my office. The remainder of the staff are staff who work for the Premier, and staff who work for the Department of the Premier and Cabinet. Essentially the Premier's office will constitute the upper floor. The lower floor will constitute staff from the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, including the cabinet secretariat.

Mr M. McGOWAN: Further on that question, the Premier is saying that the cost has not blown out. That is good news. I refer also to the other administrative support to the Premier and ministerial offices, and the reconstruction of Dumas House. I am interested, because I have a document from the Department of Finance that indicates that there could very well be, from my reading of it, at least two floors in Dumas House left empty. Is that true?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I am not aware.

Mr M. McGOWAN: It is saying that the fourteenth floor and the third floor are vacant. That is on this document, government office accommodation master delivery program summary, which is dated last year, I think. It is indicating that two floors will be left empty for some purpose, even though they have been refurbished. I am just wondering whether that is true.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: No. That is not my understanding. The Public Sector Commission, the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, and other sections, and administrative offices, have progressively over the past few months moved into Dumas House. Dumas house is a heritage building. Its standard was not up to modern accommodation standards. It required, therefore, substantial expenditure. But it is being totally occupied now by ministerial and departmental staff. If there is a vacant floor—I am not aware that there is—I would imagine that it is only because a section has yet to move in. There are certainly no plans for vacant floors in Dumas House. It will be fully occupied.

Mr M. McGOWAN: Can I clarify that, because this document that I have here on the accommodation indicates which ministers are going to which floors, but it indicates that levels 3 and 14 are vacant. The Premier is saying one thing, but I have a document here, obtained through freedom of information, from the Department of Finance, which indicates something quite different.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I assure the Leader of the Opposition that we do not restore buildings to leave them vacant, but I will ask the director general, because the progressive move of agencies is taking place. Indeed, should the Leader of the Opposition visit Governor Stirling Tower, it is a building site—the lifts rarely operate, and people can barely get into the car park for construction vehicles and construction workers. My office will be the last to leave, so please do not forget us if we are left there! The rest of the building is being gutted as we speak. I will ask the director general to say what those office floors will be used for. But Dumas will be fully occupied.

Chairman; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mr Bill Johnston; Dr
Mike Nahan; Mr Ian Blayney

Mr P.F. Conran: In relation to the fourteenth floor, for information, that is not what we could call a really suitable floor for office space. It has been used on a temporary basis by some of our staff. The accommodation, if it is available, is small areas at both ends of the building, surrounded by the plant rooms. They are very noisy offices. I think it was a staff canteen many years ago. It is not what we would regard as particularly suitable office accommodation. That will be used, I anticipate, for temporary office accommodation for agencies that are moving around. The third floor is being fitted out at the moment. We have had some discussions with the Department of Finance, and they are looking to relocate some of their department to the third floor as well. We will use some overflow of our department in that area I expect as well.

Mr M. McGOWAN: So both those floors are currently vacant without anything specifically allocated to them?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I think the Leader of the Opposition was just advised that one of the floors has the building plant and equipment in it. I do not think that is particularly a suitable location for staff on a long-term basis in terms of occupational health, and I think the Leader of the Opposition would agree with that. The other floor is being fitted out now, and then staff will move in from Finance.

The longer-term vision for that, I guess, parliamentary precinct, or government precinct, is that the central agencies of government will all be located there—in other words, all ministerial offices, the Premier’s office, the cabinet rooms, the departments of the Premier and Cabinet, and Treasury and Finance, and the Public Sector Commission. All the central agencies will operate in that one precinct. That will require other buildings to be built at some time. But it is part of that transition, and it is also part of restoring an old, but heritage-listed, building and bringing it up to modern office accommodation standards.

Mr M. McGOWAN: Just to finally clarify those two points, which section of the Department of Finance has been allocated to go to the fourteenth floor?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I do not know the answer to that at this stage.

Mr M. McGOWAN: Do the Premier’s advisers know? The Premier can look to his left and ask.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I do not know. The Department of Commerce is quite a diverse agency, if we look at the composition of the various components of it.

Mr M. McGOWAN: The Premier said the Department of Finance, not the Department of Commerce.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I think if the Leader of the Opposition asked the Minister for Finance he might get an answer.

Mr Chairman, I want to answer the previous question about the “Big Aussie Barbecue” and the broadcast. As I said, the cost of the television setup was in the order of \$150 000. The broadcast went to 47 countries across Asia, the Pacific, the Indian subcontinent and the United Kingdom. It had an audience of approximately 27 million viewers and was available to 300 million households worldwide. I think an investment of \$150 000 gave Western Australia enormous coverage. Indeed, at the time people from Scotland contacted me saying that they had just seen me on television. I am sure they were not looking to see me, but it was seen right around the world.

[2.50 pm]

Mr M. McGOWAN: To conclude my point, the Premier said that the long-term plan—I have heard him say it in this forum before—is to construct additional buildings and so forth. When does the Premier envisage that will happen?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I would hope in the next 10 years—somewhere in that time frame.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: A large number of departments are moving from their accommodation on St George’s Terrace, mainly to Dumas House. What are the overall savings of moving them to the new precinct?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I think Hon Simon O’Brien has put that in a few media statements. The savings are very significant. It is a saving of well over \$20 million, even for the moves that have been changed. The rental prices for high-quality accommodation in Perth have risen dramatically. Even the cost of staying at Governor Stirling Tower, which the government is progressively moving out of, would have been significantly higher than the current rental cost. Moving government offices out of the CBD into Dumas House is estimated to save \$11 million a year over the next 15 years. That is a saving of \$165 million on that exercise alone. That is a good efficiency measure within government. As an old-style cost accountant, Hon Max Evans used to say to me, relentlessly, that government should never rent. The government does not pay tax and so it should never rent. It should always own its buildings.

Mr M. McGOWAN: Was he clear when he said that?

Chairman; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mr Bill Johnston; Dr
Mike Nahan; Mr Ian Blayney

Mr C.J. BARNETT: Yes, and he was absolutely right. That demonstrates how much a non-taxed entity, which the government is, can save by moving out of rented accommodation into owned accommodation. There are huge savings across government.

Mr B.S. WYATT: Premier, coming back to the total number of full-time equivalents for 2011–12 in the Department of the Premier and Cabinet being 701, does that include people employed pursuant to the contract for the provision of temporary personnel services for the whole of government, reference CUA 22008, which closed in June 2009 and which expires in 2014? Does that include people employed pursuant to that \$200 million tender?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: A \$200 million tender for what?

Mr B.S. WYATT: It is to provide temporary personnel services for the whole of government. Does the Department of the Premier and Cabinet employ, or has it engaged, people pursuant to that particular contract? Do those 701 FTEs include people pursuant to that contract?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I do not know the answer to that question. I ask Greg Moore to comment.

Mr G.J. Moore: The FTEs of the department are only paid staff. Temporary staff under that CUA are usually provided on a temporary basis to fill an immediate gap. If someone phones in sick and we do not have staff to cover a work station, we will contact a temporary organisation of that CUA and it will provide a person. We do not employ that person; we pay a service to the CUA provider and it pays the temporary person.

Mr B.S. WYATT: Is that contract only to replace one of those 701 FTEs who are away for various reasons?

Mr G.J. Moore: I would not use the term “replace”; they are there to supplement staff numbers, which are pre-provided through the Department of Finance by the CUA. They are put through a number of organisations that provide temporary staff and are made available to agencies across the sector.

Mr B.S. WYATT: If all 701 of those FTE positions are occupied today and they are all busily working at their desk, will people also be employed under the CUA above and beyond those 701 FTEs?

Mr G.J. Moore: They could be utilised for temporary purposes but they do not fall within the salary vote of the department; it is paid out of the professional services’ contingency budget.

Mr B.S. WYATT: So, they are not captured by the 701 FTEs?

Mr G.J. Moore: That is correct.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: Occasionally in my office there is a temporary receptionist if someone has left, and the vacancy is filled by the temp until a permanent appointment is made. That is relatively common.

Mr B.S. WYATT: This contract deals also with senior executives; this is not just about receptionists.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: If the member is suggesting that there is another layer of staffing, that is not true.

Mr B.S. WYATT: That is what I am trying to work out.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: It is not there.

Mr B.S. WYATT: How many people are employed—or whatever term it is—by the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, pursuant to that CUA?

Mr G.J. Moore: It is a moving feast in a sense because we do not know when people will not be available for a whole host of reasons and whose positions we cannot fill by shuffling paid FTEs. It is more convenient if we know it is only a short temporary arrangement to bring someone in through the CUA.

Mr B.S. WYATT: What is the longest someone can be employed through the CUA?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: Again I refer to Mr Moore.

Mr G.J. Moore: Again, it is a question of how long is a piece of string. I know that we have used some of them for a couple of months because we have had to fill a gap. In the time it takes to put out an expression of interest to find another body or to look at a redeployment-type process, it could be more than a couple of weeks, by which time it is more efficient to bring in a temporary staff member from the CUA providers.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I make a correction on behalf of the director general. He apparently said there were 701 FTEs. The correct number is 730.

Mr B.S. WYATT: You have just got 29 extra staff, Premier!

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: I want to ask another question about the Leader of the Opposition’s office. I know that the government always provides an office for the Leader of the Opposition, but in these costings, does he still

Chairman; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mr Bill Johnston; Dr
Mike Nahan; Mr Ian Blayney

have one office or does he now have more than one office? If he has more than one office, can the Premier provide the correspondence between himself and the department relating to either the current or former Leader of the Opposition about the provision of two offices and the arrangements around that?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I have not seen any correspondence on that, but there are obviously two offices for the Leader of the Opposition—the office here in Parliament house and the office for additional staff. Obviously, 14 people cannot fit into the Leader of the Opposition's office at Parliament House. I have not seen the new office—I hope it is suitable—which is in Hay Street and replaces the so-called "Summer Palace". I am not aware of the correspondence. I imagine that the Leader of the Opposition would have made certain requests, which is appropriate, and I think that they were accommodated. As far as I can see, the department did all it could to find suitable accommodation and make sure it was set up properly. In the longer term, if new buildings are attached to Parliament, it may be possible to consolidate the Leader of the Opposition's office into one site. That would be desirable. For as long as I have been here, successive oppositions have always been split between two sites.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: I refer to the total appropriations on page 77. What are the current salaries of Mr Pontifex and Mr Wedgwood?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: That is interesting, is it not? I think those figures are already on the public record; I am pretty sure they are. Mr Pontifex receives a base salary of \$305 000. I do not have Mr Wedgwood's contract. I will provide supplementary information for the salaries of Mr Pontifex and Mr Wedgwood.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: Can I just clarify that it is the salaries and other benefits?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: There is superannuation. I will provide that as supplementary information for both gentlemen.

[Supplementary Information No A7.]

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: Can we clarify exactly what that supplementary information is?

The CHAIRMAN: The member for Cannington is asking for salary and superannuation and other benefits.

[3.00 pm]

[Mr A.P. O'Gorman took the chair.]

Mr I.C. BLAYNEY: I refer the Premier to the thirteenth dot point on page 79 of budget paper No 2. From all accounts, the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting 2011 was an outstanding success and was well supported by the people of Perth. Does the Premier have any data detailing the attitudes of Western Australians to CHOGM 2011, please?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: Yes. It was interesting, if not surprising, to note the high level of interest that the people of Perth took in CHOGM, particularly the royal visit. As I said earlier, the estimate of up to 120 000 people who attended the barbeque is quite extraordinary. A survey was conducted during the period. The responses reveal that 98 per cent of residents surveyed in the metropolitan area were aware that CHOGM was to be held; 94 per cent were aware of a number of public events; an estimated 13 per cent attended the barbeque; 73 per cent agreed that CHOGM showcased Western Australia to the rest of the world; 73 per cent thought that hosting CHOGM in Perth was good for Western Australia; 64 per cent felt they were well informed about the public events; and 65 per cent said that CHOGM made them feel proud to live in Western Australia. Those survey results therefore indicate a high level of understanding and a high level of engagement and an overwhelming view by at least two-thirds of the population surveyed that CHOGM was a good event for the state and worth the effort—and I think it was too.

Mr B.S. WYATT: I missed what the Premier said. Who conducted the survey?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: It was commissioned through the Western Australian Tourism Commission.

Mr B.S. WYATT: Can the opposition be provided with a copy of the survey?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: No.

Mr B.S. WYATT: I am not asking for it now, but by way of supplementary information.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: The member can request it later through the tourism minister if he wants it.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: I seek clarification. How much did the survey cost?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I do not know. The member would need to address that to the tourism minister.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: Was it paid for as part of the CHOGM process or in some other way?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: It was part of the CHOGM process.

Mr B.S. WYATT: To follow-up, when was the survey done?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: The survey was done during the months of October and November.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: How many people were surveyed?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I do not know. I did not conduct the survey.

Mr B.S. WYATT: The Premier has just talked about it.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: The Premier has just talked about it, and it is worthwhile knowing the details.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I provided an answer to a question about the responses to the survey.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: We are just seeking the full details of the answer to the question.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: Ask a question on notice.

Mr B.S. WYATT: If the Premier is going to talk about the survey, he should at least talk about it.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: Is there any particular reason, Mr Chairman, that the Premier does not want to tell us?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: No. I do not have the information. If the member asks a question on notice of the Minister for Tourism, we can provide it. The Tourism Commission handled the survey.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: Could I finalise that issue? Was that survey part of the information tabled in Parliament?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I cannot answer that. I do not have the information in front of me. There is no secrecy about it, but if the member asks a question on notice of the Minister for Tourism, I am sure it will be provided.

Mr B.S. WYATT: Will it be provided by the government?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: Yes, I am sure it will. I do not have it. I was just relaying some of the public's response to CHOGM in response to the question.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: I refer to the fourth dot point from the bottom of page 79, which states —

The Premier will receive support and advice on the management of strategic infrastructure projects transforming the State and the Perth metropolitan area, such as the Perth Major Stadium.

Will a person be able to get on a train at Burswood stadium and get off the train at Midland as part of the plan to do that, or will they have to change trains in the city?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: The member needs to direct that question to the Minister for Transport. Transport has responsibility for planning the rail infrastructure. To the best of my understanding there will be designated platforms for each of the four arms, if you like, of the metropolitan rail system. Some change of train will be necessary in some cases. For example, people going down south to Mandurah will have to change trains to get on the Mandurah line. In other cases they will be able to go, for example, straight to Joondalup. However, if the member wants details on how that will work, bear in mind that it is still being planned. It is some time away before the infrastructure will be constructed, so planning is going on. The government has allocated \$300 million towards transport and it will be principally for the rail system and the bridge across the river.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: In the plan that the department is assisting with, how long will it take 42 000 people to get on a train; then will they have to wait for a train in the city to get onto another train; and how long will that take?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I recall the Minister for Transport answering the member's question in Parliament earlier this year.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: I have never asked the Minister for Transport those questions.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: Yes, I recall the minister answering the member's question. I think the answer was that something in the order of 30 000 people would be moved in 40 minutes. However, the member will again need to check that answer.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: Is that not the sort of planning that is being done in the Department of the Premier and Cabinet?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: No, it is being done by transport and planning; and of course it is being done.

Mr M. McGOWAN: My question follows on from that on page 79 about the Perth major stadium. A moment ago I heard the Premier say that \$300 million has been allocated for transport-related infrastructure and so forth, which I think is on top of the \$700 million that the Premier said the stadium will cost. I recall this morning being

Chairman; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mr Bill Johnston; Dr
Mike Nahan; Mr Ian Blayney

advised in the sport and recreation estimates hearing that there is no costing on the bridge over the river, or perhaps it has not been included.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: No. The Department of Sport and Recreation has responsibility for the stadium, not the transport infrastructure, and an allowance for the pedestrian bridge across the river is included in the allocation of \$300 million for transport infrastructure. Indeed there is some discussion going on at the moment about whether it will be pedestrian only or pedestrian plus a designated bus lane. Those decisions are yet to be made.

Mr M. McGOWAN: What is the expected cost of the bridge?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: The total transport infrastructure is estimated at \$300 million. If the bridge is pedestrian only, which is the original concept, obviously that will require a lesser standard of engineering construction than one that would also take buses.

Mr M. McGOWAN: The Premier said there was an allowance in the allocation of \$300 million.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: The figure of \$300 million is a global figure for infrastructure, which will cover both rail and buses. Obviously, there will be a terminal of sorts at the stadium and also the bridge across the river, which will probably come from the vicinity of the trotting ground.

Mr M. McGOWAN: What is the allowance the Premier referred to in the allocation of \$300 million?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I cannot answer that; I doubt that anyone can because the bridge is yet to be designed, and decisions are yet to be made about whether it will be pedestrian or pedestrian with a bus-designated lane. The stadium is still very early in the stages of planning. Most of the effort at the moment is going on the actual specification of the stadium itself. Once that is resolved—that work is probably being done with intensity now—and the stadium is settled, attention will shift more onto transport infrastructure. For the moment, the major issue about transport is to make sure that the positioning of the stadium allows fully for all transport options.

Mr M. McGOWAN: How was the figure of \$300 million arrived at if none of these costings has been put together?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: The estimates were based on the work done by the Langouant task force.

Mr M. McGOWAN: Is the Premier saying it examined the issue of transport across the river and so forth?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: It was done on the basis of the work it had done on an amount. It has not been designed. This is one of the great differences, I think, between the Labor Party and the Liberal Party: the Labor Party ponders on for years and gets nowhere. We actually make decisions and get on with them. The stadium is proceeding, and proceeding very rapidly but being done properly. As each component is designed and costed, that will be known as tenders are awarded. We are not at that stage of the stadium yet. We are still making basic decisions about the size of the stadium, the configuration, the size of the seating and the orientation of the oval. All those aspects will have an impact on transport. One of the decisions being looked at now is the level of cover across the seating area, such as the percentage of seats that will be 100 per cent dry in wet conditions. That is the level at which the stadium decisions are at, including transport infrastructure. There are therefore issues now about deciding the nature that the pedestrian-cum-transport-cum-bus bridge will be. It has not been decided.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: So none of those decisions has changed the extent of the cost of the project?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: The costings have been done on the advice of agencies based on the extent of the work that was done in the Langouant report; that is, \$700 million on the figures of the day for the stadium and \$300 million on the estimate for transport infrastructure.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: I am sorry, Mr Premier, I just want to clarify this. Is the Premier saying that these design questions on the infrastructure, both the transport and the stadium itself, do not have any impact on the cost of the project?

[3.10 pm]

Mr C.J. BARNETT: No; I did not say that at all. The member keeps on suggesting things I say. I did not say that at all.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: I am just trying to clarify what the Premier is saying. They do have an impact on the \$300 million and the \$700 million?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I am saying the final and detailed design of both the stadium and infrastructure—rail, bus pedestrian and vehicle—are yet to be finalised. Work is going on. That is why a task force is taking a couple of years to do it properly, unlike, I might say, the arena on which random decisions were taken as contracts were

Chairman; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mr Bill Johnston; Dr
Mike Nahan; Mr Ian Blayney

awarded. This is being done carefully and properly so that problems of the cost blowout on the arena are not repeated.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: Is the Premier saying that this careful work will prevent any chance of the cost increasing beyond \$700 million for the stadium and \$300 million for the transport infrastructure?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: No. I know the member is a new member of Parliament, but I did not say that.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: What are the parameters of the costs?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I am not going to dwell on a realm of hypotheticals. If the member has a question on the budget, I am happy to answer it. But I am not going into a hypothetical debate about a stadium that is yet to be designed.

Mr M. McGOWAN: I refer to advice on strategic infrastructure projects on page 79. I refer to the advice the Premier received on strategic infrastructure projects such as the Perth major stadium. Will that stadium include a car park; and, if so, what will be the additional cost?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: No; it will not include a car park, if the member is thinking of a car park under the oval. There will be no car park under the oval.

Mr M. McGOWAN: There will need to be a car park.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: There will be car parking, but the objective is that around 70 per cent of spectators will arrive by public transport. The oval is being planned on that premise.

Mr M. McGOWAN: If I can go into a little bit of depth on that, people with a disability, players, coaches, people who work there on a daily basis and the Premier will all probably want some sort of vehicular access for various reasons, one of which is security. There will need to be a car park.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: There will be parking at the stadium, including I would think some parking underneath the terraces for people with a disability and obviously servicing—caterers and the rest of it. There will be some parking in the area. Also use will be made, obviously, of parking at Belmont racecourse and maybe other parking in the vicinity. The whole premise of this, and why \$300 million is being allocated to public transport, is that 70 per cent of people will travel by public transport. There will not be vast parking areas around the stadium. It will be a landscaped area for multipurpose use. It will be very attractive and will include a concourse area, barbecues, playgrounds, water playgrounds, theatres and whatever else. That is the longer-term vision. The stadium will simply be the beginning of that whole east side precinct.

Mr M. McGOWAN: Theatres?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: There will be musical venues. There will be bands playing and outdoor entertainment, as most modern stadiums around the world have.

Mr B.S. WYATT: The Premier referred to other parking in the precinct. Are there any plans to create a parking space out of the remaining area that is currently the golf course?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: No. There will be some parking obviously for service vehicles and the like.

Mr B.S. WYATT: The first nine, for example.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: There will be parking for people with a disability. If the member is alluding to the golf course, it will not be turned into a giant parking area. There will be landscaped gardens with other potential sporting and entertainment facilities built within it in future years.

Mr M. McGOWAN: I go back to the original question about the overall cost of \$700 million plus \$300 million for transport infrastructure. Have any other estimates been provided to the Premier since he made that announcement?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: No; they are still the figures we were given.

Mr M. McGOWAN: Has he had any other estimates?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: No.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: Have the people giving the Premier advice had any contact with the Burswood Casino operators about people going to the stadium and using the Burswood car park?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I do not think Mr Packer would be too impressed with football fans using his car parks, so I imagine Burswood will administer that sort of thing.

Chairman; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mr Bill Johnston; Dr
Mike Nahan; Mr Ian Blayney

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: Has there been any discussion between the Burswood Casino and the people giving the Premier advice?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: Not to my knowledge. We have taken some pains to keep the stadium development entirely separate from any issue to do with the Burswood Casino.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: I refer to the decommissioning of the Office of Shared Services mentioned in the third line on page 77. The Office of Shared Services is allocated \$243 million. Can the Premier give me some indication of the total cost of the Office of Shared Services over its short, but costly, life? Is there any residual benefit from or effect of that program?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: That issue is being handled by the Department of Finance, which has taken on responsibility for the decommissioning of the Office of Shared Services. That does not fall under the Department of the Premier and Cabinet. It is a question for finance. It is a large amount of money, I think, well in excess of \$200 million.

Mr M. McGOWAN: We discussed people who have left the government secretariat and the Premier agreed to provide supplementary information on their payouts and so forth. I refer to operating costs and so forth of ministerial officers on page 81. I am interested in whether other people have left positions in ministerial offices and gone to positions in the public sector. If so, can the Premier provide a list of those people and what position they have gone to?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: It has been a firm policy under this government that people appointed by the executive as ministerial staff who are term-of-government appointees—in other words, not permanent public servants—cannot transfer into the public sector.

Mr M. McGOWAN: Or to government trading enterprises?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: One person did move into a government trading enterprise. That is a different matter. We looked at that carefully. But certainly no-one has moved into the public sector, as happened under previous governments. That cannot happen under the Liberal–National government.

Mr M. McGOWAN: But it has happened, the Premier just said.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: No; one individual did transfer into an energy utility. I think that is now not possible either, short of some reasonable time gap.

Mr M. McGOWAN: Which is what?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I think that question should be asked of the Public Sector Commissioner, who handles those issues. He will be able to answer that question when we get to that. We have strict guidelines that we cannot parachute a political appointment into the public service. That is one of the first decisions the Liberal–National government made.

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: I refer to the second dot point on page 79 of budget paper No 2, under “Significant Issues Impacting the Agency”. What role did the department play in bringing about the provision of integrated services for children under four years of age?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: Under this government, the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, particularly in the area headed by Rebecca Brown, has played a very important and effective role in areas of social policy. The partnership with the not-for-profit organisation—I attend several of its meetings—directly led to the 25 per cent increase in funding; namely, the \$604 million of extra money for not-for-profit organisations. That work continues as we try to make some reforms. The other major area has been in the establishment of child and parent centres, announced by me and the Minister for Education earlier this year—initially 10 centres, probably ultimately up to 40. The policy work has been driven very much out of Premier and Cabinet. Apart from the funding of about \$30 million for those centres, the state budget also included funding for an additional 100 child health nurses, some of whom may well work in those centres. That initiative is probably one of the unsung achievements, if I can say so, of this government. It has a very strong social conscience and a very effective way of channelling funds into areas of greatest need, such as to people with a disability, people suffering from mental health difficulties and, in this case, the most vulnerable children in our community who are often from the lower socioeconomic areas. The areas identified are Armadale, Banksia Grove, Girrawheen, Westminster, Carey Park, South Hedland, Langford, Calista and Balga. I think this initiative will make a major difference to the opportunities for those young children. Advice and assistance for parents and health checks and vaccinations for their children from birth right through to about eight or nine years old will be good. The location of child health nurses on the school grounds will prove to be effective because for many families, particularly families that might be under stress, and children, the school is the one constant in their lives, particularly for little kids.

Chairman; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mr Bill Johnston; Dr
Mike Nahan; Mr Ian Blayney

Mothers and fathers feel comfortable going to the school, even with preschool-age children. It is early days, but I have no doubt that will make a very significant difference to the opportunities for literally thousands of young boys and girls.

[3.20 pm]

Mr B.S. WYATT: In respect to the first part of that question regarding payments to non-government organisations, the Premier said that was —

... in order to raise the standard of their services by employing more and better qualified staff.

On 23 April this year, a question was put to Rebecca Brown about whether that achieved its outcome or whether that information was even collected. The evidence given was no; that information is not collected by the department but the work is “in train”. What stage is that work at and when will we be in a position to know whether that money is being spent on the specific outcomes that the Premier desires?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I will defer to Rebecca Brown in a moment. The first payment was simply a 15 per cent increase over about 1 000 contracts. That was simply to allow the department to pay staff better and to improve what they do. The second component, the 10 per cent, related to improved performance and reduced bureaucracy on the part of both government and the various agencies. That is the real work. The money was one part of it, but that is the real work in improving efficiency. I will ask Mrs Brown to comment on that.

Mrs R.A. Brown: I will make a couple of comments. In relation to the status of the evaluation framework, the partnership forum itself put forward a proposal to government in November 2011 for the monitoring of the sustainable funding and contracting initiative with the not-for-profit sector, which was announced as part of last year’s budget. That framework is being developed jointly in terms of the collection of that data, setting baseline targets and ongoing monitoring. That work is being progressed through an implementation working group between the public and the not-for-profit sector, which reports to the partnership forum. It is expected that the development of that framework and the collection of that data will be done throughout the second half of 2012 and reported to government later this year. In the interim, there are three core elements to the monitoring of that funding. The first is the collection of anecdotal data and evidence about how that money has been passed on to organisations. That is being monitored partly through the Western Australian Council of Social Service. It undertook a survey of organisations—this was earlier in the year—and reported that approximately 70 per cent of organisations had passed on that funding in increased salaries and wages to its staff. In addition, other organisations have reported either through their membership to their boards or, more generally, through the passing on of that funding through to salaries and wages of its employees.

Mr B.S. WYATT: Mrs Brown mentioned WACOSS and other organisations. Which other organisations did she receive anecdotal feedback from?

Mrs R.A. Brown: There has probably been quite a few. Off the top of my head, they are the Senses Foundation, the Centre for Cerebral Palsy and the Autism Association of Western Australia. There are probably quite a few others, but that is off the top of my head.

Mr B.S. WYATT: I have one more follow-up question. It may be a question for the Premier. From memory, there was a desire to reduce the number of contracts from 1 000—how has that progressed and are we now down below 1 000?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: That is the second stage; that is part of the 10 per cent. We hope to reduce the number of contracts. Mrs Brown might be able to answer this. Some agencies have a large number of contracts with the one agency.

Mrs R.A. Brown: At the next stage there is probably an opportunity to look at pooling agreements that sit with one line agency. Where a not-for-profit sector organisation has multiple contracts with that line agency, there is an opportunity to pool some of those contracts in the next stage of reviewing them. There will also be opportunities to look at master agreements or heads of agreement across those contracts. All of that work is done in partnership with the sector, so that we move through this change at a pace at which they are able to directly contribute to what that looks like, but also they have the capacity to move forward with those revised contracts.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: Did the Premier’s former deputy chief of staff, Richard May, go into a public sector position and what payout did he receive?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: Richard May is a long-term permanent public servant. He is not a term-of-government appointee. He worked in my office until recently. He chose to return to the traditional public service, so he is now in the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, not working for my office, although he continues to handle, amongst his duties, selected projects. They include the Anzac celebration for 2015, the 400th anniversary of

Chairman; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mr Bill Johnston; Dr
Mike Nahan; Mr Ian Blayney

Dirk Hartog's visit and a few other projects. He has taken some of those with him. They probably properly should be located within the department itself rather than my office. That has been a natural progression, but he is a permanent public servant who has served successive governments over many years.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: Does he continue to receive the same salary package that he did when he was working for the Premier?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: That would be my understanding. Yes, that is the case.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: I refer to the eighth dot point on page 79 under "Significant Issues Impacting the Agency". It states —

In liaison with other relevant agencies, the Department will monitor the impact to the State of the introduction of the Commonwealth carbon tax.

Will the department estimate across the state or across the department the impact to the government sector?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: Yes. That work is done by way of policy input from Premier and Cabinet and obviously also Treasury is involved. Treasury estimated that slightly over half of Western Australians will be worse off financially under the carbon tax, but the policy issues continue. I do not know that I can really add much more to it without getting on a soapbox and making the argument against a carbon tax. We continue to be extremely concerned about that. Although most of the focus has been on the immediate financial impact on individual households, there is wider concern about the impact on business, particularly in a state like Western Australia which is capital intensive and energy intensive. The carbon tax will have a high cost effect. It will reduce international competitiveness, and the irony is it will probably make very little, if any, difference to the composition of generation capacity. More people may take up photovoltaics but I do not think we will see major changes in the composition of energy. What I find galling about it is Western Australia has about 60 per cent of its power generation based on natural gas. Half to a third of emissions come from conventional coal power stations. The dirtiest power stations in Australia are the ones using brown coal in Victoria. They are the ones receiving the highest level of compensation. I cannot understand the logic of that; therefore that is why I am at a loss to understand why the Leader of the Opposition and the state Labor Party is so strongly supporting the carbon tax.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Will the Premier's assessment also include local government? The City of Canning has just been notified by the commonwealth that it will have to pay carbon tax to the tune of \$2 million.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I was unaware of that.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: That is a significant impost on City of Canning ratepayers. There might be other cities that will likewise impact.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I was unaware of that, but that is the policy.

The CHAIRMAN: It is supposed to be a question, member for Riverton, not a statement.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: I was eliciting a question; he just was not aware of it.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: It was an interesting conversation.

The CHAIRMAN: The member can make him aware other times; ask questions here.

Mr M. McGOWAN: I will go back to page 79 and to the major projects and the relationships from the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting and so forth. I have a couple of questions in relation to that. The Premier said that the government undertook some tourism polling surveys post-CHOGM that found some interesting results in relation to people's happiness. I have two questions. Did the Premier consider doing any surveys or consulting the public about the naming of the waterfront project? Was it something the Premier considered throwing open for public submissions or the general public to have something to say about that rather than it emerged, as he said before, from within government or from himself? That is my first question.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: The simple answer is no. With the use of a name—in this case the Queen, or a member of the royal family—there are quite strict protocols involved. It would not have been appropriate to have a public debate about that. The Leader of the Opposition can criticise it if he likes, but the government took the position that it would commemorate the diamond jubilee—in effect, the visit by the Queen last year to Perth around CHOGM and all the events. The Leader of the Opposition can criticise it and tell me if he does not like the name; that is a matter of personal opinion. But no, we did not. Given we were discussing that with Buckingham Palace, we did not contemplate any sort of public survey or opinion poll being held. To have done so would have been both discourteous and inappropriate.

[3.30 pm]

Chairman; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mr Bill Johnston; Dr
Mike Nahan; Mr Ian Blayney

Mr M. McGOWAN: Obviously, once the name had been decided on, that would have been inappropriate because it would not have been very worthwhile to survey at that point in time. My question is more about before the Premier decided upon a name. Had it occurred to the Premier that maybe he should seek public submissions, have a public naming competition or accept ideas from the public—or something of that nature—before he decided himself on the name?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I guess it would have occurred; there are all sorts of ways to go about selecting a name. But as I answered earlier, the government headed down this path over a year ago.

Mr M. McGOWAN: My second question is about the polling and what have you conducted by the Western Australian Tourism Commission post the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting. My question relates to broader polling and so forth by the government. What surveys, polling and the like—does the government, or the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, undertake in respect of what issues? Can the Premier outline for us what that is?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I will stand corrected if there has been, but to the best of my knowledge no polling has been done by this government. We do not do that; I do not believe it is appropriate. But I would not guarantee that some opinion polling has not been done by some agencies on particular projects or issues. I will ask the director general, but there is certainly no general polling. If the Leader of the Opposition is alluding to general political or attitudinal polling, that is not something this government does. I will hand to the director general as to whether there has been any specific polling to gain public opinion on certain issues or certain plans. The planning agency may poll residents on planning matters and the like.

Mr P.F. Conran: I am not aware of any polling.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: In other words, we do not do it. The opposition did it, but we do not.

Mr M. McGOWAN: The Premier said a moment ago that Tourism did it, so it is a fair question.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: Yes, polling on attitudes to CHOGM. I took the member's question to mean general polling as has been done by previous governments on preferences of people—attitudes and the like. We do not do that. This was specific polling on CHOGM.

Mr M. McGOWAN: On a specific issue.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: Yes.

Mr M. McGOWAN: Are there any other specific issues?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: Not to my knowledge; I cannot think of any—not for Premier and Cabinet. There may be some in other agencies, but off the top of my head, I cannot think of any.

Mr M. McGOWAN: I will come back to my question about Dumas House. The Premier indicated that the Department of Finance is looking at going onto the third floor —

Mr C.J. BARNETT: One part of the finance department.

Mr M. McGOWAN: Part of the Department of Finance is looking at going onto the third floor, although the Premier was not positive which part. Are there other parts of the building that have not as yet been allocated to a specific part of any particular agency, apart from the fourteenth floor and the third floor?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: People are moving across—every week people are moving out of Governor Stirling Tower—and that is an ongoing process. But Dumas House will be fully occupied, except for the level on which the plant and equipment is located. It is something I did not know about, but obviously the level on which the plant and equipment for the building is located is clearly inappropriate for any long-term accommodation for public servants. Also on that level, apparently, there is only one lift; it is a plant level. Most buildings have a floor for plant and equipment, and that is clearly it for Dumas House.

Mr M. McGOWAN: As I recall, the original budget to refurbish the inside and outside of Dumas House was something in the nature of \$60 million. Can the Premier provide advice as to the total budget for the refurbishment and where it is at now?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: Prior to the occupation of Dumas House—I think this is correct—the refit to accommodate staff was estimated at \$26 million. Basically, as the member would have observed, it is a complete gutting and refurbishing of all of Dumas House. A further \$21 million is required to comply with the Building Code of Australia, particularly the Disability Discrimination Act. So, it is not a matter of simply refurbishing a 1960s building; it has to have the appropriate level of disability access, and the Building Code standards are clearly higher. I think some floors may not even have had fire sprinklers and the like—they were not standard fittings in

Chairman; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mr Bill Johnston; Dr
Mike Nahan; Mr Ian Blayney

the 1960s—so that all had to be put in. Not only has it been brought up to a new building standard aesthetically, but also it now has all the safety and protective standards—fire sprinklers and the like—and disability access that a modern building would have. If that is added up, \$47 million would probably do it.

Mr M. McGOWAN: As I recall, another \$9 million or so was required for work on the outside of that building or something of that nature. I am just wondering what the total cost is now expected to be.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I am advised that in addition to the \$21 million and the \$26 million, the external facade needs maintenance, with the removal of some asbestos slabs and other work, and that will be an estimated additional \$9 million. At the completion of that, the building will be totally refurbished and have a life of probably around 20 years at that standard.

Mr M. McGOWAN: Considering the figure has moved as the question has gone along, what will the total figure be at the end of all this?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: It is \$21 million, plus \$26 million, plus \$9 million.

Mr M. McGOWAN: Yes, that is what the Premier is saying, but is that what the total figure will actually be, as opposed to the budgeted figure?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: Yes, to the best of everyone's knowledge. I do not think there are any hidden secrets there. It is a government-owned building. It is on the Register of Heritage Places. If it was to be used at all, it had to have disability access and fire sprinklers, and it had to have the external asbestos removed—all those things. It is a large building with large floor areas, it is government owned, and it forms the principal building of that parliamentary precinct.

The appropriation was recommended.