

APPROPRIATION (CAPITAL 2015–16) BILL 2015

Third Reading

Resumed from an earlier stage of the sitting.

MR R.H. COOK (Kwinana — Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [2.46 pm]: Before I was so rudely interrupted by the lunchbreak, I was talking about the bromance between the Minister for Health and the former Minister for Health, Jim McGinty. I did not want to go into this shady territory, but I was inspired by the member for Geraldton, with his interjection that drew our attention to the great work that Jim McGinty had done for the hospital in his electorate. Of course, we cannot go on without making the observation that the Minister for Health refers repeatedly to Jim McGinty. Either something is Jim McGinty's fault or justified by saying that Jim McGinty would have done it, or the Minister for Health is better than Jim McGinty. We have just come from estimates and, in the seven years that the Minister for Health has been in the job, we are always reminded how few advisers he brings in to this place, compared with Jim McGinty. I must confess that on this occasion the minister is right. I have done some research over the lunchbreak, and I found that Jim McGinty did have an extraordinary number of people in here as advisers in estimates hearings. In 2006 he had 21; in 2007 he had 17; and in 2008 he had 22 advisers. I must add that that included consultants and advisers on the extraordinary reform process for health infrastructure that the previous Labor government had undertaken under the Reid review, so there were extra advisers in relation to that. It would be remiss of me not to give the present minister credit where it is due. In 2009, he had just 14 advisers in here; in 2010, 12 advisers; in 2011, 15 advisers—maybe he was getting a bit insecure that year—in 2012, 11; in 2013, 14; in 2014, 14; and in 2015, 15 advisers. It was a very lean team indeed, and one that I am sure the minister would be very keen for us to compare and contrast with his great hero and brother in arms, the former Minister for Health, Jim McGinty.

Dr K.D. Hames: And mentor.

Mr R.H. COOK: And mentor, as the minister observes. Once again, we celebrate the bromance that has extended over the long period that the minister has been in this place.

I want to finish on the points that I was making about the Quadriplegic Centre. I must confess that that situation was brought to my attention—I do not pretend to be a long-term advocate of the Quadriplegic Centre—because of the appalling situation that Mr Greg Evans, a patient, encountered at that hospital. He was tragically and sadly scalded very badly because of a faulty thermostat on the hot-water system. We wish Mr Evans all the best for a speedy recovery from those burns and hope that his experience will at least spur this government on to bring about changes to that centre.

I want to finish by just touching on the situation at Fiona Stanley Hospital.

Point of Order

Dr K.D. HAMES: The member is making an excellent contribution, but it is very difficult to hear.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms J.M. Freeman): Members, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has the call. There are lots of conversations going on around the chamber, so if you need to have a conversation, go outside; otherwise, listen to the member. Member for Willagee, that is not appreciated, thank you very much.

Debate Resumed

Mr R.H. COOK: The situation at Fiona Stanley Hospital —

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members! Just completely ignore the Chair! That is not a good look. I will just stand here. I know that there is lots of discussion about the opportunity to go home a little early, so if I keep standing up, there is no going home early.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members! I am just going to keep standing here until we settle. Are we settled now? Thank you.

Mr R.H. COOK: Obviously, in discussing the capital component of the budget, we are drawn to the many tens of millions of extra dollars that the government has spent on the information and communications technology equipment at Fiona Stanley Hospital. We were assured by the Minister for Health that the reason the government was spending that extra amount was to not only overcome the problems of the previous work done in that space, but also ensure that the hospital had the best possible system so that it could operate properly. Much has been spoken about the transition of services from Fremantle Hospital and Royal Perth Hospital to Fiona Stanley Hospital, and I think it is fair to say that from the evidence we have seen thus far, there has been a monumental failure by this government with these things.

Mr Roger Cook; Dr Kim Hames; Acting Speaker; Mr David Templeman; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Ms Margaret Quirk; Dr Mike Nahan

I want to talk briefly about the issue of the loss of files at the hospital. I spoke recently about a Hillarys man who went to Fiona Stanley Hospital to receive cancer treatment only to be told by the specialist oncologist, after he had waited many hours to be seen, that his files had been lost. In addition, he said that he was told that many patients' files had been lost.

We were also reminded of the experiences of Mr Jared Olsen, who tragically died at that hospital recently, through the evidence provided to the Education and Health Standing Committee yesterday by his father, Mr Phillip Olsen. What was clear in that evidence was the failure of that hospital's system for the discharge summary and the system that drove the communication of that discharge summary from the hospital to Mr Jared Olsen's general practitioner. We now know from the evidence given by Mr Olsen and from media coverage that the systems in place were inadequate for that GP to either receive that information or acknowledge that he had received that information and therefore understand the implications of the test results that were sent to him. Had the GP received that information, I would hope that we would have seen a very different situation for Mr Jared Olsen. One observation that was made that was particularly concerning was that the database of information that the hospital had to contact the GP was also inadequate. We see this emerging pattern of systemic failure in the communication systems at Fiona Stanley Hospital and systemic failure in the information and databases it has at hand.

My attention has been drawn to a posting on Facebook about the online article. This person observes —

Shambles here, we took our daughter here as she was complaining of stomach cramps, my partner updated all her details on arrival with hospital admin as he had changed mobile numbers and address since last being admitted to a public hospital. They sent daughter home after doing tests saying everything seems fine. 2 weeks later daughter still complaining of sore stomach, we were forwarded a letter from Fiona Stanley hospital that was sent to partners old address saying they found bacteria in her stomach and that they tried contacting my partner (on old mobile number that she updated) with no success. Partner took daughter to dr and presented the letter from the hospital but our local GP didn't know what bacteria it was as they didn't say in letter. When GP called hospital they couldn't locate our records.

Mr R.H. COOK: This seems to be an emerging pattern at this hospital.

Mr R.F. Johnson interjected.

Mr R.H. COOK: It is appalling, member for Hillarys. I hope that the Education and Health Standing Committee gets to the bottom of this matter.

The government talks about its capital works and the hospitals it builds, but all these failures with the capital works it has not undertaken or has failed to undertake properly mean that patients are not being put first. If it turns out that that is the case, the minister really should reconsider his position in this place.

MR D.A. TEMPLEMAN (Mandurah) [2.56 pm]: I would like to make a contribution to the third reading debate on the Appropriation (Capital 2015–16) Bill 2015. I want to focus on three key items in the capital aspect of the budget. I see that the member for Dawesville has left the chamber; he was worried that I might have had a go at him today.

The first item is the government's commitment through Main Roads Western Australia to the replacement of the old Mandurah traffic bridge. I really need to put on record the significance of both the old Mandurah traffic bridge and its proposed replacement. Members need to understand that the old Mandurah traffic bridge is 63 years old. It is a significant iconic element of Mandurah and, indeed, the Peel region. When the bridge was built, it replaced a very rickety structure that connected the eastern side of Mandurah where the Mandurah town site or CBD is now with the western side. Indeed, on the birthday cards that I send to my constituents—I thought I had one with me that I could table, but I do not think I do—there is a picture of the bridge prior to what is now known as the old traffic bridge. In the foreground of that picture, fishermen are preparing their nets for fishing, with the Brighton Hotel in the background. The old Mandurah traffic bridge connection is very significant. I understand the decision to replace the existing bridge, but I just hope that, in this whole process, the final design reflects the significance of the new structure for the future from a historical, heritage, cultural and social perspective. What is proposed is a new bridge that will follow the alignment of Pinjarra Road and curve slightly before it lands on the western side. The existing old Mandurah traffic bridge will still be left at this stage to the south, but, of course, the tender program proposes to include the ultimate decommissioning, I think, of the existing bridge. The question needs to be asked: what does that decommissioning mean? There is some thought in town that some elements of the old bridge should be kept intact or indeed saved for historical purposes and continue to be used for functions including fishing and whatever. I will come back to that. I made submissions and spoke to the original chair of the original committee set up to look at the whole process of the bridge replacement. In my view there have always been some key things that must be delivered in this new bridge. The

Mr Roger Cook; Dr Kim Hames; Acting Speaker; Mr David Templeman; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Ms Margaret Quirk; Dr Mike Nahan

first is that it must be iconic. We cannot just have a simple engineering option—that is, a bland bridge that delivers traffic and caters for expanded traffic demand that we know exists and will exist in the future, as it must do. I understand all that, but there is significance to this project. This bridge very much epitomises Mandurah to so many Western Australians, visitors from outside the region, from outside the state and internationally. Yesterday, I saw a very interesting YouTube video of an American fellow jumping off the existing bridge—this was going viral—called “the ultimate wedgie”. This fellow had an interesting contraption attached to the back of his underpants and he jumped off the old traffic bridge and created what was according to him the ultimate wedgie.

Mr W.J. Johnston: Where are you going with this?

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: I do not know; I have no idea where I am going with this!

Several members interjected.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: No, he did not.

Dr M.D. Nahan: That could be to Mandurah what bungee jumping is for Kiwis!

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: It could! But this ultimate wedgie, as it was known, went viral. That is maybe the humorous aspect, but it must be understood that what I want for this bridge, and what I think people who live in the Peel want, is a wow factor. When people come to visit our community when this bridge is built, they will be able to go and ask their families and friends, whether they live in Perth, in other parts of WA, other parts of Australia or internationally, “Have you seen that magnificent structure they have created in that place called Mandurah?” It is our chance. I am not attacking engineers; I have a go at the city engineers in Mandurah every now and again, but I am not attacking them. However, we have to understand the significance of this. This bridge will probably stand for the next 100 years and we must not lose the opportunity to make sure we leave a legacy that is astounding, outstanding and something we can be proud of. I am honestly hopeful that this project has that particular wow factor. It must be a project that reflects the heritage and history of our community.

One thing I will commend the former Court government on was that the then Premier took a direct interest in the Mandurah Performing Arts Centre project.

Mr W.J. Johnston interjected.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: He launched his campaign at it and I defeated the sitting Liberal member not long after that launch! However, the Premier of the day recognised the iconic nature of Mandjar Square and Mandjar Bay, which is the bay that takes in the two foreshore aspects and the ocean channel. Premier Court did something very good. I was a City of Mandurah councillor, deputy mayor, at the time. When Premier Court and the government of the day commissioned the architects Hames Sharley to do the design, the Premier took a direct interest in that project. He recognised the importance of the old bridge. For some members who may not be aware, the actual design structures, the pillars that make up the performing arts centre facade that faces out to the water, including the large poles that actually have their feet in the water, are a direct reflection of the old traffic bridge we are going to see the demise of in less than two years. It was the Premier of the day who took an interest and understood, I think, the importance of reflecting the place’s identity and its cultural heritage values. That is why our performing arts centre is a beacon of performing arts centres in Australia—because of that reflection. The same focus should be on this replacement bridge. The worry I have is that in the midst of getting this project up and getting this bridge built the focus on making it something remarkable and iconic could be lost. The design will be decided and construction well on the way before the next election, because it is supposed to be starting by the end of this year, so I appeal to the government of the day to understand the significance of this. Let us get something iconic, something absolutely special. It will have a north facing facade; the northern facade will be seen all the way around Mandjar Bay. Anyone on the Mandurah foreshore or at the northern end where the performing arts centre is or around the existing peninsula of the inlet or at the magnificent Mandurah War Memorial, which is one of the best war memorials in Australia, will have a direct vantage point to the northern facade. Therefore, that northern facade of the bridge becomes crucial. It is the picture postcard of my city. I am holding up for Hansard’s sake one of the cards I send out that shows the northern facade of the old Mandurah bridge and I have another one that shows the southern facade. I am just holding up these cards for Hansard’s sake. This is significant. Unfortunately, I do not think the Premier will take a direct interest in this, although I wish he would, but I want someone to. Maybe this is the legacy for the Deputy Premier. I had a go at him yesterday—he called me a show pony—but maybe this is his legacy. If we do this right, this will put Mandurah on the map for all the right reasons. I see that at night there would be the potential of lighting it properly so the northern facade is lit. Anyone who has been to Sydney in May will have seen the Vivid festival there when there is lighting at some of its key feature buildings—the Opera House, even the Sydney Harbour Bridge, the Museum of Contemporary Art at The Rocks—all of those buildings or facades light up at night.

Mr Roger Cook; Dr Kim Hames; Acting Speaker; Mr David Templeman; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Ms Margaret Quirk; Dr Mike Nahan

Hundreds of thousands of people go to that festival in Sydney for that two or three-week period. The potential for this bridge to be the iconic element that cements Mandurah as a magnificent place to live, work, recreate and visit is there. I do not want the City of Mandurah or the government, as a custodian of this project, to miss the opportunity. I will also say regarding the new Mandurah bridge that there is the potential for cafes to be built in as the bridge lands on the western side, in and under, facing the northern facade, to take advantage of the north-facing aspects, while being protected from the prevailing south west winds. It will be a protected element. There could be a restaurant/cafe aspect where the bridge lands on the western side, sweeping out and over onto the western foreshore. Please, if there is nothing the Treasurer has heard in the 10 or so hours of debate we have had this week, I appeal to him to work on the Deputy Premier in particular about understanding why this is significant. It is significant to me because I have lived there for 28 years.

Dr M.D. Nahan: He was the greatest proponent.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: The Treasurer is not listening. I am talking about the iconic aspect, which is crucial. The northern facade could be lit with solar-powered lighting, and it could take advantage of the increased pedestrian capacity. The present pedestrian path is just over one metre wide, and it will increase to five metres—excellent; it would be tremendous.

I want to say one last thing on the bridge, because I will finish shortly. We need to make sure that local content is used as much as possible in its construction. I have to report to the house that another bridge is being built in Mandurah, but building has come to a standstill. It is the footbridge over the Mandurah entrance road. A crane has been parked there for nearly two months. Steel structures were manufactured in China, where the manufacturing is substandard to Australian standards. I have written a number of questions to the City of Mandurah, which is overseeing the project, and was promised some responses but I am still waiting. There has been a lot of community questioning about why it is being delayed. On 26 April the spans across Mandurah Road were supposed to have been lifted to join the Mandurah train station, thus connecting the Greenfields side of Mandurah to the train station, but it has come to a halt. I was told that it would be lifted into place tomorrow. It ain't going to happen. The questions being asked are: Why is the contract stalled? Why was there no checking of the steel fabrication before it left China and came to Australia? Is it safe? What will it cost; are there extra cost overruns; and who will pay for them? The ratepayers, quite rightly, will be saying that they should not be billed for any cost overrun of it. I do not want to see the construction of our new traffic bridge a repeat of this project. People, rightly, want to know whether there is going to be local content in any steel aspect of the new Mandurah traffic bridge. Will there be local content, be it local or state businesses having a genuine share of that contract?

Mr R.F. Johnson: Is that where those roads were built in the last 12 months?

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: Yes, but the actual bridge structure is sitting on either side of the road and there is a big crane there.

Mr R.F. Johnson: It is going nowhere.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: It has been there for more than two months. It was supposed to have been lifted into place in April. Something has gone wrong and we are not hearing exactly what it is. I think there is a contractual problem. It has been difficult getting answers, but I think some questions need to be asked.

I will just say about the old traffic bridge, on 1 April this year—this is again a warning to members of the Liberal Party, particularly about their leader—an April Fools' Day joke was pulled in Mandurah. The local Coast FM station very sneakily and cheekily broadcast as their April fool's joke that the new traffic bridge was to be called the Colin Barnett Bridge. I have to tell members—they should have seen the response. I am sorry —

Mr P.T. Miles interjected.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: That was mentioned. I was quite proud. A few people said that they wanted to name it after me, and I was very honoured. I have to tell members opposite that—a lot of people got hooked by it—when they saw it was proposed to be called the Colin Barnett Bridge and if they were in the Liberal Party, they would not have been very happy about the straw poll.

Mr R.F. Johnson: As a property owner in Mandurah and part-time resident, I probably have the same view as them.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: Yes; although some expletives were used in some of the Facebook responses that I could not possibly repeat in this place. I note that National Party members seem able to use the sort of inappropriate language enunciated in the other place—I am not sure what province or region that National Party member is from—yesterday afternoon during the estimates hearings, but members would not hear me using that sort of language!

Mr R.F. Johnson: What did she say?

Mr Roger Cook; Dr Kim Hames; Acting Speaker; Mr David Templeman; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr
Chris Tallentire; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Ms Margaret Quirk; Dr Mike Nahan

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: I could not possibly repeat it.

The final thing I want to mention is the electronic school zone signs program. I wrote to the Minister for Police and the then Minister for Transport in February 2014 about what I consider to be an urgent priority. I think all the schools in Mandurah and Dawesville should be priorities but I wrote about what I consider to be urgent priorities. I did not receive a response from either minister. The urgent priorities I highlighted concerning the rollout of this program included Catalina Drive, which now has two schools side by side on it, in Lakelands—there was no response to that—and Lakes Road, where the Foundation Christian College is, and just up from Minilya Parkway is Riverside Primary School. Again, Lakes Road is very busy, so that is an absolute priority. The other priority I highlighted at that time was Meadow Springs Primary School on Oakmont Avenue, because there is only one road that effectively allows parents to drop their children off, and that is Oakmont Avenue. That was highlighted as a priority. Unfortunately, there was no response. I note that none of the Mandurah schools was included on the list of schools published as having received funding for their school zones in 2013–14 and 2014–15. I think there were two in the member for Murray–Wellington’s electorate, from memory, and none in Mandurah.

I am appealing to the Treasurer for the capital investment. I wrote only about three weeks ago to the Minister for Transport asking why regional schools were not being given priority in this next round, because it appears that Mandurah has missed out. I have to tell members that a service station and a McDonalds store were approved on Minilya Parkway, the road that comes off Lakes Road, and where the children who go to Riverside Primary School cross, and immediately opposite is Foundation Christian College which has K to 12 students, yet there is no proposal at this stage for flashing pedestrian lights there. I want to know why that is the case and I want to know why the minister is discriminating against regional schools, particularly those near high volumes of traffic and with high student numbers. I will follow that up again and ask why the minister is not delivering to those Mandurah schools, particularly the three I mentioned. Other Mandurah schools should be considered, but the ones on Catalina Drive and Lakes Road and those near Meadow Springs Primary School in particular are absolute priorities. They should be funded under this program in this coming financial year.

MR W.J. JOHNSTON (Cannington) [3.19 pm]: I am very pleased to rise to speak on the Appropriation (Capital 2015–16) Bill 2015 after the member the Mandurah. He gave a great contribution as always and identified so many important issues for his local community. And he did not even use the 30 minutes allocated to him, so even the government members cannot complain about his contribution. As always, it is a pleasure to follow on from him.

I want to start by making an observation about the government’s investment program in the health sector. I note that it is collapsing over the forward estimates and going down to very, very low levels. I am always entertained by the Minister for Health in question time. We do word bingo on this side of the chamber about how many times he will use the words: “Jim McGinty”, “Reid review”, “the member for West Swan”, “I don’t know why you are complaining, I am only doing what you were going to do” and our other favourite “This was Jim McGinty’s plan”. That is on our word bingo card. We tick them off and always get particular entertainment. Today, I want to focus on the minister’s comments about the member for West Swan considering the capital works program in the budget that the minister continually tells us is based on the Reid review. I do not have the specific page reference, but it is in budget paper No 2 volume 1. I am indebted to a question that the Acting Speaker asked Treasury boffins when we saw them. On page 42 of the “Budget Briefing 2015–16” tabled this morning by the Public Accounts Committee a question recorded under slide 20 states —

Question: Slide 20—‘Fiscal Outlook’ Composition of Asset Investment Program is Changing. Question from Hon Janine Freeman MLA,

The Acting Speaker got a promotion. The question to the boffins was —

- (4) Can you please provide a version of the same slide with an additional line displaying Health’s proportional share against the right-hand side axis?

The answer shows that the share of public works going to the Department of Health over the forward estimates declines to below five per cent or perhaps \$50 million or \$100 million on the scale. I am indebted to the Acting Speaker for asking that question.

I make the point about the minister’s view of the investment in the health sector: he says that it was in the Reid review and the member for West Swan was a member of the Reid review. The Reid review was a series of recommendations to government, which the government considered and made decisions on. The Minister for Health never likes to look at the Labor Party’s response to the Reid review. Sometimes he wants to take 100 per cent of what is stated in the Reid review, for example, to justify closing services rather than investing in physical infrastructure at Bentley Health Service. He uses the Reid review as a justification for cutting services

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Thursday, 25 June 2015]

p4898d-4916a

Mr Roger Cook; Dr Kim Hames; Acting Speaker; Mr David Templeman; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Ms Margaret Quirk; Dr Mike Nahan

at Bentley, but then says that it does not matter that the Reid review recommended a different approach to Royal Perth Hospital—he has a policy. The minister is not prepared to look at what the Labor Party was going to do.

Today we saw that in respect of the member for Fremantle’s comment about the closing of the emergency department at Fremantle Hospital, because that was a recommendation to government. Of course, the member for West Swan who was a highly respected Treasury official was part of that review, and she made a great contribution to it. The member for West Swan interjects and gets called to order about the government’s asset investment program for health that is laid out in budget paper No 2 volume 1. If the government says that its reason for closing the ED at Fremantle Hospital is because it was in the Reid review, so was Fiona Stanley Hospital, the Perth Children’s Hospital, the Midland Public Hospital, the upgrade of Rockingham General Hospital, the upgrade of Armadale–Kelmescott District Memorial Hospital, the expansion of Joondalup Health Campus and moving services close to where people live to get higher use of low-cost services in secondary hospitals rather than all patients being treated in tertiary hospitals, so there is a lower cost outcome for the whole system. I am sure next time the Minister for Health returns to the chamber in question time, he will point out all the great things the member for West Swan did.

I turn to the \$440 million expenditure on Elizabeth Quay. Members may remember and should keep in mind that when the Elizabeth Quay project was announced a group of people—particularly from the western suburbs—a number of planners, architects and others with great expertise in planning and urban design and development who called themselves the City Gatekeepers campaigned against the Elizabeth Quay project. The Premier labelled this group the “grass keepers” and said that they were trying to protect the grass on the Esplanade. That is why I am shocked to find that having spent \$440 million out of the Metropolitan Redevelopment Authority and more money out of other agencies on Elizabeth Quay, the government’s plan is to put the grass back on Elizabeth Quay. Interestingly, I made this prediction about four or five years ago during the last term of government. I made the point that the government would have no choice but to do that because it would take 20 years to get those blocks filled. Of course, we now know that the MRA’s view is that it will be 20 years to 25 years. I said that the government would have to do something with the blocks; I said that it would have to put the grass back—that is exactly what the government’s plan is. The government spent \$440 million to put the grass back on the Esplanade. That is just an unbelievably stupid decision.

I have always made the point that we want to activate the Esplanade, why not simply spend that \$440 million to build something that people want to visit, such as an Indigenous museum? Members should go to Wellington and visit Te Papa Tongarewa. Te Papa is unbelievably good. It weaves the story of pre-European history to European history. It not just weaves the story of New Zealand in a white context, but in a Melanesian and Micronesian context. It connects New Zealand to the people of the South Pacific as well as the people of Europe. It is a brilliant facility. It sits over the harbour in Wellington and is a joy to visit. It has interactive and traditional exhibits and historic artefacts. It is just a sensational facility. We could have built a museum of that quality for \$440 million between Barrack Square and the Perth Convention and Exhibition Centre, which would have activated that space.

I did not agree with the gatekeepers’ plan for the Esplanade; they wanted to keep it as it was. I never supported that, but I did support not cutting Riverside Drive, because it is an essential piece of transport infrastructure for the people of the eastern suburbs—I could not care about the western suburbs—as it connects the eastern suburbs to the University of Western Australia, Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital and West Perth, where there is employment. It connects education, health and employment areas to the eastern suburbs. Cutting Riverside Drive was a mistake.

The government wants to have this both ways; we cannot have a four-lane road because tourists will not be able to cross it. Unlike in Paris, people have to cross a freeway to get to the Seine. In London, people have to cross two lanes to get to the Thames. In New York, people have to cross a freeway to get to Battery Park. That is what happens. In Tokyo, people have to cross a freeway to get to the Imperial Gardens next to the Emperor’s Palace. That is what happens around the world. There is no issue. If the government was that worried, it could have built a ramp or a cut and cover on Riverside Drive to bring it down below ground level; it could have done all those things. If the government had wanted to, it could have extended low-rise buildings down Barrack Street and William Street to connect the buildings along the foreshore. It could have sold lots from Barrack Square. It could have done a small number of new buildings at a time, so there would be no overhang in the market and it did not sell more buildings than the market could survive with. At the moment, it will be 15 years at best before there is a continuous series of buildings to get people from St Georges Terrace to the water. That is crazy. Some of them, apparently, will be office towers. There is nowhere in the world that has a pedestrian friendly tourist attraction with high-rise buildings overhanging the water—not Singapore, not Hong Kong and certainly not Tokyo. Madam Acting Speaker (Ms J.M. Freeman) and I a number of years ago visited an industrial city in Turkey

Mr Roger Cook; Dr Kim Hames; Acting Speaker; Mr David Templeman; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Ms Margaret Quirk; Dr Mike Nahan

called Izmir—formerly the Greek name was Smirna. It is not the most attractive city in the world, but it had a massive waterfront development because it had redeveloped the existing waterfront. It had restaurants and bars. We were in a majority Muslim country and at 11 o'clock at night it was a rocking place. Elizabeth Quay is never going to be a rocking place if at 11 o'clock at night it looks like St Georges Terrace, yet that is the plan for Elizabeth Quay. It is a mistake; it was a mistake then and it is a mistake now, because there was no proper planning.

The government talks about the inlet. According to the website of the Metropolitan Redevelopment Authority, the inlet is 100 metres by 100 metres, which is eight Olympic-size swimming pools. It is not a very large space. Again, that was a point I made years and years ago when I was still on the backbench of the Labor Party. I suggested the government looked at what it was doing. At that time Riverside Drive was still open. I said if they drove along Riverside Drive from west to east, they would have William Street, a block of land and then the boardwalk or whatever, and then there would be the water. On the other side, it would be the reverse—the boardwalk or whatever would interface with the water, then the building and another road. It is actually a very small space. The government cannot compare Elizabeth Quay with something like Cockle Bay in Sydney. Also, do not forget that Cockle Bay in Sydney is near a freeway and much of the open plaza area in Sydney is underneath a freeway flyover, so it is dead space that has been activated by all those investments. It is massive. It is a huge space, which gets me to the next thing.

[Quorum formed.]

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: Members can see that this is badly planned and badly executed. The other thing that has happened is the underground railway station at the Esplanade next to what is now Elizabeth Quay. Had Elizabeth Quay not been so badly planned or even if the government had wanted to do it and had done this small piece of work before the inlet was put in, it could quite easily have done a cut and cover for the railway to go to the east. That would have allowed a future government to build a city circle railway to serve future growth in the eastern end of the city and then use the existing Esplanade railway station, so there would have been no need to build a new railway station. That option has been cut out because of the creation of the inlet. Any future railway system in the inner metropolitan area will have to go underneath the inlet, which means it will have to be deeper than a cut-and-cover option. That also means we will have to rebuild the Esplanade train station. We will not be able to reuse that train station for a central city metro service. Clearly, it will be many years before Perth needs an inner-metropolitan rail service, but the government has denied future generations the opportunity to do that. The Minister for Transport at that time, Troy Buswell, said that at some future date Perth might need a second tunnel to cross the city. Again, this government has left a future government in the situation whereby that will have to be done at greater cost than had the inlet not been so badly planned out in that project. An amount of \$440 million to put the grass back is totally bizarre.

It is interesting that yesterday's *The Australian Financial Review* reported that the Productivity Commissioner had made some comments about governments botching their selection of infrastructure. The article reads —

In a scathing attack on how state and federal government are botching the selection of infrastructure, Mr Harris challenged politicians to justify expensive but low-return projects over hundreds of smaller but more effective options.

He talks about bad planning for road projects, which I will get on to in a minute. The report also says —

... Mr Harris lambasted politicians for hiding behind commercial-in-confidence concerns when refusing to release cost-benefit studies. In his experience, according to the federal government's main independent economic adviser, such concerns were overstated and shouldn't prevent the release of information showing what the return from infrastructure projects could be.

He is paraphrased in the final paragraph of that report, which reads —

He said infrastructure decisions should have relatively little to do with the current low price of debt, which he described as “an enabler” rather than driver of projects.

Is that not interesting? The government's argument that debt costs are low and that is why it is borrowing—even though it borrowed the money in advance and had the plan to borrow the money before the debt costs were low—but Mr Harris points out that is not the right way to look at the projects.

It is also interesting that Elizabeth Quay is supposed to be supported by these office towers. I quote from yesterday's online *The West Australian* an article by Marissa Lague—I think that is the way to pronounce her surname and apologise if I have got that wrong. The article reads —

The average net effective rent (which takes leasing incentive into account) in Perth will fall from \$528/sqm in June 2014 to \$236/sqm in 2018, according to BIS Shrapnel's latest research.

Mr Roger Cook; Dr Kim Hames; Acting Speaker; Mr David Templeman; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Ms Margaret Quirk; Dr Mike Nahan

The 40 per cent fall will reflect the vacancy level over the same three years, which is expected to rise from the current rate of 18 per cent to 24 per cent.

Later on, the article says —

Over the next 12 months, about 120,000sqm of office space is due for completion in the CBD, with a further 75,000sqm due over the two years to June 2018.

Although 65 per cent of this space has been pre-leased, BIS believes the market will be slow to absorb the surplus new space and the backfill space created as tenants relocate,

The article goes on to quote Lee Walker, BIS senior project manager, as saying —

“On this basis the Perth CBD office market will become the cheapest major CBD office market in Australia,” Mr Walker said.

“Building owners in Perth will be in for a long, hard haul over the next three years with no sign of an early pick up.

“For tenants, this represents an opportunity to dramatically reduce their occupancy costs.”

This is a project that is predicated on the building of a number of tall high-rise office towers, when professional people in the office industry are saying that the cost of offices is going to be falling. Why would an investor build an office block if they cannot make any money out of it? It will not happen. They will not do that. No free-market operator will build a building if they cannot get a return.

There are some more things I need to make a point about in respect of this project. I asked some detailed questions and had a bit of discussion in the estimates committee with the Minister for Planning and the Metropolitan Redevelopment Authority about how much space is in the precinct. By way of supplementary information B58, Mr Kinsella, through the minister, provided some information that states that based on the design software for the construction of Elizabeth Quay, the public realm is approximately 21 000 square metres, comprising the landing of 5 583 square metres; the William Street landing, 991 square metres; the Western Promenade, 4 107 square metres; the Eastern Promenade, 4 418 square metres; Station Park, 5 577 square metres; and the landing timber decking, 506 square metres. We can basically ignore the timber decking. The government says that between 10 000 and 15 000 people will be able to fit into Elizabeth Quay, but no-one will be going to a concert and standing on the timber decking. That is not a safe option and it will not happen. The other thing that should be borne in mind is that this is the TARDIS, because, for example, the landing is 28 metres by 138 metres long. That is 3 588 square metres, not 5 583 square metres. I can go through the promenades on either side, according to the dimensions provided by the agency, which are not actually 4 107 square metres for the western promenade but only 1 144 square metres. The eastern promenade is not 4 418 square metres, it is 1 360 square metres. There is a massive overestimation of the size of the public realm.

I think the steps that go from the hard surface down to the water are being included. Again, unless a boat is going to be brought in and they hold a concert in the middle of the water, people will not be able to use the steps. There is an argument that people will be able to watch the Skyworks from there, but they will not be able to stand on the steps. That will be dangerous and it will not be permitted. Some people might sit on the steps, but that is a separate issue. The thing about people sitting rather than standing is that when they sit, far fewer people can fit. There is also another problem. According to the MRA’s website, much of the landing, for example, will be covered by trees. The government’s plan is to install trees on much of that space. Again, people cannot watch the fireworks standing under a tree. It will not work like that. The space that will be taken up by planters and planter boxes and features in the structure will also not be available for crowds. There is absolutely no possibility that 15 000 people will fit in there after the buildings are built. Of course, without the buildings, people would fit on the grassed area, but why spend \$440 million to pull up the grass and then put it back?

Ms R. Saffioti: You could probably fit more people right now.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: That is right; if all this work had not been done and that \$440 million had been put into the museum, as we talked about before, we could have had something that would have had more space and somewhere where people could do something, instead of just sitting around. Now the government has this extraordinary idea whereby it is letting out a contract for people to activate the empty space that has been made. The government has spent \$440 million pulling up the grass and putting it back, and now it will let another contract on top of the \$440 million to let people put dongas on the grass to sell coffee. Tell me about it! This is such a good project that I cannot believe how dumb the government was. It is just dumb! It is like building a \$2 billion stadium —

Mr P. Papalia: They need another series of *Utopia*.

Mr Roger Cook; Dr Kim Hames; Acting Speaker; Mr David Templeman; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Ms Margaret Quirk; Dr Mike Nahan

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: My wife and I were watching *Utopia* on iview last night, and we just kept thinking, “Premier, Premier.” It is just extraordinary.

The real issue here is that this is a project that nobody wants. Why spend \$440 million to pull up the grass and then put it back? It does not make any sense. As I said, I am not supporting the City Gatekeepers’ position. I never, ever supported the idea of doing nothing with that space. I just thought something low cost and smart should have been done instead of high cost and dumb—and that is what we have ended up with.

It is like the Perth Stadium. Why in the hell would someone spend \$2 billion on a stadium without having an agreement that anyone will ever use it? Of course, the member for West Swan has outlined all the massive risks taken on by the government without any guarantee of a return. Then there is the other funny thing about the stadium. The government keeps saying that it can be expanded. How much will it cost to expand the stadium? It will probably cost another \$2 billion.

Mr C.J. Barnett: No, it won’t.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: How much will it cost?

Mr C.J. Barnett: It is designed —

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: Why does the Premier not tell me that?

Mr C.J. Barnett: It is designed to have two simple expansions.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: How much will that cost?

Mr C.J. Barnett: Look, I’d be guessing. I don’t know.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: Thank you. My guess of \$1 billion is more accurate than the Premier’s guess of “I don’t know”. What a ridiculous comment. The Premier has no idea what he is talking about. He has not talked to a single person about the cost of expanding the stadium, as I have done. He does not know what he is talking about. That is the problem. He makes these decisions. Now he wants the Belmont Park Racecourse to close. That is the site on which he wanted to put the stadium. He has spent \$2 billion putting the stadium on the Burswood golf course and now he is saying that the land that the racecourse is on is to become vacant. Why did he not make that decision first? If that is really where he wanted the stadium to be built, why did he not sort it out with the landholders first instead of coming in here and saying he wants the racecourse closed? He could have done that the other way around. That would have been called planning. But, no, the Premier could not get the site that he wanted for the stadium, because it was privately owned, so he built it across the road on the golf course, which the Langoulant report told us was not suitable for transport. The great thing about the stadium is that those of us who live in the eastern suburbs will be able to get there. We will be the only ones! People who live near the Midland line will have to walk from Claisebrook or East Perth train stations. Claisebrook train station is interesting. There is no pedestrian access along the Graham Farmer Freeway from Claisebrook train station to the Windan Bridge, yet that is where people are supposed to cross. The next thing the government will do is come back in here with a small additional infrastructure project to build a footpath. The distance from Parliament House to Subiaco Oval is less than it is from East Perth station to the site of the new stadium.

Hon Ken Travers asked the government that if it were going to build the stadium and a bridge to East Perth, at least make the bridge capable of taking a future tram, but the government was too arrogant. Now it is building a footbridge that cannot take public transport. People will have to catch shuttle buses, apparently 100 of them at a time, all the way down to East Perth. My son goes to Trinity College in East Perth. I can tell people how crazy the traffic around East Perth is on a Friday night, and the Premier expects the buses to go into that traffic to let people off so they can then walk a kilometre across the river to the stadium. This was so badly planned. In fact, it was not planned. That is the problem. The Premier came back from the airport and said that he wanted the stadium built at Belmont Park. When he found out that he could not do it, he said that he would build it across the road. Why did he not want to build on Kitchener Park? It was because that was the Labor Party’s plan. It had nothing to do with whether it was a good site; it was all to do with the Premier not wanting to do what the Labor Party said it would do.

What was the Premier’s criticism of the waterfront project? That was Alannah’s project, so he could not do it; he had to do something different. Elizabeth Quay is a dumb project that has cost \$440 million to pull the grass up, put the grass down and then ask people to put dongas there to sell coffee. Come on! The people of Western Australia have worked the Premier out. That is why he is the most unpopular Premier in the history of Western Australia. There has never been a Premier more unpopular than him.

MR P. PAPALIA (Warnbro) [3.50 pm]: I take pleasure in rising to address the capital component of the budget in debate on the Appropriation (Capital 2015–16) Bill 2015. It is interesting to follow the member for Cannington with the observations he just made. I am not going to focus on some of the projects that have been

Mr Roger Cook; Dr Kim Hames; Acting Speaker; Mr David Templeman; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Ms Margaret Quirk; Dr Mike Nahan

criticised by others, such as Elizabeth Quay. I am concerned about the expenditure that has gone on that project and the clear lack of coordination and planning, particularly the way it relates to the impact on some of those small businesses at Barrack Street jetty. They are getting a raw deal. I urge the Premier, in all seriousness, to meet with them and find out how they have been treated because it is unfair. Noting how much money has been spent for future business operators who are not even there yet, it is extraordinary that these people are not looked after.

I am going to look at a place in which I feel savings can be made in the capital domain in the future. Clearly, there has been incredible wastage in the corrective services portfolio in recent years. I note this week the Premier's delivery of a brief ministerial statement relating to initiatives on Aboriginal deaths in custody and over-representation. I have been publicly critical of these initiatives because I do not think there is too much there. There is nothing too much in the way of tangible response to the commitment the Premier gave to the family of Ms Dhu on the steps of Parliament some eight months ago. Nevertheless, I welcome the second one of his three points in his brief ministerial statement. He observed that, in examining and progressing policies that will address the issue of over-representation and deaths in custody, the government will, firstly, create safer custody environments and, secondly, introduce legislative and policy measures to avoid incarceration for low-level offenders where appropriate, including new adult diversion options such as pre-charge contracts for minor offences.

My concern lies with almost the second last paragraph of the Premier's speech, in which he said that it is the responsibility of, amongst others, the Minister for Corrective Services to implement the strategy. Only a few days ago the corrective services minister denied there was a problem; he denied there was any need to focus on reducing adult incarceration numbers, particularly Aboriginal incarceration numbers, suggesting that the growth is just a reflection of the growth in the state's population, which is completely false and inaccurate. He also suggested that everyone in the prison system deserved to be there, there was nothing he could do about it and somehow it was soft of me and our side of politics to suggest that he should be reducing the population. That completely contradicts the Premier. It is disturbing because that means there are not likely to be any initiatives coming from that portfolio.

With respect to capital works and how we rein in some of the incredible waste on capital works in coming years, I think an opportunity lies in the corrective services portfolio. The Premier should start questioning his minister and get him to look at what he is doing. Some of the statements he made indicate that he is either being fed false information or he is knowingly distributing false information. On 18 June in this place, in response to a question about Aboriginal incarceration, the minister said —

The growth rate of the prison system population in Western Australia for the last five years is slightly above the state population growth rate, and, of course, that is concerning.

That is just not true. I asked questions during estimates. I knew the answers anyway but I wanted to get some more specific responses on the record from the minister and the government. I asked questions in estimates of the Minister for Corrective Services about the growth in the prison muster under the government. By way of example, in the past 18 months, noting that on 18 June, which was seven days ago, the minister said that the growth rate of the prison population was just above the state population growth. It was 11.6 per cent. The state's population grew by 2.1 per cent, according to the Australian Bureau of Statistics. The prison population is outstripping growth in the normal population by five times. It is five times the rate of the population growth and the minister does not know that. This is the same corrective services minister who came into this place in estimates—this is a concern for the Treasurer—with not one word, not one line, in any of the budget papers about a requirement for a new prison to open in the next three years, not to commence building, but to open, who was outed by the Commissioner of Corrective Services to the need for a new prison to open within the next three years.

A new prison cannot be built in the metropolitan area for under \$300 million. If we enter into a public-private partnership of some description and try to deceive the population and hide the cost, as the government did with other capital works around the state and in a similar fashion to what it has done with the Perth Stadium, the cost will ultimately still come home to the taxpayer and it will be about \$300 million. We can roughly calculate it by the number of beds we will need. There will be no point building a prison for less than 300 extra beds, noting the rate of growth of the prison muster. Based on recent builds, that is the sort of cost that will be incurred. Even if it is done under a public-private partnership, I think that would be a terrible decision without absolute transparency. With no commercial-in-confidence restraint on revealing all the true costs, that would be outrageous. If this government goes to a public-private partnership in the same way it did with maintenance management for Fiona Stanley Hospital, for instance, or something of that description, where it is decades long, compelling future generations of governments to continue in a bad contract, that would be outrageous. There is no justification for it.

Mr Roger Cook; Dr Kim Hames; Acting Speaker; Mr David Templeman; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Ms Margaret Quirk; Dr Mike Nahan

The minister has lost control of the growth of the prison muster because of the government's inability to acknowledge that its policies have failed. It has not reduced the prison muster, it has not reduced crime and it has not made people feel safer in Western Australia, so it has to plan to keep building prisons. A growing prison population is not a sign of the success of prisons; a growing prison population is a confirmation of failure of strategy. If the prison population is growing, it means the government's strategy to change people's behaviour has failed. That is what has happened. We have evidence—confirmation—that every strategy employed by the Barnett government since 2008 to reduce offending rates, reduce recidivism and get people to stop committing crimes has failed. A reduction in the prison population would have happened had the government's policies been successful, and we would have seen a diminishing prison population and less demand on the taxpayer's purse for building prisons, and the government would have been closing prisons. Instead, we have seen a 40.7 per cent increase in the number of people in our prison system in seven years. That is unprecedented.

[Quorum formed.]

Mr P. PAPALIA: Having incarcerated more Aboriginal Western Australians than any Premier in history, this Premier is now confronted with the challenge of changing his strategy. He has acknowledged that he has failed. His speech earlier this week was an acknowledgement of failure. The Barnett Liberal–National government has locked up more Aboriginal people than any government in Western Australian history, and quite likely any state government in the nation, as far as the rate of growth. It is extraordinary, but it indicates an opportunity. There is an opportunity, but it is not demonstrated in the budget, because near-term future significant costs are not included in the budget. There is no cost in capital works in the budget to accommodate the estimated 200-plus adults and 60 additional juveniles who will be incarcerated as a consequence of the aggravated burglary laws, when they are introduced over three years. That is not included, and it has been missing from the budget for the past three years. Unfortunately, in budget paper No 3 it is identified as a risk, so the Treasury is onto that one.

What is not incorporated in this budget—I am a bit shocked that Treasury has failed to rein in the government and insist on some sort of discipline in this regard—is any mention of the future prison that the minister is planning to build and open in the next three years. It is not mentioned anywhere in the budget. Also, there is no acknowledgement, beyond the conversation that we had in estimates, of the forecast growth rate of the prison muster, and the consequent demand for additional accommodation. As is my usual practice, I asked for supplementary information on the department's forecast for low, middle and high prison muster growth over the next six years. I was provided with this year's figure, and the next five years. This year's figure has already been exceeded. The projection to 30 June this year was exceeded probably a month or two ago. That is the middle projection—not the high or low projection, but the medium. It is somewhere between the midpoint and the upper projection at the moment. The projections along that midpoint range for the next five years are for about four per cent growth year on year. That is what the department's own growth modelling indicates. That compels us to acknowledge that there is a need for additional capital works if the government continues with its current strategies. The current strategies have failed and continue to fail and are continuing to grow the prison muster.

There is an opportunity to change the strategy. Instead of spending more and more wasted dollars on nothing other than beds in prisons, focus on determining whether the people who are being incarcerated need to be there, as the Premier has suggested. He has acknowledged that that is required. He said that we need to introduce legislative and policy measures to avoid incarceration for low-level offenders where appropriate, including new adult diversion options such as pre-charge contracts for minor offences. I agree with that, but that is not what the government is doing. That is an admission of failure by the Premier, and an acknowledgement that the opposition has been correct for the past seven years, and that every single Minister for Corrective Services, Minister for Police and Attorney General in the past seven years has failed, and has been pursuing the wrong strategy. It is good to see that the Premier has finally put that on paper, but I would like to see some activity to reflect it. His own minister, only days before the Premier's speech, completely contradicted his observations.

If people are wondering why this is an issue, and why I should be speaking about it under capital works, apart from the fact that there is no mention of the need for a new prison, which I estimate would cost at least \$300 million, we can look at what this government has wasted historically on nothing more than beds in prisons—\$655 162 384 in seven years on putting extra beds in prisons. What an incredible waste of money, and an absolute proof of the failure of policy. It is even more than is being wasted on Elizabeth Quay, lifting the grass out of the land and then putting it back. It is one and a half times the cost of that. It is almost half what is being spent on the stadium. When we consider those three things—Elizabeth Quay, the stadium and putting extra beds in prisons—it is an incredible amount of money and, in the case of the prisons, we do not even get the nice fluffy feeling outcome of coloured lights on the outside of the stadium, and not even the soft grass to sit on around Elizabeth Quay that was already there before it was dug up.

There is no return, because recidivism is as bad as it ever was. The rate of incarceration of Aboriginal people is 10 per cent worse than it was during the deaths in custody royal commission in the 1990s. The government has

Mr Roger Cook; Dr Kim Hames; Acting Speaker; Mr David Templeman; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Ms Margaret Quirk; Dr Mike Nahan

achieved nothing, and it is only making communities less safe. People are going into prison as minor offenders, fine defaulters and people who need to make bail for minor offences who might otherwise have got it but cannot get their act together. They are going into prison to sit next to serious offenders and learn how to do it properly. The government is opening up crime universities, and it has spent \$655 million on putting extra beds in to accommodate its bad policies. According to the Minister for Corrective Services, the government is about to build yet another prison to accommodate more people and waste more taxpayer dollars to make the community even less safe.

All it takes is a shift in mindset to consider whether we could be doing things a different way. Plenty of people need to be locked up, but not the numbers who are presently in prison. There are 5 546 or something in prison today, and they are not all murderers, rapists and the sorts of thugs that the Minister for Corrective Services comes in here and rants on about. They are exactly as the Premier has indicated only this week—people who are low-level offenders and should not be incarcerated. That is the Premier’s view, at least as articulated in his speech about Aboriginal deaths in custody and over-representation. It requires a strategic shift, and it would potentially result in the saving of money.

Another significant capital cost listed in this year’s budget is in the order of \$22 million for changing part of the inadequate Hakea men’s prison into an inadequate Hakea women’s prison—rebuilding a wall that the government knocked down two years ago. It is kind of reminiscent of putting grass back down where it was dug up at Elizabeth Quay. It is very reminiscent of that. I have suggested, on numerous occasions, that instead of turning part of Hakea into an inadequate remand prison for women, the government should accept another failure, and concede that it has failed in another initiative—the Wandoo young men’s prison, which is only full because the government raised the definition of young man to anyone aged 28 years or younger. The government should concede that that does not work; it was an abject failure that cost \$40 million, for shifting juveniles from Rangeview Remand Centre over to Banksia Hill and turning that Wandoo facility into what it is. Concede that that has failed, and turn it into a women’s prison. It has 80 beds. I understand that there will be a few more than that at Hakea Prison, but the government would not have to spend any money on it. It could turn it into a women’s prison tomorrow. It would not have to waste another year or 18 months building at Hakea until it could relieve the pressure at Bandyup Women’s Prison and it would not cost an additional \$22 million. If the government took out of Bandyup the fine defaulters who are there solely because they cannot afford to pay fines, the women who are just there on remand while they organise bail and the minor offenders who could be dealt with more efficiently in the community under more tight and better funded supervision in community corrections, it would not need more than 80 beds. It would relieve the pressure at Bandyup. It could shift all the remand prisoners to Wandoo Reintegration Facility tomorrow and save the taxpayer at least the \$22 million that the government is going to waste at Hakea and it would not disrupt Hakea Prison, which is designed for men. But that requires a bit of self-reflection and the courage and integrity to stand up and say that it has failed. It is okay to fail at an initiative, but it is stupid to continue to pursue it to the bitter end in a bull-headed fashion at the expense of the taxpayer. That is just silly.

In the current circumstances in which the Barnett government has trashed the state budget and has taken the best set of state books in history and turned them into the worst and the Treasurer has defined himself for all time as possibly the worst Treasurer in the history of the state, with the exception of his predecessor, it would be responsible and reasonable to concede that there is a huge failure in corrective services and to consider whether, if nothing else, it costs more, even if it disregarded the opportunity to have a better outcome for the benefit of society. Every year of the Barnett government, this portfolio has blown its budget by, on average, 8.5 per cent and no-one has said anything. No-one in the Barnett government has even batted an eyelid. Apparently, it is okay for the government to make the really puerile argument that it makes no apologies for throwing people into prison for breaking the law. If it is not working, it should just accept and concede that and save some taxpayer dollars. It would be a normal and responsible approach, but in the current circumstances, it is just unavoidable.

The government cannot keep doing what it has been doing; the state cannot afford it. When people ask where the money has gone, the government’s normal response is to say that it has gone towards digging up grass at Elizabeth Quay and putting grass back down, or turning the outside of the stadium into different colours or putting sound systems in the toilets at the stadium. However, a significant component of the money has evaporated into the prison system for zero return; in fact, it has been a negative return, because the people are coming out worse than they were when they went in. It is ridiculous that the government continues to refuse to acknowledge that, and it is probably because people have not questioned some of the slogans and the spin that is being spewed by the Minister for Corrective Services’ staff. I do not think that the minister necessarily believes most of what he says. He has made an effort in the space of juvenile detention; that is true and I acknowledge that and I have commended him on funding things such as the Yiriman Project. We now have the juvenile population back down to the base level it was at before the Barnett government came to office; it is back down to

Mr Roger Cook; Dr Kim Hames; Acting Speaker; Mr David Templeman; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr
Chris Tallentire; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Ms Margaret Quirk; Dr Mike Nahan

normal growth levels. The adult prison population costs the state an enormous amount and there is enormous opportunity there, and it should not be ignored just through foolhardy stubbornness.

MR C.J. TALLENTIRE (Gosnells) [4.13 pm]: I rise to make a brief contribution to the Appropriation (Capital 2015–16) Bill 2015. I begin by saying that when the budget came down, people in the Gosnells electorate looked desperately for signs of funding for the community. They saw one glimmer of hope—one useful contribution—in capital expenditure, and that was the state contribution of \$16 million towards the grade separation over the train line at Nicholson Road, which currently has a level crossing. The separation of the train line from the road is desperately needed because, at the moment, every time a freight train goes through, the boom gates come down, and we do not need boom gate problems to exacerbate the very high traffic volumes on Nicholson Road in the morning. Likewise in the afternoon, there is a constant flow of traffic from the city and areas that link to Welshpool and parts of Canning Vale, with people funnelling through to Nicholson Road to get to my electorate and to go on to areas as far afield as the Darling Range electorate and some of the growing suburbs down there, such as the new developments in the City of the Armadale. It is clear that the urban growth that we are seeing leads to greater demand on our transport networks. This grade separation is much needed. The federal government was prepared to commit to a 50 per cent funding arrangement if the state was prepared to chip in, and we see in these budget papers that the state is prepared to come to the party and contribute to that. That is some good news for us, but otherwise I am hard-pressed to see capital expenditure for my electorate and, indeed, for electorates that surround mine, and I will come to that a little later.

First of all, I want to talk about the grade separation. The real purpose is to have a grade separation at Nicholson Road when the train line is eventually extended from Thornlie to the Mandurah line, which will probably involve trains running at a frequency of perhaps one every 10 or 15 minutes during peak hour and every 20 minutes during non-peak hour. We could not have boom gates then; they just would not work. The government is promising that this grade separation work will go ahead, which shows that there is an understanding of the need for the extension of the Thornlie line. However, that is as optimistic as I can be when I look at the government's plans for this. It was quite remarkable that the member for Southern River wrote an article in Monday's *The West Australian* that documented his attempts as a government member to convince his own side to invest in the extension of the Thornlie line to the Mandurah line, with the creation of a train station at Nicholson Road and one at Ranford Road, which would act as a station for that extended catchment area for the fast-growing new southern suburbs. I think other members have mentioned this, but I was in Armadale on Monday and I saw the plans for the Wungong catchment and the number of homes that will be built in that area and the number of people who will live in that area. There will be a remarkable boost in the population numbers in that part of Perth. Those people will need good public transport connections. It is remarkable that *The West Australian* saw fit to report on the member for Southern River's unsuccessful campaigns in 2008 and 2013 for the Thornlie line extension. I am not sure of the newsworthiness of the story; it is just a matter of fact. What is quite odd, though, is that given that the Thornlie train station is in my electorate, the journalist involved did not bother to contact me about the station, but that is the standard of reporting nowadays. Nevertheless, the report records that the project, this extension of the Thornlie line through to the Mandurah line, would cost \$320 million. Relative to some of the other projects around, that is exceedingly good value. It means that for \$320 million, we would be getting one of the first of these essential links that go from east to west rather than this radial approach all focusing in on the city—that we are starting to build up those circle lines that were so much part of the Metronet proposal that we took to the last election. That was a very clever plan that we made significant capital expenditure decisions around so we could have money to begin the whole Metronet rollout. We made very big decisions about things like the Oakajee port and expenditure on a football stadium. Unfortunately, people were won over by the Barnett argument that the government's proposals were fully funded and fully costed, and that it would deliver all of these things, such as better transport linkages, multibillion-dollar stadiums and expensive projects that could have been done in partnership with the private sector, as with the Oakajee port. We heard that it was all possible and unfortunately people were seduced by that idea. It is most unfortunate. The fact remains that capital expenditure for the Gosnells electorate is only in its very early stages for some of the essential work that needs to be done—I refer to some of the essential capital works provisions that have to be made. In the very near future we need the allocation of \$320 million so we can get this linkage across to the Mandurah line. It has been pointed out that it will be essential for something as mundane as getting people to the football stadium: if we have this line in place, some of those people from the south western suburbs right down as far as Mandurah will be able to take the train to the stadium via the Thornlie line to the Burswood station or stadium station or whatever it will be called. It is essential that we have this line not only for people's capacity to get to their place of work, but also because we need to start creating the circle lines, these east–west linkages, so we can break away from the current situation of a transport network that is so radial in its approach. That is one of the key things I noted when looking for capital expenditure on my electorate.

Mr Roger Cook; Dr Kim Hames; Acting Speaker; Mr David Templeman; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Ms Margaret Quirk; Dr Mike Nahan

Neighbouring the Gosnells electorate, we were desperate to see a commitment towards the Burslem Bridge. We know there is money for road duplication, and this is a major artery in the area—a very important bridge that links up Gosnells and Maddington and goes over the Canning River. Money has been set aside for the road duplication, but not for the bridge. It can be imagined how frustrated the local government, the City of Gosnells, is. It can see some of the money is there to do the road duplication, but not money to actually construct the bridge. It is extremely frustrating for that local government. That adds to its annoyance because it is desperate to develop the Maddington town centre. There are some very exciting plans to develop Maddington. Maddington is an area that has suffered a bit. It has been forgotten about. It is not in my area; it is just on the edge. It is an area where there is that curious transitional situation of car yards, car wash facilities—some of those businesses that tend to settle on land that is in transition that in time will be useful and great land for a higher value use; however, while we wait for that to come about, for the urban renewal to take place, the land seems to go to various activities like car washes, activities that are fairly ephemeral in their nature and the can be moved on if a higher land use comes about. There is great potential in the Maddington town centre. The city has done all the work on what the plan should look like, but it is being held up because the Water Corporation has a mainline that goes under Albany Highway. Unfortunately, the Water Corporation has not been able to be convinced to spend on that upgrade; I think it involves putting pipes much deeper under Albany Highway so the roadworks can go on. The Water Corporation has not been able to find the capital funds to put those pipes much deeper down so we can get on with developing the area and implementing this Maddington town centre renewal. That is causing great frustration. I have been hearing about these plans for Maddington the whole time I have been in office—in other words, since 2008. The City of Gosnells has been telling me about how desperate it is to get on with developing Maddington, but Albany Highway has to be upgraded and to do that these Water Corporation pipes need to be sunk lower down, and the money is not being made available for that. It is very, very frustrating.

Another issue I know the city has had a high degree of frustration with is traffic lights and traffic sensors, particularly on a major roundabout in the electorate at Nicholson Road–Yale Road–Garden Street. That roundabout is related to the grade separation project I was talking about earlier. It is a roundabout that receives very heavy usage. It is very similar to the roundabout we see at the Narrows Bridge end of Mounts Bay Road where traffic metering is in place. I have only driven through that roundabout a couple of times when the traffic metering has been functioning, because it does not need to function all the time; it just comes on when the traffic volumes coming along Mounts Bay Road are such that traffic coming from near the Mount Hospital needs a break in the flow of traffic on Mounts Bay Road to enable people to get onto the roundabout. That is exactly

what is needed at Nicholson Road–Yale Road–Garden Street. Money was allocated to the City of Gosnells—\$400 000—for the traffic metering to take place, but unfortunately somebody in Main Roads said that the traffic metering project could be delayed because a major upgrade of the roundabout was done and the slip roads were alleviating the traffic volumes. The fact is that at key times, there is a problem getting onto that roundabout, just as there was a problem getting onto the Mounts Bay Road roundabout. Why was the City of Gosnells forced to give back \$400 000 that would have paid for traffic metering to be installed? I do not understand at all. The money was given to the City of Gosnells, but then it had to give it back to Main Roads. That suggests there was some pressure exerted on the City of Gosnells to hand that money back and I think that is really unfair, because that metering would make quite a difference to the flow of traffic in the area.

On this issue of traffic flow, on a part of Albany Highway in the Victoria Park area, there is a sign mentioning the trial works on traffic light flows underway.

I do not have the terminology exactly right; it is part of the Bigger Picture project, I gather, but it is about the one-per-centers, as the Minister for Transport likes to describe them, that improve the sensing ability of the traffic lights. Traffic is encouraged to flow rather than stop every time the sequencing delays are exceeded, so there is a more intelligent use of traffic light systems. We definitely need that in the Gosnells area. At many sets of traffic lights the lights change when cars go up to them and another vehicle comes from a side road. Even though 20 vehicles might be going up to the traffic lights, their flow is interrupted because one car comes in on a side road. That is the case even on Manning Road, a major road that serves my area. It is not in my electorate, of course, but it is a road many people have to use if they are driving to the city. However, there are better alternatives to driving to the city, even with the public transport network as it is.

My preferred means of transport is to cycle into the city, but I have to say that cyclists have a problem also with traffic lights. I am frustrated by the number of times I come up to traffic lights that do not detect a bike. I have corresponded with the City of Gosnells about this and I believe it has been in contact with Main Roads. The City of Gosnells says that the problem is due to the amount of carbon fibre on bikes. I own a nice bike made mostly out of carbon fibre, but I can assure members that it has plenty of metal components on it. In wet weather I ride my old steel bike and it does not trigger the sensing devices. There is clearly a problem. We need to upgrade the sensing devices located in the roads on the approach to traffic lights so that they pick up cyclists. If

Mr Roger Cook; Dr Kim Hames; Acting Speaker; Mr David Templeman; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Ms Margaret Quirk; Dr Mike Nahan

we do not do that, there will be more and more reports of cyclists going through red lights. Some people do not understand why cyclists go through red lights; they think they are committing an act of civil disobedience when, in reality, the traffic lights have not detected them. What should they do then—wait until a motor vehicle eventually comes and triggers the light change? It is essential there be capital investment in good quality traffic lights that can sense bikes and vehicles and be better adapted to working with traffic flows.

I want to expand the idea of the importance of traffic lights picking up on movement in general. When I walk through the City of Perth, I notice that quite frequently the lights are triggered by one or two cars travelling along Barrack Street, turning down Hay Street. One or two cars get the advantage of the lights while at the same time 50 to 100 pedestrians can be waiting for the signals to change. Where is the democracy in that? We give priority to people who have perhaps not planned their trip particularly well and have had to drive into the city centre, but are inconveniencing the 50 to 100 pedestrians standing around a set of traffic lights. We make them wait while we give priority to a couple of cars that want to go through the lights. Sensing devices are clearly needed to detect how many pedestrians want to cross the road so that they are given priority. It is not enough to rely on people pressing the button, because I do not believe the lights record how many people press the button. A lot of pedestrians in the inner city do not press the buttons on the lights because so many people are waiting at the lights that they have to stand at the back of the crowd. We need other sensing devices. I am sure that can be done. The technology is there; it is a matter of making sure there are adequate levels of capital investment to do that job.

In the final moments of my speech on this Appropriation (Capital 2015–16) Bill, I want to return to an issue I raised last year; namely, the upgrade of Southern River College and Thornlie Senior High School in my electorate. I requested from the Minister for Education information on the program of works, given that promises were made that both these schools would receive substantial amounts of money for their upgrade. I note that the Minister for Education will be going to both schools tomorrow. I look forward to seeing him there. I am sure he will be very surprised at the deterioration of the schools and the need for major capital expenditure at both schools. I think he will come away telling his staff to make an investment at Thornlie Senior High School and Southern River College for things such as toilets. I hope he visits the students' toilets at Thornlie Senior High School because he will be disgusted by their condition. It is unfair to have to deal with such unsanitary facilities. They deserve much better, and given the school is well over 40 years old, it is high time they were improved. Surely that is something our education capital works program should be managing. Various audits have been done of the schools and within the Department of Education and time frames and programs of works have been prepared, but there has been no communication to the schools about when the works will take place. Of course, nothing was in this year's state budget. When I go to the school boards of both these schools—both are now independent public schools; and I sit on both boards—I have to report that, sadly, there is no capital expenditure in this year's state budget for either school and they will have to wait yet another year for those very important upgrades.

I will conclude my remarks there, but I say that the south eastern suburbs deserve much, much more capital expenditure. Our transport network and our educational infrastructure desperately need upgrading. There is massive growth in the area that is resulting in more cars on the road. We need to give people better alternatives and to make sure their children have upgraded educational institutions to go to. That is desperately needed. I express my disappointment with the capital expenditure in this year's state budget.

MRS M.H. ROBERTS (Midland) [4.37 pm]: What an excellent speech by the member for Gosnells. He is right to raise those concerns about schools. The state of schools in my electorate also shows that capital works money has been somewhere between non-existent and very little. Not only has there been no real injection of funding to schools in recent years in my electorate, but also no plan for the future. In light of the Premier's comments yesterday about property sales, I am really concerned about the government's plans. I want to highlight that the government has recently announced that it will put some young people with behaviour management issues at the old Midland primary school. Midland primary school was closed in about 2008 because there were plenty of spaces at neighbouring Woodbridge and Midvale schools. It was regarded as a temporary closure because we knew the growth around Midland would be on the incline and that that school would be reopened in the future. The Minister for Education has announced that it is a 12-month trial but I am quite concerned about the location of this 12-month trial. Feedback from my local constituents is that we badly need to upgrade and reopen the Midland primary school. Effectively, both Woodbridge, which members may know formerly as West Midland, and Guildford Primary Schools are full.

There is no potential for expansion at Guildford primary school, because it is a historic site so that is very limited. About one-third of the school's total land area is flood plain. It is also the oldest continually operating primary school in this state and, as such, has a complete conservation plan that would not allow, from a heritage or conservation point of view, plonking demountables or some form of transportable buildings there. It is already

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Thursday, 25 June 2015]

p4898d-4916a

Mr Roger Cook; Dr Kim Hames; Acting Speaker; Mr David Templeman; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Ms Margaret Quirk; Dr Mike Nahan

a crowded site with limited playing area, and that playing area becomes more limited in winter if there is flooding. Within its catchment, that school is supposed to take children from all of South Guildford, including the Rosehill and Waterhall estates. The fact is there is not room for all the potential enrolments at Guildford for that part of its catchment area. I know that the Department of Education has been effectively triaging primary school-age students and preschool and kindy kids from that area, and many of them have been funnelled across to Woodbridge Primary School. Woodbridge Primary School was part of the capital works program back in 2002–03 and was a completely rebuilt school on a very nice site. That school is now full, so it is time to reopen Midland primary school. I was talking to the parent group at Woodbridge last night. They are quite concerned about plans to plonk a few transportable buildings on that very small school site, which is only 2.4 hectares. I understand the recommended size for a primary school site is four hectares. Woodbridge Primary School is a smaller than average school. It is a level 5 primary school, which is the second largest category of primary school, so it would really be most unfair to place more classrooms there. Its catchment area extends quite a way—in fact, over to Viveash. There is no other reasonably close school that kids in Viveash would be able to come to. Viveash was formerly part of the Midland primary school catchment area.

The Premier knows there is huge growth in Midland. He addressed something called Swan Connect only a few weeks ago and acknowledged that the Midland area is expecting a huge increase of population within the next few years. With the Premier's statement that the government is looking at options for selling off government property, I want to highlight here and now that one property the government must not sell is the Midland primary school site or any part of it. The demand for kindy, preschool and primary school in that area is very much growing.

I highlight just a couple of examples. Midland town centre itself, partly through the government's development assistance panel procedure, where people are getting big bonuses in terms of what I call plot ratios, is seeing lots of units going up. Where I was previously seeing, perhaps 10 years ago, two little houses on two big blocks demolished and replaced with a quadruplex of four units, I am now seeing 14 units being built where there were two little houses. We are seeing a lot of infill in that area. Likewise in Viveash, I have seen a lot of very intense development. People heard that only last week a development was approved by the Western Australian Planning Commission and signed off by the Minister for Planning for about 800 more houses to go on the site of the former Rosehill golf course. There will be memorials placed on those titles about airport noise and so forth, but even so, that is another 800 homes going there. We are expecting quite extreme growth within this area over coming years, so it is really important that we keep that site. I am mindful of the government's financial situation, but I think we should be looking at a staged reopening of the Midland primary school. I certainly do not want to see kids dislocated from either Guildford or Woodbridge, but next year I am advised that there could be a demand for another couple of classrooms' worth of students between those two schools. If there is no room for a transportable at Guildford, the transportable will have to go to Woodbridge. That is an unacceptable solution for the parent group. One way of managing this change would be to reinstitute the kindy at the Midland primary school site in a discrete location, which I am sure the Department of Education would be aware of, and then gradually grow that through to the preprimary and primary school years. It is absolutely needed. I want to say here and now that under no circumstances should any part of that site be sold.

The other land I want to briefly refer to is the site of the old Swan District Hospital. It would be a colossal mistake for government to try to balance its other capital works by selling that site off to the highest bidder. I understand that some people might have a proposal for housing or something else there, but there are some real demands in my local community, just as there are in other local communities. There is big demand for mental health space for people dealing with mental health and drug issues. This is already a site that houses an institution—the Swan District Hospital. Already, parts of that hospital will effectively have to stay there; for example, the freestanding dental clinic on that site. It is towards the front of the site and is discrete, and I understand that that will continue at that site and is not a service that will transfer to the new Midland Health Campus run by St John of God Health Care. That site has an existing mental health unit towards the back of the site that is a reasonably good facility. It would seem to me that that facility was specifically designed for mental health and the government should look at utilising that. When government wants to rezone sites for institutional uses of any kind, there are often issues, but here we already have a site that does not have any boundaries with close neighbouring residents and that is relatively close to the Midland town centre where there are big possibilities of future expansion of mental health services and/or drug rehabilitation services. People know that this is a growing need. People keep talking about the ice epidemic and the issues flowing from it. To turn people's lives around to get them off methamphetamine and sustain them very often requires a live-in arrangement and lots of support. That is worthwhile doing—otherwise those people are out in the community, often involved in crime and creating havoc with their families and the rest of the community. Facilities to deal with people who have fallen victim to the scourge of methamphetamine are very important, too. Often in the general community and generally residential areas, there is quite a resistance to putting any facility that would

Mr Roger Cook; Dr Kim Hames; Acting Speaker; Mr David Templeman; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Ms Margaret Quirk; Dr Mike Nahan

assist people who are drug addicts or have mental health issues in built-up residential areas. Here the government has a site already effectively zoned for that purpose. I highlight that it is a very large site and the other potential for that site's future use certainly has to be aged care. There is a colossal demand for aged care. We know we have a growing aged population and that demand in that area is increasing. I have spoken to local residents who have advised me that to get aged-care places for their parents, they have had to utilise facilities that are located a very long way away. I have spoken to people who may themselves live in areas like Northam, Toodyay and the like, many of whom work in Midland by day. I was speaking to one poor woman working in Guildford who had to put her mother, I think, into a facility in Osborne Park while she was travelling from Toodyay or Northam—somewhere in that vicinity—to her work in Guildford but needing to visit her mother in aged care in Osborne Park.

We know that there is a greater prevalence of dementia and people are not necessarily able to keep their parents who have dementia or Alzheimer's in their homes, especially if they need to work. What is needed are more local residential aged-care facilities. I am glad that the Premier is in the chamber to listen to my comments on this topic because the community needs to be considered when contemplating the sale of any government land and government assets. I am concerned that once these sites are sold, they will be lost forever. Imagine what would happen if the former Midland primary school site were sold and the populations of Rosehill Estate, Viveash and Midland expanded. Imagine that the government had to purchase a site and construct a new primary school. It would cost a phenomenal amount of money compared with using the existing Midland primary school site, which still has classrooms that were operative less than 10 years ago.

Before I finish my comments, I want to talk about the capital works budget for police. Frankly, it has never been smaller and there have never been fewer police stations under construction. For many years during our term in government we had somewhere between eight and 12 police stations under construction. At the moment there is a very small number under construction. Under "Works in Progress" at page 368 of the budget papers for new police facilities is Ballajura Police Station at a cost of approximately \$8.3 million; Cockburn Central Police Station, \$19.8 million; Mundijong Police Station, \$4.4 million; and Western Suburbs Police Station, \$25.493 million. It would seem that only four police stations are under construction. It should be noted that no money is being spent this year or next year on Western Suburbs Police Station, \$5.6 million is available in 2017–18 and \$8.9 million in 2018–19. I am not sure whether that can be classified as a work in progress; I would call that a future intention. Only three police stations, therefore, are listed in the budget as works in progress. For a state as big as Western Australia is and with a growing population and the demands that flow from that, I think we are way behind in our program of future needs for police stations.

Another thing that concerns me is the relatively small amount of money allocated for general maintenance. The maintenance program has never been smaller. In my view, that is to disguise the falling amount of capital works being spent on police. Things are included under the so-called asset investment program that previously would not have been included under that heading and would have potentially been in another budget. I highlight the example of the speed camera replacement program funding of \$600 000. That is listed under the asset investment program for police. Previously, that would have been listed under the Department of Transport's funding through the Office of Road Safety. That money is being transferred from the road trauma trust account to police and then added into its capital amount. I understand that the government needs to do that, because the sheer embarrassment of how little it is spending on police infrastructure and maintenance and new capital works would otherwise become even more embarrassing. There is a similar picture in education and some other areas.

My view is that state governments have a responsibility to look after core areas, and those core areas include education, health, police and public transport. I do not see a lot of funding set aside in this budget for capital expenditure on police or education in particular, and that will result in a built-up demand in the future. Again, given the time of the day, I will not go into detail, but the small allocation to maintenance for police stations will mean that necessary maintenance will not occur. I highlight briefly, for example, that there have been problems in the Pilbara with air-conditioning units in police stations in Karratha and other locations because of humidity and other factors, and that those problems will impact potentially on the health and wellbeing of police officers working in those environments. As I see it, the money allocated there is not adequate to deal with the demand. In fact, in real terms, it is much less than it was 10 years ago.

MS M.M. QUIRK (Girrawheen) [4.55 pm]: Members will be very pleased to know that I am going to be brief on the Appropriation (Capital 2015–16) Bill 2015. I want to mention a few matters that pertain to my electorate. In fact, the first two are bouquets, Treasurer. I want him to understand that I am particularly grateful when the government uses its largesse in my electorate. It tends to be fairly rare, but out of courtesy I need to say that I certainly appreciate when the government spends money in my electorate.

The first of these bouquets concerns a matter I have been mentioning for a number of years in this place, and that is the new roof at East Hamersley Primary School. I am pleased to say that the roof has finally been replaced.

Mr Roger Cook; Dr Kim Hames; Acting Speaker; Mr David Templeman; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Ms Margaret Quirk; Dr Mike Nahan

I want to thank principal Lyn Dawson and all her staff for their forbearance and patience while we have been lobbying for that roof to be replaced. Secondly, the Kingsway Junior Football Club operates out of Warradale Oval, and I am pleased to say that the oval will be resurfaced under the community sporting and recreation facilities. It simply was not good enough and the kids who played on that football oval were at severe risk of injury.

The third matter I am not so pleased about concerns the former Blackmore primary school site that will eventually be developed by Landgate as affordable housing, which is excellent because it has been vacant for many years. However, some of the public open space has been chopped off the adjacent park. I was given assurances by Landgate that there would be interesting facilities in the park, facilities that would possibly encourage adult exercise, because they are all going to be very small blocks. I am afraid that rather sad multi-coloured playground equipment has been installed. I think that is a mistake because if there had been a bit more thought and investment in that park, it would have been a jewel in the crown for Landgate and it would have been easier to sell those blocks and houses.

I am sorry that the Minister for Transport has left the chamber, but the fourth issue I want to raise concerns the list of electronic school zone signs for 2013–14. The member for Hillarys and I have the very rare privilege of receiving none in our electorates. In 2013–14 not a single school in my electorate or the electorate of the member for Hillarys managed to get an electronic school zone sign, despite my writing to the minister and his predecessor on behalf of a number of schools. I have to ask: does the safety of kids in Girrawheen not count for anything? Some electorates have four or five but mine has not got any over two years. I have written to the minister again and have asked him to reconsider, because it is simply unacceptable when something like \$20 million is being spent in 2015–16 yet there is no money for an electronic school zone sign in my electorate. I would ask the government to reconsider that.

The final thing I want to talk about is the new east Landsdale primary school, which is the jewel in the crown under this new public–private partnership. Under this arrangement, it is a build, own, operate and maintain school. The rationale for it being maintained is that if maintenance is not included in the contract, the contractors will put in second-rate equipment, such as air conditioning and what have you, and that will break down some time sooner than the currency of the 20 or so years that a school building is expected to be functional. The way around that is to have specifications that certain equipment be used. I have problems with the maintenance side of things being part of the PPP for the simple reason that work such as cleaning schools is a good local job. We have been discussing the fact that we need to generate jobs in the communities to save on congestion. I really think that the idea of including the maintenance side of the contract means that local people who could have jobs such as cleaners and gardeners may well be excluded because they will be done by the contract personnel.

I am very disappointed about another issue relating to that school. It was subject to a development assessment panel application recently and was knocked back. The government had not done its homework and did not present enough evidence on car parking. It had half the car parking that was required, and of course it got knocked back. I am very disappointed in this first PPP school—one of about eight—and that the government could not get its facts right and do its homework to present before the DAP and get it approved. That has caused a further delay. The school has been well overdue for many years. It is simply unacceptable that provision for car parking was inadequate, and of course the inevitable happened.

DR M.D. NAHAN (Riverton — Treasurer) [5.01 pm] — in reply: I will resist the request from my colleagues on this side to answer everything at length.

Mr B.S. Wyatt: Come on, Treasurer—you've got plenty of time. You've got 30 minutes.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: I could. I hear the member for Victoria Park arguing that I should do so. I am really disappointed that members opposite are so deeply disappointed in us for spending too much and at the same time spending too little. It is a real art putting a budget together. I am very proud that this 2015–16 budget continues to be a record spend per capita on infrastructure. Indeed, we continue on this budget and over the forward estimates to spend 60 per cent more per capita on infrastructure than is the case in other states and also 60 per cent more than when we came into government than the previous government from 2001 to 2008.

Members opposite have decried this budget as the worst in history, but I think they will rue the day they made those complaints. I commend the budget to the house.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.