

DIVISION 9: TREASURY AND FINANCE —

[Supplementary Information No A42.]

Question: Ms R. Saffioti asked for the cost of the three components of the Perth City Link Project, and the estimated total cost of the Project.

Answer: The estimated total cost of the project is \$656.3 million. The component breakdowns are:

- development above ground - \$47 million (East Perth Redevelopment Authority); and
- rail infrastructure - \$360.3 million, bus station - \$249 million (Public Transport Authority).

[Supplementary Information No A43.]

Question: Mr W.J. Johnston asked for the actual figures of tax as a percentage of GSP for the last two years.

Answer: Actual figures for tax as a percentage of GSP are not yet available for 2009-10. Based on the estimated outturn in the 2010-11 Budget, the estimate for 2009-10 is 3.7 per cent. This compares to the 2010-11 estimate of 3.6 per cent.

[Supplementary Information No A44.]

Question: Mr B.S. Wyatt asked the Treasurer to confirm that, of the additional funding provided for Child Protection in the 2010–11 financial year, was \$28.3 million (held by Treasury), money that had been already allocated to child protection?

Answer: The Liberal-National Government boosted the Child Protection Budget by 11% in 2010/11 to \$442 million.

Part of the funding will be used to reform and expand residential care services and increase the number of child protection and support workers. Part of the Department's budget includes \$28.3 million of funding for the Ford Review which is being support by this Government.

[Supplementary Information No A45.]

Question: Ms R. Saffioti asked how many complaints were received through the State Supply Commission over the 2009–10 year and the nature of the complaints.

Answer: Nine complaints have been received in 2009-10. Three of these complaints were not goods and services or works related, and were referred to the appropriate authority.

Of the remaining six complaints, five related to the conduct of the tender process, whilst one complainant claimed they were discriminated against as they were not a local provider.

The six complainants were investigated and none could be sustained. None of the complainants have taken any further action since being advised of the outcome of the review into their complaints.