

Division 1: Parliament, \$50 011 000 —

Mr M.W. Sutherland, Chairman.

Mr G.A. Woodhams, Speaker of the Legislative Assembly.

Mr P.J. McHugh, Clerk of the Legislative Assembly.

Mr R. Bremner, Executive Manager, Parliamentary Services.

Mrs D.G. Timmerman, Chief Finance Officer, Parliamentary Services.

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

The estimates committee's consideration of the estimates will be restricted to discussion of those items for which a vote of money is proposed in the consolidated account; this is the prime focus of the committee. Although there is scope for members to examine many matters, questions need to be clearly related to a page number, item, program or amount within the volumes. For example, members are free to pursue performance indicators that are included in the *Budget Statements* while there remains a clear link between the questions and the estimates.

It is the chairman's intention to ensure that as many questions as possible are asked and answered and that both questions and answers are short and to the point.

The Speaker may agree to provide supplementary information to the committee rather than asking that the question be put on notice for the next sitting week. For the purpose of following up the provision of this information, I ask the Speaker to clearly indicate to the committee which supplementary information he agrees to provide, and I will then allocate a reference number. If supplementary information is to be provided, I seek the Speaker's cooperation in ensuring that it is delivered to the committee clerk by Friday, 11 June 2010 so that members may read it before the report and third reading stages. If the supplementary information cannot be provided within that time, written advice is required of the day by which the information will be made available. Details in relation to supplementary information have been provided to both members and advisers, and, accordingly, I ask the Speaker to cooperate with those requirements. I caution members that if the Speaker asks that a matter be put on notice, it is up to the member to lodge the question on notice with the Clerk's office. Only supplementary information that the Speaker agrees to provide will be sought by Friday, 11 June 2010.

It will greatly assist Hansard if when referring to the program statement volumes or the consolidated account estimates, members give the page number, items, program and amount in preface to their question.

I now ask the Speaker to introduce his advisers to the committee.

[Witnesses introduced.]

The CHAIRMAN: Members, questions please. The Leader of the Opposition.

Mr E.S. RIPPER: Why is it that the —

The CHAIRMAN: Sorry, which page?

Mr E.S. RIPPER: It is page 49. Why is it that the appropriation for the Assembly is nearly \$1 million more than it was two years ago?

The CHAIRMAN: Sorry, where is the Leader of the Opposition reading from?

Mr E.S. RIPPER: From page 49, under "Delivery of Services". Why is it that the appropriation for the Assembly is nearly \$1 million more than it was two years ago, and why is it that the total cost of services for the Assembly is nearly \$2 million more than it was two years ago?

The SPEAKER: Effectively, on page 49, if I were to draw the Leader of the Opposition's attention to "Major Spending Changes", that is possibly the section to which he is referring. We have brought forward \$500 000 from the last financial year, and there was also roughly about \$1 million that we had pulled forward from previous years also. Most of that money would be for use on the various committee operations we have, and there was also some spend in there for the regional Parliament.

The CHAIRMAN: Further questions?

Mr E.S. RIPPER: Not on that issue. I do have further questions.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: My question relates to the works in progress on page 58, under the "Asset Investment Program", and it is about the Legislative Council chamber refurbishment of \$2.4 million for 2009–10.

Chairman; Mr Eric Ripper; Speaker; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Joe Francis; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Andrew Waddell

The CHAIRMAN: Sorry, the member cannot ask questions on the Legislative Council, only on the Legislative Assembly.

The SPEAKER: If I might, Mr Chairman, there is some capacity in this, because —

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: It is under Parliamentary Services.

The SPEAKER: It would be under Parliamentary Services, so I could get Mr Bremner to provide some further information in this context. However, let me give the member some information, and perhaps the head of Parliamentary Services might like to add some further detail. Parliamentary Services did manage the fit-out, so it is the responsible organisation, and it did that on behalf of the Building Management and Works division of the Department of Treasury and Finance. If the member wants to talk specifically about that, she would need to direct that question to that agency. However, \$2.5 million was the capital allocation to PSD for the Legislative Council chamber fit-out, and the costs to date are just under \$2 million. Currently, Building Management and Works is in discussions with both the contractor and the project architects regarding the finalisation of those building costs. Possibly, any difference between the final total costs and the \$2.5 million that was allocated would be the subject of discussions with the Department of Treasury and Finance in seeking approval to utilise those funds for other capital projects within Parliament. That is about as much information as I can provide. I do not know whether Mr Bremner wishes to add further detail to that.

Mr R. Bremner: No, but I will clarify one point that the Speaker made. Parliamentary Services received the appropriation. However, we engaged the Department of Treasury and Finance, through its Building Management and Works division, to manage the project on our behalf. It let the tenders and superintended the project, so it is responsible for all the project management, and we get accounts from Building Management and Works and we pay the accounts. But the rest of the information is as what the Speaker said.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Just following up, no breakdown is available, so, from the Speaker's perspective, would it be appropriate to ask DTF for that breakdown?

The SPEAKER: Yes, the member would need to ask the Department of Treasury and Finance. Alternatively, the member could make inquiries with the Legislative Council and go down that road.

Mr J.M. FRANCIS: I have a question relating to the Speaker's answer on the expenditure for the refit of the Legislative Council chamber. I am not sure whether the Speaker will know the answer, but, if he does, can he inform us when the decision was made to refit the Legislative Council chamber?

The SPEAKER: Off the top of my head, I do not know the date. Mr Bremner?

Mr R. Bremner: I would have to check.

The SPEAKER: If the member would like us to do it, we can provide that information, but we do not have hard data in front of us on the table here. That would only be through Parliamentary Services. If the member wants us to provide that as supplementary information, I am sure that we can follow that road.

[9.10 am]

Mr R. Bremner: All I can say at this stage is that two financial years ago the appropriation was first allocated. We received a \$240 000 tranche in 2008–09; last year a \$2.2 million tranche; and this year a \$60 000 tranche. It was spread over three financial years.

Mr J.M. FRANCIS: It would have been in 2007–08 that the decision was made.

Mr E.S. RIPPER: I can provide information on this. The decision was made by the incoming government, not the previous Labor government, if that is what the member is driving at.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I refer to page 45, under "Efficiency Indicators". It indicates that the average cost of providing procedural and administrative support to each committee for 2009–10 was \$235 100 —

The SPEAKER: I might interrupt there. The member is dealing with Legislative Council information and I cannot answer on behalf of it. Sometimes I would like to, but I do not have to do that.

Mr E.S. RIPPER: I want to go to Parliamentary Services. A sentence on page 55 states —

The Department provides apolitical ancillary services to Members of Parliament.

I want to refer to the drafting services available to non-government members of Parliament. My understanding is that those services have changed. Previously they were provided by a private legal firm. Now non-government members are referred to Parliamentary Counsel, which is saying that it gives priority to the government. Why is that service no longer provided to non-government members? Who made the decision to instigate those changes? Can you, Mr Speaker, assure us that the same confidentiality given by that company to non-government members will now be met by Parliamentary Counsel? Is there a dedicated resource for non-government members

Chairman; Mr Eric Ripper; Speaker; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Joe Francis; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Andrew Waddell

or will non-government members have to get in line behind the government and never get their material drafted in the same way as in the past?

The SPEAKER: In fact that responsibility is not with Parliamentary Services. It sits with the Legislative Assembly still and I might get the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly to provide you with detail of that.

Mr P.J. McHugh: There has been an approach made by others to myself because of levels of dissatisfaction expressed with the turnaround time for the private drafter in the past and perhaps the quality of some of the work, although I do not want to cast any aspersions at all on Talbot Olivier, which was undertaking the work. The money provided to that company has been diverted to the Parliamentary Counsel's Office to assist them with general drafting and providing staff who are well qualified and experienced to get the drafting done. As to the financial transfers to bring this about, I cannot swear by that, but it is a matter for the Attorney General and Department of Treasury and Finance. The advice from Walter Munyard, the Parliamentary Counsel, is that they will give their best endeavours. While they are a good group, he says there will be no issue in getting a good turnaround, particularly in session. They express concern about drafting very large bills in a very short time, but that will be a problem in any event. My understanding is they have guaranteed in the documentation sent to members last week that they will maintain absolute confidentiality and in our discussions with them, frankly, I have no doubt that that will be the case. Can we guarantee it? I suppose we cannot guarantee it, but we have certainly been given undertakings and the Parliamentary Counsel has written in that document that it will maintain absolute confidentiality. In terms of priorities, they say in that document that priority will be given to government drafting. From my discussions with Walter Munyard, I understand that they expect to be able to turnaround all the amendments and drafting in a very good time. I suppose we will have to wait and see whether any problems will emerge from it. Our view in the discussions was that this would be a better system for members of Parliament.

Mr E.S. RIPPER: I have a follow-up question. The advice to members of Parliament is that the government's legislative program is to remain PCO's primary function and the provision of non-government drafting services is not to interfere with that legislative program. Having previously been involved with setting drafting priorities for the previous government, my understanding is that there is such competition for drafting priorities that a statement like that could mean that there would be no opposition or private members' drafting at all. Would it not be better if there was a quarantined resource in the Parliamentary Counsel's Office that was for non-government members of Parliament? It would appear that at the moment we are relying on internal decisions of the Parliamentary Counsel's Office to ensure that non-government members get a go, given the intense competition between government agencies for their drafting priorities.

The SPEAKER: I recognise the points that you make. I do not know whether Mr McHugh wishes to add further detail.

Mr P.J. McHugh: All I can say again is that Parliamentary Counsel has given us a best endeavours approach. It may well mean that in some circumstances the Parliamentary Counsel may have two or three individuals taking on amendments and private members' drafting as well as their other work and that there could be some segregation between that and the other drafting that they were doing. In some circumstances there might be quite a high demand for private members' drafting and that might be spread across three or four drafters perhaps, as opposed to having one dedicated resource. At this stage we have not seen it work. We did discuss the question of a dedicated resource that was thought not to be the best approach. I cannot say more than that at this stage. I guess it will be a case of seeing how it works out in practice. The Parliamentary Counsel seemed to me to be very genuine in the approach he intended to take.

Mr E.S. RIPPER: With whom should complaints be lodged if the service does not meet the requirements of non-government members?

THE SPEAKER: In the first instance, the best thing to do would be to draw that attention to me. Certainly I would need to be made aware of it. I have not had any members come directly to me to talk about drafting issues. Historically, there probably is a process in this place whereby members may have come to the Table while Parliament was sitting to seek advice and perhaps the Clerk, Deputy Clerk or someone else may have indicated how that might be obtained. To answer the Leader of the Opposition's question directly, I suggest that if there are major issues I should be the first person to be made aware of that.

Mr A.J. WADDELL: I refer to a line item at page 50 of the *Budget Statements* that states —

Promote Public Knowledge and Awareness of the Parliament

I note that there has been a drop of \$100 000 from the 2009–10 estimated actual to the 2010–11 budget estimate. I also note on page 51 a note at the second paragraph indicating that there is a remote regions education program that appears to have been discontinued. Why is this program being discontinued and who took the decision to discontinue the remote regions education program?

[9.20 am]

The SPEAKER: I missed the first part of the member's question, but can I just allay any fears the member for Forreestfield might have? I would be equally disturbed—in fact, I might even be further disturbed—if there were any suggestion at all that this program would not continue. We had allocated some funds to do a test run for this program, but the program is certainly ongoing and continuing. It has been a very successful program from this Parliament's perspective, and there is no intention at all that I am aware of for this program to cease. If it did, I, along with many other people in this place, would be manning the barricades to make sure that it continued.

Mr A.J. WADDELL: What accounts for the reduction in costs?

The SPEAKER: That is simply the figure attributed to the test run; that is all that figure is for. There is a greater allocation to enable the program to run in the out years. I know that the Clerk has been involved in this as well. He may want to add some more details to that.

Mr P.J. McHugh: Just briefly, Mr Speaker. There are two aspects to our outreach program. One is to get to most of the parts of the state, and we engage casual presenters in various regions around the state to deliver that program. However, in the current financial year, an amount of up to \$130 000 was allocated to get to the 77 remote schools in the Kimberley, Pilbara, Mid West, Goldfields central and Goldfields east regions, covering about 4 000 students. That was the Hear Me program; members might have seen the calico scrolls from that program being put up around the Parliament. The idea of that program is to see how we can get to those remote schools, which is very expensive, and how we can communicate best with those kids, many of whom do not necessarily meet the usual level of education for students of those years. Many of them are in remote Aboriginal communities and there are particular communication issues. The idea of this program was to test out across those 77 schools how best we can communicate with them. I do not think it would be a practical matter to allocate \$130 000 every year to communicate with those schools, so there will be an evaluation of this program at the end of this financial year. There is still a visit underway as we speak, and we will be looking at how we can get presenters into those areas, or at least train up teachers in communication methods that will assist those students' understanding of our political process. There is an evaluation yet to take place.

The SPEAKER: If I might just add a little more detail, we are talking about the Kimberley, Pilbara, the inland parts of the Mid West and the Goldfields. As members will appreciate, the Goldfields stretch out to the border with South Australia and the Northern Territory in parts, so it is a large patch. For some of those kids we are trying to reach, English is definitely a second language, so there are some added tasks in there, but, as the Clerk points out, that money is really to enable this pilot program to be developed so that we can make some assessment of it, because that is the part that disturbs me; I reinforce that there is absolutely no desire at all to shuffle this program off—not at all. I thank the member for asking the question.

The CHAIRMAN: Member for Mandurah, did you have a question? I have you down for one.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: I am a non-committee member, but I think I am allowed to ask a question.

I refer to various parts of the *Budget Statements*, but particularly to the table on pages 50 and 51, where the numbers of full-time equivalent parliamentary employees appear. I am interested in current permanent staff versus casual staff. Has there been a reduction in permanent staff in favour of more casuals; and, if so, what are the numbers and what is the reason for that?

The SPEAKER: Can I just get some clarification from the member? When the member says “parliamentary”, is he talking only about the Legislative Assembly?

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: It is staffing, including dining staff and Legislative Assembly staff. My understanding is that there has been a change in the number of permanent staff versus casual staff; and, if so, I would like some indication of what numbers that involves and the reason behind that shift.

The SPEAKER: We are talking about two things, effectively, or two separate operations; we are talking about the Legislative Assembly operation and about the Parliamentary Services Department. I think it might be appropriate to ask Mr McHugh, the Clerk, to answer on behalf of the Legislative Assembly and how that operates, and then I might ask Mr Bremner to respond for Parliamentary Services. They are two different operations, really, but I understand the question the member is asking.

Mr P.J. McHugh: Thank you, Mr Speaker. In relation to the Legislative Assembly, we have just under 34 full-time equivalents. The only casuals in the Legislative Assembly are casual presenters who work from time to time in the regions, presenting our education program, and they do that work on an as-needed basis. The rest of the staff in the Legislative Assembly are permanent.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: What about dining staff and that section?

The SPEAKER: Mr Bremner?

Chairman; Mr Eric Ripper; Speaker; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Joe Francis; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Andrew Waddell

Mr R. Bremner: In respect of Parliamentary Services, there are two main areas where we engage casual staff. The first area is reporting services—the Hansard and audiovisual areas. Our AV operators, who man the control room on sitting days, elect to be casual staff rather than part-time or sessional part-time staff. In the dining area, we have always engaged casual staff because of the sessional nature of parliamentary sittings and the fact that Parliament House is used for both executive government and parliamentary functions. We have a very atypical organisation and structure in our catering environment inasmuch as we have dinners only two nights a week for about 22 or 23 weeks of the year. We do not have the typical Friday and Saturday dinner situation, and we have to staff the dining room with casuals when we have late bookings, because we have to provide a core permanent staff to provide a member service during the week. However, we have a lot of bookings coming in during the week and, depending on those bookings, in the morning the dining room manager may in fact get casual staff in. By and large, the option is generally given in the first instance to casual staff who work here on an ongoing or longer term basis to take any permanent positions that come up, but in some cases our casual staff elect to be casuals because of the loading and because of their own financial situation.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: Of the permanent staff—for example, in the areas of dining or gardening—has there been a reduction in the number of permanent staff in favour of casual staff between last year and this year?

The SPEAKER: I will ask Mr Bremner to answer that.

Mr R. Bremner: I would have to get back to the member, but, off the top of my head, I would say no. It would be much the same. Certainly in the gardening area, the only time we ever have casual staff is when we engage casuals to cover people going on long-term leave; we get people in to cover an extended period of leave.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: What about the dining area?

Mr R. Bremner: No; I think we probably have exactly the same number of permanents as we had this time last year, but I can certainly check that and get back to the member.

[9.30 am]

The SPEAKER: Could I suggest that we provide that as supplementary information?

The CHAIRMAN: Exactly what information are you going to give?

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: Could I have a breakdown of the number of permanent staff versus casual staff in the various parliamentary areas?

The SPEAKER: Is the member just talking about the Parliamentary Services Department or the Legislative Assembly as well?

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: I would be pleased to have the staffing levels for both the Assembly and Parliamentary Services.

[*Supplementary Information No A1.*]

Mr J.E. McGRATH: My question is along similar lines. I am interested to know something about the staffing of the Legislative Assembly committees. A public statement was made earlier this year about the workload of the committee staff. I am chairing one new committee that is reporting this year. I think it is placing extra pressure on staff in the Legislative Assembly committee area. What are the staffing levels in the committee area? Are they adequate? Have there been any increases in staff in the past 12 months? Mr Speaker, do you have a view on the growth of the roles of committees, which seems to have had a number of inquiries and reports over the past 12 months?

The SPEAKER: We do have two unfunded committees that the member is possibly aware of. Representation has been made to Treasury with respect to that. Those two committees remain unfunded. The member for South Perth has been around for two Parliaments and he would notice that the levels of inquiry or the work of a particular committee may vary quite substantially from committee to committee and from year to year. Sometimes Parliament will refer an inquiry to a committee. At other times a committee might create its own inquiry. The parliamentary inquiry has precedence, and that is the one that needs to be followed through. From my observation, that is quite often the one where additional stress is involved.

I do not think it is my place in this estimates hearing to make a personal observation about committee workloads. A range of things happen. I am not trying to skip around it. Outside of this place, I could make some comments about how difficult it is for some committees to do their work, but I do not think it helps our process in here for me to make personal observations. I would argue for greater funding, and that is something that we should take to Treasury. If this place wants those two committees that are currently unfunded to continue and to deliver some reasonable information and results into this place, we need to get some funding for them. For the time being, that is not the case.

Chairman; Mr Eric Ripper; Speaker; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Joe Francis; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Andrew Waddell

Mr J.E. McGRATH: For the sake of *Hansard*, what are those committees?

The SPEAKER: The Joint Standing Committee on the Commissioner for Children and Young People and the one that the member for South Perth is involved in—the Joint Standing Committee on the Review of the Racing and Wagering Western Australia Acts. Both of those committees serve a substantially important role in the current environment. On the record, it would be fantastic if they could be appropriately funded.

Mr J.E. McGRATH: I have one further question on committee staffing. The budget does not specify how much money is paid for staff in the committee area. I could not find that. What is the cost of staffing the committees and what was the cost last year? What has been the increase?

The SPEAKER: It is a good question. Although I have plenty of information about committees and budgets et cetera, I do not have that sort of analysis or comparison. I am more than happy to provide the member with supplementary information.

The CHAIRMAN: For clarity, what information are you seeking?

Mr J.E. McGRATH: I am seeking the cost of staffing the Legislative Assembly committees last financial year and this financial year.

[Supplementary Information No A2.]

Mr E.S. RIPPER: We have accountability arrangements for ministers' travel and for the travel of members of Parliament but it would seem that Presiding Officers' travel is not subject to the same reporting requirements. Mr Speaker, are you prepared to adopt the same reporting requirements as apply to ministers for the travel that you undertake, including the people on the delegations, the locations, the itinerary and the cost, and provide that information to Parliament?

The SPEAKER: The details of my travel arrangements, including the itinerary undertaken—it would be similar for the President of the Legislative Council—are provided in an annual report that is tabled. That report shows the travel that I have undertaken or the travel that other Speakers may have undertaken on my behalf.

Mr E.S. RIPPER: Is that an annual report of the Legislative Assembly?

The SPEAKER: I table an annual report that is available to the Leader of the Opposition or any other member in this place if they wish to see it.

Mr E.S. RIPPER: Is this an annual travel report?

The SPEAKER: No, certainly not. It is a report of my office over the past financial year.

Mr E.S. RIPPER: When would we expect a report for this financial year?

The SPEAKER: While I have not looked directly at the report for this year, I am advised that it is in the Legislative Assembly's report. It is not a separate Speaker's report but the detail that I referred to earlier would be found in there. I am not familiar with the absolute requirements for those ministerial reports that the Leader of the Opposition referred to. I could certainly make myself more familiar with them in terms of the accountability that is found in them that the various ministers have to adhere to. That is certainly something that I am prepared to look at. At this stage I would be a little reticent to adhere to something that I do not have enough knowledge about in terms of what ministers have to report, when that reporting is done, what the accountability is and what the areas of responsibilities for that minister are. I do not know totally what all those requirements are. I could familiarise myself with that and make a decision. At this stage, I would be rather reticent to say, "Yes, I would do the same thing" without knowing what it is.

Mr E.S. RIPPER: When will that annual report for this financial year be available? Is that subject to the same rules as other agencies, so we should have that report by 30 September?

The SPEAKER: Yes, at the end of September.

[9.40 am]

Mr E.S. RIPPER: Mr Speaker, are you prepared to make a statement by way of supplementary information, or indeed in the report, on harmonisation of accountability requirements between ministers, members of Parliament and Presiding Officers? I appreciate that you want to look at those requirements before you make a statement, but are you prepared to commit to making some later statement about these issues?

The SPEAKER: I would be prepared, Leader of the Opposition, for you and I to sit down and discuss this. I really need to familiarise myself with all that information. I am certainly not familiar with it at the moment. But I give an undertaking to you to certainly sit down with you and talk further about it before I am prepared to make a statement, and I would like to talk to further about it.

Chairman; Mr Eric Ripper; Speaker; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Joe Francis; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Andrew Waddell

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: My question relates to page 51 and the asset investment program. I notice there is nothing estimated for 2010–11 and forward years. I am just wondering if there is no further asset investment proposed or if that is portrayed somewhere else in the *Budget Statements*.

Mr E.S. RIPPER: While that answer is being worked out. I hope to ask some questions of the Parliamentary Commissioner for Administrative Investigations. I am concerned we might not have time to do that.

The SPEAKER: I acknowledge what the Leader of the Opposition has said. I was going to draw your attention, Mr Chairman, to the time, because I know that the Ombudsman is here and it would be worthwhile for this estimates committee to meet with the Ombudsman.

To answer your question, member for Scarborough, most of those funds are attributable to two things. They are in fact the replacement of photocopying facilities. While we describe it as a one-off event, those sorts of things happen from time to time, but most of the capital you see there is a photocopier replacement, printer replacement programs and, likewise, some acquisition of mainly Indigenous artworks. That is what appears there, but in terms of other assets or other developments in the out years, I might ask if the Parliamentary Services Department, through Mr Bremner, wants to add any detail. From our perspective in the Legislative Assembly, we do not have any capital or funding next to it, and we do not see any replacement programs at this stage.

Mr R. Bremner: I just draw the member's attention to page 58 where the PSD asset investment program is listed. I am more than happy to answer any direct questions in relation to that either now or outside this forum.

Mr J.E. McGRATH: We talk about capital investment. Once again in the committee area, I notice in the existing committee accommodation that some of the committees are overlapping and are sharing accommodation, one after the other. If one committee sits a bit late, another committee might be waiting to use the room. Do you foresee any problems in future years with accommodation in the existing facilities that the Legislative Assembly committees are using, and do you see that that might have to be addressed?

The SPEAKER: Yes; there will be difficulties in the coming years. You are referring, I imagine, member, essentially to just the separate rooms.

Mr J.E. McGRATH: Yes, for hearings.

The SPEAKER: Some rooms are able to do things that other rooms are not. That is why a committee might want to be able to access room 2 instead of room 3, or whatever it might be. Yes, those problems are there. They are acknowledged from conversations I have had and from the information that is continually brought to my attention. It is one of the issues that over a period of time we need to resolve, but in the meantime it remains a challenge.

The CHAIRMAN: The question is that the appropriation be recommended for division 1.

Mr J.M. FRANCIS: I have another question on this division, which is a very short one.

Mr E.S. RIPPER: We are going to finish our questions so that we can talk to the Ombudsman. If we have other questions on this division, time is going to be chewed up.

The appropriation was recommended.