

APPROPRIATION (CONSOLIDATED ACCOUNT) CAPITAL 2012–13 BILL 2012

Third Reading

Resumed from an earlier stage of the sitting.

MR W.J. JOHNSTON (Cannington) [4.10 pm]: I want to get on to Western Power, but before doing so I want to note something. Before the break I was referring to the *Canning Examiner* of 20 March 2009 under the heading “Bulldozers warm up”, which states —

The bulldozers will be turning up the ground on stage eight of Roe Highway before the next state election, according to Riverton member Mike Nahan.

The member interjected on me and said that he never said that. I checked the paper for the following couple of weeks to see whether his letter demanding a correction had been published, but apparently his letter demanding a correction was not published by the paper. That correction apparently is capable of being delivered only here in the house. What did the member for Riverton say? It is interesting to note that Hon Simon O’Brien was sacked as transport minister by this Premier last year.

Mrs L.M. Harvey: He was promoted.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: He was sacked! The Premier outlined today all these sackings by the former government; surely that was also a sacking. The Premier said that changing portfolios is a sacking.

Mrs L.M. Harvey: He was promoted.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: That is the definition given to us by the Premier. Surely the Premier of the state of Western Australia was not seeking to mislead the house by creating terminology that is not accurate. Surely the Premier of Western Australia was not doing that. Before he was sacked as Minister for Transport, Hon Simon O’Brien in the *Cockburn Gazette* of 25 May 2010 said —

The current budget allocation will enable the necessary preconstruction activities such as project development, scope finalisation, environment and heritage approvals, stakeholder consultation and project design to be completed,” he said.

“Once the project scope is defined, a further allocation for the construction phase of the project will be sought.”

The government has had three years and three budgets now to allocate that money. As I say, we know the commitment of this Liberal government to the Roe Highway extension. It is zero. Zero cents is how much it has allocated to the project; that is the Liberal government’s commitment and that is what it thinks about that project. I welcome that decision by the government not to build it. All I am saying is that Liberal Party members need to tell the truth on this project in the southern suburbs for the first time.

I want to turn to the question of Western Power.

Dr M.D. Nahan interjected.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: That is the truth, member. If there was one cent of commitment to the project, it would be in the budget papers. It is not in the budget papers.

Dr M.D. Nahan interjected.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: There is nothing there! They are not my budget papers. If the member for Riverton wants to move an amendment to the motion on the budget papers, he should do that. Move an amendment. Demand an amendment. Not one cent is allocated to Roe Highway by this government; that is this government’s belief. This government’s belief in the Roe Highway project is zero cents.

Mr D.A. Templeman interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms A.R. Mitchell): Members, there is one member on his feet and that is the only member talking.

Dr M.D. Nahan interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Riverton!

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: Not one cent is the amount that the Liberal government has committed to the construction of the project on Roe Highway—not one cent. Any Liberal member who goes to the southern suburbs and says that the Liberal Party is committed to building Roe Highway stage 8 will be lying to the people

Mr Bill Johnston; Acting Speaker; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Fran Logan; Dr Graham Jacobs;
Mr Joe Francis; Ms Margaret Quirk

of their electorate and they will be lying because we know that not one cent has been committed to it. I have referred already to the line item on page 647 of the *Budget Statements* for “Roe Highway Extension—Project Development” and the allocation for this year which is zero; the allocation for next year is zero; the allocation for 2013–14 is zero; and the allocation for 2015–16 is zero. All the decisions that the government has made are in this budget paper, and there is not one cent for the construction of Roe Highway. Any Liberal member of Parliament who goes into the southern suburbs and says that the government is committed to building Roe Highway stage 8 is not telling the truth. There is no commitment—not one cent—and any Liberal member who says that in the southern suburbs is lying. If the budget papers —

Dr M.D. Nahan interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Riverton.

Mr F.A. Alban interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Swan Hills, I call you to order for the first time today.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: We know the commitment of this Liberal government to that project. I do not want to go on any further. If the member for Riverton believes that this project needs to be built, he has the opportunity to stand in this place today and say so. He is not bound by caucus solidarity. He can make his own decision. He can get up in this place today and move an amendment to the budget motion to put this project in the budget papers. He can do that right now; that would be honest. But the one thing that no Liberal member of Parliament can do is lie to their community by saying that the government is committed to this project, because it is not.

I want to go on to another issue related directly to my shadow portfolio. It is very interesting, when we review the commitment of the Liberal government to the power industry, to watch what has happened so very recently with the very bad storm on Tuesday night. I want to pay tribute to the many people out there who are working away on behalf of Western Power—contractors and direct employees—to restore power to very many people in Western Australia. The storm, which was a one-in-10-year storm, led to the cut-off of electricity for over 15 per cent of Western Power’s customers.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members! Member for Cockburn, I will say it again: there is one member on his feet. I remind members to keep quiet. There will be no other conversations going on in the house.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: It is surprising that a storm, which was only a one-in-10-year storm, led to 15 per cent of Western Power’s customers being without power because of the failure of the network. We need to look at the commitment of the Liberal government to investment in the network. Western Power is detailed on pages 598 and 599 of budget paper No 2, volume 2, of the *Budget Statements*. Set out there is an investment program that is usual with these sorts of investment programs. However, this government’s budget, unlike other governments’ budgets, is actually declining over the forward estimates. It declines from just over \$1 billion now to an expected \$865 million in the final year of the out years. It is also interesting to ask: how does that compare with the amount of money that Western Power believes is required to bring its network up to standard? This is very important, because in September last year Western Power said that its wooden pole network had reached the end of its safe and useful life. Of course we had the December 2011 report of the Economic Regulation Authority, which was very critical of Western Power’s management systems; we had the Trenorden report of the Standing Committee on Public Administration in January 2012 which set out the travesty of the maintenance arrangements by Western Power; and then we had the subsequent report of that committee into the fact that in the opinion of the committee Western Power had deliberately misled the inquiry. Although Western Power did not acknowledge it did that deliberately, it did acknowledge that it misled the inquiry. Is the government’s commitment to upgrade the network, therefore, sufficient to do that upgrade? We know about all the problems in the network that have been allowed to develop while Minister Collier has been in power. I also point out that Minister Collier is frequently in the media and in the other chamber saying that everything is okay, everything is getting better and things are going well. That is his position; he thinks things are going well.

The member for Belmont in the estimates process asked a question and got back a very interesting answer. It is in supplementary information B58. Western Power tells us —

The existing Asset Investment Program in the State Budget is \$998 million lower than the Capital Expenditure contained in Western Power’s revised AA3 submission at 29 May 2012, across 2012/13 to 2015/16.

The government is providing almost \$1 billion less to Western Power than Western Power believes it needs to use to get the network up to standard.

Mr V.A. Catania interjected.

Mr Bill Johnston; Acting Speaker; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Fran Logan; Dr Graham Jacobs;
Mr Joe Francis; Ms Margaret Quirk

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for North West!

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: Another interesting thing is that Western Power let us know that the asset investment program contained in the budget has an allocation of \$328 million less than the capital expenditure contained in the ERA's draft decision of 29 March 2012 for those same four years. So even if we take the lower figure that has been concluded by the Economic Regulation Authority in its draft decision, the government is still intending to underspend on the network over the next four years by \$328 million.

So, any claim by the government that it is investing sufficient resources into the Western Power network is exposed as not true. It is exposed that the government is not even spending the lower amount that the Economic Regulation Authority believes is necessary. The government is underspending on the network, so —

Mr V.A. Catania: A \$1 billion black hole left by Labor in 2008.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: What dishonesty from the back of the chamber!

Mr V.A. Catania: It was said by the member for Belmont.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms A.R. Mitchell): Member for North West, I call you to order for the first time today.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: What is being said here has to be understood. This is an underspend against the demands of the network; that is the government's intention. It has been underspending to this point, and it plans to continue to underspend. The people in the electorate of Murray–Wellington, for example, who have been without power since Sunday night and still do not know when their power will be reconnected have to ask: was that underinvestment by this government a contributing factor to that blackout? I welcome the Energy Safety Division's decision to investigate the circumstances of the Western Power infrastructure and the way it fell over and left over 15 per cent of Western Power's customers without power on Sunday night, and I will be interested to see what happens.

The minister will not acknowledge the problems at Western Power. Let us look at his performance. The former managing director of Western Power was allowed to go away with a huge payout, plus his superannuation, although he is the person who oversaw the crisis that has been allowed to develop. Every time the minister has been asked to stand up for the energy consumers of this state, he has not; he wants to side with the cultural problems inside Western Power. That is not good enough. That is not his job, and the budget papers simply demonstrate that fact. The minister needs to get up and do some work and ensure that adequate investment is put into the network to ensure reliability and safety, a network which Western Power itself says is beyond its safe and useful life. The minister, of course, rejected that in answer to a question on notice from me, but that was what Western Power said; it is time for some action by this minister.

I can go through a whole range of other issues. I have already touched on the high efficiency gas turbine project and Muja power station, and there all these other problems in the energy system. We have not even got on to the question of the debacle that this minister has been responsible for with the Synergy billing system, which he said in April 2009 was a world-class billing platform. It has in fact blown out by nearly three times its original budget, and the saving of \$75 million that the minister said would be made from the introduction of that scheme in April 2009 has not been realised. I have not even got into that. These issues are all directly related to this minister's performance on the budget.

There are real challenges in the energy portfolio. We know that the Premier says that the minister is not suited to the portfolio and, no matter who wins the election, whether it is the current opposition leader or the current Premier, one thing we all know is that Minister Collier will not be the Minister for Energy after the election. Quite frankly, I think it is time the Premier stepped in and put in a Minister for Energy who is interested in the job.

Point of Order

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: We are talking about the capital expenditure in the budget papers; we are not talking about the personalities of the ministers involved and what the Premier should or should not be doing in relation to a particular minister. Madam Acting Speaker, I ask that you bring the member back to what is specific in the budget papers under capital.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms A.R. Mitchell): Thank you, Leader of the House.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: On the point of order —

The ACTING SPEAKER: I would like to speak on the point of order first, before —

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: Yes, I would like to speak on the point of order.

Mr Bill Johnston; Acting Speaker; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Fran Logan; Dr Graham Jacobs;
Mr Joe Francis; Ms Margaret Quirk

The ACTING SPEAKER: Thank you; on the point of order.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: I would just make the point that in developing my argument about the fact that Western Power is not being allowed to spend sufficient money, clearly the performance of the minister is directly related to the ability of Western Power to do its work, given that is his job.

The ACTING SPEAKER: I think that is far too long an explanation, and I would suggest to you, member, that the debate on the capital appropriation bill is confined to only those items found in the bill. Thank you.

Debate Resumed

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: As I was saying, in respect of the detailed table of Western Power's expected expenditure over the next four years, which is on page 599 of budget paper No 2, and the answer provided by Western Power as supplementary information B58 arising from the hearing of Legislative Assembly Estimates Committee B on 31 May 2001, in which Western Power explained that it is being required to spend \$328 million less on the network than not only it but also the ERA believes is necessary, that brings into question why the people of Western Australia should support this budget. Why is it that the government is not prepared to allow Western Power to spend the money it needs? What will be the implications of the declining investment in the Western Power network proposed by this government? It is not what is being asked for by Western Power and not what is being provided by the Economic Regulation Authority, but it is the decision of the government to underspend both those targets. That is a real challenge, and we saw that this week with the performance of the Western Power network, which clearly has to come back to the only one person responsible. If we turn to volume 2 of budget paper No 2, we will see that under part 12 it reads that the Minister for Energy is the person responsible for that section of the budget. That is why I am raising, entirely consistently with the budget papers, the performance of the minister, because this is about his portfolio. I am not quite sure who else the Leader of the House wants me to blame for the failures, but given that the Minister for Energy is the responsible person I reckon he should take the blame. Perhaps the Leader of the House can get up after me and say who he blames for the failures in the energy portfolio.

Mr R.F. Johnson: You! I blame you, absolutely.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Cannington! Thank you, Leader of the House. Just restrict your comments to the content of the bill.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: Absolutely; that is exactly what I am doing. As I made clear, I am referring to the third item on page 599 of the budget papers.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Cannington!

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: Yes; I am doing exactly what you asked, Madam Acting Speaker.

The ACTING SPEAKER: You do not need to explain to me, just do it.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: Yes; thank you very much. I am just doing exactly what I am told; I am just explaining to the house and to you, Madam Acting Speaker, that somebody has to be responsible for this decision. My view is that in the energy portfolio, the person responsible is the minister. Apparently, it is not, according to the Leader of the House; in his view it is the opposition that is responsible for the decisions of government. That is an interesting concept. I am very intrigued by that, and I am looking forward to the Leader of the House getting up and explaining his position on that issue. But I personally think the community should look at the Minister for Energy.

In every aspect of the energy portfolio part of the budget papers we can see budget blow-outs, failures, cost overruns, lack of planning, lack of delivery and lack of performance, and they all come back to one spot—the Minister for Energy.

In conclusion, given that the Premier is not going to allow Minister Collier to be energy minister in the next government, why does he not get rid of him now? We might as well have a good minister who is capable of doing the work now, rather than having to wait until the 9 March 2013 election of a new government.

MR M. MCGOWAN (Rockingham — Leader of the Opposition) [4.29 pm]: I will not take long. This is the final opportunity that we will have in this house to debate the budget. This has probably been one of more extraordinary budgets in Western Australian history. The budget was presented but the Treasurer is no longer here to deal with the budget debate.

Mr R.F. Johnson: Are you the final speaker on your side?

Mr B.S. Wyatt: No!

Mr R.F. Johnson: How many will be speaking?

Mr Bill Johnston; Acting Speaker; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Fran Logan; Dr Graham Jacobs;
Mr Joe Francis; Ms Margaret Quirk

Mr B.S. Wyatt: You will find out!

Mr R.F. Johnson: You defy all convention, do you know that?

Mr B.S. Wyatt: You will find out.

Mr M. McGOWAN: I think it is very unusual that the Treasurer who presented the budget to the house, set out the parameters of the budget and announced the major initiatives in the budget is now no longer the Treasurer.

Mr R.F. Johnson: This is tedious repetition, and you know that.

Mr M. McGOWAN: Please.

Mr R.F. Johnson: Tedious repetition.

Mr M. McGOWAN: Please.

The Treasurer is now no longer even the Treasurer dealing with the budget. What I also find disturbing is that the budget will pass through this house this evening and the current Treasurer, the member for Cottesloe, who is also the Premier, is not even in this place to deal with the third reading stage of this bill.

Several members interjected.

Mr M. McGOWAN: He is paired.

Mr R.F. Johnson: Traditionally, there have never been any speeches on the third reading —

Mr M. McGOWAN: It is very unusual that we have a Treasurer —

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms A.R. Mitchell): Thank you, members!

Mr M. McGOWAN: The Treasurer who commenced the budget process is no longer here to deal with it. The replacement Treasurer is not in this place to deal with the third reading stage of what is the most important piece of legislation to pass through Parliament each year. This is the most important piece of legislation and the Treasurer himself is now not even here to deal with the third reading of the budget. I want to make one other point in that regard —

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members!

Mr M. McGOWAN: I want to make one other point in relation to —

Mr P.T. Miles interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Wanneroo, I call you to order for the first time today.

Mr T.G. Stephens interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Pilbara, I call you to order for the second time today.

Mr M. McGOWAN: I want to make one other point about the Treasurer who presented the budget, the now member for Bateman. As I said yesterday or the day before, I wish him the best in a federal parliamentary career. It is a difficult life that he has embarked upon. I think the fact that he has shown —

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members, I suggest if you are in the house that you take a seat and you listen. Leader of the Opposition, I remind you, as I have said to others, that the debate that you are involved in at the moment is confined to only those items found in the bill.

Mr M. McGOWAN: Thank you, Madam Acting Speaker, I will not be long.

I want to make the point that the Treasurer who presented the budget, the member for Bateman, is on his way into federal Parliament and I wish him all the best in that. It is a hard life that the member for Bateman has chosen. I think it highly irregular and unusual that he would give up his portfolios for some sense of propriety in the middle of a budget process. I can only imagine that this was not the member for Bateman's preferred course of action, because it is very unusual. I heard the Premier —

Several members interjected.

Mr M. McGOWAN: The Premier indicated that there was some sort of sense of propriety or something that would not have been appropriate about the then Treasurer being a federal candidate whilst maintaining a portfolio. Is that correct?

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Thursday, 14 June 2012]

p3764a-3764a

Mr Bill Johnston; Acting Speaker; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Fran Logan; Dr Graham Jacobs;
Mr Joe Francis; Ms Margaret Quirk

Mr R.F. Johnson: I believe that it is up to the former Treasurer and Attorney General to speak for himself, and he is very eloquent in doing that. But let me just tell you: he is one of the most honourable people in this chamber and he would not do anything that lowered his integrity. He is a man of the highest integrity and he believes that it would be wrong to continue.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Leader of the House and Leader of the Opposition, I ask you again to confine your comments to only the items found in the bill.

Mr M. McGOWAN: Of course, I am interested in the capital appropriations of the budget, which were handed down by the member for Bateman. There are some matters in the budget that deal with the electorate of Bateman. I am very interested in those matters that deal with the electorate of Bateman and indeed I am very interested in those capital matters that deal with issues in the federal electorate of Pearce. There seems to be some concern that capital that is being spent in the federal electorate of Pearce might have caused some conflict of interest or some problem for the member for Bateman in staying on as the Attorney General and Treasurer.

I will just raise one issue. I had a look at the history of Sir Robert Menzies.

Mr P.T. Miles: Is he in this budget?

Mr M. McGOWAN: Please. Sir Robert Menzies was a member of the Victorian Parliament before his election to federal Parliament. When he arrived in the Victorian Parliament, he became a minister immediately. People recognised his intellect and his qualities. He rose to be Deputy Premier of Victoria, funnily enough, prior to his move into federal Parliament. He held the position of Attorney General of Victoria from 19 May 1932 to 24 July 1934. He was elected to federal Parliament on 15 September 1934; therefore, he was elected to the federal Parliament some five or so weeks after he ceased to be Attorney General of Victoria. Sir Robert Menzies was preselected for the then United Australia Party for the federal electorate of Kooyong some considerable period before that. In the case of Sir Robert Menzies, the founder of the Liberal Party, it was entirely acceptable for him to be Victorian Deputy Premier and Attorney General whilst he was a federal candidate in the 1930s. It was entirely acceptable for the founder of the Liberal Party himself. I fail to see why it was acceptable for Sir Robert Menzies to undertake that role, yet it was not acceptable for the member for Bateman, which has caused all that turmoil and consternation inside those portfolios and consternation in the government because of the portfolio changes that have to be undertaken. If it was okay for Sir Robert Menzies, I do not understand why it was not okay for the member for Bateman. I think there is a greater story yet to be told about what has gone on.

MR F.M. LOGAN (Cockburn) [4.37 pm]: I thank the Leader of the Opposition for taking us to those critical points about capital expenditure in the budget.

I draw the house's attention to page 860 of budget paper No 2, which is about the Water Corporation. The second paragraph deals with the southern seawater desalination plant near Binningup and the acknowledgement that the Water Corporation will spend \$260 million on the expansion of that project. The issue about the southern seawater desalination plant that I raised during budget estimates was over not exactly the signing of the contract, because my understanding, from the sort of explanation we had from the Minister for Water and the CEO of the Water Corporation, Ms Sue Murphy, was that AJ Lucas, the principal constructor of the desalination plant at Binningup, already had the contract to build stage 1 and then in October last year it was given, as part of the general package, the right to build stage 2. I do not think AJ Lucas was given a new contract; I think it was all part of a one-single-contract process, but it obviously had the right to build stage 2 of the desalination project at Binningup—the expansion phase. As I pointed out from that paragraph in the budget, that is \$260 million of capital expenditure awarded by the Barnett Liberal government, announced by the Premier himself and the Minister for Water, to a company called AJ Lucas, which is currently building the plant at Binningup as we speak. At the time that media announcement was made and at the time that expansion project was awarded to AJ Lucas, AJ Lucas, as a company, was suspended from the Stock Exchange in Australia. It voluntarily suspended itself in May 2011 and it did not return to the Stock Exchange until December 2011. AJ Lucas suspended itself from the Stock Exchange because of the financial situation it found itself in; that is, it owed \$110 million to creditors and had only \$13 million in the bank. It was significantly financially constrained and was obviously trying to find some form of refinancing so that it could continue on in business until it could relist itself on the Stock Exchange.

I raised this fact with the Minister for Water and the Chief Executive Officer of the Water Corporation during the estimates committee hearings. I asked them why the minister had not notified the general public and this house that the Liberal–National government had signed off on an agreement for \$260 million with a company that was suspended from the Stock Exchange. That is big news; that is an important piece of information in respect of the government's transparency and accountability to this house and to the various organs of government, whether it be the Ombudsman, the Auditor General or the Corruption and Crime Commission. Various organs of the Western Australian government would have liked to have known that information, and the most important organ

Mr Bill Johnston; Acting Speaker; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Fran Logan; Dr Graham Jacobs;
Mr Joe Francis; Ms Margaret Quirk

of government is this house. We should have been advised of that. If the government really wanted to be transparent, the media release put out by the Premier and the Minister for Water, trumpeting the expansion of the desalination plant should have read, “The company we’ve done the deal with has been suspended from the Stock Exchange.” I am sure that, for political reasons, it would not do that, but it could and should have at least acknowledged the fact.

When I raised that matter with the minister and the CEO, their response was a simple one: “Look, what’s the problem? We’re in an alliance with the Spanish company that actually owns the technology for that.” The alliance partners on the project were Técnicas Reunidas, Valoriza Agua, WorleyParsons, AJ Lucas and the Water Corporation. The five of them are all partners in the alliance for the construction of the desalination plant. What is the problem? If one of the partners goes over because it is bankrupt, the other partners will pick up the cost and continue on with the project. The questions I asked the minister and the CEO were: How do we know that? How does the general public know that? When was the general public going to be told? Had the company fallen over, were we to be advised? Would the project have continued on without anything being said? When were we going to be advised that the state government had done a deal with a company that was already in financial trouble and had suspended itself from the Stock Exchange? Why should we not have been told about that?

The point I made to the minister was that, had Water Corp been a private company, it would have been required, under the Corporations Act, to inform the Stock Exchange about the fact that it had signed an agreement with another company that was suspended. The Water Corporation is covered by the Corporations Act, but it is not listed on the Stock Exchange, and the state government allows it to hide behind a government trading enterprise veil of secrecy. The details of contracts signed between government trading enterprises and private companies are denied the scrutiny of this house and the general public on the grounds of commercial confidentiality. If Water Corp were a private company, it would have had to acknowledge the fact that it had signed a \$260 million agreement with a company that was suspended from the Stock Exchange; but because it is a public company hiding behind the veil of government trading enterprise commercial confidentiality, it does not have to explain anything. The minister and the CEO of Water Corp came into this house and said, “What’s the problem? We don’t have to tell you anything. It’s all covered.” How do we know it is all covered? We do not know whether the government is being exposed to a \$260 million risk, because under the terms of the contract we are not allowed to see that; that information is held back from us.

We then had to ask ourselves whether we could have confidence in the minister to be able to do the right thing in a situation in which he has personally signed off, on behalf of the government, with a company that is suspended from the Stock Exchange. Should that company go bankrupt, can we rely on the minister? Can the general public put its faith in the Minister for Water? His answer was that the minister does not get involved in the contract. He has said the same thing for other contracts: “I never read the contract”. The same Minister for Water told us during estimates not to worry about these things, or about raising the possibility of a \$260 million contract going over and that it was all okay. He then admitted that he had not read the contract and does not get himself involved in it! How can the general public and this house have any confidence whatsoever in the government and the Minister for Water?

I had a lot to say about the previous Minister for Water, the member for Eyre; unfortunately, the poor old member for Eyre is sitting up the back, twiddling his thumbs, and I think he should be joined up there on the back bench by the member for Nedlands, because the current Minister for Water is a complete halfwit. He is a complete halfwit because he stands in this house —

Withdrawal of Remark

Dr G.G. JACOBS: I ask the member for Cockburn to withdraw that term—“halfwit” is unparliamentary.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms A.R. Mitchell): Member for Cockburn, I think it is appropriate that you refer to the minister by his correct title and I ask you to withdraw that remark. It is appropriate to withdraw, I think.

Mr F.M. LOGAN: What—“halfwit”? All right; I withdraw.

Debate Resumed

Mr F.M. LOGAN: I think we need to be a little careful about what we rule out of order in this place sometimes; it will come back to haunt people. Anyway, if I am not allowed to actually use the term “halfwit” to describe people, he is absolutely incompetent. I did say that about the member for Eyre a number of times.

Ms M.M. Quirk: You’ve devalued the word, and now you wish you had not.

Mr Bill Johnston; Acting Speaker; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Fran Logan; Dr Graham Jacobs;
Mr Joe Francis; Ms Margaret Quirk

Mr F.M. LOGAN: I wish I had not devalued the word, because otherwise I could use “halfwit”, but “incompetent” will do, because incompetency is a great reflection of what I am talking about. We have a Minister for Water currently who signed off —

A member interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members! Settle! The member for Cockburn, to continue.

Dr G.G. Jacobs: An island blew up on your watch!

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Eyre!

Mr F.M. LOGAN: It may well have done. Member for Eyre, did you set fire to it? I certainly did not.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Thank you, members. We will not have conversations across the chamber. I am on my feet, member for Cockburn. We have one person on his feet for the third reading speech, and that is all. I am still on my feet, member for Cockburn.

Mr F.M. LOGAN: I will come back to issue of incompetency and the incompetent minister who we have to deal with at the moment. The reason I use the word “incompetency”—it is an accurate word for what the minister is doing—is that this is a minister who has admitted on three occasions that he has not read contracts worth over \$1 billion. If that is not incompetence, I do not know what is. In most other jobs, the man would have been sacked to admit that. He is above the CEO. He is the ultimate responsible body in Western Australia for the application of those contracts. Although it is a government trading enterprise, the buck still stops with him. He has admitted in the house and to the general public that he does not read contracts. He has not read the Transfield–Degrémont contract, the Programmed Facility Management maintenance contract or the alliance contract for the southern seawater desalination plant. Those three contracts add up to well over \$1 billion, and the Minister for Water says he has not read any of them. To me, that is a sacking offence. It would be had it been in the private sector. It is complete and utter incompetence, particularly when one of the signatories to the contract is a company suspended from the Stock Exchange. That is incompetence! It is misleading and deceptive for the people of Western Australia to not be told by this minister that that one of those Alliance partners had been in trouble serious enough for the board itself to suspend the company from the Stock Exchange. If the board of AJ Lucas saw the problem that seriously, why did the minister and the government Western Australia not see the problem as serious enough to either not award the contract until the company had sorted out its own financial problems or award the contract to another company? That is what it should have done, and it did not do it. Not only did the government not do it, it did not even acknowledge the fact. We had to find that out through stories in the media. I think it is absolutely an act of incompetence by the water minister.

Another issue that is highlighted in the line items for the Water Corporation goes to water programs, in particular the metropolitan waste water sources and the general water distribution across metropolitan Perth. The issue with that line item that I raise goes to the contracts that I have just referred to. On numerous occasions I have accused the Liberal–National government of privatising Water Corporation by a backdoor method of contracting out work that was previously done by Water Corp. I have raised it in the house and in the media on numerous occasions. The first of two contracts that I am referring to now that relate to this specific line item is the contract for the maintenance and replacement of pipes generally across the south west integrated system, and for metropolitan Perth in particular, and that is the contract with Programmed Facility Management. The contract is worth over half a billion dollars.

The other contract is the Transfield–Degrémont Water Corp alliance contract. The Minister for Water stood and told this house that the contract was simply of rollover of maintenance from one particular company to another company—that it was a rollover of existing maintenance work that was done by a previous company to a new alliance. It was a different way of working. It was an alliance. It was the same type of work but done a different way through an alliance between Water Corporation and Transfield–Degrémont–Suez. I found out after leaving the house on that occasion that in fact it had nothing to do with a rollover of a maintenance contract. It was a complete handover of the operations of all metropolitan waste water treatment plants, dams and water extraction processes. It was the handover of all this state’s water infrastructure to effectively an Australian–French-led contractor. The way the contract works within Water Corp, the alliance is running the organisation. If an employee wants to remain in the organisation, they can apply for a job with the alliance. Someone may have well been working for the Water Corporation for the last 30 years, but if they want to carry on work in the operations area, particularly if they are in management, they have to apply for a job in the alliance, and they may or may not get that job. I asked the simple question, through the minister, of the CEO of the Water Corporation, Sue Murphy, of whether the jobs of Water Corp employees are safe under the new alliance, which is now running our water infrastructure in Western Australia. Will Water Corp employees retain their jobs?

Point of Order

Mr Bill Johnston; Acting Speaker; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Fran Logan; Dr Graham Jacobs;
Mr Joe Francis; Ms Margaret Quirk

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Once again, another member of the opposition is speaking on items that are not directly related to capital expenditure or cannot be quoted from the budget papers. He is speculating on so many other areas. Madam Acting Speaker, I ask you to draw him back to what he is supposed to be talking about. While I am on my feet, I remind members that convention is that there are virtually no speeches on the third reading debate on this bill, and members of the opposition are breaking that convention.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms A.R. Mitchell): Thank you, Leader of the House.

Mr F.M. LOGAN: In response to that point of order, as you know, Madam Acting Speaker—maybe the Leader of the House was not here—I drew your attention directly to the line item I am talking about.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Cockburn, you did do that, but you are drifting a bit, so I suggest you come back to the point of the debate.

Debate Resumed

Mr F.M. LOGAN: I will continue dealing with the line item that I was referring to. If the Leader of the House stays in here a little longer and listens to what I am saying, he will see that I am referring to a specific line item about these contracts. They are set out. Remember, Leader of the House, there are only capital works on this page, and that is the one I am referring to. Those contracts are part of that capital works project. He might not like to hear that, but they are, and that is what I am dealing with.

Mr R.F. Johnson interjected.

Mr F.M. LOGAN: The problem is —

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms A.R. Mitchell): Thank you, members! I have said before that the conversation is not to be across the chamber. Member for Cockburn, will you complete your speech in the third reading but, as I said, stick to the main capital items?

Mr F.M. LOGAN: Thank you, Madam Acting Speaker, but I will remind members and you as well that everything on this page is capital works. I am referring you to a line item. I ask you to remember that, Madam Acting Speaker. I am referring to line items in accordance with your direction.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Cockburn, you did refer to the line item, but you have drifted from the line item. I ask you to speak to the line item.

Mr F.M. LOGAN: I will continue to deal with the line items I have been referring to, and I come back to the point I was making about the security of employment for people who will be employed on this contract. During the budget estimates process I put questions to the CEO of Water Corporation about the security of employment for Water Corp employees. In answer to my questions, I was given an assurance by the CEO, through the minister, that their jobs were safe and that nobody was going to lose their employment as part of Alliance Water Resources being awarded this new contract; therefore, what is the issue? Once again, just like the answer I was given on AJ Lucas Operations, I was told, “What is the issue? There is no problem here as their employment is not going to be threatened.” So I put the question to the CEO of Water Corp in a slightly different way. I put forward an actual case that is occurring right now with a constituent of the member for Mandurah. I referred to employees of Water Corp in Mandurah who leave their employment to take up employment elsewhere or they simply leave or retire or something like that. I asked whether those positions that had been filled by Water Corp employees would be filled once again by Water Corp employees. The response from the CEO of Water Corp was, “Not necessarily, that will be up to competitive pricing; it could be a contractor or a Water Corp employee.”

Dr G.G. Jacobs: She said it would go to the best person for the job.

Mr F.M. LOGAN: If that is not privatisation by stealth, what is it? Infrastructure that belongs to the state government is being handed over lock, stock and barrel to the private sector, not just to maintain but to operate and maintain both the pipes and also the capital equipment. All the major infrastructure that delivers our drinking water is being handed over to a private sector alliance; and the private sector alliance, which is led by the private sector, determines who works under that new organisation; and if any Water Corp employee leaves for reasons of getting another job or retiring, there is no guarantee that a Water Corp employee will replace them; it will probably go to a contractor. That is privatisation by stealth. I said that in here.

Point of Order

Mr J.M. FRANCIS: Under standing order 94(1), “A member’s speech must be relevant to the question under discussion.” I can see no absolutely relevance whatsoever to the question.

Mr F.M. LOGAN: In response to that point of order, Madam Acting Speaker. As with the previous point of order, if members oppose —

Mr Bill Johnston; Acting Speaker; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Fran Logan; Dr Graham Jacobs;
Mr Joe Francis; Ms Margaret Quirk

The ACTING SPEAKER: What is the point of order?

Mr F.M. LOGAN: The point of order is there is no point of order because —

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member, I would also like to respond. You don't have to tell me!

Mr F.M. LOGAN: As you know, Madam Acting Speaker, because you have been sitting there, members from the government wander in halfway through speeches.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Cockburn, I would like to respond and I will respond. I do not need to be told how to respond.

Member for Jandakot, there is not a point order. The discussion is on the implementation of the capital project, and I think we should let the member continue and finish.

Debate Resumed

Mr F.M. LOGAN: Madam Acting Speaker, I just have this feeling that members do not want to hear what I have to say. I do not know why. I know there are people who want to get out of this chamber. I just do not think they want to hear what I have to say.

The point I am referring to is under “Works in Progress” and relates to metropolitan water resources, distribution and waste water programs, which go to the points I have raised in this house over and again about privatisation by stealth of these particular assets set out in this line item. The Minister for Water stood up in this chamber and outside Parliament and said, “That is not true! The member for Cockburn is making it all up; it is all waffle!” Then when I point out in this house, line by line, exactly how that privatisation by stealth is happening with the Alliance Water Resources contract—handing over the assets to the private sector, letting the private sector pick and choose who it wants to employ and then not guaranteeing employment for Water Corp employees—how can the government possibly deny this is not privatisation by stealth? Of course it is! It is staring the general public in the face, and that is why I criticise and will continue to criticise this government and this minister.

Firstly, the minister is being deceptive with this house by misleading the house on many occasions, denying the facts I have just outlined to the house and through his incompetence by signing off on these huge contracts—these are half a billion dollar contracts—and admitting to the house and the general public that he has not read them. That is why I believe the minister is incompetent and he is being deceptive. For those reasons, these issues needed to come out once again as part of this speech this afternoon, because the estimates committee hearing did not allow us enough time to address these issues in detail. Only a speech like this will allow members to address the issues in detail or be able to call to account the Minister for Water, who is not even in the house and has not been in the house for most of day, and allow me to state that this water minister, like the previous one, should be sacked for incompetency.

DR G.G. JACOBS (Eyre) [5.09 pm]: I am conscious of the time and more than anybody in this place would like to go home because I have a long way to travel to get home. However, I will be a little more positive than the previous speaker and I will talk about some capital investment in the Appropriation (Consolidated Account) Capital 2012–13 Bill 2012, and I will bring it close to home if I may. I would like to talk about my region, my electorate, and I have every right to do that. I would particularly like to talk about that beautiful place called Esperance that, because of this government, is even better for the capital investments that this government has made in the electorate. The investments over this very short time —

Mr R.H. Cook: I hope you are not talking about the hospital.

Dr G.G. JACOBS: I will get to that.

The investments over this very short time have been on the significant issue of our transport corridor, in trying to separate road trains from trains from vehicle traffic in order to get increased product through our port, which is a very important gateway not only to Esperance but also to the hinterland and particularly the Yilgarn and Koolyanobbing, from where our iron ore comes. However, there are some junior players in the Yilgarn as well that need to get product to market. It is the commitment of the state government of \$60 million, with an additional \$60 million from the federal government, that has made possible a \$120 million program for a transport corridor to get our product into port. As those who have been to Esperance would know, there are some bottlenecks at the gate of the port, with road trains, trains and vehicle traffic conflicting. So this is important work for Esperance and it is important work strategically for the region.

There will also be a spend on a new Esperance Primary School. Esperance Primary School is the school that I went to when I went to school—yes, I did go to school, but members might be surprised, or they might not be surprised, that there were a couple of years when I did not go to school. That was because the track was so bad

Mr Bill Johnston; Acting Speaker; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Fran Logan; Dr Graham Jacobs;
Mr Joe Francis; Ms Margaret Quirk

that the school bus would not go far enough to pick us up, so mum taught us by correspondence in a caravan by a waterhole when my father took up new land farming in 1957.

Mr R.H. Cook: We are talking about capital works, not archaeology!

Dr G.G. JACOBS: History is important.

The hostel has a \$30 million commitment to accommodate students for the very good Esperance Senior High School.

Mr T.G. Stephens: Which line item is this?

Dr G.G. JACOBS: If the member wants me to go through the line items, I will, but in fact I believe, with the consciousness of time, that we need to get on with it.

The hospital commitment is a \$31 million commitment, of which \$5.5 million has been committed this year. If there is any institution or any place that I know a bit about, it is Esperance hospital, because I worked in and around it for 27 years. It is really important. That is not archaeology. That is fact. We need to upgrade the emergency centre, the theatre, and of course the maternity suite. In fact, the emergency department is the same department in which I started working in 1979, when the population of Esperance was 4 500 people. The population of Esperance is now hitting 15 000, and we still have the same three emergency bays in the emergency department that we had back in 1979. So the plan is to expand that to 13 bays, with a twenty-first century resuscitation room to cope with the increased population, and also to provide for tourism, because, as people would know, Esperance has some of the nation's best beaches.

Funding has also been provided for an interim general practitioner clinic, as part of the \$1.4 million allocation within the Western Australian Country Health Service budget, with the aim of providing clinical accommodation for practitioners, achieving economies of scale for practitioners to practise, and of course attracting new doctors to the town. As people would realise, the generation X or the generation Y doctor does not do it like the old doctors did and come to town and make an investment and settle in. Basically, doctors today want to come to town and practise medicine and leave the administration and the investment to somebody else, unencumbered. So we will create an interim GP clinic that will be co-located on the hospital grounds to enable that to happen.

I want to make some comments about the waterfront development in Esperance. The waterfront development has been at the top of the list for the SuperTown development of Esperance and the expansion of Esperance as a strategic and important region. It is at the top of the list for a couple of reasons. First, it is not just about doing up the waterfront and making it aesthetically pleasing. It is an important part of reconnecting the town to the water. It is a bit like what has happened in Geraldton—the member for Geraldton would know this—where there was a railway line between the residential and business area of the town and the waterfront, and that impeded development.

Mr T.G. Stephens: And who fixed that up? It was a good Labor government that fixed that up!

Dr G.G. JACOBS: I am just using that as an example. We do not have to have a political debate about that. I am just using it as an example.

Mr T.G. Stephens interjected

The SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Pilbara!

Dr G.G. JACOBS: That obstructed the development of Geraldton. There is a similar situation in Esperance, where we have had the problem of erosion and of trying to rejuvenate the beach. That has caused a build-up of sand that has disconnected the residential and business area of the town from the waterfront. So there was a recognition that we needed to do something about that. It will also have an important commercial impact, because there is a fuel line that connects the port with the fuel storage depot, and after the 2008 January “perfect storm”, there was major damage that has not yet been repaired, so that issue needs to be definitively looked at and dealt with. The \$12.5 million that will be provided under the SuperTown program will enable a significant amount of that work to at least start to create an aesthetic rock wall barrier that will prevent ongoing erosion, and also enable landscaping of the waterfront to reconnect the main town with the waterfront. That is an important development, and it was pleasing to be with the Premier in Esperance, along with the Minister for Regional Development; Lands, and my parliamentary colleague Hon Wendy Duncan, for that announcement.

I need to thank a few people, because as I said in my comments after the announcement, I am very proud to be part of the Esperance community. The reason I am very proud is that the community has done the work on this project. I would like to recognise the members of the Esperance SuperTown project team working group. From the Goldfields Esperance Development Commission, there were Mr Shane Liddelow, manager southern region, and Ms Rose Riley, senior project officer, who did a lot of work in getting this project up. The Shire of

Mr Bill Johnston; Acting Speaker; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Fran Logan; Dr Graham Jacobs;
Mr Joe Francis; Ms Margaret Quirk

Esperance was behind this as well, with Mr Mal Osborne, shire chief executive officer, Mr Greg Golinski, manager governance and strategic projects, and Mr Trevor Ayers, manager economic and business development. The Esperance Chamber of Commerce and Industry was strongly behind this as well, with Mr Grant Shipp, the chief executive officer. There was also an extended project team, with Mr Mal Heasman, shire president; Mrs Victoria Brown, shire vice-president; Mr Robert Hicks, Goldfields Esperance Development Commission chief executive officer; my office and I when I was in town; the office of Hon Wendy Duncan or her representative; Mrs Melissa Rowe, chair of the community reference group; and the Department of Regional Development and Lands. I thank everybody for their contribution in driving us into the future.

If I may, Mr Speaker, I want to take one moment to respond to the member for Cockburn's comments in budget estimates about the Water Corporation portfolio and the capital investment program. The question that he was going on and talking about was the alliance. This is really important, and I want to get this very clear for the record. He talked about the issue of AJ Lucas collapsing and the world collapsing and about how the world did not know. I will be only a few minutes, Leader of the House, but I want to put on the record the response from the chief executive officer of the Water Corporation. If anybody wants to question this, this is from the proof copy of the *Hansard*.

Mr T.G. Stephens: And the line item?

The SPEAKER: Member for Pilbara!

Dr G.G. JACOBS: It is pages 311b–322a of the extract from *Hansard*. The CEO of the Water Corporation gave the following response —

Phases 1 and 2 of Southern Seawater Desalination Plant have been constructed in an alliance between the Water Corporation and a number of other entities, —

That was pointed out by the member for Cockburn —

including two Spanish firms ... AJ Lucas and WorleyParsons. The structure of the alliance is that everyone shares in the risk and reward and is jointly responsible for the outcome. In a contractual sense, if one of the private sector parties in the alliance were to fail, the others immediately have all the obligations thrust on them. Even if there are questions about one partner, and it is a minor partner in the arrangement, the Water Corporation is made whole. Our assessment, both financially and legally, is that the corporation was suffering no risk through that process, due to the contractual arrangement.

I may add that the taxpayers of Western Australia were not subjected to any risk in this contractual arrangement.

In closing I will mention another issue. The member for Cockburn waffled on for I do not know how long. I am from Eyre and I have to travel 700 kilometres, so I reckon it is about time I responded to him for one minute. He talked about the issue of contractors and existing Water Corporation employees. This was the answer given on that issue by the CEO of the Water Corporation, Ms Murphy —

To make savings over time, the intent is to keep the same size workforce as the number of services and connections grow in Perth and to use growth as a way to absorb numbers. The whole principle of the alliance is “best for project”. For many of the key roles in the project there were Water Corp people and alliance people or people from our partners both competing for the same roles. The team is selected by the alliance lead team and that team is in place.

...

If the job is vacant, it will be filled by the most appropriate candidate. That could be a Water Corp person or a non-Water Corp person.

...

At the end of the day, we want our customers to get the best service from the best people at the lowest cost. That is what the act requires us to do and we will do it.

I think that is a very responsible attitude. It is not about privatisation; it is about efficiency and getting the best person to do the job. We just get scaremongering from the member for Cockburn, who tends to go on and on and on. Basically he had all the answers at the budget estimates. They were very clear and acceptable to most reasonable people.

MS M.M. QUIRK (Girrawheen) [5.24 pm]: Thank you, Mr Speaker; you are looking so enthusiastic about the fact that I have got up to speak! I will be brief, as I know that a lot of people opposite want to go to the football. It is nice to see they have their priorities right! We on the other hand care very much about the state of the budget.

Mr Bill Johnston; Acting Speaker; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Fran Logan; Dr Graham Jacobs;
Mr Joe Francis; Ms Margaret Quirk

Mr V.A. Catania interjected.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: There are two issues I want to raise, thank you, member for North West!

There are two capital expenditure items I want to talk about. The first relates to the education budget and to the reference to the asset investment program in the budget papers. The budget papers state that the Department of Education's planned asset investment program for 2012–13 has an allocation of \$518.5 million, and it is noted that the program relates primarily to improving infrastructure for private schools throughout the state. There is also reference in the capital expenditure program to moneys that will be spent on the transition of year 7s to high schools, which as we all know will be a major move for high schools as they will need to accommodate that cohort that is coming up.

The issue I have with this budget is that the money spent on the asset investment program for the transition of year 7s is being viewed a little simplistically. It is not a question of saying that there are enough rooms to cater for year 7s. The budget does not, for example, factor in the need for specialist rooms. For example, home economics and other areas need a specialist fit-out. Girrawheen Senior High School, for example, has done a count. It has enough rooms and they are structurally all right, but they have not been upgraded internally since the 1970s. The school is in a situation in which the philosophy of teaching and the way in which classes are conducted have changed. For example, the rooms for home economics need a different fit-out and computer cabling is needed in other specialist areas. It seems to me that the program for the allocation of moneys for the transition of year 7s is very simplistic. The education department is doing only a room count and is not actually assessing whether the rooms it says are available suit the pedagogical needs of those particular subjects. I am very keen for the Minister for Education in her last months in this place to give that process greater scrutiny, as that issue, if not planned, will cause some great problems in time to come. I also note in this context that there is nothing in the forward estimates for the refurbishment of schools. Again, that will affect ageing high schools which, although structurally sound, need some refurbishment of the rooms they have available.

The other brief matter I want to mention is capital expenditure for the Fire and Emergency Services Authority. New works are listed on page 691 of the *Budget Statements* and I note the provision for one career fire station at Butler, which should be completed next year. We all are very grateful that it is being built because the current situation at Butler is unsatisfactory. Similarly, Wangara Fire Station will receive modifications. However, in the forward estimates there is very little reference to ongoing capital works.

Mr Speaker, you will be very pleased to know that although the construction of a fire station at Geraldton is somewhat delayed, allowances have been made for it in the forward estimates. However, from the look of the forward estimates, it will probably not be completed until late 2014. There is also a reference to a fire station at Australind that was due to be completed this year, but the asset investment program indicates it will not be completed before 2016. You, Mr Speaker, and other members of the house will be very mindful that one issue referred to in the Keelty report was the lack of resources in the south west. Many members also know that there is great growth in that area and that the need for an additional fire station in the Australind area is overdue, especially when Bunbury Fire Station is half the size it should be. Another fire station is mentioned in the budget papers for Bassendean–Kiara; and that is about it. When I asked in estimates about capital works in the next 10 years, I was told by the minister that there was no capital works plan and he could not advise me as to what was going ahead.

I raise this issue because this government has an ambitious SuperTownns program. It seems to me that if the government intends to build major infrastructure in places such as Karratha, it needs a career fire station to back that up. However, in the capital works listed in the budget, no career fire station is contemplated or planned for either the Pilbara or the Kimberley in the next 10 years. With the growth in population there, the structures are such that those places need a fully equipped career fire station to deal with structural fires. The lack of a career fire station is unacceptable. There has also been an increase in industrial activity. All those issues seem to me to show a lack of foresight. We have a situation in which the Leader of the National Party goes up to Karratha, announces all these multistorey dwellings —

Mr V.A. Catania: Which the community loves.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: What I am concerned about is the member's constituents' dwellings actually burning down, waiting for the poor old volunteers to get there!

It seems to me that the services need to follow the people. If there is no planning for those services now, what will happen is what has happened in Geraldton and what has happened in Australind, and it will be on the drawing board for many years to come because the decisions have not been made now.

Extract from Hansard
[ASSEMBLY — Thursday, 14 June 2012]
p3764a-3764a

Mr Bill Johnston; Acting Speaker; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Fran Logan; Dr Graham Jacobs;
Mr Joe Francis; Ms Margaret Quirk

That is really all I wanted to say about the two aspects of capital expenditure. Firstly, the education budget for the transition for year 7s to high school does not accommodate the need for some refurbishment within rooms; there is no refurbishment allocated for in the forward estimates and the out years. Secondly, given the challenges we have around fire and other hazards and our growing population, the capital works program of the Fire and Emergency Services Authority, the capital works program will certainly not keep up with the demand.

Question to be Put

MR J.M. FRANCIS (Jandakot) [5.31 pm]: I move —

That the question be now put.

Question put and a division taken with the following result —

Ayes (24)

Mr P. Abetz	Dr E. Constable	Dr G.G. Jacobs	Ms A.R. Mitchell
Mr F.A. Alban	Mr J.H.D. Day	Mr R.F. Johnson	Dr M.D. Nahan
Mr I.C. Blayney	Mr J.M. Francis	Mr A. Krsticevic	Mr D.T. Redman
Mr T.R. Buswell	Mr B.J. Grylls	Mr W.R. Marmion	Mr M.W. Sutherland
Mr G.M. Castrilli	Dr K.D. Hames	Mr J.E. McGrath	Mr T.K. Waldron
Mr V.A. Catania	Mrs L.M. Harvey	Mr P.T. Miles	Mr A.J. Simpson (<i>Teller</i>)

Noes (18)

Ms L.L. Baker	Mr J.C. Kobelke	Ms M.M. Quirk	Mr M.P. Whately
Dr A.D. Buti	Mr F.M. Logan	Mr E.S. Ripper	Mr B.S. Wyatt
Mr R.H. Cook	Mrs C.A. Martin	Mr T.G. Stephens	Ms R. Saffioti (<i>Teller</i>)
Mr J.N. Hyde	Mr P. Papalia	Mr C.J. Tallentire	
Mr W.J. Johnston	Mr J.R. Quigley	Mr A.J. Waddell	

Pairs

Mr I.M. Britza	Ms J.M. Freeman
Mr C.C. Porter	Mr P.C. Tinley
Mr A.P. Jacob	Mr D.A. Templeman
Mr C.J. Barnett	Mrs M.H. Roberts
Mr M.J. Cowper	Mr M.P. Murray
Dr J.M. Woollard	Mr M. McGowan

Question thus passed.

Third Reading Resumed

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

House adjourned at 5.35 pm
