

Speaker; Mr Roger Cook; Mr John Kobelke; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Terry Waldron; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr John McGrath; Mr Eric Ripper; Mr Troy Buswell

PERTH MAJOR SPORTS STADIUM — BURSWOOD

Matter of Public Interest

THE SPEAKER (Mr G.A. Woodhams): I have received within the prescribed time a letter from the Deputy Leader of the Opposition in the following terms —

I wish to raise the following as a matter of public interest today.

“That the House —

Condemns the Premier for selecting the most expensive site for the new Perth Sports stadium and for his failure to be honest with the people of Western Australia about the full cost of the stadium.”

[At least five members rose in their places.]

The SPEAKER: Members, the matter appears to me to be in order; it can proceed.

MR R.H. COOK (Kwinana — Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [3.12 pm]: I move —

That the house condemns the Premier for selecting the most expensive site for the new Perth sports stadium and for his failure to be honest with the people of Western Australia about the full cost of the stadium.

In February 2008 the Carpenter Labor government made an announcement that it would develop the new major sports stadium at Kitchener Park. This was to be partially completed by 2014, with 40 000 seats, and to be fully completed by 2018—one and a half years ahead of the Premier’s current projection of 2016 for his project—with 60 000 seats. That decision was made after a long dispassionate and objective analysis of the evidence that was available to the public at the time by the Major Stadia Taskforce; the decision was made not by a project selection team but by esteemed Western Australians with expertise in this area, including John Langoulant, Terry Budge, John Longley, Gaye McMath and Paul Jones. The decision to go to Kitchener Park was made after careful consideration of the impact upon the taxpayers of Western Australia, the need for football in this state to maintain Subiaco as the home of football in Western Australia and the desire to develop a state-of-the-art major sports stadium of which this community could be proud.

I move forward now to the election of the Barnett Liberal government and the pronouncement that the costs of a new stadium would be too great. This was explained to us at the time as a matter of austerity that reflected the times in which we lived. The global financial crisis was upon us and government revenues were under threat. The Premier put up a very spirited defence of his decision to put off the development of the stadium, saying at the time, as reported in *The West Australian* in October 2008, that he could not justify spending \$1.1 billion “on an extra 20,000 seats”—that is, he would not move ahead with the development of the new stadium at Subiaco. The article goes on to speculate that that was in part because the Premier, reputedly, and I think rightly, put the children’s hospital as a higher priority. The article observes also that the Premier was under some pressure at the time to meet the demands of the National Party to form a coalition for this particular government.

That is the history of this project. Since then, WA taxpayers have been assailed with a tsunami of increases in household fees and charges. In only three years, the Barnett government has slugged Western Australian families and pensioners an extra \$1 073 a year on household bills and expenses. Western Australians are struggling to cope with the Premier’s massive increases: 57 per cent for electricity, 45 per cent for water and 44 per cent for gas. Indeed, these are austere times and we all must manage our budgets. It seems that the only person who does not have to manage the budget is the Premier himself. On 28 June the Premier made an announcement to build the stadium at Burswood, and it is clear from his announcement that his decision lacks clarity, planning and costing. As evidence comes to light, it is emerging why this is the case. It is another example of this Premier’s arrogance to build the biggest monument of self-aggrandisement since the Court government’s belltower. We all knew that the proposal to build a stadium at Burswood was undercooked, but none of us estimated just how underdone it was.

The documents we made public on the weekend reveal the true costings of this particular project. In advice to the minister —

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Thank you, members!

Mr R.H. COOK: In advice to the Minister for Sport and Recreation that the minister received in May this year, his own department advised him about the costs associated with developing a stadium at Burswood. It put those costs in 2010 values at \$1.24 billion; that is, for the development of a stadium with a car park, because, as Mr

Speaker; Mr Roger Cook; Mr John Kobelke; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Terry Waldron; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr John McGrath; Mr Eric Ripper; Mr Troy Buswell

Langoullant is often known to observe, no major stadia across the world nowadays is developed without some car park facilities underneath for players, VIPs and so forth —

Several members interjected.

Mr R.H. COOK: As we know, at one stage the Premier actually preferred the redevelopment of the Subiaco site and discussed the redevelopment of the Melbourne Cricket Ground—MCG—as a good example of how we should move forward. He has since changed his mind and instead decided that he needs this new monument to himself. The Department of Sport and Recreation goes on to observe that extra costs are associated with the Burswood development such as the car park, the raised plaza, treatment of site contamination, piling, public transport infrastructure and cost escalation during construction. Most important of all, the department makes an observation about advice it has received from the Public Transport Authority—and this is what the Minister for Sport and Recreation has never let us know. The Public Transport Authority estimates that the extra costs involved with developing the public transport associated with a major stadium at Burswood would be in the area of \$200 million. We know therefore that the costs associated with Burswood, which the Premier disclosed in his announcement in June, were wrong. Now we know that, at the time, the Premier knew they were wrong, but he wanted to justify to the people of Western Australia why he should move forward with his own pet project to develop a stadium at Burswood.

It may be that the Premier does not see fit to have at Burswood a raised plaza, a car park and so forth. Let us say we took out those elements. Still, we would be looking at a development at Burswood of around about \$1.2 billion. That is because the Premier says that that facility does not need a car park as there will be a footbridge across the river into the stadium. The Premier failed to mention that the footbridge is not costed, and he failed to mention that he has received advice on that. We know, for instance, that the Kurilpa footbridge across the Brisbane River in that city was developed in 2009 at a cost of around \$63 million. We know that a 100-metre footbridge across the Adelaide Oval will cost around about \$40 million. We therefore know that a footbridge well in excess of 400 metres, which is the length of the Windan Bridge—of course it will have to be longer than the Windan Bridge—will cost towards \$100 million. Those are the sorts of details that the Premier did not want to release in June because the people of Western Australia believe he is committed to a project in the order of \$1 billion. But he knows and we now know from these documents that that is patently untrue.

Today I want to reveal further information that the Premier has not allowed the people of Western Australia to be privy to. I can reveal today that we have received more documentation. This time it is a memo from the Department of Sport and Recreation to the Minister for Sport and Recreation received on 17 June, just days before the announcement. This letter goes to the issue of the nature of this site and its suitability as a stadium, and in part states —

The general area within the Peninsula highlighted for possible stadium development coincides with a 75-year history of waste landfill and uncontrolled fill, including industrial and domestic waste, cinders and building rubble. Further, some sections of the study area are known to contain asbestos contamination.

It goes on —

Several geotechnical risks have been identified, including;

- Paleochannels ... may be prevalent across the Peninsula and may cause lateral ground movement with potential seismic risk.

The Department of Sport and Recreation is therefore saying that the Premier wants to develop his pet project on a site that represents real structural risk and real financial risk, and that it is the people of Western Australia in particular who will pay that cost. Why therefore has the government chosen this site? There is no vision. There is no evidence about this site. This is simply about a Premier who wants to pursue his own arrogant agenda because he cannot bear the thought of continuing a project that began under a previous Labor government. Where is the Premier's concern for austerity now? While the taxpayers of Western Australia are struggling to pay their household fees and charges and while they are struggling to deal with the costs of living, fundamentally delivered by this Premier, we see the Premier pursuing a project that will essentially deliver higher costs to this community. We have said that the cost is in the order of \$300 million. I think it will go further north than that, and we will remind this government time and again every time that that is the case.

The Barnett government has decided to erect a monument to itself against all advice, and it has chosen the most expensive site for the football stadium. Everyone has to manage their budgets, Mr Premier, including you! Why is the Premier going out and spending money like a drunken sailor on a project which he has not costed and on which he has not done the hard work? This is an undercooked project. Labor believes strongly in a new stadium. It is our project; we began it. We committed more money to this project than this government ever has. We

Speaker; Mr Roger Cook; Mr John Kobelke; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Terry Waldron; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr John McGrath; Mr Eric Ripper; Mr Troy Buswell

object strongly to a Premier who is now using taxpayers' money to pursue the most expensive option, who is not being honest with the people of Western Australia about the journey he is taking them on and about the further costs and further structural problems with this site, and who is yet to tell the people of Western Australia exactly the hidden costs they will be up for.

MR J.C. KOBELKE (Balcatta) [3.24 pm]: As the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has already outlined, the former Labor government was committed to a major new stadium. To make sure that there was clear definition on what sort of stadium was needed, how it would be built, what it would cost and how it would be run, we put in place the Major Stadia Taskforce. It worked for nearly two years, it cost nearly \$2 million and it presented a report that outlined how we could deliver a world-class stadium and know that it stacked up. The former Labor government put money in the budget to start the delivery of that stadium. When this government was elected, it took the money—it has the right to do that—in the order of \$350 million to spend on other purposes. However, it said it would revisit this issue and it has revisited it. The problem comes when we look at the way the government has done that. Despite the Premier having said in a statement in February this year that the government was working on the issue and was looking at what would happen, on 28 June the Premier finally announced that the government would proceed with a major new stadium but that it would be at Burswood. Is there justification for the Burswood site? It is very hard to find. The Langoulant report indicated that it would cost \$300 million more to build the stadium at Burswood than at Kitchener Park. It also said under “Transport/Connectivity” that on a comparison of the short-listed sites, there was a cross against Burswood for transport connectivity. It was at the bottom of the list for all the transport problems in getting people to and from the stadium. On page 54 the report states —

- The Burswood site comes at a cost—largely due to the significant upgrade in transport infrastructure required and the costs of dealing with the local site conditions i.e. building on reclaimed land and on a site previously used as an industrial waste dump.

In those intervening two years, has the government done a detailed geotechnical report on whether it would be \$300 million or \$400 million or only \$200 million? Was any detailed geotechnical work done, Premier?

Mr C.J. Barnett: I will talk in a minute.

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: No, there was not. The Premier's ego is bigger than the taxpayers he is ripping off through higher electricity and water prices. This man's ego is out of control. No geotechnical study has been done. His attitude is that Burswood is a good option. Was there another detailed transport study on the cost of getting people to and from the stadium?

Mr C.J. Barnett: You are proving why you could not make a decision in government. All you do is studies and reports.

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: I take it from the Premier that, no, there was no transport study done. Again, the Premier has committed to Burswood. The best advice he has is that the stadium will cost another \$300 million. It might cost \$400 million, \$500 million or \$600 million more or it might be slightly under \$300 million more, but has he done a study to look at the extra transport costs? No. Has he done a study to look at the geotechnical aspect of the extra cost? We know that Windan Bridge just up the way is sliding sideways. That will cost millions of dollars to fix. The engineering problems there are substantial. The Premier will therefore build a project, with no geotechnical study, that he was told will cost nearly \$1.4 billion. The Premier is not worried about whether it slips sideways or goes up, goes down or whichever way. This is the Premier's ego out of control. There has been no proper process. He does not believe in process. This is the emperor speaking! His fiat will be what is done! Forget the cost to residents in my electorate who are being ripped off with higher prices for electricity, water and emergency services to fund this Premier's profligate spending, whether it be his palace across the road or whether it be wanting to get his name on a major stadium at Burswood. Where is the technical detail to give some certainty on the cost? If the process that this Premier has talked about is not gone through, we will end up getting a stadium that fails to deliver on what we need. It will be below standard or there will be major over-runs in cost and time—or we will have both, given the way in which this Premier manages things. We will end up with a dud stadium costing us more. That is the way this Premier manages. Remember his two big projects that he is committed to. He killed Oakajee with his interfering. He actually stuffed up that project because he pushed around the proponents and interfered with it. Look at the Northbridge Link here in Perth. He wrote to former Prime Minister Rudd saying that it would cost a total of \$263 million. In this year's budget, it is not \$263 million, not \$363 million, not \$463 million, not \$563 million and not \$663 million; \$760 million is what it will cost, when the Premier said it would cost \$236 million. That is evidence of this Premier believing that his fiat can deliver the particular monuments he wants in his name but not looking at the issues.

Speaker; Mr Roger Cook; Mr John Kobelke; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Terry Waldron; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr John McGrath; Mr Eric Ripper; Mr Troy Buswell

Further to that, in the Premier's media statement there is no mention of a geotechnical or transport study. He has said that the stadium will cost \$700 million plus transport, when he has an email from the Department of Sport and Recreation saying it will cost \$1.3 billion. But he forgot that!

Mr T.K. Waldron: On your project!

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: Well, the minister did not do any other work! So what else does he have to work off? Did the minister do any more work?

Mr T.K. Waldron: It is a different project, different scale.

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: Yes—a far more expensive one, minister! That is the problem!

Let us just show how this Premier's ego is out of control. The Premier said in the ministerial statement, "There will be an international design competition to attract the best ideas." That was good on 28 June. But within a couple of weeks, no, jettison that; that is a bad idea. That is how much planning they have actually put into it! There is no planning. It is all just the ego of one man. The Premier then floated the idea of a footbridge. Has he done any costing? Where will the people walk to? Will they walk to a residential area? Will they walk to a transport hub? There is no planning. It is just a good idea, because it suits the ego of this Premier who would be emperor.

We have a situation where this Premier cannot put together a project. This Premier is so poor that he is about to unveil a statue of a previous Premier, Charles Court! That was a deal done over three years ago! The site was nominated; the family agreed to it. This Premier took three years to actually get a sculptor to put the sculpture together so that it is almost ready to be put in place. What was the hold up, Premier? Was the problem that the Premier wanted the statue to look more like him? Was that the problem? It took the Premier three years, because he could not get the artist to make the statue of Charles Court look more like him! That was the problem.

The Premier can have his ego. My concern is that the residents and taxpayers in my electorate are being milked by this government, because it cannot control expenditure. This government just operates on the whim of the Premier and wastes money; and the people in my electorate are paying higher electricity and higher water rates, as dividends to this government, because of the total mismanagement by this government.

MR C.J. BARNETT (Cottesloe — Premier) [3.32 pm]: Only the Labor Party in Western Australia would bring on a motion against the Burswood stadium in grand final week; only the Labor Party would do that. Everyone else out there is interested in the grand final. But the Labor Party's contribution is to oppose the Burswood stadium in grand final week. The Labor Party might even think about its timing, let alone the issue.

I will go through the issue very briefly, and then several other members on this side will speak on the motion. Members will recall that when the Liberal–National government came to power, that coincided almost exactly with the global financial crisis and a great loss in the forecast revenues of the state. As a consequence, we made the decision that the stadium project would go on hold for two years. We also made the decision—a very proper decision—that a new children's hospital would be a higher priority than a sports stadium. That was the decision that we made. Two years on, earlier this year—after two years had elapsed—we went back to looking at the stadium issue. The reason that we chose Burswood is that it is clearly the best site for a major new sports stadium. It is clearly the best site.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members!

Mr C.J. BARNETT: It is interesting that the West Australian Football Commission, the football clubs, the other sporting codes, most of the media and most of the general public overwhelmingly agreed that Burswood is the best site. Indeed, that was raised at the West Australian Football League Grand Final, during the luncheon gathering, and people clapped. There was overwhelming support for Burswood as a greenfields site for a new stadium—and congratulations to Claremont, too!

Several members interjected.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I would like to address the topic. I assume the Labor Party was serious in raising this issue—or is it just sort of the trivia for the day, again?

Our decision is that Burswood is the right site, for the right reasons, and money has been put into, and indeed the priority given to, the new children's hospital. I note that as of now, \$575 million is in a special account in Treasury for the new children's hospital, basically for funding the structure itself.

As promised, we returned to the stadium issue in February this year. We took a long-term view as to what would be the best site, and the best size and form of the stadium, for the long-term future of this state and this city. We began with the Langouant report—the Major Stadia Taskforce report. We began with that work. We did not

Speaker; Mr Roger Cook; Mr John Kobelke; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Terry Waldron; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr John McGrath; Mr Eric Ripper; Mr Troy Buswell

discard it at all. We took a number of the recommendations and main points from that. We had wide discussions with the Eagles, the Dockers, the West Australian Football Commission, the Australian Football League, the local government, other sporting codes, and so on. They had an extensive period of discussions and meetings with me, the Minister for Sport and Recreation, and the member for South Perth. We very quickly came to the position that it was a choice between Subiaco—that is, the Kitchener Park option—and Burswood, and we compared those in reaching the final decision. There are arguments in favour of Subiaco. It is the traditional home of football. There is a lot of history there, a lot of nostalgia. It has good transport. There has been an investment in Subiaco station. It is quite well served for public transport. There are surrounding facilities, the Subiaco business area, and hotels, clubs and pubs; all of that. So it has some advantages.

Mr R.H. Cook: There is the casino in the Burswood option!

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I am speaking, Mr Speaker. What is against Subiaco is that it is a constrained site. Already events at Subiaco have been constrained. The use of lights at night, and the use of the stadium for concerts and the like, has been constrained. There is a long history of people living in the vicinity of Subiaco Oval complaining and restricting the use of it. There have been mixed views from the Subiaco council over time as to whether the stadium would be available for night-time events and when the lights can be on and off and so on. Clearly the constraints are there. It also should not be forgotten that under the proposal for Subiaco, 32 private residences were to be resumed and the properties destroyed, and 66 Homeswest units were to be destroyed. So, 98 residences and 98 families would be disrupted. That is not insignificant, and that was a big consideration in the decision.

We decided that the stadium choice would be Burswood. The advantages are that clearly Burswood is unconstrained. It is a large open area. It is government owned. Indeed, building the stadium there would mean no interruptions to the fixtures for the years during construction. There would be no loss of crowd. Subiaco stadium would continue to be in use until the new stadium was completed. Another big factor is that by building the stadium at Burswood, it would become an entry to the city of Perth. It also would open up a whole eastside precinct in all of that peninsula area. Indeed, the vision for this is not simply the stadium, but other sporting and entertainment facilities and recreational facilities to be built on that eastside precinct over the years to come. That is an important part of it.

Mr E.S. Ripper: And the tennis!

Mr C.J. BARNETT: And the tennis centre is there. It will be part of the eastside precinct and the waterfront. It will complement the other changes.

On the stadium decision itself, the first decision was that it would be for the long run, not just for football. The Burswood site was chosen. We accepted from the Langouant report that it would be designed as a 70 000-seat stadium but initially constructed to accommodate 60 000. So, it will be 60 000, and then, when necessary, it can easily be upgraded to 70 000.

The new stadium will be of the Etihad Stadium style. In other words, unlike Subiaco and the MCG, where the seating is layered back, the three tiers of seating will come in close and be right over the ground, allowing high-quality viewing, with every seat close to the game or whatever fixture is being played there. It will be a high-technology stadium, with the use of electronics, lighting, visual effects. As I said at the time, at the Eagles' games it will light up in Eagles colours; at the Dockers' games, it will light up in Dockers colours and so on; so a high-technology, highly-sophisticated stadium.

Several members interjected.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: We may not be able to do that in a constrained site in a residential area like Subiaco.

Decisions were also made about the facilities, the number of change rooms, the number of entertainment facilities, the size and quality of the seating. All those issues were considered.

As to cost, as I announced on 28 June, along with the Minister for Sport, the cost of the stadium itself—just the stadium—is estimated at \$700 million. I want to make this point. The proposal at Kitchener Park was a stadium with car parking beneath the playing surface. The Burswood stadium will not be elevated. The stadium will not be sticking up on pylons. It will be sitting on the ground. There will not be car parking underneath it. That literally takes hundreds of millions of dollars off the cost of the stadium.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members!

Speaker; Mr Roger Cook; Mr John Kobelke; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Terry Waldron; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr John McGrath; Mr Eric Ripper; Mr Troy Buswell

Mr C.J. BARNETT: Transport is a critical issue. The public will be required to use public transport to get to this stadium at Burswood. Yes, there will be some parking and there will be parking at Belmont Park Racecourse. As I made very clear on the day I announced it, we estimate that public transport infrastructure would be in the order of \$300 million. That was stated on the day. Therefore, there is \$700 million for the stadium and \$300 million for transport infrastructure. Members may have noted last week when the government announced a budget surplus of \$1.6 billion that \$100 million of real money was put into a special account in Treasury as the first down payment on the stadium. That was not money in the forward estimates, not funny money; it was real money in a trust account in Treasury as a first down payment on the stadium.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members! Leader of the Opposition!

Mr C.J. BARNETT: Yes, public transport is important. There is proposed to be four platforms serving each leg of the metropolitan rail system. There will be an event station, there will be a bus station and, yes, we are proposing a pedestrian bridge from East Perth connecting across that will make the eastern precinct for not only football but also recreational purposes. The timing is that we can be ready for the 2018 season maybe midway through 2017.

In conclusion, we on this side of the house looked at the stadium issue and we looked at it very carefully. What do we get from the opposition? All we get is opposition. I think out of this debate —

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Thank you, members!

Mr C.J. BARNETT: Members opposite have had their say. What is the position of the Labor Party? The position of the Liberal–National government is crystal clear; we are building a new stadium in a major sporting and entertainment precinct, which will cost, on our best estimates, \$700 million, plus \$300 million for transport. But where is the Labor Party? This is the important point. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition and spokesperson on sports sitting opposite said, and I quote, “WA Labor preferred the Subiaco site”. Okay, that is his position; that was in his press release. Then we have the member for Victoria Park, and I quote again, in the *Southern Gazette* —

Mr Wyatt said the stadium was “the most important investment in my lifetime for the eastern corridor.”

I agree with him; that it is absolutely spot on! The member is right and he is doing the right thing for football followers, other sports followers and people in the eastern suburbs. What does the leader of the Labor Party in the Legislative Council, Hon Sue Ellery, say? She does not want a stadium at all! She said that the billion-dollar footy stadium should be scrapped. Therefore, we have one member saying Subiaco, one member saying Burswood and in the upper house they want to scrap it. That is where the opposition is a complete and utter shambles!

Dr A.D. Buti interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Armadale!

MR T.K. WALDRON (Wagin — Minister for Sport and Recreation) [3.42 pm]: Just following on from the Premier and concurring with the Premier’s words, I want to make something clear from the start. I have said consistently that we could make cases for all three sites, including the East Perth site. We could have built good stadiums at all three sites. We are not saying that the previous government’s proposal for Kitchener Park was not a reasonable proposal. But this is a new project; we have moved on. We have moved on because we have made a decision, yes, for the stadium, but it is more than just a football stadium or a multipurpose stadium; it is more than that, it is about the precinct, which the Premier has talked about.

The member for Kwinana, the opposition spokesman, in his motion condemns the Premier for being misleading. I think we might condemn the member for being misleading because on the weekend he came out with that stuff about the blow-out in the stadium et cetera and he based it all on the base costs of the opposition’s previous stadium project and took the building index and extrapolated that. The Department of Sport and Recreation gave me advice about that, saying that they were the costs if those costs were extrapolated.

Mr R.H. Cook: They’re the costs from your department that you chose to ignore!

The SPEAKER: Member for Kwinana!

Mr T.K. WALDRON: No, I did not ignore them. Can I just make one thing clear? I get stuff from my departments all the time. Of course, I take notice of it; it does not mean I necessarily agree with everything. But

Speaker; Mr Roger Cook; Mr John Kobelke; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Terry Waldron; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr John McGrath; Mr Eric Ripper; Mr Troy Buswell

the member has forgotten that he went and said to the papers that there is a blow-out in the new stadium. The new stadium is not a project that the previous government had; it is different. Members have already heard the Premier talk about the car parking. We will not have the underground car parks, which was one of the issues at the previous government's stadium site.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Kwinana!

Mr T.K. WALDRON: Also, it involves the area around the stadium, so it is actually a different proposal. I will just say that was a briefing note that came to me on 12 April and it recast cost estimates on three of the shortlisted stadium locations addressed by the Langouant task force. These projections were simply calculated by applying annual cost escalations to the original Langouant task force figures proposed in 2007. So the government —

Mr E.S. Ripper interjected.

Mr T.K. WALDRON: Just let me finish!

The SPEAKER: Leader of the Opposition!

Mr T.K. WALDRON: The government's current indicative cost projection is \$700 million based on the scope of works that does not include certain components proposed by the Langouant task force, such as the underground car parking and the raised plaza. It is a big difference.

Several members interjected.

Mr T.K. WALDRON: I will tell members why the site was chosen. The site was chosen because it is the best site. I will go through a couple of things that the Premier said. I just want to let members know that I spent 10 years working at the West Australian Football Commission and I went through developments at Subiaco Oval, so I have a pretty strong background in this. Some of the things that we looked at include the linkages to Perth—I think there are great opportunities for Victoria Park, which I think the member for Victoria Park has recognised—and the actual entertainment and recreation precinct that is similar to those of other cities that we can create.

The basic thing and one of the things I have learnt since being Minister for Sport and Recreation, in dealing with projects is that one of the biggest confines is if there is not a greenfields site. For years I looked at Subiaco and the constraints that were put on us there on the Roberts Road side. I know that the previous sports minister understands that well. Although what the previous government put forward about how to do that was, I think, a fair project, this is better because we have that greenfields site so we have the ability to create. Recently I was at Metricon Stadium, which is the new stadium on the Gold Coast. It is not a big stadium and it is not a flash stadium but it is a very workable stadium. One of the features of that stadium is that it has room for screens in outside areas for families et cetera to picnic and all that type of thing. We could not do that at a lot of the other proposed stadium sites, but we are unconstrained with what we can do at the Burswood site. That is why it is certainly the best site. It is owned by the government—unconstrained—and there will be no impact on existing facilities. Having worked in football and other sport for a long time, I know that there was going to be a big impact doing it the other way. I think this site makes the whole project a lot easier and takes the pressure off, whereas Subiaco was constrained. There was little opportunity at Subiaco for future growth.

I like the traditions of footy; I played at Subi Oval. Yes, I like those traditions. Subi will be retained. The Premier also mentioned housing and the issues we had with that. At Subiaco, we needed the resumption of 32 residences and to relocate 66 Homeswest sites, which were all big issues in dealing with that site.

I will follow up on what the Premier also said about the position of the opposition. It is really interesting that members opposite are all over the place on this matter, with the member for Victoria Park supporting it, the member for Kwinana saying he wants the stadium to be at Subiaco, and the Leader of the Opposition in the Legislative Council, Sue Ellery, not wanting the stadium at all.

Dr A.D. Buti: What did the planning minister say?

Mr T.K. WALDRON: I do not know what the planning minister said, but I —

Several members interjected.

Mr T.K. WALDRON: I want to tell members a couple of other things. It was really interesting that the week that we made the announcement, *The West Australian* newspaper ran a survey. The announcement had not been made, but the newspaper ran a survey about where the public thought the stadium should be and 48 per cent

Speaker; Mr Roger Cook; Mr John Kobelke; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Terry Waldron; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr John McGrath; Mr Eric Ripper; Mr Troy Buswell

supported the Burswood site and another 14 per cent supported Belmont. If I worked it out properly, 62 per cent of the public supported a stadium in that area. Nineteen per cent supported Subiaco, 12 per cent supported East Perth —

Ms R. Saffioti interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for West Swan!

Mr T.K. WALDRON: I actually think East Perth was quite a good site; I have no problems with East Perth. Seven per cent of the public supported Kitchener Park. That is what the public thinks. As sports minister, I have been regularly talking to the AFL, to the football codes, to all the sporting codes, including cricket et cetera; they are rapt to go to Burswood because they can see the potential. This is not only a sensible investment, it is a great investment for the state, a great investment for sport and a great investment for all Western Australians. When I see those little kids running around kicking little footies —

Mr R.H. Cook: It's a National Party-sponsored two-year delay!

Mr T.K. WALDRON: We are going to get a fantastic stadium, which is what we have always wanted and needed.

I will leave it at that. This is a good decision; the member for Victoria Park supports it, and he needs to talk to his colleagues because they need to get on board. He wanted a stadium, or said he did. Let us get on board and get on with this so that we can end up with a fantastic stadium, which we will.

MS R. SAFFIOTI (West Swan) [3.50 pm]: Today we have heard some big statements, but we still do not know how much the stadium is going to cost. It is clear that the Minister for Sport and Recreation received a briefing note in May which, at the time, was the most accurate information about the total cost of the project. At the time, the total cost was to be \$1.24 billion. A month later, when the announcement was made, it was stated that the cost was going to be \$700 million. It is clear that this government did not tell people the true cost of the stadium—information that the government knew about.

Mr T.K. Waldron interjected.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: It is okay if the minister did not have that briefing note; I know he gets tonnes of briefing notes across his desk.

Mr T.K. Waldron interjected.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: No, it is here. It is information provided to the Minister for Sport and Recreation.

Mr T.K. Waldron: Yes, I've got it here.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I can tell the minister that it says \$1.24 billion.

Mr T.K. Waldron: Yes, based on your project! The project has changed! Hello!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: What project is the minister delivering? What is the total cost? The minister stood and said, "Oh, yes; we're not having a car park." The Premier, on the day, said that that would save \$300 million; today he said hundreds of millions of dollars. That same briefing note said that the cost of the car park was only \$130 million, not \$300 million.

Mr T.K. Waldron: But it's not just the car park. Read the rest; it's not just the car park.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Pilings? So now we are not going to put any poles down to build the stadium? Public transport?

Mr T.R. Buswell interjected.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Is the member saying that poles do not have to be put in to build the stadium?

Mr T.R. Buswell: Of course you have to put poles in!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Why were they excluded then from the cost when the government announced it?

Can the minister tell us the cost of the public transport? This briefing note said that the cost of public transport was \$200 million, so is that how much it is going to be?

Mr T.R. Buswell: Oh, give or take.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: "Give or take"? The footbridge? Can the minister tell us how much the footbridge will cost?

The SPEAKER: I only want to hear from the member for West Swan. I do not want to hear from the Minister for Sport and Recreation; you have had your opportunity. I do not know whether you are going to get your feet,

Speaker; Mr Roger Cook; Mr John Kobelke; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Terry Waldron; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr John McGrath; Mr Eric Ripper; Mr Troy Buswell

Minister for Transport; you might and you might not, but I do not want to hear from you at this point. The only person I want to hear from is the member for West Swan.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Back to the briefing note; that is, the information provided to the government before it made the announcement. This briefing note clearly states that the cost of the Burswood option, a 60 000-seat stadium, would be \$1.24 billion. It goes on to outline other items, including car parking, but the Premier said that car parking would cost \$300 million.

Mr C.J. Barnett: No, I didn't.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Yes, the Premier did. I will quote from *The West Australian* of 29 June —

Mr Barnett said \$300 million would be saved by scrapping plans for a carpark under the arena.

So the Premier did say that?

Mr C.J. Barnett interjected.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Yes, the government said it was going to save \$300 million. However, the briefing note said \$130 million. The briefing note also said that \$200 million of additional expenditure would be required in relation to public transport.

Mr C.J. Barnett: Yes—\$300 million. I said that on the day. I said \$300 million for public transport.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Okay, so let us say that the cost was \$1.24 billion, take away the car park of \$130 million, and add the piazza, which is \$43 million. The minister is telling me that the government is not going to spend money on the other factors that made up the \$318 million, which was loosely used to describe a car park, including site contamination, piling, and public transport escalation. Is the Premier saying that none of that is going to happen?

Mr C.J. Barnett: Are you opposed to Burswood? Are you opposed to it?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Premier, this is about the integrity of the process.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: The member for Mandurah possibly did not see me standing. Member for Kwinana, I am going to formally call you to order for the first time today. Member for West Swan, I will give you the call back. I am going to ask members, once again, to desist from interjecting.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The briefing note to the government said \$1.24 billion. The car park estimation was \$130 million. Okay, scrap the car park. I ask the minister: will there be a car park at all for players and officials? How much will that be? Will they use the footbridge? How much is the car park?

Mr T.K. Waldron: Of course there'll be some parking. The Premier's already outlined it.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: So how much is it? The government has removed the car park allowance of \$130 million, but it has not told us how much the car park is going to cost. The minister said there would be no car park; that is what has been said—no car park. I was imagining players and officials walking across this fantastic footbridge to attend their games!

The minister also says, "We're using the old figures." According to the briefing note provided to the minister, the government is using those figures for the reason that the existing major stadium project delivery plan was used as the basis for the desktop review, given that there had been neither direction nor resources provided to review or update the existing strategy. The minister comes in here and says that we should not be using this information, even though it is the only information provided to the government on which to base this decision. That is absolutely ridiculous. As I said, we just want the truth. We want to know how much it is going to cost. The Minister for Sport and Recreation was talking about the polls. He went out and surveyed people, saying that the stadium was going to be \$300 million cheaper than the previous government's stadium at \$700 million. Sure!

Mr T.R. Buswell: The announcement came after the poll!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: When was the poll—before or after?

Mr T.K. Waldron: About a week before, from memory.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Okay; you have got me on a technicality!

Mr C.J. Barnett: Lack of research.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Lack of research? This is the Premier. Talk about a lack of research! Where did the Premier initially want to build the stadium? I thought it was Belmont Park, as I recall.

Speaker; Mr Roger Cook; Mr John Kobelke; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Terry Waldron; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr John McGrath; Mr Eric Ripper; Mr Troy Buswell

Mr C.J. Barnett: Yes, I did.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Sorry; yes, he wanted to rebuild Subiaco. Then, on 29 January it was reported on the front page of *The Weekend West* that —

The Barnett Government wants to build WA's new sports stadium at Belmont Park.

...

“When driving over Windan Bridge it is impossible not to notice that large, under-utilised area of the city,” Premier Colin Barnett said.

Mr C.J. Barnett: That's right.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: That is right! He did his research! He drove over the bridge, saw a bit of land, thought, “Hang on, looks like a good place for a stadium,” rang up Ben Harvey and got a front page!

Mr C.J. Barnett: No, I didn't.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Okay; he rang the Premier.

The key issue is that we still do not know how much it is going to cost. Nothing said today by the government has disputed anything that the shadow Minister for Sport and Recreation has said. The key issue is that the government had information that its figures were very different from what was announced; that is the key, and the minister has not been able to rebut that key issue.

MR J.E. McGRATH (South Perth — Parliamentary Secretary) [3.58 pm]: What we have here is an opposition that is fighting to maintain support for a proposition that it put to the people of Western Australia when in government to build a new stadium at Subiaco Oval. It is maintaining support for the Subiaco Oval concept, in spite of the fact that Burswood has emerged as possibly the most exciting project in the history of Perth. This stadium is the biggest sporting project in the history of our state, and it appears that only the opposition is against the stadium being sited at Burswood—apart, of course, from the member for Victoria Park and a number of other members I have spoken to. Wherever I, the Premier or the minister have been, the people of Western Australia have told us what a great site it is for the stadium.

If the stadium had been built at Subiaco Oval, it would have been a new stadium built on top of an old stadium, so it would have been a very difficult project in the first place. It would have disrupted football at the ground while this massive stadium was being built on Kitchener Park; certainly it would have made it difficult for people to get in and out of Subiaco Oval. Back in 2007, that was costed at \$934 million. What would that be by today's standards? Given the history of the Perth Arena, the blow-out could have been anything. The Premier made a decision that, rather than spend \$1 billion trying to put a stadium in Subiaco, which is very constrained—there are one-way streets; it is difficult for people to get in and out of; there is resident opposition to big crowds and late-night sport and concerts—we should take this stadium to a greenfields site. Fifty or 60 years ago, Professor Gordon Stephenson, the man who did the planning for our wonderful freeway system, identified the Burswood peninsula as a site where Perth could one day have a stadium for 80 000 people. That was his visionary comment.

There has been lot of talk about the Langoulant report and the problems it identifies with the Burswood site. I can tell members that Langoulant report also thought the Burswood site was an outstanding site. In part, the report stated that the site provides —

... an outstanding opportunity for the development of a landmark stadium with significant opportunity for urban regeneration.

And that it offers —

... the Government the ability to develop a highly visible, modern facility that could reflect the aspirations and success of the State.

At a time when we should be celebrating the chance to have a brand-new stadium for future generations of Western Australians, the opposition is saying to us, “You haven't got the figures right.” I have spoken to a lot of people about the cost of building stadiums; I am Parliamentary Secretary to the Premier on this project. I can tell members that the Perth Major Stadium Steering Committee has done, and is doing, a lot of work around the planning for where the stadium will be, the best area on the peninsula for the stadium, the planning for the transport, and the new station that the Premier talked about, which will have four platforms and will be very similar to Richmond station in Melbourne, so that people can get in and out of the station fairly quickly. We are making a generational change with this stadium. This is an opportunity to introduce a new concept for people in going to watch football and sport. People will have the experience of travelling to Burswood, and we envisage

Speaker; Mr Roger Cook; Mr John Kobelke; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Terry Waldron; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr John McGrath; Mr Eric Ripper; Mr Troy Buswell

that people will park on the East Perth side of the river in the member for Victoria Park's electorate and travel through the beautiful parklands of Burswood to get that great arena that will be sitting there on the banks of the Swan River.

Members opposite might have concerns about the cost, but the Premier's cost of \$700 million for the stadium's construction was announced only after long consideration, as the Premier pointed out before, of the decision to take out the underground car park. If members look at the cost overruns of the Perth Arena, they will know exactly how much can be saved —

Ms R. Saffioti: Is there going to be a car park? Is there going to be a car park?

The SPEAKER: Member for West Swan!

Mr J.E. McGRATH: — by taking out an underground car park

Ms R. Saffioti: Yes, but is there going to be a car park?

The SPEAKER: Member for West Swan!

Ms R. Saffioti: Is there going to be a car park?

The SPEAKER: Member for West Swan, I gave you a considerable amount of protection.

Ms R. Saffioti: Come on! He was interjecting on me all the time.

The SPEAKER: I will formally call you to order for the second time today.

Mr P. Papalia interjected.

The SPEAKER: I will call you to order for the third time today, member for Warnbro. Member for West Swan, I am going to ask you to cease interjecting in this place. You have had an opportunity to put your point. Consistently asking the same question over and over is not going to work for you.

Mr J.E. McGRATH: In response to the member for West Swan's question, of course there will be parking. There will be parking for players; there will be parking for all the officials and umpires and people who work at the ground; there will be parking for corporate sponsors; and there will be parking for the public. There will be a lot of parking because Belmont Park, on the other side, has 9 000 parking bays, and there will be parking at Burswood and East Perth. But we are attempting to change people's habits. We want people to travel by public transport to this stadium. I think some outstanding public transport will be made available for people to go to this new stadium, and the Minister for Transport will speak on that subject in a few minutes. We will have a train station and a bus station so that people can get to the ground using public transport.

The steering committee is already making a lot of progress in putting all these things into place. It is working with the various agencies that will be responsible for aspects of this development. I think it is an exciting development, and I am very happy to be involved in it. I do not have the doubts of members on the other side of chamber; I believe this will be a wonderful project about which the Liberal–National government will be able to say to the people of Perth that it has delivered a stadium for the future. It will not be the biggest, but it will be the best and most modern stadium and it will have all the necessary infrastructure. Because it is being built with public money—no private money will go into this stadium—it will be a stadium for the people of Western Australia, and for the first time in a long time they will be able to attend sport and big events in comfortable surroundings.

MR E.S. RIPPER (Belmont — Leader of the Opposition) [4.06 pm]: What a hide the Premier has! He came into office, he delayed the project by two years, he took \$80 million out of the budget for it in 2008–09, and then when he finally announced the project, he said that he should be given credit for getting on with it!

I have listened to what the government has had to say, and I am very concerned. We asked for all documents between the Department of Sport and Recreation and the minister on this project, and this is what we got. We got costings for 2010 that showed that the Burswood site would cost \$1.242 billion, whereas the Kitchener Park site would cost \$934 million. The minister's defence is, "Ah, but it's not the same project."

Mr C.J. Barnett: No, it's not.

Mr E.S. RIPPER: And so we say, "Well, what's the difference?" The minister says, "Oh well, there's no car park and there's no plaza." So, we take those out so that we are comparing apples with apples, but, to be fair, we also added in a costing for the footbridge, and what we get is a \$352 million difference between the Burswood cost—adjusting for the minister's claims—and the Kitchener Park cost. All we have had from the government in response to that is how good Burswood is! The great vision! Well, my people, like the member for Balcatta's people, are suffering under a 57 per cent increase in electricity costs, and a 45 per cent increase in water costs! They are suffering under that, and they do not want to see \$352 million extra spent on a stadium when a stadium

Speaker; Mr Roger Cook; Mr John Kobelke; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Terry Waldron; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr John McGrath; Mr Eric Ripper; Mr Troy Buswell

at Kitchener Park would cost \$934 million. So, that is the problem. If the government has some sort of different costing from what is here, it is up to it to reveal that to the public. We asked for everything that the Department of Sport and Recreation had given to the minister and this is the only costings information we received. On what basis is the government making the decision to locate the site at Burswood? If the government has some basis other than this, it is up to the government to come clean with the public and table that information.

It is clear to me that this project is headed for financial disaster. It has all the hallmarks of a wrong process and a wrong decision. Month after month, year after year, this project will blow out and taxpayers will pay over and over again for the poor decision making of this Premier. He inherited a proper process of decision making. The stadium should be at Kitchener Park—that is Labor’s position—because it is \$352 million cheaper to build it there than to build it at Burswood. The amount of \$352 million is not to be sneezed at when the debt is already \$12 billion, and when the debt is projected to go to \$22.4 billion, even without taking into account the stadium and the second stage of the Binningup desalination plant, and we have had the savage series of increases in electricity and water prices. The government wants to own the projects. It never calls the Burswood stadium the projected stadium but it wants to disown the associated debt. In the government’s view, the projects are real but the debt is unreal. It cannot own the projects and disown the debt.

MR T.R. BUSWELL (Vasse — Minister for Transport) [4.11 pm]: I listened with interest to the Leader of the Opposition describe a financial disaster. I listened with interest to him describe a blow-out and taxpayers having to pay for government incompetence. That is not a description of a blow-out and government incompetence; this graph is a description of blow-outs and government incompetence. It is called the Perth Arena. Building on that project started while the Leader of the Opposition was the Treasurer. Effectively, he was the person in charge of this project. What happened to that project? He has form when it comes to blow-outs.

Mr E.S. Ripper: Does it say April 2009?

Mr T.R. BUSWELL: Yes. It was estimated to be a \$160 million project that will cost \$500 million.

Mr M. McGowan: Northbridge Link—\$500 million more.

Mr T.R. BUSWELL: The opposition is fixated with car parks. I will tell members one of the reasons this project blew out. The original plan had a car park next to the Perth Arena. All the soil was dug out and clean fill was brought in. The acid sulfate soils were remediated offsite. It was compacted to build a roof on top and then it was decided to put the car park underneath so all that fill had to be dug out and trucked off. That is one of the reasons it will cost hundreds of millions of dollars more. It is unusual to hear the Deputy Leader of the Opposition attempt to debate a topic in this place without using a speech written by Dave Kelly.

Here are the facts. As late as last week, members of the opposition were in this place saying that the stadium will never be built and that it is a phantom project. It is the same argument they used about the Perth City Link project.

Mr M. McGowan: Who said that?

Mr T.R. BUSWELL: The member was in here last week talking about that. It is the same argument opposition members used about the Perth City Link, which is underway. It is the same argument they used about the foreshore project, which will start after the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting. The facts are that these things are proceeding. The Perth City Link is proceeding. The foreshore project is proceeding. The stadium is proceeding. It adds up to a transformation of the city of Perth. In 10 years we will look back and say, “It is amazing to see the way in which this city has transformed during this period with the Link project, the foreshore project, the sinking of the railway and the development of the stadium.” These are transformational projects for the city and for this state and all we get from members opposite is constant opposition.

Mr E.S. Ripper: They’ll transform state debt.

Mr T.R. BUSWELL: If the Leader of the Opposition had run the Perth Arena project more effectively, we would be half a billion dollars less in debt. That is because of his incompetence.

I wish to say two quick things. I want to make a correction, not that I do this very often. I think the Premier referred to Hon Sue Ellery. My recollection is that he should have been referring to Hon Kate Doust. Last week she said that there will be no stadium because the opposition will invest in wooden power poles. That was a visionary statement from Hon Kate Doust.

Mr R.H. Cook: Bring her back into the cabinet.

Mr T.R. BUSWELL: It is good fun in there.

I want to quickly close on transport links. The Burswood site is an excellent site to provide great public transport links for the people of Perth.

Speaker; Mr Roger Cook; Mr John Kobelke; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Terry Waldron; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr John McGrath; Mr Eric Ripper; Mr Troy Buswell

Mr E.S. Ripper: Where?

Mr T.R. BUSWELL: The Leader of the Opposition is fixated on where people will park their cars. Where do members park now when they go to Subiaco Oval?

Mr J.M. Francis: The train station.

Mr T.R. BUSWELL: I park at the train station and catch a train there. That is exactly what is going to happen next time. Not only will we have a good train service with four platforms —

Ms R. Saffioti: What about the players?

Mr T.R. BUSWELL: Of course the players will be able to get there, perhaps not the opposition players.

Amendment to Motion

Mr T.R. BUSWELL: I move —

To delete all words after “house” and insert —

commends the state government’s decision to build a world-class sports stadium at the Burswood site.

Mr D.A. Templeman interjected.

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

Amendment (deletion of words) put and a division called for.

Bells rung and the house divided.

Point of Order

Mr M. McGOWAN: Mr Speaker, I seek your advice in relation to the amendment moved by the Minister for Transport. The wording used by the Minister for Transport in the amendment “commends” the state government. The matter of public interest motion moved by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition “condemns” the state government. I am seeking your advice as to whether that is a direct negating of the motion moved by the opposition; and, if so, my view is that it therefore would be ruled invalid because it is, in effect, a direct negative of the motion originally moved by the opposition.

The SPEAKER: No, it is not a direct negative, member for Rockingham. I am quite prepared to talk to you after this division if you would like some further information on that.

Division Resumed

The division resulted as follows —

Ayes (28)

Mr P. Abetz
Mr F.A. Alban
Mr C.J. Barnett
Mr I.C. Blayney
Mr J.J.M. Bowler
Mr I.M. Britza
Mr T.R. Buswell

Mr V.A. Catania
Dr E. Constable
Mr M.J. Cowper
Mr J.H.D. Day
Mr J.M. Francis
Mr B.J. Grylls
Dr K.D. Hames

Mr A.P. Jacob
Dr G.G. Jacobs
Mr R.F. Johnson
Mr A. Krsticevic
Mr J.E. McGrath
Mr W.R. Marmion
Mr P.T. Miles

Ms A.R. Mitchell
Dr M.D. Nahan
Mr D.T. Redman
Mr M.W. Sutherland
Mr T.K. Waldron
Dr J.M. Woollard
Mr A.J. Simpson (*Teller*)

Noes (24)

Ms L.L. Baker
Dr A.D. Buti
Ms A.S. Carles
Mr R.H. Cook
Ms J.M. Freeman
Mr W.J. Johnston

Mr J.C. Kobelke
Mr F.M. Logan
Mr M. McGowan
Mr M.P. Murray
Mr A.P. O’Gorman
Mr P. Papalia

Mr J.R. Quigley
Ms M.M. Quirk
Mr E.S. Ripper
Mrs M.H. Roberts
Ms R. Saffioti
Mr T.G. Stephens

Mr C.J. Tallentire
Mr P.C. Tinley
Mr A.J. Waddell
Mr M.P. Whitely
Mr B.S. Wyatt
Mr D.A. Templeman (*Teller*)

Pairs

Mrs L.M. Harvey
Mr C.C. Porter
Mr G.M. Castrilli

Mrs C.A. Martin
Mr J.N. Hyde
Mr P.B. Watson

Amendment thus passed.

Extract from *Hansard*
[ASSEMBLY — Tuesday, 27 September 2011]
p7780d-7793a

Speaker; Mr Roger Cook; Mr John Kobelke; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Terry Waldron; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr John McGrath; Mr Eric Ripper; Mr Troy Buswell

Amendment (insertion of words) put and a division taken with the following result —

Ayes (28)

Mr P. Abetz
Mr F.A. Alban
Mr C.J. Barnett
Mr I.C. Blayney
Mr J.J.M. Bowler
Mr I.M. Britza
Mr T.R. Buswell

Mr V.A. Catania
Dr E. Constable
Mr M.J. Cowper
Mr J.H.D. Day
Mr J.M. Francis
Mr B.J. Grylls
Dr K.D. Hames

Mr A.P. Jacob
Dr G.G. Jacobs
Mr R.F. Johnson
Mr A. Krsticevic
Mr J.E. McGrath
Mr W.R. Marmion
Mr P.T. Miles

Ms A.R. Mitchell
Dr M.D. Nahan
Mr D.T. Redman
Mr M.W. Sutherland
Mr T.K. Waldron
Dr J.M. Woollard
Mr A.J. Simpson (*Teller*)

Noes (24)

Ms L.L. Baker
Dr A.D. Buti
Ms A.S. Carles
Mr R.H. Cook
Ms J.M. Freeman
Mr W.J. Johnston

Mr J.C. Kobelke
Mr F.M. Logan
Mr M. McGowan
Mr M.P. Murray
Mr A.P. O’Gorman
Mr P. Papalia

Mr J.R. Quigley
Ms M.M. Quirk
Mr E.S. Ripper
Mrs M.H. Roberts
Ms R. Saffioti
Mr T.G. Stephens

Mr C.J. Tallentire
Mr P.C. Tinley
Mr A.J. Waddell
Mr M.P. Whitely
Mr B.S. Wyatt
Mr D.A. Templeman (*Teller*)

Pairs

Mrs L.M. Harvey
Mr C.C. Porter
Mr G.M. Castrilli

Mrs C.A. Martin
Mr J.N. Hyde
Mr P.B. Watson

Amendment thus passed.

Motion, as Amended

Question put and a division taken with the following result —

Ayes (28)

Mr P. Abetz
Mr F.A. Alban
Mr C.J. Barnett
Mr I.C. Blayney
Mr J.J.M. Bowler
Mr I.M. Britza
Mr T.R. Buswell

Mr V.A. Catania
Dr E. Constable
Mr M.J. Cowper
Mr J.H.D. Day
Mr J.M. Francis
Mr B.J. Grylls
Dr K.D. Hames

Mr A.P. Jacob
Dr G.G. Jacobs
Mr R.F. Johnson
Mr A. Krsticevic
Mr J.E. McGrath
Mr W.R. Marmion
Mr P.T. Miles

Ms A.R. Mitchell
Dr M.D. Nahan
Mr D.T. Redman
Mr M.W. Sutherland
Mr T.K. Waldron
Dr J.M. Woollard
Mr A.J. Simpson (*Teller*)

Noes (24)

Ms L.L. Baker
Dr A.D. Buti
Ms A.S. Carles
Mr R.H. Cook
Ms J.M. Freeman
Mr W.J. Johnston

Mr J.C. Kobelke
Mr F.M. Logan
Mr M. McGowan
Mr M.P. Murray
Mr A.P. O’Gorman
Mr P. Papalia

Mr J.R. Quigley
Ms M.M. Quirk
Mr E.S. Ripper
Mrs M.H. Roberts
Ms R. Saffioti
Mr T.G. Stephens

Mr C.J. Tallentire
Mr P.C. Tinley
Mr A.J. Waddell
Mr M.P. Whitely
Mr B.S. Wyatt
Mr D.A. Templeman (*Teller*)

Pairs

Mrs L.M. Harvey
Mr C.C. Porter
Mr G.M. Castrilli

Mrs C.A. Martin
Mr J.N. Hyde
Mr P.B. Watson

Question thus passed.