



Parliamentary Debates

(HANSARD)

FORTIETH PARLIAMENT
FIRST SESSION
2017

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday, 13 June 2017

Legislative Council

Tuesday, 13 June 2017

THE PRESIDENT (Hon Kate Doust) took the chair at 2.00 pm, and read prayers.

CITY OF JOONDALUP — ANIMALS LOCAL LAW — AMENDMENTS

Petition

HON MARTIN PRITCHARD (North Metropolitan) [2.01 pm]: I present a petition containing 1 577 signatures couched in the following terms —

To the President and Members of the Legislative Council of the Parliament of Western Australia in Parliament assembled.

We the undersigned residents of Western Australia are opposed to any changes to the City of Joondalup Animal Local Law which prohibits horses from accessing the animal exercise beach and adjacent ocean waters at Whitfords ... Crown Reserve 48731.

We respectfully request the Legislative Council disallow the local law based on the following:

1. Reserve 47831 is Crown Land set aside for the purposes of recreation with horse access to the ocean waters formerly established over 40 years ago.
2. Removes the only access to the ocean north of Perth used by members of Riding for the Disabled; and the use of ocean waters as a source of physical therapy for injured horses.
3. The horse exercise area (160m of beach pathway) includes the ocean, with ocean waters outside the City of Joondalup municipal boundaries.
4. The ocean waters at Whitfords beach are the safest for horses, owners and riders in the northern suburbs with no alternative options offered, identified or proposed.

And your petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

[See paper 260.]

A similar petition was presented by **Hon Martin Pritchard** (2 061 signatures).

[See paper 261.]

GENETICALLY MODIFIED CROPS — FARMER PROTECTION LEGISLATION

Petition

HON DIANE EVERS (South West) [2.04 pm]: I present a petition containing 903 signatures couched in the following terms —

To the President and Members of the Legislative Council of Western Australia, in Parliament assembled.

We the undersigned citizens respectfully request that the Parliament:

1. Introduce Farmer Protection Legislation to compensate any non-GM farmer who suffers economic loss from GM contamination.

And your petitioners as in duty bound, will ever pray.

[See paper 262.]

PERTH MODERN SCHOOL — RELOCATION

Petition

HON DONNA FARAGHER (East Metropolitan) [2.04 pm]: I present a petition containing 1 654 signatures couched in the following terms, and can I just indicate that this petition is similar to one that I tabled at the last sitting week, which contained 6 459 signatures —

To the President and Members of the Legislative Council of the Parliament of Western Australia in Parliament assembled.

We the undersigned residents of Western Australia respectfully oppose the Government's 'Education Central' plan to:

- remove without reason the selective academic status of Perth Modern School;
- relocate the selective academic school students to an inner city location called 'Perth Academic College' in a high-rise building.

Education Central was developed without any consultation with the Perth Modern School community. 'Perth Academic College' would compromise student health, safety and wellbeing; does not provide

equity of access to the outdoor natural environment and sporting facilities, as available in other government secondary schools; and unnecessarily disrupts Perth Modern School students in order to address student enrolment pressures in other secondary schools.

Perth Modern School's alumni organisation, the Perth Modernian Society Inc., at present provides an exceptional level of support—including the Sphinx Scholarship Fund's financial and moral support for disadvantaged students. Similarly for the Perth Modern School Parents & Citizens Association. These are important elements of Perth Modern School, and are non-transferable to the proposed 'Perth Academic College'.

Your petitioners therefore humbly pray that the Legislative Council recommends that:

- Perth Modern School retains selective academic school status in its current location;
- a comprehensive and transparent consultation process is undertaken with all stakeholders to develop:
 - evidence-based strategies for secondary school planning, including meeting the demand in Western suburbs;
 - principles to ensure student equity around health and well-being, including on-site outdoor ground-level spaces for sport and recreation.

And your petitioners as in duty bound, will ever pray

They will be happy today.

[See paper 263.]

CITY OF MELVILLE — TOMPKINS PARK — SURF SPORTS WAVE PARK

Petition

HON PIERRE YANG (South Metropolitan) [2.06 pm]: I present a petition containing 3 409 signatures couched in the following terms

To the President and Members of the Legislative Council of the Parliament of Western Australia in Parliament assembled.

We the undersigned residents of Western Australia do not want a surf sports wave park to be constructed or operated on Tompkins Park, Alfred Cove in the City of Melville.

Your petitioners respectfully request the Legislative Council to request the responsible Ministers and Government Departments to exercise authority or discretion to not approve or consent to:

- 1) Any development application or environmental approval application for the Wave Park Group Pty Ltd or any associated entity to construct or operate a Wave Park at Tompkins Park.
- 2) Any application by the City of Melville to acquire, purchase or transfer Crown Land Lot 9789 Volume/Folio LR-3141/868 or to grant any extension of any Management Order with Power to lease over the above land to the City of Melville.

We are asking that you ensure that the whole of Tompkins Park remains as a public open space freely available to the entire community whilst maintaining Tompkins Park's natural amenity and protecting adjacent estuarine environments for all current and future generations.

And your petitioners as in duty bound, will ever pray.

[See paper 264.]

CITY OF MELVILLE — OFFICERS AND COUNCIL INQUIRY

Petition

HON PIERRE YANG (South Metropolitan) [2.08 pm]: I present a petition containing 2 746 signatures couched in the following terms —

To the President and Members of the Legislative Council of the Parliament of Western Australia in Parliament assembled.

We the undersigned residents of Western Australia are seriously concerned about the Officers and the Council of the City of Melville.

Your petitioners therefore respectfully request the Legislative Council to instigate an urgent enquiry into the Officers and the Council of the City of Melville, relating to all aspects leading up to and including the Wave Park proposal and proposed lease as well as the changes of zoning and approval of high rise developments within the City.

And your petitioners as in duty bound, will ever pray.

[See paper 265.]

EDUCATION — LOCAL INTAKE SECONDARY SCHOOL — SUBIACO*Statement by Minister for Education and Training*

HON SUE ELLERY (South Metropolitan — Minister for Education and Training) [2.09 pm]: Today, the McGowan government announced that it will build a new local intake secondary school in Subiaco to take enrolment pressure off western suburbs schools whilst offering a first-class education for local students. The first stage of the school will cost \$68 million and will accommodate a total of 2 000 year 7 to year 12 students by 2025. Architects are in the process of being appointed to design the new school.

The inner-city college will be built as part of the reinvigoration of the area and will allow the famous Subiaco Oval to become the new school's playing fields, shared with the local community. This project is an efficient use of existing infrastructure, including Subiaco and West Leederville train stations, the use of Subiaco Oval and the proximity to the town centre. The Kitchener Park site is the best location for a new secondary school and is far more convenient for public transport than the City Beach option. The school addresses the need for a secondary school in the booming inner western suburbs, rather than in the coastal area where population growth is much less. City Beach is not where the population growth is. The growth of City Beach is actually going backwards. For the years 2016–2026, the projected percentage growth of City Beach is minus 0.97 per cent, whereas for Mt Hawthorn and Leederville it is 13.9 per cent and for North Perth it is 16.4 per cent. The Subiaco site will provide 2 000 student places. In comparison, the City Beach high school option would provide 1 600 student places and was a refurbishment of an old school with the addition of some new buildings. Perth Modern School will remain on its current site in Roberts Road as the state's only fully selective academic school.

We have maintained our commitment to provide a new local intake school for the community of the inner suburbs and to take the enrolment pressure off Churchlands Senior High School and Shenton College. This is an option that will contribute to the beating heart of Subiaco and will open up opportunities for the area and the community.

PAPERS TABLED

Papers were tabled and ordered to lie upon the table of the house.

BILLS*Notice of Motion to Introduce*

1. Petroleum Legislation Amendment Bill 2017.

Notice of motion given by **Hon Alannah MacTiernan (Minister for Regional Development)**.

2. Criminal Code Amendment (Industrial Manslaughter) Bill 2017.

Notice of motion given by **Hon Alison Xamon**.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON ILLICIT DRUG USE*Establishment — Notice of Motion*

Hon Alison Xamon gave notice that at the next sitting of the house she would move —

- (1) A select committee examining alternate approaches to reducing illicit drug use and its effects on the community is established.
- (2) The select committee is to inquire into and report on —
 - (a) other Australian state jurisdictions and international approaches, including Portugal, to reducing harm from illicit drug use, including the relative weighting given to enforcement, health and social interventions;
 - (b) a comparison of effectiveness and cost to the community of drug-related laws between Western Australia and other jurisdictions;
 - (c) the applicability of alternate approaches to minimising harms from illicit drug use from other jurisdictions to the Western Australian context; and
 - (d) consider any other relevant matter.
- (3) The select committee shall consist of five members.
- (4) The select committee is to report no later than four months after the motion is agreed to.

LOCAL PROJECTS, LOCAL JOBS INITIATIVE*Notice of Motion*

Hon Darren West (Parliamentary Secretary) gave notice that at the next sitting of the house he would move —

That this house congratulates the McGowan Labor government for its local projects, local jobs initiative and for the positive impact this will have on local communities.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY*Motion*

Resumed from 25 May on the following motion moved by Hon Dr Sally Talbot —

That the following address be presented to Her Excellency the Honourable Kerry Sanderson, Companion of the Order of Australia, Governor in and over the state of Western Australia and its dependencies in the Commonwealth of Australia —

May it please Your Excellency: We, the members of the Legislative Council of the Parliament of Western Australia in Parliament assembled, beg to express our loyalty to our Most Gracious Sovereign and thank Your Excellency for the speech you have been pleased to deliver to Parliament.

HON PETER COLLIER (North Metropolitan — Leader of the Opposition) [2.17 pm]: It gives me a great deal of pleasure to make some comments in response to the Governor's address. Her Excellency the Honourable Kerry Sanderson was an outstanding choice for Governor and she is doing a sensational job in that role. I spent almost three years working with the Governor. To see her interest in science in our schools and also Aboriginal welfare is a credit to her in that she has made every effort to make inroads into both of those areas. I thoroughly enjoyed working with her.

I would like to take this opportunity, Madam President, in a formal capacity, to congratulate you once again as the first woman President of the Legislative Council. It is quite an achievement. Congratulations to you and to the Deputy President and Chair of Committees, Hon Simon O'Brien. Although it is a little belated and is getting a bit monotonous, I would like to congratulate the government once again on its fairly emphatic win. It is a clear representation of the fact that we have a bit to learn. But, of course, in life we can only excuse losing if we do not learn from it. If we are going to grow, learn and achieve as a political party, we must understand why we lost and what our mistakes were, and take steps to correct them. I have no doubt whatsoever that we will re-emerge in the not-too-distant future. Having said that, I would also like to congratulate the new members of the chamber, particularly those on the crossbench who have not been represented in this chamber for a time—the members from Pauline Hanson's One Nation, the member from the Liberal Democrats and the new Greens members. I also congratulate Hon Rick Mazza on his re-election; our National Party colleagues and close allies in government; and, of course, my colleagues in the Liberal Party.

We have four years during which it will be our role to hold the government to account. From my perspective, I enjoyed being in opposition last time. I came in in opposition. I think everyone should have a period in opposition to get used to the trappings of government. Having said that, I prefer to sit on that side of the chamber than on this side of the chamber. If there is one silver lining to losing government, having been a minister for eight and a half years, it is getting back this little thing that I have not been used to—a life. But I thoroughly enjoyed it.

We have hit the ground running and over the next four years we will keep the government to account. Having said that, I wish members opposite all the best, particularly those with the role of minister. Being a minister is a magnificent job. Having been a minister for eight and a half years, I know it is one of the great privileges of my life and I will never, ever regret it. I can say that I lived the dream, and I continue to live the dream in a different capacity. Being a minister of the Crown is quite unique and special and it is to be treasured.

There are a couple of things about being in government. One thing that members opposite need to hold on to is humility, and the other thing that they will want to try to avoid is arrogance. They can capture the two. Ultimately, of course, if they can get an even balance and hold onto humility while avoiding arrogance, they will have every chance that when we put ourselves on the line again in four years' time, the stakeholders out there will say, "Yes, they are good people. We believe in them. They are sincere and we will vote for them again." Alternatively, we can present ourselves, on the other side of the chamber, as a viable alternative. There has been spades of humility by members opposite! The backslapping and high-fiving has been extraordinary. Good luck to them. With a win like that, why would they not? As I said, they have to be very careful in government. I know the honourable member is shaking her head, but we can see what has been going on already in three months. The world of politics is a fickle existence. It will change like that; just wait.

Hon Alannah MacTiernan: Thanks for the lesson.

Hon PETER COLLIER: Good; no worries at all. The member has tried every level of government in Australia, so she should know.

Hon Alannah MacTiernan: We're learning from you.

Hon PETER COLLIER: Keep listening, because the honourable member has a lot to learn. I have a lot of experience.

When we get down to it, the government is already in trouble. The hallmark of why it was elected is Education Central; that is why it was elected.

Hon Sue Ellery: I thought it wasn't.

Hon PETER COLLIER: No. The Leader of the House has to listen to this one; this is a pearler.

Hon Sue Ellery interjected.

Hon PETER COLLIER: The honourable member is the very first one to have the self-righteous attitude that when she talks, we listen.

Hon Sue Ellery: Are you pointing at me as well?

Hon PETER COLLIER: No, I am not; this is gesticulating. This is the art of politics.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Leader of the Opposition, I remind you that you are talking to me, not inviting interjections from other members.

Hon PETER COLLIER: Thank you, Madam President. I promise you that I would much prefer to speak to you.

Education Central was the pivotal policy upon which the government was elected. The reason I know that is that for the first three months of this government, all we heard from the Minister for Education and Training, the Leader of the Government in the Legislative Council, and the Premier was that they took it to the people and they were elected on that policy. It was so good that they abandoned it after three months!

Hon Sue Ellery: Isn't that what you asked us to do?

Hon PETER COLLIER: No. I am delighted. If the government wanted to do that, why on earth did it go to the people with that policy in the first place? With that in mind, over the last three weeks, we have had answer after answer prefaced with the same old monotonous lines of "having been part of the government that saw our hard-earned credit rating downgraded due to its gross financial mismanagement", which was said in the very first week, "I am not sure where the member gained her understanding", and "In respect to the Labor government having to clean up the many financial messes left behind by the former government". These are from representative answers.

Hon Sue Ellery: You don't think you left a mess.

Hon PETER COLLIER: Uh-uh, uh-uh! Madam President, if it is good for me.

Hon Alannah MacTiernan interjected.

Hon PETER COLLIER: I have got my hand up.

Hon Alannah MacTiernan interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Hon Peter Collier has the call and I encourage him not to invite interjection.

Hon PETER COLLIER: Thank you, Madam President; I will adhere to your ruling, as always.

Hon Alannah MacTiernan interjected.

Hon PETER COLLIER: Uh-uh, uh-uh!

Hon Sue Ellery: You don't get to say uh-uh, uh-uh.

Hon PETER COLLIER: Yes, I do. I have the call.

The PRESIDENT: Members! Only one person has the call and he is not going to make any progress if people keep interrupting him.

Hon PETER COLLIER: I have unlimited time. We have a legislative agenda we have to get —

Hon Alannah MacTiernan interjected.

Hon PETER COLLIER: The honourable member really has forgotten what level of government she is in. She is in the Legislative Council. We listen to the ruling of the President. We do not ignore the President. As much as it is difficult to hear this stuff, she is going to have to hear it. I am in pretty good form today. I reckon I could go to at least 10 o'clock and then come back tomorrow. I reckon we should have an all-nighter on the last day, just like that mob over there did to us. That is what I reckon we should do.

Several members interjected.

Hon PETER COLLIER: Madam President, I put to you that we are going to have an all-nighter. Will that not be great?

Several members interjected.

Hon PETER COLLIER: There is too much unruly interjection, Madam President; it is really disconcerting. I have talked to our guys about this. We are bringing in our swags on that last Thursday. We are having an all-nighter. The Clerk might like to let the kitchen and Hansard know. Be prepared. We are going to give back what we received. On that last Thursday night, we are going to talk all this out, we are going to move amendments and we are going to do trivial stuff to waste this chamber's time just to give back. So, Madam President, be prepared.

Hon Alannah MacTiernan: You'll be lifting your work rate; that's something.

Hon PETER COLLIER: Look and learn, honourable member.

We were talking about electricity prices and the disastrous financial state left by the former government. You get my point, Madam President. All I am saying is that pretty much every answer that came from the amateurs in the other place in the last two weeks was nonsense.

Hon Alannah MacTiernan interjected.

Hon PETER COLLIER: Uh-uh, uh-uh! Madam President, I really am trying.

The PRESIDENT: I know you are trying very hard to be heard.

Hon PETER COLLIER: It is very difficult when I get constant interjections and I have made it quite clear that I am not going to accept interjections today.

That was the first one. Obviously, there is a lot of humility over there and members opposite have taken to government particularly well.

I will remind members opposite about a few stark statistics that they might like to consider. Since 2001, which was the last time the state Liberal–National government was voted out of office, there have been 12 federal and state elections in Western Australia. There have been five state elections and seven federal elections. Since 2001, the Labor Party has received above 40 per cent of the vote on two occasions and the Liberal Party has received above 40 per cent of the vote on seven occasions. The average ALP primary vote since 2001 is 34.2 per cent. If members opposite genuinely think that they were embraced overwhelmingly because the public of Western Australia was so enamoured with them, they might like to look at these statistics. In 2014, just a couple of years ago, the Labor Party got 21.5 per cent of the vote in the Senate election. That is a princely sum—one in five Western Australians voted for the Labor Party! Members should not think for one second that the public of Western Australia are rusted onto WA Labor. They should stop being so high and mighty about this win.

Several members interjected.

Hon PETER COLLIER: That is exactly what they are doing. At the very least, if there is a modest swing against this government in four years' time of, say, five per cent, it would pretty much be out of office.

Several members interjected.

Hon PETER COLLIER: Yes, it would. That is 10 seats. It would be pretty much out of office. It would be hanging on by a thread. I am stating the statistics. Whether or not the government likes it, I am stating the statistics; these are facts. All I am saying is that members opposite can continue backslapping and high-fiving all they like, but when it comes down to it, we were on the nose as a government. As I have said before, I acknowledge that. As is historically based—anyone who knows anything about politics will agree with this—governments are notoriously voted out of office; oppositions are not voted into office. We are already seeing examples of the current government not learning from its past mistakes. It is already making decisions that indicate arrogance. As I mentioned in the debate on Perth Modern School three weeks ago, if a party starts being arrogant before it is even elected, it really has some problems. It probably has a few issues that it needs to address before it starts, or continues, to focus entirely on the opposition. It needs to start performing.

Let us have a look at a couple of other things with regard to humility. We have heard, particularly from Hon Dr Sally Talbot and Hon Darren West, great platitudes that the Labor Party is the bastion of women. I acknowledge, once again, that we have a long way to go in that space. The Liberal Party really has to look at addressing the issue of female representation—no disrespect to my male colleagues. Having said that, we have heard that the Labor Party is the sole recipient of the suffragette movement. Yes, we have the first leader of the Legislative Council who is a woman, Hon Sue Ellery. It is a well-deserved position. I think Sue has the experience and, dare I say it, the fibre, to hold that position. Having said that, Madam President, I move on to your position—the position of President. It is a great position and I congratulate you on your position not because you are a woman, but because I think you are eminently qualified to hold that position. After the election we were very keen to support you or Hon Adele Farina as President. I would have thought that Hon Adele Farina would also have been a likely candidate for the role, having been Deputy President for four years. She did a very good job in that role. I have to be honest; I was a little bit surprised when I saw a WA Labor media statement about the McGowan Labor government's ministers elect. Down at the bottom of

the statement it stated “Legislative Council President or Deputy President: Kate Doust”. I could not work that one out because I was sure that the Labor Party was not going to try to get the position of President and Deputy President—that was the only solution I could come up with—because we would have supported Hon Kate Doust for the position. Then I learned that everyone on this side of the chamber was a desired candidate for President rather than Hon Kate Doust. Why on earth would the government, which had just been elected overwhelmingly, not take this wonderful opportunity to have one of its own to be the first candidate for the first female President? Why were members opposite so keen to get someone from this side of the chamber to be President?

Hon Sue Ellery: Why do you think?

Hon PETER COLLIER: I am going to tell the member. The answer is numbers, and 18 always beats 17.

Hon Sue Ellery: That is correct.

Hon PETER COLLIER: Absolutely! Hon Sue Ellery actually admits it. The government was willing to compromise the Presidency for the numbers; is that right?

Hon Sue Ellery: How was it compromised?

Hon PETER COLLIER: The government was willing to forgo the Presidency for the numbers.

Hon Sue Ellery: Wouldn't it be in everyone's interests, with such a massive majority elected in the Legislative Assembly, to ensure that we could deliver on our election commitments and the policies that we took to the election and ensure that we could pursue our agenda?

Hon PETER COLLIER: I cannot believe the interjection. Is Hon Sue Ellery saying that the people on this side of the chamber or the Greens cannot make their minds up? We sat on that side of the chamber for the last eight years with a thumping majority; did we ever abuse it? Can Hon Sue Ellery tell me once when we ever used the gag or the guillotine? Can she tell me once?

Hon Sue Ellery: Nobody uses the guillotine in this chamber—nobody!

Hon PETER COLLIER: It is only a convention, though. You guys tried to make us use the guillotine. The Labor Party had us sitting here until 10 o'clock one morning for some nonsense.

The PRESIDENT: Members! You are now having a conversation, not giving a speech. I encourage you to focus your discussion with me.

Hon PETER COLLIER: To uphold the conventions of this chamber, I would never, as leader of this chamber, forgo those conventions. We were challenged, time and time again, to challenge our integrity and role and bulldoze legislation through. We never did it. Never once did we do it. For Hon Sue Ellery to suggest that somehow we bulldozed legislation through is nonsense.

Hon Sue Ellery: I never said that.

Hon PETER COLLIER: That is exactly what the member said. We sat in those chairs for hour after hour. We were scrutinised day in and day out. We sat in this chamber for two full nights but we never compromised. The government does not have a majority in this chamber; it has 14 members.

Hon Simon O'Brien interjected.

Hon PETER COLLIER: That is right. To suggest for one second that anyone on this side of the chamber did not deserve to be elected is sheer arrogance. It is the electoral system that the members opposite put into place. When I heard former member Hon Lynn MacLaren carry on about the electoral system and how corrupted it was, I thought, “Give me a break!” These guys were a part of the construction of that electoral system. They cannot come along and say, “This is the electoral system we want,” but when it does not suit them they do not want it anymore. They cannot do that and say, “We're going to play but only if we win.” What nonsense! What a load of garbage! The role of the President was to be compromised just so that the government could get its legislation through. I mean no disrespect to the Greens. I have respect for the Greens because its members stand up for what they believe in. I do not agree with them most of the time but they stand up for what they believe in. That is fine. The Greens are essentially part of government. It voted with the Labor Party 86 per cent of the time in the last —

Hon Diane Evers: Let us have our go when the time comes.

Hon PETER COLLIER: What does the member mean by, “have our go”?

Hon Diane Evers: Don't assume that we will vote any particular way each time.

Hon PETER COLLIER: In the last Parliament the Greens voted with the Labor Party 86 per cent of the time—most of the time. It abstained six per cent of the time. Over 90 per cent of the time, the Greens voted with the Labor Party.

I have to wonder whether members opposite would have bothered with that if they felt so comfortable with that role and respected the fact that every member over here has just as much right to vote as anyone over there. Having said that, the outcome was fantastic, Madam President. I have known you for many years and I think that you are eminently qualified.

What about Hon Adele Farina? With all due respect, she must be wondering what she did wrong. We former ministers sat in those chairs and, quite frankly, she was a pain in the neck in that role. I mean that affectionately; I really do.

The PRESIDENT: I am not sure Hon Adele Farina will take it that way.

Hon PETER COLLIER: I hope she does. I can assure her that I meant it with great affection. We knew that when we sat in those chairs as ministers and we had a piece of legislation under scrutiny that we had to know our stuff when Hon Adele Farina stood up. She was relentless; she was forensic. She made life hell for us. We knew that we would not get out of that chair until that legislation was fully and utterly scrutinised. If members ask anyone in the south west about Hon Adele Farina and the work she did down there, they will tell them exactly what she did for them. I know the questions that I got on TAFE numbers and education across the board. In addition, she played an outstanding role as Deputy President for four years. After all that time and all her commitment to the party in opposition, what was her reward? She was banished to the back bench. As I said, if Madam President had been appointed a minister, which I think she deserved, although she will probably enjoy this role as well, we would definitely have supported Hon Adele Farina.

I know it is a bit difficult for members opposite but my point is that it is all well and good to be the upholders of the suffragettes but they should make sure they do not get too bold with their assertions that they are the upholders of all that is right for the representation of women. When there was an opportunity to appoint a woman President, members opposite did everything they possibly could to get a man from this side to take on the role—it is true.

Let me look at a couple of issues. I would like to go through some of my former portfolio areas, but I will save a bit of that for the Loan Bill 2017, which we will have some fun with. First of all, again regarding humility, one of the things that used to drive me mad as a minister was when Hon Dr Sally Talbot stood up relentlessly, day after day, and talked about how we used to be chauffeur driven all over the place in our white limousines and that we had a special key to use in the lift to go up and down. I did not have a clue what she was talking about; I never had one. Apparently, you can get into Dumas House with a special key and it goes straight to the top. Somehow, that would make us less significant. Somehow, that gave us lofty privileges of being ministers that we were not entitled to. We used to hear it time and again: “Off you go with your chauffeur-driven limousines, in and out.” That has nothing to do with us being members of the Liberal Party; this is the politics of envy with members opposite. It has nothing to do with us being Liberals or living in an age of entitlement, it is just the fact that ministers have a role. We used to hear this day in and day out so I naturally assumed that the ministers opposite would forgo their white limousines. I assumed they would forgo the keys to get up to the thirteenth floor of Dumas House, although they do not go there. There is a videoconference facility up there and they obviously do not use that, which I will get to in a little bit. I assumed government members would not use their white limousines and that it would be the end of the Government Garage. I thought: “The Bolsheviks are back in town. They’re not going to use cars; they’ll use their own energy-efficient VWs.” I was really pleased when the Premier caught the train from Rockingham to Perth on day one. I thought this was the start of the new regime and that the government was true to its word and would be egalitarian. They would all be the same and would not use the white limousines with the chauffeur service. But, of course, I was wrong.

Many times in the last three months I have seen the white limousines waiting out the front of Parliament House. Several times, I have seen ministers being picked up in their white limousines. I do not have a problem with that. I think it is part of the job, but there cannot be a double standard. Members opposite cannot criticise us for it when they were on this side of the chamber and then do exactly the same as we did when we were on the government side of the chamber. When I was President—it is only a matter of time!—when I was a minister, I always drove myself to work. I used the car service only when I visited schools, attended a function at night, or something along those lines. I used it rarely. I never had one of the keys, but it would have been nice. Sometimes I got in the lift at seven o’clock in the morning and it took me half an hour to get to the top. I hardly ever used my ministerial credit card. I was dying for someone to apply the freedom of information process to my ministerial credit card. They would have found a couple of coffees at a ministerial council meeting, and that was it. I never, ever abused the privileges of that office. That is what used to bother me.

As I said, I was somewhat disappointed when I found that the mob opposite not only kept the limousines, which shows, if anything, that they have a double standard, but that they have two cars. They do not have one; they have two cars. One car was not good enough for them; they had to have two. I saw this and thought: hello, hello. I’ll have a go at Hon Sally Talbot about this, but I better get my facts right first. So I checked on it.

Hon Donna Faragher: She would have been condemning us if that were us.

Hon PETER COLLIER: Yes, she would have condemned us for using the chauffeur-driven white limousines and the magic key. I am still really disappointed I did not get one of the magic keys!

I asked a few questions to find out how members opposite got two cars. I read about it in a story in *The Sunday Times* on 14 May. It talked about double dipping and how some ministers had a second car because of changes to the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal ruling. I asked a series of questions, as you do in opposition. I asked about the notion of double dipping. I will not go through the whole list, but I asked how many ministers double dipped, when the Premier found out about it and how many members paid back the double dip. The first answer I got was absolute rot, quite frankly. It was about five paragraphs of nonsense. One paragraph really incensed me. If anything, it inspired me to go even further; I would have left it alone after the first question otherwise. In part, the answer states —

It is disappointing that this was kept secret and it is disappointing that this government has been forced to clean it up. This affects all ministers and as such this government is moving to have it rectified as soon as possible.

What a backhanded go at the former government. I did not think that was right because we never did it, so I asked another question. I thought: you're not going to get away with that, mate. I have to be honest, Hon Martin Aldridge asked a similar question on the same day and got the same response that it was disappointing this had been kept secret—how juvenile. The next day, like a red rag to a bull, I asked another question. The Premier said he had written to the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal about this issue. I asked when the Premier had written to SAT, whether he would table a copy of the letter to SAT; and, if not, why not. The Premier replied that it was on 12 May 2017 and that he would table the document. I have a copy of the letter he sent to the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal. He sent the letter on 12 May 2017. The story was published in *The Sunday Times* on 14 May 2017. Honestly, do members opposite think we are stupid in this chamber? Those of us who have been in government all know that the Premier got a question from *The Sunday Times* on either the Thursday or Friday and he thought, “Oh, I better fix this up!” He then wrote to the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal. If he felt such a moral obligation to fix this onerous problem that the former government had left him, he would have done it on 12 March, three months before. He would not have waited until May. It is nonsense to suggest that he did it. I thought I would take this a bit further. In his response to the question, the Premier said that the former government was responsible and that we had hidden it. His words were that the government was “forced to clean it up” and that we had “kept it secret”. Kept it secret—rubbish! The next day, I asked the Premier whether the determination of the double dipping was listed in the *Government Gazette*; and, if so, on what date was it listed? I got a very curt response —

(1)–(2) The determination was published in the *Government Gazette* of 23 December 2016, special edition 232.

How could we have kept it secret if it had been in the *Government Gazette* four months before? It was in the *Government Gazette*, which is publicly available, yet somehow, these terrible Tories—the terrible former government—that had no transparency had kept it secret! The Premier said this publicly.

Hon Simon O'Brien: Leader of the Opposition, was it the case that people had two cars or did they have cars plus cash?

Hon PETER COLLIER: I will answer that. It is a very good interjection. I will take that interjection, Madam President.

Hon Jim Chown: Or was it the whole cabinet, including the Premier?

Hon PETER COLLIER: I would love to know, Hon Jim Chown.

I thought: righto, you guys, I'm going to give back, with credit. I asked that question and then I had another go. I asked how many ministers were double dipping if, by chance, they had not read the *Government Gazette*. The former government did not keep it a secret; in fact, it was in the *Government Gazette*. I asked how many were double dipping and, if they were double dipping, how many had paid it back, and I was basically told where to go. I should have learnt from this. When the Premier was the education minister back in 2007–08—I got my researchers to do a survey of this—27 per cent of the answers I received from the then education minister, now the Premier, told me to put the question on notice. I should have been prepared for this. The Premier has form. I asked that question. As a member of the opposition, I should ask how many ministers have double dipped and how many have paid it back. I took it a step further. I also wanted to find out how many vehicles were on a novated lease. If they are on a novated lease and they still have to pay that novated lease, how will they pay it out? Will they have to pay it out or will they keep the two cars?

In answer to the first lot of questions about the double dipping and whether they have paid it back, I was basically told where to go. I have asked that question on three different occasions and each time I have not been given an

answer. We still do not know how many ministers have double dipped. We still do not know whether any ministers who double dipped have paid the money back, including the Premier. The fourth part of the answer was —

I am advised that there is not enough time to provide the answer and I request that the member put the question on notice.

Ministers have sat around the cabinet table or they have got the Premier's office to put out an email to ask, "Is your minister's vehicle on a novated lease?" Bang—two minutes later, it comes back. They cannot even do that; I have to put it on notice. So, I put it on notice. You can keep on trying to avoid me, guys, but it is not going to work. I will get the answers to this, I am telling you. This is not a good start. This is that arrogance I keep talking about. If the government responds to questions like this less than three months after it has been in government, imagine what it will be like in four years' time!

I was staggered to read about it in *The Sunday Times*. The government must have a good connection to *The Sunday Times*. I have to be honest, I told *The Sunday Times* about these questions I had been asking, and it followed up. I did a bit of background for the journos. *The Sunday Times* asked the same question about how many ministers have double dipped and how many have paid it back. *The Sunday Times* reported —

Mr McGowan previously said he became aware of the allowance soon after the election, and he sent a letter to the SAT asking it to reconsider the determination on May 12—the same day *The Sunday Times* put questions to his office.

A spokesman for the Premier yesterday said Mr McGowan had not received the extra allowance.

"The Government has now applied the amended SAT determination to all ministers to reflect the decision," the Premier's spokesman said.

"Ministers have one vehicle except where the SAT allows otherwise, the exception being for non-metropolitan members. This is in recognition of the significant challenges faced by regional members in accessing their electorate.

"In cases where office holders had been paid, since March 17, the motor vehicle allowance in addition to receiving a government vehicle, there is no expectation this money be repaid as they were paid in accordance with the tribunal determination."

I want to repeat that in case some members did not pick up on that. If they got their vehicle allowance, they got it for two months but they do not have to pay it back. That is \$4 000 that they do not have to pay back. A minister earns \$270 000. The mob opposite—this crew, the Bolsheviks opposite—have put a \$1 000 a year cap on increases to a public servant's salary. Let us look at Mrs Smith, a year 3 teacher from Joondalup Primary School, Nurse Baxter from Royal Perth Hospital and Constable Smith from Fremantle Police Station. They are getting their \$1 000 a year salary increase from the workers' party. It takes them four years to get \$4 000. How long does it take a minister to get \$4 000? Two months. In two months, this government's ministers got \$4 000 that they are not entitled to, yet they go out and say to the workers—21 000 teachers and tens of thousands of nurses—"Sorry, guys, suck it up. Do it for the state; take one for the team." Where are their union mates now? Why are they not out there crying from the rafters? Talk about hypocrisy. That is a shocker. That is so bad.

Let us move on to another question to see whether this government has developed an arrogance at this very early stage of its tenure. I thought I would ask another question. A question about conflict of interest is always a great question. I did not know the answer, to be perfectly honest, but I thought I would just ask it. When I asked this question, a flood of journos came to me and asked, "What is going on? Who do you know?" I said, "You're just going to have to wait!" I did not know anything. I honestly had no idea. I asked —

Have any ministers or parliamentary secretaries declared any conflicts of interest?

I asked a simple question of the government. The first two questions were answered. The third question was, "Since 17 March 2017, have any ministers or parliamentary secretaries divested themselves of any conflicting positions?" I asked this question on the first day of this Parliament—on 16 May. I was just fact-finding. I was sniffing around as a member of the opposition. Do members know what response I received from the Premier? The response was —

It is not possible to provide the information in the time required. I, therefore, ask the honourable member to place this question on notice.

The government does not know who has declared a conflict of interest! Once again, that was the very first question I asked as Leader of the Opposition in this chamber. I was told to put my very first question on notice. Again, arrogance is already there.

Then I asked another question. Another issue that was creeping along related to a document left on a desk used by the former government, apparently. The Premier made a big deal about this in the media. It was about Roe 8. A document was "found" on a desk and it just happened to get in the hands of a journalist. I thought: I am going

to find out about this. As government members would know, if they had distributed that document somewhere else, they would be facing a criminal offence. Under the State Records Act, that cannot be done. If the Premier or someone in the Premier's office took that document and gave it to someone else, it is against the State Records Act. We are following up on that. I tell members right now that we will not let this one go. I tried to find out where that document came from, who had it and who transferred it to the Premier; did the Premier hand it to anyone, who handed it to the Premier, and one thing and another. To say that I did not get a response would be an understatement. Again, it was just ditto when it referred to questions to the Premier. I asked a multifaceted question about who found it and whether it was entered into the TRIM records management system and a whole raft of other questions. The Premier's response was —

- (1)–(2) As the Premier stated in the other place last week, the document was not received by anyone. It was left in a ministerial office. This document was subsequently provided to the media in the spirit of openness and transparency.

How condescending. It then went on to refer to a raft of other things but I did not get an answer to who got the document and who provided it to the Premier et cetera. I asked a number of other questions but I was shunted from pillar to post each time. There was absolutely no response whatsoever. We are following up on this one. I remind members that transferring a document from one person to another without their authority, particularly an official document, is against the State Records Act. It is an offence to transfer that document, punishable by a fine of \$10 000. We are following up on that. The government can be too smart by half, and be open and transparent, as the Premier says, while not telling me anything, or it can give me information, and there will be no issues. However, if the government is continuing to send me down the garden path with its responses, that will make me go harder. I am saying that right now. When the government keeps giving me back this nonsense about putting things on notice, and these flowery things about looking after the mess of the previous government, it just makes me more determined than ever.

Let us have a look at another one. I heard that the last time the Labor Party was in office, it employed its mates in the union movement and family members, so I asked a question about whether the Premier would list the names of the chiefs of staff of each cabinet minister, including the Premier; and, if not, why not. I also asked whether the chief of staff of any cabinet minister, including the Premier, was related to any Labor member of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council. I got the names of the chiefs of staff, but for the next question, about whether any of them were related to members, the answer was yes. That is fine; no worries, guys. When I asked a question the next day about who was related to whom, I got the response I wanted. Again, it will not bring down the government, but those are the things that an opposition should do. We used to sit on the other side, while those guys were over here carrying on about how terrible the government was in one thing and another. Three months into its term, I have this litany of information—pages and pages of it. I am keeping a record of instances of arrogance and complete disrespect for this chamber. As I said, that is a bit of gratuitous advice, and I have no doubt that the government will ignore it. The fact that it is happening so consistently at such an early stage of this government's tenure is concerning.

Right—where can we go now? Okay, the next subject is very important to me—Perth Modern School. The decision to move the school was probably the worst decision that the Minister for Education and Training will ever make. Having said that, the decision she made today about Perth Modern School is the best decision she will ever make, because she has saved Perth Modern School. The last words I said in the debate last week on this matter was that if she did not change her decision, regardless of anything else, she would always go down as the minister who destroyed Perth Modern School. Fortunately, that has been avoided. The Perth Modern School debacle has been avoided. We did our bit, but once again it was the community that came along and told this crew that that is not how government is handled. When I made my first comments about Perth Modern School, I said that the government became arrogant before it was elected, and I stand by that. The Labor Party made a decision on Perth Modern School that had purportedly won it government, and over which it had purportedly conducted enormous public consultation, but it was fatally flawed. Absolutely nobody wanted it whatsoever.

Members opposite were strident on this matter. Two weeks ago, when we debated it, the minister spent 45 minutes, without coming up for air, telling us why it was such a good policy. We were wrong; we got all the modelling wrong, and everyone loved it. The public gallery was full, with hundreds of parents, and we tabled petitions with thousands of signatures, and we continue to do so. Every single advocacy group in Western Australia was against it, but members opposite knew better than us; they knew better than everyone. It really frustrated me, because, as I have said on numerous occasions in this chamber, I am first and foremost an educator. All I ever wanted to be was a chalkie; I have said that. I wanted to be a chalkie from the time I had Frank Hayes in year 7 at North Kalgoorlie Primary School, and Tony Terry in year 9 social studies at Eastern Goldfields Senior High School. I could have done law, medicine or whatever I wanted to, but I wanted to be a chalkie. That is why, when I held the treasured role of Minister for Education, I always made sure that I consulted with the community. When dealing with children, a minister is always vulnerable. To be told ad infinitum by members opposite and by the Premier that they were elected on this issue and that it was the right

policy was very frustrating. It made me remember those heady days of 2007 and 2008 when I was trying relentlessly to get the then Minister for Education to abandon the ill-fated outcomes-based education policy. *Hansard* is full of hours and hours of debate and hundreds of questions. Every single advocacy group in Western Australia that knew anything about education was calling for the abandonment of this flawed policy. But the minister would not do it, and ultimately it cost the minister her job, or at least contributed to that. I really like that former minister, and I get on very well with her, but at the time it was very frustrating.

That is why Education Central was frustrating: it was not a policy that had any public support at all. In fact, I would say it had the support of two people—the Minister for Education and Training and the Premier—who tried relentlessly to convince everyone else that they were right and we were wrong, but ultimately, when it came down to it, it did not work. I am very pleased that the minister has made her decision, and Hon Donna Faragher was today congratulating the minister on that aspect of the decision, although not on the second part of the decision.

Hon Donna Faragher: Credit where credit is due.

Hon PETER COLLIER: That is right. That in itself is staggering, considering that the government was so rusted onto the old policy just two weeks ago. Having said that, the next part, the Kitchen Park business, really disappointed me. How the government can go from being totally rusted onto the idea of a multistorey building in the city two weeks ago to saying that it does not like that anymore and it is going to build a school in Kitchener Park in Subiaco is absolutely beyond me. Not only that, what aggravates me more than anything is that it is our fault. Just listen to this tripe. This is from *The West Australian* on Monday, which is yesterday. The article reads —

Education Minister Sue Ellery said Labor had taken a comprehensive policy to the election to address the school overcrowding issues in the inner suburbs of Perth.

“This is a serious problem that we inherited from the previous Liberal National government,” she said. “As we work through the policy, we are listening to the community so we can address some of the concerns raised.”

It is our fault? You have got to be kidding—talk about red rag to a bull with me! There is no comprehensive policy in this rubbish. Education Central is not a comprehensive policy; it is about building a multistorey building in the middle of Perth. There is nothing about Kitchener Park at all, and nothing about a Subiaco school. It is all about one school and one solution. The policy itself states —

A McGowan Labor Government will build Education Central near Yagan Square in the Perth City Link Precinct. During the construction phase of Education Central 500 new jobs will be created.

It then goes on with all this tripe about the manageability of Education Central et cetera, but that is all it mentions. This one policy document, which is nine pages long, has one solution—that is, a multistorey building in the City of Perth. It does not talk about Kitchener Park. To have the audacity to come out and say that we left the government with this mess is just extraordinary. I cannot believe that the minister can say it with a straight face. As I have said over and over again, the policy that I announced about eight months ago was multifaceted. Just to repeat it, once again, it was a new school in City Beach.

It was an expansion of Carine Senior High School, Churchlands Senior High School, Mount Lawley Senior High School and Shenton College, and it was a rebuild of Balcatta Senior High School; it was a multifaceted approach. It was well thought out after an extraordinary level of work had been done by the Department of Education. The Minister for Education has been almost monotonous on this stuff about the growth areas not being in City Beach. Yet again, she simply does not get it. The whole point of building the City Beach school was to take that pressure off Churchlands. The areas around Floreat, Wembley, Wembley Downs and Woodlands et cetera will continue to grow. The students there will go to City Beach college, which will take pressure of Churchlands Senior High School; that is the point of the exercise. This will significantly reduce the student numbers at Churchlands, which is very important. The expansion of Mount Lawley Senior High School for 650 students helps to look after those inner-city students. Only 200 students in the inner city would go to the multistorey school, so they are not affected at all. The plan we came up with was multifaceted and effective. The minister is desperate at the moment to salvage something from this. For her to say that they are now building it in the wrong area is manifestly wrong. Two weeks after the minister stood in this place and stridently advocated for a multistorey building, she is now saying, “No, that is all finished. We are off to Kitchener Park.” How ludicrous! I can just imagine what is going on in the department at the moment. The staff will be going, “Oh my goodness.” I can just imagine it. They are a most fantastic department but they will be absolutely pulling their hair out at the moment. The government has form for this and it will be saying to the department, “Just make it happen. It’s an A-class reserve but that doesn’t matter. We’ll get it through the Parliament. Don’t worry about it.” Bring it on guys. I can tell members opposite right now that we are going to have a big debate on that one. If that A-class reserve is changed and the government gets rid of that green space, we will challenge the government on it—I am telling you right now. Yes, we have to consider that environmental issue, but it is just

the wrong decision for education and it involves a combination of factors. This government is arrogant enough, yet again, to say that this is what it is going to do and it is going to have it all orchestrated in two weeks, but that just cannot happen. At the moment, the staff in building services at the Department of Education will need to have double doses of Valium—I am sorry to be so flippant, but they will. I know what it is like to create a new school. It cannot be done in just two weeks. This government was committed to Education Central two weeks ago. All of a sudden it is wondering: what is that spot there? Okay, we will put it there. Let us do a random survey. Who lives within one kilometre of Kitchener Park? I do. Let us do a random survey of everyday Western Australians: who agrees with putting the school on Kitchener Park? No-one has put up their hand. In a random survey of Western Australians, 100 per cent of the population do not agree with it. If anything, the government must listen to the community and say that it has got this one wrong.

I got wind of this proposal on my way to my local for a coffee this morning. Members opposite are leaking like sieves at the moment; it is always a problem. I knew that this was happening so while I was having my coffee I spoke to a few people. We often meet there in the morning. I asked them what they thought about the news and they went rabid and said, “No way!” Yet again, I would love to know how much consultation was done in the last two weeks because, as I said, two weeks ago we were rusted onto Education Central. For the government to now say that it has done all this work is just nonsensical. I had a similar situation back with City Beach when we looked everywhere for a location. Someone said something to me today about had we done all this work on Kitchener Park. I said, “Rubbish! We did not do any work on Kitchener Park.” We thought of about 50 different areas across Western Australia—we might have even thought about Northam oval—but, of course, none of them were suitable and there were always reasons. We had to go through the process forensically. About two and a half years ago, I sat down with department staff and we looked at a map of central Perth right through to the western suburbs and I saw a gold mine. I asked, “What’s that there”, and they said it was the old Skyline Drive-in. It was perfect; it was right next to City Beach Senior High School. It still had the undulating cement left over from the drive-in so I said, “Perfect. Why can’t we put it there?” I was told it is Bush Forever land. How could it be Bush Forever if it has undulating concrete on it? We went through the whole thing and tried to work it out. It was going to take years to get through those approvals processes. In addition, as it worked out, it was not the right site; it was not large enough to have the two schools on a shared oval, which is fascinating after what I heard today. This government absolutely and stridently advocated for a multistorey school in the centre of Perth in Northbridge and now, two weeks later, it is suddenly saying that it is not going to do that anymore and that the site is moving to Kitchener Park with plans to open the school by 2020. Well, sorry guys, but to coin an Aussie colloquialism, you’re dreaming—you really are. This change in site will bring 4 000 students to Roberts Road. I live there and I can tell members that there is no hope of that happening down Roberts Road at any time of the day or night. We can tell those students to take public transport but there are parents of 12 and 13-year-olds who do not like telling their children to take public transport. It will be an absolute nightmare. For the life of me I do not know why the government is digging in on this one because, quite frankly, it is wrong. As I said, the minister’s department is the one that did the modelling.

That brings me back to the minister’s New South Wales trips. The minister took a trip, I assume under imprest, to Victoria last year, which is fine. She went to look at a multistorey —

Hon Sue Ellery: I paid for it myself.

Hon PETER COLLIER: The minister should have used her imprest. Apparently she could have used that; she could have double dipped. The minister went to Victoria and then, after the election, she went to New South Wales. Did I ask this question or did Hon Donna Faragher?

Hon Donna Faragher: I did.

Hon PETER COLLIER: Sorry, I heard about it and of course our hardworking shadow Minister for Education and Training asked a question of the minister. Apparently the minister, Hon Rita Saffioti and four others—six people—went to New South Wales to have a look at a multistorey building. I do not know why they had to go. They already had their policy written up and here it is. Why did they have to go? The policy was already written up so surely they had done the modelling and did not have to go to try to convince themselves. But they paid for a business class trip that I assume would cost \$28 000 or \$30 000 and they would have racked up a few Frequent Flyer points, which is fine. They flew over and met with members of the Department of Education, but the policy does not say anything about meeting with the —

Hon Simon O’Brien: If they had met with members of our Department of Education, they might have learnt something.

Hon PETER COLLIER: Precisely, they did not need to go to Sydney, but I assume that they at least contacted the minister. They met with the department and they had a look at the construction of the new Parramatta primary and secondary school. The total cost of that trip was \$30 880.44. The airfares cost \$28 008.39, accommodation for six people cost \$2 244.70 and other costs came to \$627.35. That is \$31 000 to go over and hear about something that they are already going to do.

Hon Simon O'Brien interjected.

Hon PETER COLLIER: Precisely—\$30 000 would get two chaplains or an education assistant.

I have a suggestion for the Minister for Education and Training. There is a little magic key she can get at Dumas House; I do not have it. Hon Dr Sally Talbot knows all about it; I have never seen it. If she turns it round, it will go all the way to the top, and she will not be interrupted. The honourable minister could have got in the lift, used that key, and gone up to the thirteenth level. Do honourable members know what is up there? There is a videoconferencing area. It is magnificent. Members who are ministers go to ministerial council meetings, and they are really good because there they get to interact with their colleagues and tell them why we are getting a rough deal. But there are other instances in which a minister is dealing with one or two issues, and to get on a plane on a Thursday morning, fly all day for a two-hour meeting, and then fly all the way back, is a pain in the neck. Quite frankly, I would much rather be visiting schools here in Western Australia than doing that, if it could be done more efficiently.

We decided, as a government, that we would be more efficient, so we built the videoconferencing centre on the thirteenth floor of Dumas House. It has these big screens, so it is just like being in a meeting. It is just like being there.

Hon Alanna Clohesy: It's not on the thirteenth floor.

Hon PETER COLLIER: The fourteenth floor, sorry. If the government knows where it is, why did it not use it?

There are these big screens. We can sit there and watch the guys at the back pick their nose or whatever! They forget they are on video, or they will be pushing —

Hon Alanna Clohesy: Come on. Raise the level.

Hon PETER COLLIER: It is true! I am telling the member, one sees the funniest things. One sits there and sees the advisers sitting behind, interacting, and they do not realise they are on video, and it is actually quite amusing.

The government knows where I am going with this: why on earth would the minister spend \$30 000 on this, in a very cash-strapped community—we know that, because every question we get is telling us how cash-strapped we are—when she could get in a lift with her director general, her adviser and her chief of staff? It would take her two minutes to get to the fourteenth floor to have a videoconference. She did not even visit a school. She would not have visited Parramatta, because it is not finished. No wonder she did not go ahead with it; it is about \$50 million over budget and 18 months late. Imagine if they got over there and they said, “Oh, you beaut, let's have a look at our 17-floor Education Central”—that is what the one in Parramatta is—only to find out it is tens of millions of dollars over budget and 18 months late. They would say, “Oh, my God. We could have this thing built by 2020, and we can't do that. We can't go to Yagan Square because they haven't finished that and we've got to get someone to build it, because we're not building it; the private sector's going to do that, and we're going to pay \$14 million a year ad infinitum.”

There are some serious issues around this whole thing. The fact that the government can actually spend \$30 000 to fly to New South Wales for one day when the ministers could have got in a lift and gone up two floors is a sad indictment of the attitude of the mob opposite. The government carries on about financial mismanagement et cetera, but what a terrible start to government this is.

That gives me a nice segue into being in government.

Hon Simon O'Brien interjected.

Hon PETER COLLIER: Yes, after I have finished my opening remarks, I will get into a bit of substance!

It is fine for members opposite to have a go; that is politics. It is tribal, and one gets used to that, but if the government is going to give it out, it is going to get it back, particularly in the instances I have raised. The government cannot justify even one of the instances I have raised, so good luck, guys.

My role in eight and a half years as minister was magnificent. I loved every second of it and I lived the dream. I desperately wanted to be education minister and I did it, and I am so, so grateful for the opportunity. As I used to say when I was coaching tennis or in the classroom, one can live life as a series of opportunities or as a series of events, and as far as being a minister was concerned, it definitely falls into the former category—an opportunity. There was no way I was going to waste it.

In addition to that, I have a deep personal regard for Aboriginal people and always have. I am a Kalgoorlie boy. The Wongi used to come in off land when I was a little tacker; my dad used to keep the bread for them. They used to come and camp in our backyard in Boulder. They used to bring in boomerangs, and my whole wall was full of boomerangs from the Wongi. I was never fearful of the blackfella, ever. A lot of my friends were, but I never was; I just loved them. I loved actually interacting with Aboriginal people. I wanted to make sure that, if I got the opportunity, I would do as much as I could to help the original Australians. It is unacceptable that in the twenty-first century—we are all complicit in this—the quality of life for Aboriginal people is what it is. The fact

that educational standards for Aboriginal people are appalling in comparison with their non-Aboriginal counterparts is unacceptable. The fact that living, health, and housing standards are so substandard for Aboriginal people is appalling. We live in one of the richest nations on earth. When I go out there and see my Aboriginal brothers and sisters and some of the quality of life in which they live, it really, really bothers me.

I wanted to make sure that I could do all I possibly could for Aboriginal people. I remember the opportunity arose in 2011; I was Minister for Aboriginal Affairs for six years. I remember saying to the boss at the time, the Premier, “I really, really would like Aboriginal Affairs”, and he said, “It’s yours, mate.” The sad part about it was that whenever I used to tell people I was Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, many of them would be almost in shock; “Why would you want to be Minister for Aboriginal Affairs?” I would say, “Because I love it”, and I really loved it. It was such a shame, because when we got out there and worked with Aboriginal groups and people, I realised that they really want to be part of this process of reconciliation. They want to be part of the endeavour to ensure that ultimately—not for the reasons members opposite provided—one day we will not need a Department of Aboriginal Affairs, or a section in government for Aboriginal affairs, because Aboriginal people will be able to have the same quality of life as their non-Aboriginal brothers and sisters in their nation. That is what I would love to see—to get to the point at which we know that an Aboriginal child is going to have the same opportunities as anyone from Northam, Kalgoorlie, Wembley or wherever else it might be, but we are very far off that.

Having said that, for the first two years of my role as Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, I was very frustrated, because the role of minister in that portfolio was pretty much redundant. Education, Health and Housing et cetera had their own little bucket of money for Aboriginal affairs, and the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs had virtually nothing to say or do about it. I expressed my frustration to the then Premier in 2013, after we won the state election, and I said, “There’s no point in having a minister or a department if you don’t have some authority.” We agreed then that we would establish the Aboriginal Affairs Cabinet Sub-committee, and that worked really, really well. I chaired it and any decisions on Aboriginal affairs came through that subcommittee, and it was fantastic. The Aboriginal Affairs Coordination Committee comprises all the directors general of all the departments. The director general of the Department of Aboriginal Affairs used to go to those meetings and basically get flippant regard and felt that he had no say whatsoever. As a result of the establishment of the Aboriginal Affairs Cabinet Sub-Committee, the director general then had the capacity to determine policy. That cabinet subcommittee was really good; it worked extremely well.

I understand that, in addition to abandoning the Department of Aboriginal Affairs, the government has abandoned the cabinet subcommittee. I have to be honest with members, and I will not make this too political, but I think the government has made a serious mistake. People have their views on the Department of Aboriginal Affairs. When there is no Department of Aboriginal Affairs, there is no go-to place. I know there are issues of responsibility et cetera, but there will be no go-to place for Aboriginal people. We will go straight back to that silo approach to Aboriginal services in which the Department of Health will do what it likes, the Department of Education will do what it likes, the Mental Health Commission will do what it likes and the Department for Child Protection and Family Support will do what it likes, and they will go, “Up you” to anyone else. They will have their little pool of money and they will use it, and we will go back to the scattergun approach to Aboriginal affairs, with no coordination between departments. In four years’ time, we will look at each other and say that nothing has changed. But something did change five years ago: we coordinated Aboriginal affairs. I am really disappointed that you guys have abandoned that. I really hope that somehow members can find it in their hearts, particularly Ben Wyatt, who is a good man, to say, “We have to get back to that point where all the departments are working together”, because that worked really well.

The first thing I did was cosmetic more than anything. At first, the Department of Aboriginal Affairs was in a multistorey building in St Georges Terrace. It had little rabbit warrens and no structure whatsoever. There was a place near the Department of Education. It was a perfect place to put it. It had great access for Aboriginal people, but, at the same time, there were great connections with education. First and foremost, what we have to get right to make a difference with Aboriginal people is education. When we get education right, I promise that that will instil those seeds of advancement in Aboriginal people that are so desperately needed. That is what I did; I moved the department down next to the Department of Education.

Then I worked on early intervention, which is absolutely imperative. There is a lot of disconnect between Aboriginal parents and their children and a lack of empowerment. Two years ago, we opened 37 Aboriginal kindergartens under the KindiLink program. They were spread right throughout Western Australia and provided early intervention, literacy and numeracy programs, parenting workshops, speech therapy and pastoral support. They are great. I desperately wanted to turn them into child and parent centres, with a much more expansive role, but, of course, as always, money was an issue, and we had to face that. That was money well spent. I really hope that the current government not only retains the KindiLink program and those 37 Aboriginal kindergartens, but also expands them and their role. I am telling members now that if we plant those seeds in three-year-old Aboriginal children, as a community, we will reap the benefits in five to 10 years. Those children will develop

much more self-esteem and resilience. In addition, parents are part of the child's education, so parents are empowered as well. The foundations are there; the seeds are there. Guys opposite, please do something about expanding the program.

Another area that I looked at because I wanted to ensure that it was expanded was Aboriginal culture in our schools. We ensured that that was the case with the national curriculum, and I will talk about that a little later. We wanted to ensure that we had a cultural standards framework throughout our schools and we introduced that. In 2016, I introduced the Aboriginal cultural standards framework. There is a line in the sand now in all our public schools in Western Australia. Aboriginal culture is an embedded component of the curriculum. It is nothing to be scared of; it is something to be proud of. We were the very first state to introduce that cultural standards framework. The cultural standards framework is the way forward. I promise that it is embedded within our curriculum.

Another thing that I am proud of is the Partnership Acceptance Learning Sharing program. It was previously done through the Department of Aboriginal Affairs. I do not know what is going to happen to it now that there will be no Department of Aboriginal Affairs. That is a shame; it is a magnificent program. It deals specifically with individual government and non-government schools. They are asked to do a program—it could be a video, play, poem or story—that engages all of the school community. About 105 or 110 schools did the PALS program when it first started in 2011. This year, 526 schools throughout Western Australian will be doing the PALS program. More and more schools are getting involved in the acknowledgement of Aboriginal culture than ever before.

Another thing I did was with regard to the Western Australian Aboriginal Advisory Council. The previous government abandoned it. It is part of the statute, but the government did not use it. Kim Hames, to his credit, resurrected it in 2009. When I took over, I expanded it. It is constituted of Aboriginal people. I am not an Aboriginal man. How dare I impose a policy on Aboriginal people if I am not an Aboriginal person? I sought great advice from the WAAAC. I was a little disappointed with the outcomes from the WAAAC. It wanted a summit to bring all the mobs together, which we did in August 2014 at the Pan Pacific Perth hotel. Several hundred Aboriginal people from right across Western Australia came to that summit. It was fantastic. I wanted recommendations from the WAAAC about what was needed, particularly to discuss the effectiveness of investment in Aboriginal affairs. I never received anything from the WAAAC. That is my one criticism. I was disappointed after the change of government when I heard a couple of members of the WAAAC say that government has to listen to Aboriginal people more. I was relentless with the council and said, "Guys, that's good, but you've had your summit." I remember vividly saying at the time, "I do not want it just to be a talkfest. Give me something tangible that I can work for and advocate for." We did not get that. I hope that the government will dust off the report from the summit and see what the council recommended. I made some changes to the WAAAC the following year and made Ian Trust, a man of great experience, chair of the WAAAC. Until the change of government, I had not received a report from that summit, and that disappointed me.

Another thing of course was the Aboriginal economic participation strategy. That strategy tried to engage Aboriginal people in, dare I say it, economic participation. It was really good. Hundreds of businesses came online. In fact, the online Aboriginal directory was established and it now has almost 500 Aboriginal listings throughout Western Australia, which is really good.

As Minister for Training and Workforce Development, I was very conscious of the fact that there is a real disconnect between employment and Aboriginal people, particularly in the regions, so I established the "Training together — working together" policy. We went right around the community and again established a committee, which Sue Gordon chaired. It was fantastic. We went all over the state to talk to Aboriginal people. The thing that they wanted more than anything was a go-to place for employment, so that they felt that they were given opportunities. With that in mind, as a result of those recommendations—again, it came from Aboriginal people; it was not the gospel according to Pete—the government established five Aboriginal workforce development centres. There is one in Broome, one in Geraldton, one in Kalgoorlie and one in Bunbury and there is one on Murray Street. Tens of thousands of Aboriginal people have gone into those centres to connect to employment with employers in the mining sector, the agricultural sector, the retail sector or whatever. It has been a conduit from training to employment. I hope, again, that the current government sees the benefits of those Aboriginal workforce development centres, because they are working very well indeed.

The regional services reform caused a lot of consternation in the community. It came as the result of the removal of around \$90 million of funding from the federal government for remote communities. The then Premier made some comments that we were potentially going to close 150 remote communities. He acknowledges that it was probably inappropriate to make those comments, and I acknowledge that as well. It caused a lot of dismay and uncertainty in those communities and we had to work really hard to get that back. The regional services reform unit was ultimately established 18 months ago to ensure there is much more coordination with those communities and that the communities are much more engaged in determining what service delivery is required. It is working very, very well. For example, the Aboriginal regional employment package will change the way the

public sector recruits staff, awards contracts and buys goods and services by introducing mandatory regional targets. We introduced that as part of the reform unit. In addition, the Kimberley schools project is a \$25 million partnership between public, independent and Catholic schools that supports principals and teachers to deliver teaching tailored to local Aboriginal students. Again, the Aboriginal community is a part of that and 22 schools were piloted for it. The North-West Aboriginal Housing Fund, which is a \$200 million initiative to expand the state government transitional housing model, was developed with the Wunan Foundation to help Aboriginal participants set life management goals, manage personal finances and access community support networks. They are just a few of the projects that came from the reform unit.

Whether we ever get to the point at which we debate Hon Robin Chapple's bill, I want to make one thing perfectly clear for at least the 100th time: never, ever, on any occasion were we going to close remote communities—ever. I can promise members that that was never going to happen. I like to think that the reform unit, which, as I understand has bipartisan support—it certainly did when we were in government—will be expanded. I will ask some questions on that in the coming weeks to find out its status. If the government abandons that reform unit, I am telling members again that in five or 10 years when we go to those remote communities, exactly the same issues that existed five or 10 years ago will exist. I really hope that the government sees its way clear of retaining that reform unit. As I said, I loved the Aboriginal affairs portfolio—I really did. As a result of the initiatives, particularly at the entrance level with the KindiLink program and the student-centred funding model, which I will talk more about next week, with the parenting workshops et cetera and at the exit level with the Aboriginal workforce development centres, we are providing a lot more opportunities for Aboriginal students than ever before. I am going to be long out of here before we ever see any real advances in results in those areas, but I am very confident that those policies will improve Aboriginal outcomes. Mr Acting President, is it your first time in the chair?

The ACTING PRESIDENT (Hon Dr Steve Thomas): In this chamber.

Hon PETER COLLIER: It is? Good to hear. Welcome to the role.

Let us look at the other area for which I was minister for that last term; that is, education. As I said earlier, I was absolutely delighted to get that portfolio and it was a great portfolio. I have to be honest with members—I say this with all humility that I can garner—we handed over a Rolls Royce education system to members opposite. I will go through a few areas to show what we did, because in education we have become the envy of the nation. If the Minister for Education and Training goes over to ministerial meetings, she will get that from not only her Labor colleagues, who I got on very well in those meetings, I have to say, but also her Liberal colleagues. There is an enormous amount in education that I can deal with. I do not intend to go through the whole lot—I am sure members will be pleased with that—but I will cherry-pick a few areas of most significant reform. I will be talking about other areas in my speech on the Loan Bill next week.

One area that we needed to reform was the curriculum, because that is first and foremost the role that we need in a compulsory education system. We have to ensure that we best prepare our students for life beyond compulsory education. Regardless of whether they want to go to university, into retail or obtain a training qualification, wherever they want to go, we have to best prepare them in compulsory education. We were not necessarily doing that. For generations our education system was geared towards university entrance. In fact, everything was generated towards university entrance, yet, realistically, less than one-third of our students go to university. It just seemed absurd that in the twenty-first century, when we are much more of a multifaceted globalised society, we were not preparing our students for life beyond compulsory education. As I said, we might take a student to year 12 and say that they will do tertiary subjects. They struggle for the last two years of education because, quite frankly, they are certainly not interested in it and they are not qualified to take that subject choice. Saying to them at the end of year 12, “Off you go; we have done our job”, is how we got the problems that lie with resilience and self-esteem. If a student is doing subject choices in years 11 and 12 upon which they are consistently getting 40 to 50 per cent—remember that the state average for all Australian tertiary admission rank scores is around 57 per cent—of course it is not going to do their self-esteem much good at all.

A number of fads took place in education over recent decades, not least being outcome-based education, which was an unmitigated disaster. We made those changes in the first term, but we needed to move into something much more formal with the curriculum and that was with the Australian curriculum. The national curriculum was important. As a die-hard, true federalist, I am always reluctant to hand over to the Feds. The problem with that is that when power or authority is handed over to the federal government, most of the decision-making is done on the east coast. With regard to the national curriculum, that was a no-brainer because there was much more population transience in Australia. It is very important that we have some sort of uniformity with the curriculum. The periodic table and the times table is the same in every state and we spell “curriculum” the same in every state. Why do we have eight different jurisdictions with different curriculums? That is why we pushed for the national curriculum. I chaired the ministerial council meeting for the first six months I was minister, and we were dealing with tying up the final outcome for the national curriculum. One of the first things I did was I insisted that we, as a jurisdiction, had the capacity to adopt and adapt. Yes, we were going to have the framework

for the national curriculum, but in Western Australia, and all jurisdictions, we would have the capacity to adopt and adapt. That was accepted unanimously by other jurisdictions and that aspect of the national curriculum is very important. Phase 1 was implemented very seamlessly in 2015. I pushed back phases 2 and 3 as I thought we had had enough changes in our education system for the time being. We probably needed a bit of a Bex and a lie down, so I said we should push phases 2 and 3 back to 2018, again I consulted with the education fraternity, and they agreed with it. Going back to the national curriculum, there were a couple of things. Because our education system was always so focused on exit and the end product, we were always going to have problems. When I was coaching or teaching I always said that if I focused on the process, the outcome would take care of itself. In the education system in Western Australia, we were always looking at the outcome: What did you get for your ATAR? What did you get for your TEE? What did you get for your leaving? Or whatever it might be. It was always the outcome, as opposed to getting the entrance level right then the outcome taking care of itself.

One of the things I did very early on was provide a lot more emphasis on early intervention. We did it a number of ways. I have already mentioned the KindiLink program to help one of the most marginalised groups in the community, Aboriginal people, to become better attuned to life in primary school and then in secondary school. In addition, over the last four years we opened 21 child and parent centres throughout Western Australia. They are magnificent. They provide enormous early intervention support for students and their parents. All the centres are attached to a primary school and anything up to 10 feeder schools will come into them. They provide early intervention literacy and numeracy support, speech therapy, mental health support, dietary support, parenting workshops—they are vital for parenting workshops—and psychology advice. These wraparound services are all provided in one centre. They deal with tens of thousands of students throughout Western Australia every week. They are in lower socioeconomic areas because they are the areas of most need. Ideally, again, had we been in government, we would have expanded the centres. We went into the last election committing to another five centres. As we know, we did not get there this time, but I like to think that the government will consider it. Once again, I never heard one voice of complaint about the child and parent centres. They work magnificently. We have to get that early intervention. We have to put the seeds in place very early in a child's life. For the KindiLink program, the child and parent centres and the new funding model, which I will talk about in my speech on the Loan Bill 2017, we looked at ways to ensure that funding was generated and how it should have a heavy focus on early intervention. That will reap the benefits in the years ahead. In addition, I launched the kindergarten syllabus, which the kindergarten and early childhood sectors have been calling out for for decades. They now have a clear syllabus so they are not just childminding areas. The syllabus leads into the national curriculum. It was overwhelmingly called for. On each one of these occasions, I consulted enormously with all sectors. I was never bold enough to suggest that I knew everything about education. As I keep saying, I have always been involved in education. I had 23 magnificent years in the classroom. I never had a day off; I loved the job. Apart from being education minister, it is the best job on earth. Having said that, I wanted to make sure that when I left I could put on my curriculum vitae not only that I had been education minister, but also that I had perhaps done something profoundly important to enhance education in Western Australia. The curriculum was important. After the debacle of outcomes-based education when the previous government did not listen, we listened, and we put in place a structure for the curriculum. It starts with a child at birth, which is when a child's education begins, and goes right through to compulsory education. As a government, we did an enormous amount for higher education. I will see how I go; I will mention that either today or deal with it next week.

Pastoral care is the second area I would like to talk about. People talk about pastoral care now and it just rolls off the tongue. It is just a part of a school. The definition of pastoral care is very subjective, but, fundamentally, pastoral care is to look after the social and emotional wellbeing of a child. In an increasingly complex society, it is absolutely vital that our education system provides pastoral care. When I was a little tack in Kalgoorlie, we never heard anything about psychologists, chaplains, therapists or whatever. We did not have, believe it or not, any Aboriginal students in my class; they were in a demountable at the back, which was disgraceful. There were no students with a disability. I cannot remember any ethnic students. It was very much a white, Anglo-Saxon, Christian society back in the 1960s and education was very un-complex; it really was. It was very much chalk and talk, teacher-centred, with a lot of rote learning and regurgitation of facts. There was not necessarily any critical thinking. We have moved on from that, and we now live in an increasingly complex society. From an educational perspective in terms of pedagogy, we now ask our students—plead with them—to think more critically and analytically, and not just assume they will come back with a one-sentence response. They have to think about things and try to come to a value conclusion. That aspect of education has changed. I have talked about that regarding the curriculum. In addition, every single day in our classrooms, hundreds of thousands of students bring a litany of complex social issues with them. Substance abuse, the broken family structure and the abuse of children, in a whole raft of manifestations, are major issues in our community. Teachers do not go into classrooms now with *Trends and Turning Points* or *Biological science: the web of life*, open to page 50 and do the questions. They ask students to think and then they need to be mindful of the fact that a lot of children suffer in silence. We have to support teachers with this, which is why pastoral care is so vitally important. In that respect, we expanded resources for pastoral care enormously over the term of the previous government.

Regarding bullying, as I said, tens of thousands of students are bullied every single day in silence. Unfortunately, bullies' methodologies have now become much more sophisticated than they ever were. It was previously called bullying when someone hit someone on the arm or decked them. It is no longer like that. Ostracising or alienating a child is much more powerful and damaging than hitting someone on the arm. The advent of social media means students can now alienate and ostracise their peers, and they do it in a very powerful sense. Degrading comments online or unfriending on Facebook may seem minuscule, but in the eyes of a seven-year-old, an 11-year-old or a 17-year-old, they are profoundly significant. Now, when a teacher goes into a classroom, they deal with a multitude of social issues. With that in mind, pastoral care is absolutely vital. Our schools have a number of strategies at the moment. For example, Promoting Alternative Thinking Strategies, Aussie Optimism, Friendly Schools Plus and Positive Parenting are all anti-bullying programs that our schools use to enormous effect.

The Safe Schools policy is one area that recently caused some national debate. The Safe Schools policy was created at the federal level and funded by the previous federal Labor government. I have to be honest; I strongly objected to the original Safe Schools policy. Frankly, I will not even go into it, but some of the things it asked school students to imagine were offensive. I understand, and I regard myself as a compassionate person, that there are issues with bullying, particularly for gay students in our community, but this policy in isolation will not solve the problem. In its previous manifestation, this policy would not have solved the problem. I certainly never, ever banned the policy. I always left it up to individual schools, as we should with these policies. It was not like the Victorian government, which insists that all schools implement the Safe Schools policy; it is mandated. The current federal government did a review of the Safe Schools policy, which made it more empathetic, but, at the same time, it was still quite edgy. As minister, I would never have mandated the policy for Western Australian schools. We should do what we do with every other policy and allow it to be voluntary. As soon as you start doing that, guys—I am telling you—you suffer the possibility of drawing attention to a particular child. There is no discrete anti-bullying policy for obese students or ethnic students et cetera but bullying is bullying is bullying. How it manifests itself in our community is unacceptable no matter what happens, but the school community must be taken with any anti-bullying program that it implements. They cannot be imposed on schools. That is with no disregard—I am not remotely dispassionate—to any individual child, be they gay, heterosexual, transgender or whatever. All I am saying is that a school has to be taken with the community. This year, 29 out of over 1 100 schools in Western Australia chose to implement the Safe Schools program. They made that choice. I never on any occasion opposed the schools doing it; it is their choice, and that is the way I would like to think it will remain. If the government imposes the program, I promise that it will create enormous issues within our school community and the community as a whole. The current minister has said that she will fund the Safe Schools policy. I am not quite sure what she is going to fund because it is an online program that has already been established. She has said that she will fund it from an internal funding stream. I have to tell members that there is not much money in the education budget. If I walked down the street and saw \$2 on the footpath, I would pick it up and put it into the education budget. Western Australia does not have the spare cash to put into these policies; it simply does not. If the minister wants to go to the Economic and Expenditure Reform Committee—or whatever its manifestation is—to ask for that funding, so be it. I implore members opposite, and I hope that they understand the sincerity behind this view, not to impose a mandated bullying program in our schools. If the government does, it will cause an enormous social issue that will come back to bite it on the backside. I am saying that the Safe Schools policy, regardless of what members think of it, is there; some schools use it but a large number do not. We have to ensure that every single child is made to feel significant, regardless of their size, ethnicity, ability or otherwise, or intellectual capacity. We have to say that every single child is important. That is why an anti-bullying program has to be a cultural attitude across the school community. That is happening in all our schools—public and non-government. Some of the programs in place in our schools that ensure that each child feels empowered to be part of decisions and that each child understands that every one of their peers is important are working really well.

Another area, and one that I copped a lot of flak on, was the expansion of the chaplaincy program. I was called a bible basher and all sorts of things, which showed a complete disregard for the role of chaplains in our school communities. The role is not theologically based; it is not a faith-based policy at all. The number of chaplains in our schools has expanded enormously. About 530 government schools now have a chaplain. Those schools have made that call. I funded it and increased the funding significantly to add that additional support for pastoral care, but the chaplaincy program is there because the schools wanted it. On no occasion did I ever say that schools must have a chaplain. In fact, it was a headache for me because there was so much demand but we did not have the money. I had to go back to the EERC and get more money for it. There was so much demand that backbenchers everywhere were supportive. I challenge any member opposite to find any school that has a chaplain that will tell them that it does not want to have a chaplain. If they ask their schools, I challenge them to find one that says it does not want a chaplain, because they do. There is always a problem, of course. It was one of the things that we had a fight with the Feds on. The Feds decided that it was a good idea for a while—that was my guys, my troop—but they decided that they were going to bail, so we had to top up the funding. I will talk more about that when I discuss the gospel according to Pete on funding in education in my next speech! The current structure is not working. Two levels of government trying to fund education is manifestly flawed.

That brings me to another area, my baby, the independent public school system. IPS came from my years of experience in the education system. I am a public school boy—born and bred. I taught in the public education system and had no desire to go to the private education system because I was loving my time in the public system. I had my first time at John Curtin Senior High School, where I taught my first year with Michelle Roberts. I then went to Lesmurdie Senior High School, travelled a bit with the tennis, and then went into the private system. The only reason I went private was that in those days—back in the 1980s—teachers had to do their country service. I was desperate to do my country service when I first went out; I wanted to go back to Kalgoorlie. We had plenty of teachers in those days. There was an excess of teachers. I was desperate to go to Kalgoorlie but I was sent to John Curtin—go figure! I was sent to one of the most sought after schools in the state rather than back to Kalgoorlie. Having said that, when I got back after travelling for a bit, I went to Lesmurdie and I was told that I had to go to the country the next year. I had a couple of good tennis players at that stage so I asked them to give me a couple of years and I would gladly go. I was told that I had to go the next year; I said no. There was inflexibility in staffing in those days when teachers had to do country service. I said that I was quite willing to do it in a couple of years but I was told that I had to go then. That is the only reason I went into the private education system, but I am glad that I did. I had a few good years at Presbyterian Ladies' College, travelled again, and went to Scotch College for 15 years. I worked in the public education system, and at an all-girls school and an all-boys school.

When I came out of teaching, the Liberal Party was in opposition and it was abundantly clear to me that there was an issue with the perception of our public education system. The number of students was declining at an alarming rate. I did what I should do in opposition—as our guys have really started doing—and communicated with the schools and local constituents. It became evident to me that principals, administrators and teachers felt very constrained by decisions that were imposed upon them by central office. Decisions about a member of staff for Port Hedland were determined by someone in East Perth. The principal had no say in staffing levels. Why was this the case? Why was there a situation in which a principal, who was in middle management and knew his constituency, his environment and community, could not have a say in what went on in his school? It seemed so illogical to me. We talked around and went through it; we had a little group that met for a couple of years including a couple of principals from public schools, who obviously will not be named. I talked to a number of principals. At the beginning of 2008, the Liberal Party released the empowering public schools policy, which we took into the 2008 election, which came—as members will be well aware—a little early for us. It was a good policy that ensured that we empowered local communities. I do not know how we did it, but we won government that year. I was very disappointed that I did not get the education portfolio, but I got the training portfolio and was able to do some stuff there. I also had the energy portfolio, which I loved. About three years into that term of government, I was made education minister. The independent public school system is a magnificent system of education that has completely transformed public education in Western Australia. It ensures that authority is given at the local level, where it belongs. It has created boards constructed of members of the community—someone with financial expertise, someone with social expertise and someone with economic expertise. The boards represent the broad community. In addition to that, the principal has the authority to hire his or her own staff—at last! When a principal decides that they need a literacy and numeracy specialist, they no longer need to ring up East Perth and be told that such-and-such has been on the list for two years so they can have him or her. Principals can advertise positions in the paper and they can determine who will be the literacy and numeracy expert to suit their cohort of students. How can members argue against that? They cannot. The unions hated it and they hated me for it because those teachers who were called redeployees might miss out on their school of choice or may not end up in a school that they like. But it has increased teacher quality throughout Western Australia. This year, 524 out of about 790 of our public schools are independent public schools. We went into the last election with a policy calling for another 100 independent public schools. I reckon that would probably do it because some regional schools do not have the capacity to become independent public schools. They are too small so they probably will not need to. Another 100 schools would do it. I know that even though members opposite grudgingly supported IPS, there will be very little appetite to expand the IPS program because the unions will not support it. I am telling members opposite, though, to listen to their communities. They should listen to their communities and ask the schools whether they like being IPSs. I visited 628 schools when I was education minister and never once had an independent public school tell me that it wanted to go back. Dozens said that they wanted to be part of the process. We are empowering the local community. Why should parents not have a say in the uniform, the logo and the structure of the school? They should have. The non-government sector has been doing that for generations, and it is working very well indeed. At last the public education system has taken the lead from the non-government sector. The non-government sector does not like it particularly much. Western Australia is the only state in the nation that has seen, for six years in a row, an increase in the market share for public education, and the biggest influx has been into IPS schools. It changes the culture of the school, ensuring that the school community is now empowered. IPS has been one of the great success stories of education in this state. A lot of the other states have followed suit. I reckon that if we had put a patent on IPS, we could have pretty much paid off our debt, because all the other states are following us. IPS, without a shadow of a doubt is a success story in education.

With that in mind, I would like to pretty much finish up here. I am sure that everyone will be pleased with that. A number of my colleagues want to speak, and I get another chance next week, members will be pleased to know. I have another chance to talk about higher education, on which the previous government did an enormous amount, and a bit more about some of the reforms we instituted and, very significantly—members will love this—about money. We copped it relentlessly from the other side when we were in office, and I will give some cold, hard facts about funding. I promise that we will be watching every single school that members opposite have commented on for the last four years to make sure that they get back their purported cuts. I know that Hon Donna Faragher has been up at night going through the speeches of members opposite over the past four years.

Hon Donna Faragher: They are scintillating, as well.

Hon PETER COLLIER: They are scintillating; that is right. I will be talking about the student-centred funding model, and showing how that model really does what it should do. It funds every child in Western Australia regardless of where they live, their ethnicity, and whether they have a disability. It ensures that the money follows the child. At last, we have some transparency in our funding. I will leave it at that with regard to funding. As I said, I will be talking about that in my next contribution.

I conclude by saying once again that I feel privileged to have been a minister for eight and a half years, particularly education and Aboriginal affairs minister, and also Leader of the House for four years, but I am looking forward to and relishing the role of Leader of the Opposition and working with my colleagues and the crossbench, ensuring that we keep the government to account. It infuriates me when I hear this stuff about us leaving the government with a mess in the western suburbs, because I know it is not right. Members opposite can go off about financial disasters in their answers to questions, but in the area of education we left these guys a Rolls Royce. I would love to have been a fly on the wall when Hon Sue Ellery had her first meeting with the corporate executive. It would be a bit like Reg and Stan and the activists in *Monty Python's Life of Brian*. The honourable minister would have rocked up and said, "Well, the unions are back in town; the Tories have gone. What did the Tories ever do for us in education?" The corporate executives would be sitting there saying, "Well, actually, we do have the highest paid teachers in the nation", to which the reply would be, "Well, yes, but apart from the highest-paid teachers, what have the Tories ever done—what have the Liberals ever done for education?" "Well, we had the best resourced schools in the nation." "Well, apart from the best resourced schools, what else have the Liberals ever done for education?" "Well, we had the best National Assessment Program — Literacy and Numeracy results of any state in the nation." "Well, all right, apart from the best NAPLAN results in the nation, what have the Liberals ever done for education?" I can imagine that this is what would be going on. The corporate executives would then say, "Well, they sorted out the curriculum, actually." "Okay, they might have sorted out the curriculum, but what else have the Liberals ever done for us?" The reply would have been, "Well, they put a chaplain in every school." "I know they put a chaplain in every school, but what else have the Liberals ever done for us?" The corporate executives by that stage would be getting very frustrated. "All right, then, apart from having the highest-paid teachers in the nation, the best resourced schools in the nation, the best NAPLAN results in a nation, putting a chaplain in every school, early intervention, what have the Liberals ever done for us in education?"

Hon Simon O'Brien: Independent public schools?

Hon PETER COLLIER: Of course, independent public schools. Hon Simon O'Brien has been on the corporate executive, has he not?

Hon Simon O'Brien: No, I have just been hearing some very fine speeches.

Hon PETER COLLIER: I will just finish that bit of flippancy, but the point is, as I said, that I am proud of what our government achieved in education. We have gifted the present government an outstanding education system that is the envy of the nation. I implore the Minister for Education and Training not to waste this opportunity.

HON SIMON O'BRIEN (South Metropolitan) [4.17 pm]: I am absolutely delighted to associate myself with this motion, in which we join together in expressing our loyalty to our Most Gracious Sovereign, and thanking Her Excellency the Governor for the speech that she was pleased to deliver to Parliament. It is a time to come together and contemplate where we have been and where we are going in the course of this Parliament, and what better way to start than by contributing to the debate on a motion moved by Hon Sally Talbot, which probably for the first time is one with which I would fully concur. I thank the honourable member for that. I also thank the Governor for her presence and her encouragement to all of us at this time. It has been noted several times in the course of this debate that we have a female Leader of the House, and we have acknowledged the election of the first female President of this house, after she went to present her credentials to the state's first female Governor. As a previous speaker has noted, I do not intend to dwell myself on the gender of those three officeholders because, quite apart from that, I think they are all competent occupiers of those several positions. In the case of our President, as with the others, I am sure she will perform with distinction, and she will have the support of members from all corners of the house to do that. Indeed, it is probably some measure of the ability that we

ascribe to her that, despite the many onerous tasks that devolve to the President of the Legislative Council, the house has seen fit to equip her with only one deputy, whereas the Deputy President needs five. Perhaps a balance has been struck there that recognises the value of Hon Kate Doust in the role of President.

On the gender theme, there is probably not much more I can really contribute, except to note that I am the first male occupant of the Deputy President's role for several years, but I do not really think that that is stop-the-press news—so sorry about that. However, I thank the house for the great privilege of being Deputy President and Chair of Committees, and I pledge to do my best to serve in that role, and in particular to act in concert with our President to make sure that the dignity of the house is preserved and that our rights and privileges are defended whenever they may come under threat—and come under threat they do from time to time, not so much from pressures within the house but from without.

We all know what a blessed irritating nuisance Premiers, for example, can be. In this house, we have seen it with many successive Premiers that they do not understand the role of a house of review, but that is all right because we do. Collectively, this house understands its responsibilities and if the Premier of the day does not, that is too bad because he is not to influence the way this house conducts itself. Members on both sides over the years have staunchly stood up for the responsibilities of the Legislative Council, and they will certainly continue to do it now. I do not think that members here or in another place have been particularly well served by Premiers over the years when it comes to looking out for their welfare. That is just one of the ways that we find it manifest that Premiers want to interfere in things that they should not interfere in. Members have to understand this and sometimes they have to stand up to people. I regret that so often we see entitlements and other prerogatives of members of Parliament just given away on a whim because it seems like a good idea to some leader of some party or other at the material time. I will come back to that topic on another occasion.

I want to talk today a little bit about the recent election. I congratulate the Labor Party on regaining the government benches and we will no doubt be watching the performance of members opposite with great interest as time progresses. Indeed, I can see the Leader of the Opposition is already closely engaged, as is Hon Donna Faragher and others. I am sure that all members will make sure that they do their job as members of the house of review in making sure that this government does the right thing. I will come back to that in just a moment. During the course of today, I also wish to talk about a matter that I first raised back in 2014; namely, the efficiency of our road systems. My comments on that matter caused quite a deal of public interest at the time and I want to review progress on those matters. I will do that a little later in my remarks. We are going to break for question time fairly soon and I will probably not finish before then.

For now, I want to go back to that theme about what happens now that we have had a change of government. On 22 May, I had the great privilege to become the father of the house as its longest serving member. It seems like only yesterday that I was a young upstart —

Hon Alanna Clohesy: You still are—just delete “young”.

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: Thank you, but now things have changed a bit. At the time of the election, a number of new members came into this place. I think the number was 13 if my memory serves me correctly, which is not an extraordinary number of changes to have at a general election for the upper house. To all of those new members who joined us from 22 May, I welcome them and I hope that they will find their time in here, be it long or short, one that they can look back on with satisfaction and pride that they have been able to achieve some of the things that they set out to do when they came in here. I wish them all the best in working towards those goals, many of which were outlined in their inaugural speeches. I look forward to working with them, where appropriate, to achieve some of these goals. The election was also an occasion on which we farewelled, obviously, a similar number of now former members. It was a disproportionate contribution to that list from my party. It included not only quite a few people who did not want to go, but also one or two who did not even think that they were going to go. That is the nature of politics; it can be a very cruel and ruthless beast and we have seen the parting of ways now with quite a few of the friends who were former members of the Legislative Council from the Liberal Party. I have to tell members that I miss them—some more than others, admittedly.

Hon Samantha Rowe: Which ones?

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: I will not give members a league table of “degrees of missing-ness” or anything like that. That would be quite indiscreet and indeed it might invite a response that I might not want to hear either, but I do miss members whose company I do not now have the pleasure of, including Hon Robyn McSweeney. I am very sorry to see that Robyn is not here. Hon Brian Ellis is another person who I know will be missed by members. I have never heard anybody say a bad word about Hon Brian Ellis and I know that a number of members here on both sides would share those sentiments. I was also sorry to see Hon Phil Edman depart from South Metropolitan Region; what a very hardworking member he has been. To all of those members, I wish them well. To others who I have not mentioned, I miss them, too, and wish them all the best in the future. The fact remains that it means a little more to me this time to see people go because now there is no-one else who was here when I came in, whether it was the nine or 10 who came in with me or indeed the whole house that was

here when I first arrived. It is a salutary experience and a slightly lonely one to realise that all of those people who I looked up to on my arrival have all gone. It reminds me of a few things, but in particular it is a humbling experience to know that I have managed to endure with the pleasure of my party and the people of the South Metropolitan Region.

Debate interrupted, pursuant to standing orders.

[Continued on page 720.]

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

EDUCATION CENTRAL — SECONDARY SCHOOL — KITCHENER PARK

142. Hon PETER COLLIER to the Minister for Education and Training:

I refer the minister to her backflip on the Labor Party's Education Central policy and to the decision to build a new secondary school on Kitchener Park. Which groups did the minister consult before making the decision to build the secondary school on Kitchener Park?

Hon SUE ELLERY replied:

I was hoping that I would get asked this question. I did anticipate that it would be by the opposition shadow Minister for Education and Training, but I am pleased that it is first-up, because a couple of things have happened today. One is that, of course, the department has drawn to my attention the longstanding practice that, in fact, it is not the department's practice, nor, indeed, previous governments' practice, to consult with the community about the acquisition of sites for public schools.

Hon Peter Collier interjected.

Hon SUE ELLERY: It is not the practice. More importantly, I was really pleased to see today the City of Subiaco come out with an announcement in the name of the mayor welcoming the announcement and looking forward to working with us.

I want to go back to the first part of the question, because I asked the department to give me some advice about the extent of consultation on the acquisition of sites and it has advised me, as I have just been told, that it is not its practice to consult on the acquisition of sites. It is its practice—the former minister would be well aware of this—to appoint principals, in advance of the opening of a new school, to liaise with the prospective school community and, indeed, the local community about things like traffic arrangements, the uniforms of the schools, the values of the schools —

Hon Peter Collier: Did you do that before you made the announcement?

Hon SUE ELLERY: Neither did you, my friend.

I asked the department to advise me about what consultation happened when the announcement was made to move, for example, the International School of Western Australia from the City Beach site to the Doubleview Primary School site. I asked what consultation happened about that and the advice I got back was that there was absolutely zip, none, nada. There was no consultation about that —

Hon Peter Collier: The local members did.

Hon SUE ELLERY: After the announcement —

Hon Nick Goiran: Will you table the advice?

Hon SUE ELLERY: I have notes in front of me, my friend. I asked for the advice over the phone. My notes are my own and they remain my own.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I am trying to hear the answer.

Hon SUE ELLERY: However, I am happy to give the member a list of some of the schools for which there was no consultation about the acquisition of land. Let us begin. We could pick a year. Shall we go back to 2009? There was Ashdale Secondary College, Dalyellup College, Fitzroy Valley District High School, Karratha Senior High School, Kingston Primary School, Madeley Primary School, Manea Senior College, Somerly Primary School and Success Primary School. Shall we jump ahead to 2015? There was Broome North Primary School, Golden Bay Primary School, Tuart Rise Primary School and Joseph Banks Secondary College.

Hon Peter Collier: They're new areas—all those new residential areas.

Hon SUE ELLERY: Okay; let us go back. We will talk about a whole range of other areas as well. Let us talk about 2014. There was Byford Secondary College, John Butler Primary College, Treendale Primary School,

Hammond Park Primary School, Yanchep Beach Primary School, Wandina Primary School stage 1 and Lakelands Primary School. It is not the practice of either the government or the department to consult on the acquisition of land.

Hon Peter Collier: Garbage!

Hon SUE ELLERY: It is not. We will look forward to adopting the longstanding practice of consulting with the local community and the prospective school community about all the features for how the new school will work. I am looking forward to doing that.

NATIONAL DISABILITY INSURANCE SCHEME

143. **Hon PETER COLLIER to the Minister for Disability Services:**

I refer to the media statement that the minister put out on Friday, 9 June titled “Unique event puts people with disability at forefront of consultation”. I appreciate that he probably will not be able to give me a full answer, but I think he will also appreciate that it is an area that is causing great concern at the moment. In particular, I refer to the comment within the media statement that states —

This has been a tremendous opportunity for us to hear what is important to people with disability as we roll out the scheme in this State.

Will the minister be rolling out the WA National Disability Insurance Scheme or the commonwealth NDIS and when will it be rolled out?

Hon STEPHEN DAWSON replied:

I thank the member for the question. First of all, Friday, 9 June and Saturday, 10 June were two great days when the Disability Services Commission, along with the Disability Coalition in Western Australia, hosted a fantastic event at which people with disability got to share their views and their concerns about the NDIS. However, people also expressed a great deal of frustration, partly because the previous government refused to consult whatsoever on the NDIS, and that is why we are in the situation now. I have spent the last three months consulting with people, hearing their views and cleaning up its mess. In relation to the NDIS, 1 July is getting close. I will be making an announcement over the coming days about the future of the NDIS in Western Australia.

EDUCATION CENTRAL — SECONDARY SCHOOL — KITCHENER PARK

144. **Hon DONNA FARAGHER to the Minister for Education and Training:**

I refer to the minister’s announcement today that the government has abandoned its Education Central policy—I indicate that the Liberal opposition is very supportive of that decision—and that it will now build a new local intake secondary school at Kitchener Park. Can the minister advise what approvals at a parliamentary, state and local government level will be required to be given prior to the commencement of any works at Kitchener Park for the proposed new school?

Hon SUE ELLERY replied:

The member’s question would probably be better addressed to the Minister for Planning, but I will give it my best shot. There are the lease arrangements with the West Australian Football Commission. Planning provisions—I am trying to think of the correct name for it—apply over the actual stadium site and that footprint site. I am sorry.

Hon Alannah MacTiernan interjected.

Hon SUE ELLERY: Yes, it is, but there is a precise term for it. What I might do is give the member an answer to the extent that I am able to by checking my notes before the end of question time, but if I think, when I read *Hansard*, that I need to give her more information based on what she has asked and what is in *Hansard*, I will then refer that to the Minister for Planning.

ELECTORAL ENROLMENT — PILBARA

145. **Hon JACQUI BOYDELL to the minister representing the Minister for Electoral Affairs:**

- (1) Is the minister aware of a 22 per cent increase in registered voters in the Pilbara for the period 30 June 2016 to 30 September 2016?
- (2) Is he aware that enrolments decreased for three of the five quarters preceding this period?
- (3) How many of the voters registered in that period were as a result of changes to the Electoral Act 1907 allowing direct enrolment?
- (4) How many of the voters registered in that period were new enrolments?

Hon ALANNAH MacTIERNAN replied:

I have been given the following answer by the Minister for Electoral Affairs.

- (1)–(4) In answering the honourable member’s question, the minister notes that it is an important democratic principle that every eligible person should have the opportunity to register to be included on the electoral roll and to vote. The Western Australian Electoral Commissioner has advised that he will need to consult the Australian Electoral Commission in order to provide the detailed information sought. It is therefore requested that the honourable member place the question on notice.

FISH KILL RESPONSE PLAN — COCKBURN SOUND**146. Hon RICK MAZZA to the minister representing the Minister for Fisheries:**

Following the Cockburn Sound fish kill, including the iconic pink snapper in late 2015, a multi-agency fish kill response plan was to be developed to improve responses to and management of future fish kill events.

- (1) Can the minister therefore advise has the response plan for fish kills been finalised?
- (2) If yes to (1) —
- (a) has the plan for fish kills been implemented;
- (b) is the plan publicly available; and
- (c) what is the level of stakeholder support?
- (3) If no to (1) —
- (a) given that 17 months have elapsed, why not; and
- (b) when is the plan expected to be finalised?

Hon ALANNAH MacTIERNAN replied:

I thank the member for the question.

The Minister for Fisheries has provided me with the following answer —

- (1)–(2) (a)–(c) I am advised that the Department of Fisheries’ incident management plan has been significantly updated since the 2015 Cockburn Sound fish kill event. Changes include improved reporting and investigation procedures; clear checklists of roles and responsibilities; an extended stakeholder communication list; and, a dedicated communications plan to enable the more effective dissemination of information to the public.

The plan is not yet publicly available. However, I am advised that stakeholders were widely consulted during the Cockburn Sound fish kill debrief and were supportive of the improvements outlined above. The plan has been successfully used in responses led by the Department of Fisheries to significant fish kill events since 2015, including an event in Broome in March 2016.

- (3) (a)–(b) Not applicable.

CHILDREN IN CARE — CLAIMS**147. Hon NICK GOIRAN to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Child Protection:**

I refer to the answer to my question without notice on 18 May 2017 regarding the Department for Child Protection and Family Support policy, practice and procedure for the handling of potential claims for children in care.

- (1) Will the Minister for Child Protection table the documents that detail the department’s policy, practice and/or procedure that mandate that matters be referred to the department’s general law unit?
- (2) If yes to (1), when?
- (3) If no to (1), why not?
- (4) Will the minister table the documents that detail the department’s separate police, practice and/or procedure that mandate when matters are referred to an independent lawyer?
- (5) If yes to (4), when?
- (6) If no to (4), why not?

Hon SUE ELLERY replied:

I thank the honourable member for some notice of the question.

- (1) Yes.
- (2) I table chapters 3.3 and 3.4 of the department's casework practice manual.
- (3) Not applicable.
- (4) Yes. I table a copy of the High Court decision of *Bennett v Minister of Community Welfare* in 1992, which establishes the common law duty to children in care to take reasonable steps to avoid suffering loss and damage in consequence of a legal right. Children are referred for independent legal advice in circumstances in which there is a conflict or potential conflict with the department.
- (5)–(6) Not applicable.

[See paper 266.]

MINING — SMALLER SCALE OPERATIONS — VIABILITY

148. Hon SIMON O'BRIEN to the minister representing the Minister for Mines and Petroleum:

- (1) What benefits does the state derive from smaller scale mining operations, including the so-called iron ore "juniors"?
- (2) What are the main factors affecting or likely to affect the viability of this part of the mining sector?
- (3) Does the government support this part of the mining sector; and, if so, what will the government do to assist its viability?

Hon ALANNAH MacTIERNAN replied:

The Minister for Mines and Petroleum has provided me with the following answer —

- (1) Western Australia's smaller scale miners play a vital role in providing jobs and opportunities for Western Australian workers, their families, and communities. Smaller scale miners often extract resources that larger companies will not mine.
- (2) The viability of the sector is influenced by global commodity prices and its ability to keep production costs low, while maintaining sustainable cash flows.
- (3) The government recognises the contribution that all sections of the mining industry provide. An important priority for this government is to encourage continual investment in the resources industry.

FLORENCE HUMMERSTON KIOSK — RELOCATION NEGOTIATIONS

149. Hon ALISON XAMON to the minister representing the Minister for Planning:

I refer to the confidentiality of the compensation settlement agreed with Wang Nominees regarding the relocation of the Florence Hummerston kiosk at Elizabeth Quay.

- (1) On what grounds was this compensation settlement determined to be confidential?
- (2) Was any advice sought regarding the confidentiality of this settlement?
 - (a) If yes, who provided the advice?
 - (b) If no, why not?
- (3) Will the minister now table the compensation settlement amount?

Hon STEPHEN DAWSON replied:

I thank the honourable member for some notice of the question.

- (1) The confidentiality clause within the deed provides exceptions to the obligations of confidence, which includes the disclosure of its contents to satisfy the requirements of parliamentary accountability.
- (2) Yes.
 - (a) It was the State Solicitor's Office
 - (b) Not Applicable.
- (3) The Minister for Planning advised of the settlement amount in response to a question in the lower house earlier this afternoon. I have only just seen this answer so I will find out what that amount is and bring it to the member's attention as soon as I can.

EDUCATION CENTRAL POLICY — SECONDARY SCHOOL — KITCHENER PARK

150. Hon COLIN TINCKNELL to the Minister for Education and Training:

Can the minister please explain why the Kitchener Park site is a better site than the alternative site at City Beach high school site than was previously suggested?

Hon SUE ELLERY replied:

I thank the member for the question.

It is better on several counts. Firstly, the area of population growth is occurring on the city side of the western suburbs—that is, the inner-west and the inner-north western suburbs, where higher density is happening and where increasingly people are choosing not only to live, but also to raise their families on smaller blocks, closer to the city; therefore, the need for schools in those areas is increasing. Secondly, it is a better site because it is much better connected to public transport. It has two train stations, with Subiaco train station within a very short distance. It is where the growth is. It is a better site for public transport purposes. It also gives us the opportunity to build a school for 2 000 students. The City Beach high school site proposal was based on the proposition of 1 600 students in an area in which population growth is going backwards. Over the 10 years 2016 to 2026, growth on the coastal strip of the western suburbs will go into negative; it will go backwards. It is much more sensible planning to put a school where the population growth is happening and where we know we will need new schools. It is also the case that the redevelopment of Subiaco north's master plan envisages, I am advised, a school on that site. Subiaco council envisaged the revitalisation of that whole area, looking at a mix of development. Therefore, we are able to take advantage of that, with all the benefits that go with revitalising that area, to support in particular local businesses on the high street of Subiaco that will go through a pretty serious transition when AFL football moves away from the Subi stadium. For all those reasons, it is a much better site than City Beach ever was.

AMMONIUM NITRATE PLANT, BURRUP PENINSULA — NITROGEN DIOXIDE RELEASE

151. Hon ROBIN CHAPPLE to the minister representing the Minister for Mines and Petroleum:

I refer to the 29 April nitrogen dioxide release event from the Yara's technical ammonium nitrate plant on the Burrup Peninsula.

- (1) Will there be a release of this nature every time the plant is in start-up mode?
- (2) Given the cumulative nature of the acid load build-up and the damaging effects this will have on the surrounding ancient rock art, does the government consider these ongoing emission release events acceptable?
- (3) Were these start-up releases addressed in the Environmental Protection Authority's original assessment of the TAN plant?
- (4) If yes to (3), is this a breach of Yara's operating conditions?
- (5) If no to (3), why not?

Hon ALANNAH MacTIERNAN replied:

The following information has been provided to me by the Minister for Mines and Petroleum.

- (1) No, as this is an abnormal event.
- (2) The government endeavours to ensure that all practical measures are in place to minimise emissions.
- (3)–(5) These questions should be referred to the Minister for Environment.

WESTERN AUSTRALIAN RURAL FIRE SERVICE

152. Hon KEN BASTON to the minister representing the Minister for Emergency Services:

My question relates to a report in *The West Australian* on 10 April in which the minister estimates the costs of a rural fire service at \$400 million.

- (1) Is this costing based on department advice or modelling; and, if so, will the minister table it; and, if not, why not?
- (2) Which local governments and bushfire organisations were consulted in determining this costing?
- (3) How many rural fire service bases were included in this costing?
- (4) Is the minister aware of other models; and, if so, what other forms do they take?

Hon STEPHEN DAWSON replied:

I thank the honourable member for some notice of the question. The following information has been provided to me by the Minister for Emergency Services.

- (1) The costing was not an estimate, but a figure used to demonstrate the unaffordability of a Western Australian rural fire service comparable with eastern states models.
- (2)–(3) Not applicable.
- (4) The minister is considering a range of options to implement the recommendations of the Ferguson report, including the delivery of a rural fire service.

REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT COMMISSIONS — AMALGAMATION

153. Hon JIM CHOWN to the Minister for Regional Development:

- (1) Does the government intend to amalgamate any of the nine regional development commissions?
- (2) If yes to (1), which development councils will be amalgamated?

Hon ALANNAH MacTIERNAN replied:

I thank the member for the question.

- (1)–(2) There is no intention at present to amalgamate any of the nine regional development commissions but we note the recommendations of the Duncan review that —

Amendments to the RDC Act and a reordering and renewal of the roles, responsibilities and priorities of the organisations concerned with regional development are necessary to provide better support and outcomes for regional service delivery and policy.

POTATO MARKETING CORPORATION — LEGAL PROCEEDINGS

154. Hon COLIN HOLT to the Leader of the House representing the Premier:

My question relates to the potato industry and related matters.

- (1) Did the Premier or his representatives formally write to Tony Galati prior to the March election this year?
- (2) If yes to (1), will the Leader of the House table a copy of the letter in Parliament?
- (3) If no to (2), why not?
- (4) If a letter was written and she will not table it, did the letter contain commitments to Tony Galati or his nominated companies that the Premier will drop any civil actions by the state of Western Australia that were before the courts at that time?

Hon SUE ELLERY replied:

I thank the honourable member for some notice of the question.

- (1)–(4) As per the standing orders, the Premier is not able to answer the question as it does not relate to actions or decisions made since he was sworn in as a minister of the Crown.

MANGLES BAY MARINA

155. Hon DIANE EVERS to the minister representing the Minister for Lands:

I refer to the proposed Mangles Bay marina in Rockingham.

- (1) What is the total government expenditure to date on this proposal?
- (2) What are forecast costs, by item, to LandCorp for —
 - (a) further planning and environmental works associated with the project;
 - (b) provision of facilities and amenities; and
 - (c) environmental offsets?
- (3) What is the current forecast cost for relocating, replacing and upgrading the Water Corporation assets that traverse the proposed site, and has Water Corp agreed to pay for all these costs?
- (4) Does the minister agree that the business case for this project conducted in 2013 can no longer be relied on as accurate, given the significant changes in our economy since 2013?

Hon STEPHEN DAWSON replied:

I thank the honourable member for some notice of the question. The following information has been provided by the Minister for Lands.

- (1) LandCorp has invested a total of \$1.9 million on the proposal to date.
- (2) Planning and development costs are currently being pre-funded by Cedar Woods.
- (3) A total of \$12 million has been estimated. The government is yet to agree to the payment of these costs.
- (4) Business cases are continually reviewed to reflect economic and other changes.

DRUG TRAFFICKING CONVICTIONS

156. Hon CHARLES SMITH to the Leader of the House representing the Attorney General:

- (1) Can the Leader of the House please advise the house of the number of convicted drug traffickers who have been given the available maximum custodial term over the last 10 years?
- (2) What is the average custodial sentence over the last 10 years for a drug trafficking conviction?

Hon SUE ELLERY replied:

I am sorry but I do not appear to have that question in my file. I do not personally remember signing off on it, but people are listening to this and I am sure they will be chasing it up to see whether a question was lodged and an answer is available.

DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND WILDLIFE — ARUM LILY —
SHIRE OF CAPEL AND CITY OF BUSSELTON**157. Hon Dr STEVE THOMAS to the Minister for Environment:**

I refer to infestation of the declared weed plant arum lily—*Zantedeschia aethiopica*—in the tuart forest in the Shire of Capel and the Capes region in the City of Busselton.

- (1) What plan does the government have to prevent the spread of or eradicate arum lily in the south west?
- (2) Has the Department of Parks and Wildlife conducted any spraying of arum lily in the south west over the past five years; and, if so, how much in each year?

Hon STEPHEN DAWSON replied:

I thank the honourable member for some notice of the question.

- (1)–(2) Arum lily is a control category 3 declared pest under section 22 of the Biosecurity and Agriculture Management Act 2007 administered by the Department of Agriculture and Food Western Australia. Control is undertaken in accordance with area management plans. Spraying of arum lily is conducted on an annual basis at multiple Department of Parks and Wildlife–managed lands within the Shire of Capel and the City of Busselton. These areas include the Tuart Forest and Leeuwin–Naturaliste National Parks; Locke, Fish Road, Ruabon and Yallingup Siding nature reserves; Geographe Bay coastal wetlands; and areas of state forest.

Over the period 2012 to 2017, Parks and Wildlife has undertaken arum lily control on over 1 919 hectares of department-managed lands within the Shire of Capel and the City of Busselton. In 2012, the department, in partnership with the South West Catchments Council, completed 144 hectares of arum lily control in the Webster Paddock section of Tuart Forest National Park.

ELECTORAL ENROLMENT — PILBARA

158. Hon JACQUI BOYDELL to the minister representing the Minister for Electoral Affairs:

I refer to voter enrolments in the Pilbara electoral district for the period 30 June 2016 to 30 September 2016.

- (1) What is the explanation for the disparity between a 22 per cent increase in electoral enrolments and a 50 per cent increase in the number of vacant properties?
- (2) Can the minister outline what analysis the Western Australian Electoral Commission has undertaken as part of the investigation into these irregularities?

Hon ALANNAH MacTIERNAN replied:

I thank the member for the question. The answer is precisely the same as the answer I gave to her previous question, which is substantially the same question. This information has been provided to me by the Minister for Electoral Affairs.

- (1)–(2) The minister notes that it is an important democratic principle that every eligible person should have the opportunity to register to be included on the electoral roll and to vote. The Western Australian Electoral Commissioner has advised that he will need to consult the Australian Electoral Commission in order to provide the detailed information sought. It is therefore requested that the honourable member place the question on notice.

BANKSIA HILL DETENTION CENTRE — RURAL AND REMOTE YOUTH

159. Hon ALISON XAMON to the minister representing the Minister for Corrective Services:

I refer to the practice of transporting young people from remote areas to Perth for detention at Banksia Hill Detention Centre, which, as acknowledged in Parliament by the now Premier on 17 September 2014, is “expensive, counterproductive and does not work”.

- (1) Is the government considering any strategies to reduce the number of young people being transported from rural and remote areas to Banksia Hill Detention Centre?
- (2) If yes to (1), what specific strategies are being considered?
- (3) If yes to (1), which organisations or individuals are being consulted about these strategies?
- (4) If no to (1), why not?

Hon STEPHEN DAWSON replied:

I thank the honourable member for some notice of the question. The following information has been provided to me by the Minister for Corrective Services.

- (1) Yes.
- (2) The McGowan government will allocate \$1.2 million over four years for the implementation of the framework to improve the juvenile justice system. In light of this commitment, the minister will be considering recommendations contained in this framework.
- (3) The government is considering the recommendations made in the Kimberley Alternative Justice Framework as part of our election commitment and will be consulting with the relevant organisations and individuals once a decision has been made.
- (4) Not applicable.

CITY BEACH SCHOOL SITE

160. Hon DONNA FARAGHER to the Minister for Education and Training:

I refer to the article in the *Subiaco Post* titled, “Don’t mess with Perth Mod: Bishop” on 13 May 2017. It states —

Ms Ellery said the state government was consulting with Cambridge council about options for the City Beach site.

- (1) Has the minister and/or her department met with the Town of Cambridge to discuss options for the City Beach school site?
- (2) If yes to (1) —
 - (a) who did the minister and/or her department meet;
 - (b) on what date/s were the meeting/s held; and
 - (c) what options, as stated in the newspaper article, were discussed?
- (3) If no to (1), has any other minister and/or department met with the Town of Cambridge on behalf of the Department of Education to discuss options for the City Beach school site? If yes, who has met with the town, on what date/s and what options were discussed?

Hon SUE ELLERY replied:

I thank the honourable member for some notice of the question.

- (1)–(3) The premise on which the question is asked is incorrect. Comments printed in the *Subiaco Post*, dated 13 May 2017, stated, and I quote —

Ms Ellery said the state government was consulting with Cambridge council about options for the City Beach site.

A written statement was provided by me to the *Subiaco Post* that stated the state government is currently looking at its options and will consult with the Town of Cambridge and the local community over future options for the City Beach site.

MURRAY RIVER FISH KILL

161. Hon RICK MAZZA to the minister representing the Minister for Water:

I refer to the circumstances of the May 2017 fish kill in the Murray River.

- (1) What is the lead agency for fish kills in river ways and estuaries, the Department of Water or the Department of Fisheries?
- (2) Was an investigation undertaken?
- (3) If yes to (2) —
 - (a) what samples of fish and water were taken, and when;
 - (b) what tests were done on the samples and what were the results;
 - (c) what site observations were taken, and when;
 - (d) what is the estimated number of fish deaths to date;
 - (e) what are the government's conclusions as to the causes of the fish kill; and
 - (f) can the minister direct me to a copy of the report?
- (4) If no to (2), why not?

Hon ALANNAH MacTIERNAN replied:

I thank the member for the question. The Minister for Water; Fisheries provided the following answer.

- (1) It is the Department of Water.
- (2) Yes.
- (3)
 - (a) Fish, water and phytoplankton samples were taken on 24 May 2017. Water samples and phytoplankton were also taken on 30 May 2017.
 - (b) Fish pathology samples included analysis of gills and organs. The results were inconclusive due to the poor sample quality. Testing using this method requires immediate sampling of dying fish, and as the event occurred overnight, limited suitable samples were available at the time of investigation. Water quality sampling results support the conclusion that fish deaths were likely due to low dissolved oxygen levels overnight. Phytoplankton samples indicate that the phytoplankton species and density present were unlikely to have contributed to the event.
 - (c) Site observations were taken from the shore on 24 May 2017 and 26 May 2017 and from a boat on 25 May 2017 at Yunderup Reach in the Murray River. Observations included atmospheric and tidal observations, as well as the extent and spread of dead fish.
 - (d) It is 30 000.
 - (e) The fish appear to have died of a temporary change to low oxygen conditions in that reach of the river.
 - (f) No.
- (4) Not applicable.

UTAH POINT — SUBSIDY

162. Hon TJORN SIBMA to the minister representing the Minister for Transport:

I refer to the \$2.50 per tonne cost relief package that applies to users of the Utah Point bulk handling facility that will expire on 30 June 2017.

- (1) Will the minister issue a direction under section 72 of the Port Authorities Act, or through some other mechanism, to extend the cost relief package beyond the 30 June expiry date?
- (2) If yes to (1), for how long will the cost relief be provided, at what price and under what conditions?
- (3) If no to (1), has the government undertaken any modelling to evaluate the impact of the cessation of the package on industry?
- (4) When will the minister communicate her decision and provide certainty to port users?

Hon STEPHEN DAWSON replied:

I thank the honourable member for some notice of the question.

- (1)–(4) This matter is currently being considered by the government.

BUNBURY WATERFRONT DEVELOPMENT — BUSINESS CASE

163. Hon COLIN HOLT to the Minister for Regional Development:

I refer to the minister's answer to Legislative Council question without notice 89, answered on 23 May 2017, about the preparation of a business case for stage 3 of the Bunbury waterfront.

- (1) Who is preparing the business case?
- (2) What is the expected cost of the business case?
- (3) What funding is being used to prepare the business case?
- (4) When will the business case be completed?

Hon ALANNAH MacTIERNAN replied:

I thank the member for the question.

- (1)–(4) LandCorp is coordinating the business case preparation with the support of the South West Development Commission, the Department of Transport and the Southern Ports Authority. Questions on further details should be directed to the Minister for Lands.

EDUCATION CENTRAL — SECONDARY SCHOOL — KITCHENER PARK

Question without Notice 144 — Answer Advice

HON SUE ELLERY (South Metropolitan — Minister for Education and Training) [5.05 pm]: I can provide part of an answer to question without notice 144 and the honourable member can make a decision about whether she wants to formally put the question on notice.

I was asked a question without notice by Hon Donna Faragher about the planning instruments—I think I described them that way—that apply to Kitchener Park. The term I was looking for was “management order”. The management order with the City of Subiaco would need to be removed. It can be revoked, taken for public work or a mutual agreement can be entered into. I note the Minister for Planning's comments today that she was looking forward to reaching a mutual agreement with the City of Subiaco.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

Motion

Resumed from an earlier stage of the sitting.

HON SIMON O'BRIEN (South Metropolitan) [5.06 pm]: Madam President, thank you very much for once again calling me to address this important question. Prior to question time, I indicated that I wanted to canvass a couple of matters in the course of my contribution. One of those matters relates to the aftermath and wash-up from the recent state election and the change of government and what goes with it. The other, which I will come to a little bit later, is about some matters that I think will be of interest to all Western Australians, particularly those living in Perth who are concerned about traffic congestion. I will come to that in just a moment.

Firstly, I want to acknowledge the very kind remarks of Hon Darren West earlier in this debate. In response to an unruly interjection from me he said, as recorded on page 594 of *Hansard*, “I look forward to the honourable member's contribution.” To Hon Darren West I say, hug yourself in delicious anticipation because the moment is nigh but, sadly, my dear friend is away from the chamber on urgent parliamentary business. We hope he gets well soon; I mean that genuinely, of course. He will have to have the benefit of my experience via *Hansard* or, if he is really desperately, deliriously ill, via some electronic means if he is monitoring this debate remotely. In the course of his contribution, he raised some matters post the election that I think command a response. Firstly, the demeanour of his remarks, to me, was seriously very encouraging. It encourages me that regarding the degree of rot that has already set in to this government before it has even started, in this particular interlude—which came after a crushing defeat from our point of view on 11 March—there is light at the end of the tunnel.

One of the responsibilities that I have to assume as the father of the house is to say certain really irritating things from time to time. That is a heavy responsibility that I will accept, so members will now hear me say, and not for the last time, the following: all governments come and go. That is one of the things that is true and not debatable, in this place or any other. Sometimes members can get a bit carried away with themselves after an election result and think they are bulletproof. I know. I warned a whole heap of them about it in 2015, saying, “I'm going to be here at least until May 2017. I'm concerned that a lot of you aren't going to be here after March 2017.” Nobody wanted to hear that, because they had won their seats by big margins in 2013, thanks to the efforts of Julia and Kevin and the issues of the day. They did not want to hear from me; they did not want to hear a discordant note. They did not want to hear about whether any person, be they prince, pauper or emperor, wore any clothes or not. I never wanted to be in a position to say “I told you so” to those then colleagues. When the time came to say “I told you so”, if I wanted to, it was pointless anyway because none of them were left! That is what happens sometimes when people do not understand how they came to be here in the first place, how their party comes to the government benches and how they think they are the best thing since sliced bread and they can do no wrong.

Hon Darren West reassured me that the very substantial seed of decay is already alive and well in the Australian Labor Party, which convinced me, as with all other governments, that this government will go as well. It might well be sooner rather than later. Thanks very much for that, but I have to correct him on a couple of things that he raised. Firstly, my attention was drawn to his remarks in *Hansard*, in which he was telling us —

... how tiresome it is for Labor governments to come into office and have to clean up the mess.

That was his conclusion. In effect, he said that not only had the Barnett government recently been the government that saw a downgrading of the state's AAA credit rating, but also we were serial offenders, because the Court government left a similar legacy that had to be cleaned up by the Gallop government. I do not know about my short-term memory but my long-term memory is pretty intact, and there is a two-syllable word to describe that claim. Members might know what it is; it is nonsense—absolute nonsense. The facts have to be placed on the record because we cannot let those assertions stand. I have recourse to relevant parts of history. I am not sure where the honourable member gets his information from but it certainly does not gel with my understanding of what happened, and I was a keen observer of politics at the material time. Back in the days of the Lawrence Labor government, the state's AAA credit rating was downgraded and it was a political scandal of the day. Yes, my side made a great deal of mileage of it, as well we might, but it certainly was not the Richard Court government that presided over the loss of the AAA credit rating. That was the government that worked hard to have it restored.

I remind members of an article by Colleen Egan, a journalist of repute, writing in *The Australian*, a journal of record, on Tuesday, 5 December 2000. Under the heading “Premier gets a AAA-grade present for election lead-up”, she stated —

THE Court Government was handed a modest pre-election gift yesterday with the retention of the AAA credit rating for Western Australia by Standard & Poor's.

Another interesting comment states —

But the good report card appeared to be tenuous, with the ratings agency citing recent privatisation as the main reason for the tick.

It went on to state —

Premier Richard Court said yesterday the Government had struck a good balance between tight fiscal policy and reasonable budgets for public works and services.

He was clearly pleased, if not relieved, to retain the rating, which was restored in 1998 after being downgraded to AA in 1991 after the disastrous WA Inc years.

If we look at the available documentation, we can find a number of credit rating histories from Standard and Poor's and others. I wonder whether these are the things that perhaps my friend read in a particular way, because it is possible to read and interpret ratings listings in different ways. I do not want to go into whether he was looking at local currency ratings, long term or short term, or whether he was looking at foreign currency ratings, short term or long term. A range of ratings can be held at the same time. For example, AAA, stable, A1+ was one of the ratings held during the time of the Court government. I do not think that really matters. Suffice to say, it is a matter of historical record that the Lawrence Labor government presided over the downgrading of a AAA credit rating. It is also a matter of historical record that the Barnett government was in office at the time of a downgrading of the credit rating. What that means is perhaps an argument for another day. Certainly, in political terms, it is dynamite. There is some practical effect, but I am not going to get into that now. Suffice to say, if the member opposite wants to make an issue of it, it is one—all. In terms of fixing up the mess, it is one to us and it is zero to the ALP. That is the record. The ALP has said it is now charging to the rescue, and Hon Darren West is very enthusiastic about that. The Labor Party is coming to fix up the mess. He told us what the parameters are but he needs to be aware that at this stage, in terms of downgrades, it is one—all, and in terms of “fixing up the mess”, as he wants to term it—as if it were that simple—it is one—nil, our favour. The ball is very much in the new government's court. I wonder what the government is going to do. I wonder what Hon Darren West's response will be to a further downgrade of the state's credit rating. That might change the dialogue that I have just highlighted. I imagine it will be someone else's fault when that happens. I remember the look on the face of the Treasurer in recent days when he came face to face with the reality that changing commodity prices have a dramatic negative effect on the budget outlook. Welcome to the real world, Treasurer, I would say to him. The former Treasurer would like to point out to the new Treasurer that sometimes we have to deal with the hand we are dealt, even though it is not the one we engineered or asked for. We shall see, but if the member is determined that credit ratings and upgrades and downgrades will be a key criterion, that is fine. Let us find out what this government proposes to do about restoring the state's credit rating. Let us see if it is capable of taking responsibility for the credit rating not being further downgraded. Those matters will no doubt be touched on as bills yet to come before the house are finally received.

I have been listening with great interest to the debate that has been going on between the Leader of the Opposition, a former education minister, and the Leader of the House, the current Minister for Education and Training. That is very interesting, and we will find out a bit more about the Perth Modern School saga in due course. I have listened with great interest to what the respective leaders have had to say, and I do not believe that a solution like the one that was announced this morning could be arrived at overnight, and yet that is what the government would have us believe. We do not want to be bamboozled with talk about whether we do consultation about this or that, or something else. I never thought “consultation” was such a dirty word, as it apparently is with this government. I know that is not possible to backflip from an undeveloped proposal to move a school from the Perth Modern School site to a central office site, and then replace it with another—I will not even call it half-baked—completely unbaked idea to create a new high school in a place that has never been contemplated for use as a high school. That is not how governments should go about developing infrastructure. It cannot just be done on a wing and a prayer. How on earth is the government going to get a high school in place in Subiaco by 2020? It can only be done if all the classes are held in tents. It will not be possible to do all the things that are necessary and prudent to create such a school in the time available.

I am a former minister for works, so I know what is involved in what the government is contemplating. There is no business case that I am aware of. If anybody can tell me by way of interjection or otherwise that there is a business case, that is fine, but are members on the government side seriously saying that they intend to go ahead on this course that the government has outlined to build a senior high school in the Kitchener Park area in Subiaco, come hell or high water? Where on earth is the work that is necessary before embarking on such a course of action? It does not exist. How many millions of dollars will be spent on this? The government does not know. What environmental and other considerations have to be complied with before it can go ahead? I do not believe the government knows; if it does know it could easily tell us. I do not know how the government proposes, or whether it has even considered, getting around the A-class reserve status of Kitchener Park. So many other things on the one hand cause me concern, but on the other give me some comfort that this government is not as good as it thinks it is. It is carried away by a dramatic result which is no more dramatic than the result we had in 2013.

Before I move off that subject, I wish to make one other point. I heard a bit of bleating, from not only my good friend Hon Darren West, but also the Leader of the House and others, asking why, if the election result delivered the government 75 per cent of seats in the Legislative Assembly, it does not have a similar result in the Legislative Council. Why does the government not have 75 per cent of the seats in this chamber? It is not fair, is it? I can almost see the foot stamping and the breath holding. It is not fair. Again, members opposite need to understand how politics works in this state, and they also need to show a little bit of humility, and they might comprehend this. The result that the Australian Labor Party got in the Legislative Council is exactly what it should have got, give or take. The number of seats that the government holds is roughly proportionate with the vote that it received across the state. The Liberal Party has nine seats out of 36, which is 25 per cent of the seats. I think that even we did a little bit better than getting 25 per cent of the vote across the state. Is the government going to stand up and say that we were duded? We are not saying that at all. If I look at the other parties on the crossbenches and correlate the number of seats that they have got with the votes that they got, it is a darn sight closer than members opposite might have us believe. Conversely, did the Labor Party candidates—I have already congratulated them on a great and very personally satisfying result—get 75 per cent of the vote across the state? No, they did not. They got 40-something per cent, or 45 per cent, just off the top of my head, as a ballpark figure. That is a very high proportion to get for a major party. It is a high-water mark. We will find out again what a high-water mark is when the tide goes out. It was a significant part of the vote and it was enough, with preferences, to secure the vast majority of the seats, and the government benches. However, the government did not get 75 per cent of the vote, but it got 75 per cent of the seats in the Assembly. Why is the government not crying foul about that? That is the aberration, if there is one—75 per cent of the seats on 45 per cent of the vote. We know how that happens, with single-member constituencies, and I am not arguing against that. However, the government should not come in here and try out some voodoo logic that suggests that it should have 75 per cent of the seats in this chamber, just because it got such an overwhelming result in the Legislative Assembly. Why would the government want that? It wants that because it could then push through anything it wanted without regard for what the people want. Would that be good for Western Australia? No. Acknowledging that the ALP is so clever—because a whole lot of people in the Labor Party were saying how wonderful they were on 11 March and how they were untouchable—does the Labor Party ever get it wrong? Yes, it does. It is quite capable of getting things wrong.

Hon Peter Collier: It only took two months—Perth Mod.

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: They got things wrong before then, but that is a noticeable one for today—talk about a backflip with a full pike and a half twist!

All governments get things wrong and have to be held to account. I heard some people sucking in their breath—at least mentally—when I described an occasion on which I pointed out a deficiency to my party room a few

years ago. The fact of the matter is that governments of all kinds come and go and governments of all kinds occasionally get things wrong. That is when it comes to this house and our responsibility to do what the other house cannot do. We are not necessarily dominated by the government party. It does not happen in this day and age. We can be a genuine and impartial house of review, whereas that place over there cannot be. By definition, the government of the day has the numbers down there and the Premier of the day has the power. By and large, those who give him the power watch their p's and q's because they are brand-new. They are very delighted to be there and think, "How clever we are! Aren't we lucky that the leader has bestowed his benign countenance upon us—so we'd better watch out." We cannot rely on the good folk down there to keep the bastards honest because it never happens. It is up to us in this place to do it. It is absolute tripe for anyone, whether they are from the ALP or wherever else—I have not heard anyone else saying it—to suggest that because Labor has 75 per cent of the seats in the Legislative Assembly, it should have 75 per cent of the seats here as well. Rubbish! If anything, if we follow that logic, Labor should have 45 per cent of the seats in the Legislative Assembly. I am not saying that that is how it should have come about, but in a place where we have proportional representation, we are more representative, in the purest sense, in this house than they are in the Legislative Assembly.

I want to return to a speech I made on 20 February, 2014. I moved the motion —

That this house encourages the government to make greater efforts to inculcate better driving habits in Western Australian motorists.

This motion struck quite a chord at the time. Hon Rick Mazza might recall that members on all sides were keen to get up to contribute to the debate in which I challenged members to contemplate whether Western Australian drivers were really useless or just spoilt. I was born and bred in Perth; I remember the good old days when it was an overgrown country town. Is it the case that we are spoilt by all those big open roads and wide open spaces? As our population becomes more and more dense—I am talking about population density here!—and the traffic becomes more and more congested and there are proportionally a greater number of cars and other vehicles on the road per linear kilometre, are we having trouble getting used to these newfangled freeways?

Hon Rick Mazza: I think you determined that it was both.

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: It is a bit of both. I thank Hon Rick Mazza.

Hon Ken Travers joined in the debate with gusto and it was taken up by media outlets as well. We had the Ken and Simon show, us both being past transport spokespeople for our respective parties over many years. We had some great bipartisan discussions. We were almost a tag team on one or two radio stations. The theme of useless drivers, merging and people who cannot merge—all of that—was taken up. We offered some constructive comment. Ken is another member who came in on the day I started but he has now left this place. We had a good constructive debate. I pointed out a number of things on that occasion. If members are interested, they can look up *Hansard* from 20 February, 2014 and follow that debate. I wanted to get a couple of key elements across. One of the points was that we have lanes where people are expected to merge where the dotted line between two adjacent freeway lanes simply stops and later on the road converges. Somehow Western Australians, with their uncanny inability to merge, are expected to work it out. I said, "No, that's not how you do it." I can see Hon Diane Evers smiling. Perhaps she will relate to what I am about to remind the house of. When we go overseas and hire a car in Europe—the UK was the example that I gave—that is when Western Australians learn how to drive. When we are on the M1, which is four or five lanes wide, bumper-to-bumper and we are all going along at about 130 or 140 kilometres per hour, that is when we have to learn how to drive, merge and what have you. One of the examples that I described of the engineering of the roads in the UK was of a lane discontinuing and the driver having to merge into—in most cases—the right-hand lane. There are big arrows for some hundreds of metres in the terminating lane that show a turn to the right. That lane actually stops; the dotted line closes to the end so drivers literally run out of lane. The point of those arrows is in the right-hand lane—the continuing lane, if you like. The psychology of that—it works very well—is that everyone, whether they are in the terminating lane or the continuing lane, can see those big white arrows that tell drivers in the left-hand lane that it is about to terminate and they will have to move over before they run out of road. The arrows indicate to those in the continuing lane that the traffic next to them will be merging so they have to make sure they let that traffic in. If everyone understands it that way, that is how it works.

What was the response that we got for years and years from plenty of people in Main Roads? It was that we could not possibly do that here. Blow it! This time we actually succeeded. In the couple of years since then we have seen that tried and installed on many of our roads; the on-ramp north at Canning Highway onto Kwinana Freeway is a very good example. They got a little wrong at first but now it works very well indeed. I think that today we can declare that Western Australians are learning how to merge. They are doing it by a change in road geometry, without spending hundreds of millions of dollars on engineering solutions that provide extra lanes. We have a percentage improvement in road behaviour simply because we have a greater understanding inspired by different road markings and a slightly different road layout that is enabling people to merge. Is everyone there yet with the merging? Tragically, no.

My attention was drawn to a letter in *The West Australian* just last Wednesday, 7 June, from a dear lady from East Victoria Park. I will read out a little bit of the letter in a minute but I want to make it quite clear, Mr Acting President, that if the President is listening or becomes aware of this debate that I would not dream of casting any sort of aspersions on or make generalisations about the driving ability of women drivers through East Victoria Park. The Leader of the House similarly would be reassured that I would not dream of doing any such thing. However, this dear lady from East Vic Park says in part in her letter to the editor —

Sometimes you have to exceed the speed limit to merge. With the road running out, and the driver on your right accelerating to prevent you getting in front of him, you have no other course but to exceed the speed limit to avoid an accident.

I do not think that that dear lady has quite got the merging idea right yet. We are not there yet; we need to keep reinforcing but I am seeing a great deal of improvement on our roads, and I am someone who takes a bit of notice of this having worked with successive Commissioners of Main Roads over the years. There is more that we can and should do, and I want to put this out there. Firstly, we need to congratulate Main Roads Western Australia for doing what it has done—it is actually working and we would like to see more of it. However, a few people need to work out what they can contribute. Back in the 1950s when the Americans brought in their freeways, they worked out how to educate people and Walt Disney produced instructional cartoons to show people how to go about it. Later the WA government brought in its program called “It’s Child’s Play”—members might recall—from late last year I think it was. They were simple messages but good messages. On 20 February 2014, I pointed out that what we do not need, for example, the Canning Highway on-ramp to Kwinana Freeway is a 60-kilometre-an-hour zone that then suddenly it becomes a 100-kilometre-an-hour zone 50 metres before the freeway and a driver has to somehow come up to freeway speed from there. I indicated that what we need is perhaps not a sign but the general understanding, particularly by those who have speed cameras in their hands, that a person on an on-ramp to a freeway needs to be able to come up to speed. If we put up a sign, it would have to say something like this: “Freeway starts. Come up to freeway speed.” I am not suggesting that we have a 300-foot sign saying all of that, but that is what a driver is meant to do. But what happens? Sometimes we end up with a police officer on the other side of the 100-kilometre-an-hour sign with his speed gun up to make sure that people are not exceeding 60 kilometres an hour on an on-ramp to a freeway where there are no pedestrians or driveways and people should be coming up to freeway speed whether it is 100 kilometres an hour and flowing nicely or crawling along at 30 kilometres an hour; that is what people should be concentrating on. We have this big-country-town mentality that we have not quite ironed out in officialdom or drivers.

The other thing that I would like to see improve and needs to improve is that with the introduction of more and more roundabouts to the exclusion of traffic lights we need to make sure that all drivers collectively understand how we are meant to go about using roundabouts, because at this stage it is something that is fairly new. I am seeing some signs of hopelessness around the chamber, but I am sure that if we can do it with merging, we can do it with roundabouts as well.

Again, we need to understand that the whole purpose of a freeway system and making it work is to avoid to the extent possible the need to hit the brakes. It is all about keeping the traffic flowing. It does not matter if the notional speed limit is 100 kilometres an hour but the traffic is moving at 40; that is not a terrible thing. That just recognises that it is really busy, but if a person is travelling at 40, they are doing very, very well. The problem is when people hit their brakes and their accelerator too often. They come up behind people and then stop, and that then causes a ripple effect of stop-start, which causes dysfunctional traffic. I encourage everyone to ease off the accelerator. To the lady from East Victoria Park who reckons we have to speed up in a race to get to the merge point ahead of the other person, that is not what we do. One of the drivers needs to back off and just let the other one in. If people understand that it is not a burden to ease off the accelerator, it will actually make their journey a lot easier and smoother. Perhaps on another occasion I might even dare to venture into the highly problematic and controversial area of variable speed limits, about where we make use of our freeways best by all driving at a speed that enables us to keep moving. Do members remember when the Narrows Bridge was being duplicated? Lanes were shut on the approaches to the old narrows and I think the maximum speed limit was 60 kilometres an hour along the area just in front of Parliament House. I have never seen the traffic flow better than it did at that time. The speed limit was 60 kilometres an hour, a lane was shut and yet the traffic flowed better than it does on any other day of the week. Perhaps that was because people then were, by necessity, having to back off and travel at a speed that did in fact allow the traffic to keep flowing. Anyway, we will talk about that no doubt many times in the future, but we need to be prepared to challenge some traditional ways of doing things and work out what we are trying to do as a community to address this question of congestion. Opposition members will talk about congestion this and congestion that. I have done it in other decades and what have you, but it is part of the game. The fact is that we all have to be part of the solution.

Finally, I want to conclude with some comments to the Leader of the House in her capacity as Minister for Education and Training. I dropped some remarks earlier in my speech about some matters, and she would not have wanted to hear any of that about Perth Modern School and Kitchener Park and so on.

Hon Sue Ellery: I was here; I heard everything you said.

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: Yes, and the Leader of the House probably did not feel like sitting through more of that. Although critical in part, those comments are actually offered in good faith. I would like to see value for money and good outcomes for the students of this state and their parents. I think that the Leader of the House would share those sentiments very much as well. Congratulations on having the guts to recognise that that was not going to fly and making a decision collectively to revisit that path. I mean that because she knows she is going to get the sort of flak about backflips that a minister gets when they change their mind, but good on her for that decision. I am sure the Leader of the House was involved in it and was not just told to do it or anything. In the same spirit, I urge her to have a look at what was done under the previous administration and she might find that some very good work has been done on not only the plans for City Beach and Mt Lawley, but also a range of other measures. I hope she will do that. I only encourage her to do so.

Finally, I was at South Fremantle Senior High School the other day. South Fremantle Senior High School, of course, is going to become Fremantle College, a new institution on that site. I do not know whether the minister has had the opportunity to go back to South Fremantle since she has come to government.

Hon Sue Ellery: I haven't, but I spoke yesterday to one of the deputy leaders at the new Fremantle College.

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: No doubt she will find her way down there sooner rather than later. It is coming along; there is a lot of work going on. The principal will be Myles Draper, who came from Applecross Senior High School. He showed us around. To give some feedback to the minister, I think the new operation is coming together pretty well and we would all like that to be a success. Perhaps I will get an opportunity outside of the house to pass on some observations of mine to the minister if she is interested in how we can make sure that it goes even better. I think it will be a great success. I want to join in making it a great success for the benefit of the people of Freo and the South Metropolitan Region generally.

May I conclude by again offering my support to the motion. I value the opportunities to vent matters of some interest, and this is a splendid vehicle by which to do that. I commend the motion to the house.

HON JACQUI BOYDELL (Mining and Pastoral — Deputy Leader of the National Party) [5.51 pm]: I rise just before the dinner break, but I will make some further comments after we have had the opportunity to have dinner. I rise in the first instance to express my thanks to Her Excellency Kerry Sanderson, Governor of the state of Western Australia. It is always a great opportunity to be involved in such an important occasion as the opening of a new Parliament. To have the first female Governor address the Legislative Council and, indeed, members of the other house as we formally opened the fortieth Parliament was definitely a memorable moment in many ways. As has been said repeatedly by many members of the house, the very fact that Her Excellency Kerry Sanderson was the first female Governor to address the Legislative Council and members of the other house on the opening day was something that I, as a female member of this house and the Parliament of Western Australia, was exceptionally proud to be involved in.

The fortieth Parliament has created quite a few historic moments in its infancy, with the first female President of the house and the first female Leader of the Government in this house in Hon Sue Ellery. It is exceptionally important to commemorate those moments of history making, because they forge a path forward for us as a society and as a Parliament representing the people when we come here and debate their issues. It is exceptionally important that we remember those moments and record for history the momentous occasion it was for each member to celebrate those firsts in this fortieth Parliament.

When I spoke to my daughter, who turned 18 last weekend, about the fact that we have the first female President of the house, the first female Leader of the Government and, indeed, the first female Governor of the state, she thought it was incredible that it had taken this amount of time to get to that position. It made me reflect on when I was a young woman—that was some time ago—and the real progress we have seen in the landscape of female representation in the business sector and in the field of education, and in the Parliament, which is the ultimate leading organisation in the nation. My daughter's take on that was that it should have been done sooner, and I agree with that, but we have got there. That is why we have to commemorate those moments. It is not just about women commemorating other women as they make those achievements; it is something that the fortieth Parliament—I have heard this from other members of the house—needs to celebrate jointly. This is not about men or women; it is about how we progress as a representative society and while representing 50 per cent of the population, as women do in the houses of Parliament. As I, as Deputy Leader of the National Party and Leader of the National Party in the Legislative Council, and Mia Davies, as the first female Leader of the National Party, seek to work out how we will serve our tenures as leaders of our political party, one of the points that we would like to be a legacy of our leadership is that the National Party has a process in place to provide incentives for women to come into Parliament and to provide role model leadership and mentorship to young women and men as they seek to be involved in the greater debates within our organisation of the National Party. In turn, that means they can become involved in the greater debate that we have as members of Parliament. That is a great thing. If I can leave that as part of my legacy once I leave that role—hopefully, sometime into the future, but not tomorrow—I will be very happy about that.

I also recognise Hon Simon O'Brien and congratulate him on apparently being the first male Deputy President for some time. Well done. It is not a milestone. Many men have held that position, but I note that he felt the need to mention it in the house tonight. I congratulate him on that role.

I also welcome and congratulate the new members of the Legislative Council. One of the greatest honours that anybody can undertake in their career is to seek to represent the interests of the people in their electorate, as they do that in their role in this house. Sometimes it will be fantastic and sometimes it will be demoralising. Sometimes members will have a win and sometimes they will have to make some really tough decisions, but they will be in the interests of the greater community of Western Australia. It is a great privilege. It can be a great challenge as members balance the expectations of people within their organisations respectively and those of the people who voted for them. They expect members to robustly come to Parliament and represent their interests, as they should, not members' personal interests. That is not our job. We do not get to come here and talk about what we solely believe. It is about forming a responsible, reasonable position as we, as legislators, move forward the interests of regional Western Australia. It is a great achievement and members should celebrate it. We are not here for a long time. The great point about democracy in Australia is that people get to decide whether we stay or go, and I for one will always support that. It is one of the reasons we choose to live in Western Australia.

The ACTING PRESIDENT (Hon Dr Steve Thomas): Hon Jacqui Boydell, I note with interest that when we return, we will listen with pleasure to another first speech. On that basis, I invite you to seek the leave of the house to continue your remarks at a later stage of this day's sitting.

Hon JACQUI BOYDELL: I seek leave to continue my remarks at a later stage of this day's sitting.

Leave granted.

[Continued on page 729.]

Sitting suspended from 6.00 to 7.30 pm

HON TIM CLIFFORD (East Metropolitan) [7.30 pm]: Kaya, hello. I have pay my respects to the traditional custodians of the land we are meeting on today, the Whadjuk people, and the contribution they make to the life of the city and this region. Thank you, Madam President, for giving me this opportunity to address the Legislative Council of the fortieth Parliament of Western Australia, and congratulations on your appointment in becoming the first woman president of the Council; it is truly a historic occasion.

We are back! I am so proud that the Greens yet again have a presence in the East Metropolitan Region. I am looking forward to continuing the great work started by the previous member for East Metro, Hon Alison Xamon, who is now back representing the North Metropolitan Region. I have really valued Alison's support throughout the years and am looking forward to working closely with her, and also with my colleagues Hon Robin Chapple, member for Mining and Pastoral Region, and Hon Diane Evers, member for South West Region. The pathway to where I stand now has been lined with people who have prodded me along, stood strongly beside me, inspired me and helped me feel proud to be standing here today, not just as an individual elected by the constituents of East Metro, but also as a part of a strong, supportive community. There are too many people to thank individually; however, I would like to thank the following people in particular: Chantal Caruso, Chris Redman, Jonathon Hallet, Zia Hakimi, Mary O'Bryne, Andrew Beaton, Sophie Greer, Katrina House, Jo Campbell, Emma Pringle, Grace Turco and Phil Jenkins. I also thank my family, my mum and my dad and my three sisters; and my close friends Luke Barker and Janelle, who I am sure are watching tonight; Aaron Olszewski; Hayley Stinson and little Fred at home; Ashley Large; and Jesse Millea. I also thank the fantastic East Metro candidates Anthony Pyle, Sarah Quinton, Bhuwan Khadka, Iwan Boskamp, Gene Marshall, Lee-Anne Miles, Caroline Perks, Matt Biggs, Rafeif Ismael, Anne-Marie Ricciardi, Matt Roberts, Evan Webb, Don McAleese, Beth McMullan, Robyn Walsh and Sarah Nielsen-Harvey. I would also like to thank Scott Ludlam, Rachel Siewert, Joe Valentine, Alison Xamon—again!—Giz Watson, Ruth Greble and Trish Cowcher. These people have had a big role in helping mentor me throughout the years. I would also like to thank especially again Caroline Perks; she was really supportive throughout this whole campaign and she can stop knocking on wood now, because we did it! Finally, thank you to the thousands of volunteers who took part in this amazing campaign, because without you I would not be standing here today.

I grew up in the quiet south west town of Albany, where I lived with my mum, Linda Graham, and my three sisters, Kerianne, Shenade and Nicole. My father, Dennis Clifford, worked away as a service man in the mining industry for months at a time. We did not have much, but we did not ask for much either. We did, however, live under a roof provided by the state and also relied on health care provided by the state. We knew and respected the value of those services, services that are at the core of our community and that should mean that no person, child or family goes without the home, health care or education that they need—yet, unfortunately many do. After leaving Albany, like so many, I began working in the construction industry as a labourer, which then eventually led to working in the mining industry as a fly in, fly out worker. I worked for a company that used workplace agreements as a tool to crush workers. They knew full well the personal circumstances of any given

worker and would use it against them. Knowing the worker had a mortgage or a family, they would deny them pay rises or offer them something not to rock the boat. I know what it is like to carry the stress of a mortgage and battle with your employer, knowing that they might try to get rid of you if you take a stand, make any noise or create any waves against the unfair working conditions under which they operate. The odds are resoundingly stacked in favour of the big mining companies. Most people do not hear about the constant battles workers have with their employers over safety conditions, allowances, salaries and wages. Their voices are kept silent, but it is the workers' voices that the members of this chamber need to listen to most closely.

This was the impetus I needed to say enough is enough and to get involved and challenge the system. We need to challenge the status quo and fight for those who for too long have been denied a voice by the very rich, by the vested interests and by the neoliberalism that has seen the pursuit of financial reward at the expense of those things that truly matter. I am here to make sure that the current government does not sit back and regard its election as a job that has already been completed. Its political capital must not sit on the shelf for four more years. The challenges that existed under the Liberal government still remain today. I expect this government to expend capital on decreasing the housing waitlist, combating climate change, pushing for a 100 per cent renewable energy grid and ridding politics of the corrupting influence of corporate donations. If it does not, what is it here for? Is it to remain popular in the polls? That is not enough. It is never enough. I say to my colleagues from all parties: we are here to solve problems—homelessness, inequality, climate change, growing the renewable energy market and transforming Perth into a more liveable city. I am here to see real change and to ensure that in four years' time the people of Western Australia have a better community than they have today, to ensure that people are being listened to and to ensure that we are working to deliver a better future for those who follow us.

The generations who follow us are our children, our friends and our future. I believe that in recent years they have had a bloody raw deal. During the election campaign a 22-year-old woman told me —

I'm sick of older people telling me that we are wrong. Just because we're young, it doesn't mean the science is wrong. Because we're young, doesn't mean that donations are any less corrupt when we point out what they're doing to our democracy. We're definitely not wrong when we say it's unfair that students are barely surviving and need to a full-time job while they study just to make ends meet.

I am 13 years older than her and I am bloody sick of it too. This is just one of many hundreds of similar conversations I have had with younger people throughout Western Australia. Make no mistake: there is no justice when massive tax cuts are being handed out to the rich while life is being made much harder for young people across the state. I call out to all young people in the state: this is the people's Parliament; it is your Parliament. Parliament is not a place reserved for the elites of this world; it is for everyone, and each and every one of you should have the opportunity to stand where I am standing right now. Change does not happen easily, but I know that through movement, building and continuing to push for what we want, we can effect real change. If I can start a campaign with three people in a park and build it to hundreds of people willing to fight for the changes that really matter, then I know that there are others out there who can do the same as me. Remember, this is your fight to address the biggest issues of our time.

We live in a privileged country with immense resources and incredible talent. We should be the envy of the world in relation to our approach to reducing carbon emissions, and yet Australia is one of the world's biggest carbon emitters. Our level of carbon pollution per capita is nearly double the average of what other developed nations are emitting today, and more than four times the world average. In Western Australia we emit 86 million tonnes of carbon dioxide every year. This is the equivalent of 18 million cars on the road every year. We need our young people, our brightest minds and our sharpest entrepreneurs operating in a policy environment that encourages innovation, and we need our government to truly listen and implement these good ideas. We need to be living in a state where people can store energy generated from rooftop solar panels. That energy would be put into batteries in their own homes and provide excess unused power back to the grid so that other people could use that energy. We must focus on structural incentives to continue to foster and grow consumer-led decentralised energy generation, whereby households harness their own renewable energy and sell it to their neighbours, providing a choice for consumers. We need our state's energy market to be economically sound and to operate in a way that reduces emissions and lowers our carbon footprint. We need to make sure that the cheapest renewable energy options are available for all and that electricity is charged at an appropriate rate so that those most at risk are not disadvantaged.

We cannot keep subsidising dirty energy. This is a cycle that needs to be broken. We need strategies that support low income earners to pay for solar installation and battery storage solutions for their homes. Western Australia has just nine per cent renewable energy in its power mix. Over eight years, the Barnett government hampered construction of renewable energy projects in the state. We must turn this around. The Greens look forward to seeing the new Labor government take up this important and urgent challenge. We need to improve our performance. We need to encourage the market to invest. Currently, there are 3 900 megawatts of renewable energy projects in the pipeline across Australia to meet the Large-scale Renewable Energy Target. Embarrassingly, only 180 megawatts of these are in Western Australia.

Across the world, exciting technical innovation in electric vehicles is changing the way we commute around our cities. However, electric car sales in Australia have stalled. Other countries such as China, which set a target of five million electric cars by 2020, are putting us to shame. We can do many things, such as offering free registration for these vehicles, funding infrastructure and transitioning our government fleet to electric vehicles. We know that the renewable energy sector has the potential to provide real jobs for people, so let us put these jobs at the centre of a strong, green economy. We can keep vibrant communities such as Collie alive, with clever installations of renewable energy such as pumped storage hydroelectricity. We can invest in people by upskilling and providing training so that they can continue to live in Collie after the coal has been phased out, and it will be phased out.

Climate change is a global reality and we all have a part to play. I do not hold with statements that suggest we are just a small bit player and that our contributions will not count. In fact, that is a short-sighted and potentially dangerous view. Every individual country, state, city or town across the world is either adding to the problem of climate change or working to fix it. The choice is ours. At the moment, WA is adding to the problem. We are the leading state in the country for all the wrong reasons and we need to fix this. With a federal government that is actively undermining the efforts of states to take meaningful action on climate change, it is more important than ever that WA stand strong on this issue.

The Greens have a plan. It is called Energy 2030. It is a plan that would install solar in community housing, install battery and electric vehicle infrastructure across the state, and give household power generators the choice to sell on their power to whomever they choose. Our modelling shows that this is possible. We could power the south west interconnected system with 100 per cent renewable energy by 2030. These are the kinds of initiatives that people in Western Australia want to see. In the lead-up to the election, my team doorknocked on over 12 000 doors in the East Metropolitan Region and listened to people from all over tell us that they wanted more renewable energy and battery storage solutions for their rooftop solar. I intend to continue to have these conversations with constituents so that I can respond to the issues that matter most to our community.

The previous government appears not to have listened to anyone other than the fossil fuel companies that fuel climate change. It is time we changed this. Climate change is the greatest challenge of our time and self-interest should not prevail. I have watched successive governments fail to address this issue, and enough is enough. We need to take action. The state needs a dedicated minister for climate change. We need a dedicated government department that will develop policy, implement strategies to ensure a reduction in Western Australia's emissions, plan for the future and be accountable.

We are currently witnessing a dramatic unwinding of the social fabric of our society. Our most vulnerable people, including students and pensioners, are seeing their living standards decline. Let me be clear: there can be no justice as long as the gap between the rich and poor continues to widen. With successive governments putting political donations ahead of the needs of their constituents, it is no surprise that our society has shifted towards valuing stuff and material wealth over valuing its people. The pursuit of growth has left many casualties in its wake, and at the heart of the issue is fairness. Tax concessions for multinationals and the wealthy few have led to an unacceptable level of inequality within our society. We are currently witnessing a criminal extraction of resources from the poor and middle class of our society in order to line the pockets of people who do not need it.

There has recently been a lot of discussion about people having difficulty accessing the housing market. Property prices are so high that even police, nurses and teachers are struggling to afford a modest home in today's market. This serious problem needs addressing, but I am even more concerned about the thousands of people in our community who are having difficulty accessing even a roof above their head every night. Someone on a youth allowance will not have any luck finding a rental on their budget. Even someone on a minimum wage will have access to only one per cent of rentals. It is perhaps unsurprising that 42 per cent of homeless people in this country are under 25 years old. I believe that the success of a society is based on how it treats its most vulnerable and the number of people living on the streets every night. A decade ago we would not have seen the level of homelessness we see today on Perth city streets.

Let me share a story with members. This happened a few years ago when I was walking to work on St Georges Terrace. I was walking past an alleyway and a woman called out to me. She was asking for money. I had an awkward conversation with her, but I really wanted to know how she and her two small children came to be there. She slept the night in her car and had found a spot in the city to camp for the day, begging for some coins to keep her and her two kids fed. She lived in fear that the authorities would take her children, but had no way of finding a permanent solution to her problem. The shame of her situation showed on her face, but the shame should not be hers; it is ours. Every night our car parks, alleyways and park benches are the beds of thousands of people across this state. What is most alarming is that women and children are the most at risk. Domestic violence is the biggest single cause of homelessness in WA, and it does not have to be this way. If we are going to be serious about homelessness, service providers need to be sufficiently funded. Every day, people are turning up to ask for help and walking away without having received the assistance they so desperately need.

Housing is an issue close to my heart. I will work to address structural issues to support affordable housing for everyone, including pushing for reforms to increase the supply of social housing for the people most in need in

this state. We are in the midst of a housing crisis—a housing emergency—and the public housing waitlist times must be reduced. It is simply not good enough that there are still over 2 000 people with priority needs waiting for a home in this state. This is unacceptable, and we must understand that housing is a human right and it should be for everyone.

I am not here to do what is popular at any given time. My positions on issues will not be based on which way the political wind is blowing; they will be based on my values and informed by strong, well-thought-out policies. I regard my election to this chamber as an opportunity to take politics to the people and say, “This is your Parliament.” You expect someone with values and integrity and with a strong moral compass to be standing for you and speaking up for you. I can guarantee that my voice will not be drowned out by lobbyists and business interests. I am prepared to take risks and to look beyond the short-term gains of politics. I am here to change society in a thoughtful and considered way that provides all people with access to the things that matter. And I do not do this alone. I have colleagues here to support me and the backing of a party grounded in social justice and equality to guide the policies that I will be advancing during my term in office.

I am here speaking for the community, for those who voted to see real change, who have been discontented with politicians and who are cynical of politics. I promise to take on long-term issues and to expend political capital to change things. I am here to make sure that people get a decent show at succeeding in life, whether it is defending the healthcare system, reducing wait times for social housing, ensuring a healthy environment or tackling climate change. I am committed to holding this government to account and to making sure that decisions are not based on single budgetary cycles and that projects have long-term visions to solve complex and difficult issues.

We can choose a world that continues to allow the vested interests and the failed ideals of neoliberalism to flourish; one that ignores the workers and ignores the need for better schools, more access to health care and social housing; one that ignores the reality of people facing poverty and homelessness, and ignores Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people; or we can choose the alternative. If we choose to do that, there is nothing that can stop us. There is nothing that can stop us from ensuring that everyone has safe shelter and that every child can go to school, have a meal and see a doctor or a dentist. There is nothing that can stop us from working with our first peoples to close the gap and deliver treaties and reparations. There is nothing that can stop us from ridding politics of dirty money and the undue influence of vested interests. There is nothing that can stop us from standing up to big business and business-as-usual politicians and saying, “We are done with you acting in your own interests and not in the interests of us all.” There is nothing that can stop us from taking genuine action against catastrophic global warming and climate change. I choose this alternative and it is a choice I will make every single moment I have in this job.

I will never apologise for my idealism, nor will I let it be shouted down. The job of a politician is to be idealistic and to turn those ideals into reality. This is a job that I begin today with pride, purpose and humility. Thank you very much.

[Applause.]

HON JACQUI BOYDELL (Mining and Pastoral — Deputy Leader of the National Party) [7.53 pm]: Congratulations to Hon Tim Clifford who has given his inaugural speech tonight. I look forward to his contributions in the house as we move forward. Picking up on one point made by the honourable member, all members of this house come with the same basic principles—to represent the interests of the people who elected them and to consider and review legislation that comes to the house. That is what we are here for. That is our job. Although we may have differing opinions about how that is delivered, every member has that interest in their hearts as they join us in the chamber at the start of every day. It is the great ideal of democracy that we get to do that in this house. I look forward to different contributions from members throughout this fortieth Parliament.

Having been a member of the Mining and Pastoral Region for the past four years, this being my second term, one of the things that I have loved about being here is the opportunity to represent those communities that are close to my heart and advocating on their behalf in this Parliament. It is enormously rewarding being able to do that. As I said earlier, sometimes that can be difficult when we cannot achieve the outcomes we set out to achieve. Sometimes members have to give a little, which can be difficult as those issues are worked through. The opportunity to represent regional communities in particular and the interests of regional WA as a whole in this Parliament has been my absolute privilege. My colleagues within the National Party and I hold representing our regional constituents in the highest regard, as I am sure all members do. Representing regional Western Australia is a difficult job. We represent large regions. Sometimes people who live in very remote communities have unique issues. Because they choose to live in those smaller remote communities does not diminish their issues. Too rightly, they expect their members of Parliament to advocate on their behalf as we find a way to move to a scenario that allows them to continue to live where they choose to live and raise their families. When regional Western Australia is prosperous, the state of Western Australia is prosperous. That has been said many times in this house. The Pilbara, in the heart of the Mining and Pastoral electorate, is well-known as being the engine room of the national economy. We certainly want to see that continue. That does not mean the Pilbara region is

purely a mining pit for the resource industry to come in, dig up and move on. The National Party is about ensuring regional communities benefit from the assets that are sold from their communities. The people of Western Australia should benefit from the sale of assets. Assets are sold only once on behalf of Western Australians. It is our job, and indeed the Premier's and the government's job, to represent the interests of the people of Western Australia. Mining companies are a part of my electorate, but a large number of people in communities in regional WA and in Perth expect the government to act on their behalf and in their best interests. I have no doubt that members of this house will hold the Premier of Western Australia and his government to account on their behalf because we expect nothing less from him.

Fundamental services like health care, education and beautification projects for regional communities or funding in general being spent on people in regional Western Australia is something that I have been proud to be a part of. The National Party's royalties for regions program while we were in government delivered real change and outcomes for people in regional WA. It was absolutely outstanding for me to have been personally involved in that. I hope to see that continue, because investment in those regional communities is warranted. It is my responsibility and that of my colleagues, especially in this tight fiscal climate in which we find ourselves, to ensure our regional constituents are represented in this Parliament—now more than ever! I intend during my tenure in this fortieth Parliament to continue to do that, because when the budget is under pressure, historically it is regional communities that suffer. I hope that the Minister for Regional Development, whom we are lucky enough to have as a member of this chamber, has the capacity to take up that fight on behalf of regional Western Australia every single day. It will take all the minister's capacity to argue with her government and cabinet colleagues that it is worthwhile continuing royalties for regions investment in regional communities. I hope that is the number one priority for the minister. The Nationals WA will continue to raise those issues in Parliament and to scrutinise legislation. We will critique legislation brought to this house, particularly through the lens of regional constituents and regional development, on how it affects those communities.

During the Address-in-Reply other members commented on the role of the Legislative Council. I want to make a couple of comments around that, but particularly in response to Premier Mark McGowan's comments that the Legislative Council needs to understand that his government has a mandate in the Legislative Assembly and that it won a landslide victory. I say to the Premier that that is not our role. We will not rubberstamp legislation that is brought to this house. It is the job of government members to make sure that they bring responsible, reliable legislation to the house and we will scrutinise it fairly. It is beyond belief that the Premier of Western Australia would ask members of the Legislative Council to rubberstamp legislation brought to the house because he thinks he has a mandate. That will not be happening, Premier! I look forward to members in this house debating legislation as it comes through.

The people of Western Australia delivered to the government an upper house that was structured to ensure that scrutiny of legislation is done in the best interests of the people of Western Australia. That is what the government has to work with. Just as we have to work with the numbers in the Legislative Assembly, the government has to deal with the numbers in the Legislative Council. That is the government's and the Premier's responsibility. The Premier should not suggest that members in this house purely respect the government's mandate. That is not the role of the Legislative Council in any way, shape or form.

The Nationals WA have proven to be strong advocates for change in regional WA, and the next four years will be no different. Thanks to our former leader, Brendon Grylls, and our bold visionary plan for regional WA called royalties for regions, over the past eight years the Liberal–National government was able to deliver on the royalties for regions policy. I have personally seen some amazing transformations.

[Quorum formed.]

Hon JACQUI BOYDELL: As I was saying, the Nationals WA have been strong advocates for regional Western Australia over the past eight years, particularly in government through the royalties for regions program. I have seen some amazing transformations take place in regional communities, in particular targeting agriculture and infrastructure, and changes in community spaces, which have been well regarded and welcomed by people in the Mining and Pastoral Region. Indeed, as I have travelled throughout regional Western Australia, the changes that royalties for regions has brought to regional WA are unprecedented and are held in high regard by the people of regional WA.

Royalties for regions has been described to me by members of the Mining and Pastoral Region in many different ways. It has been a lifeline. It has been a facilitator to allow not-for-profit groups to continue and for community organisations to operate. It has been a revitaliser of town spaces and community centres. When I go to those community centres, I can see people enjoying facilities that they would never have had otherwise. Royalties for regions is a supporter of regional Western Australia, and that is why at every single opportunity I will champion the cause of royalties for regions and continued investment in regional WA.

I do not think anyone can deny that royalties for regions has enabled regional communities to be revitalised. Royalties for regions has a dedicated funding stream. It has a strong vision, and it had a strong vision from the outset. It has a decentralised structure, and it had a ministry and department solely working with regional WA. It

is a little disappointing that that department has been rolled into a supersized department. We will see the outcomes when that comes to fruition. I am glad the Minister for Regional Development has joined us in the chamber. It might be the first time I have seen the minister in the chamber today!

Several members interjected.

The ACTING PRESIDENT (Hon Robin Chapple): We have one speaker, and you should be addressing the Chair.

Hon JACQUI BOYDELL: It might be the first time I have seen the minister in the chamber today taking an interest in regional Western Australia, apart from question time, so it is refreshing to have her here.

After absolutely years and years of neglect, regional Western Australia was finally on the government agenda. Did that all work well? Of course, it did not. No government program or project is without fault. I can say to the minister, when she has the audacity to call investment in regional Western Australia a petunia on the main street of a community, that it is insulting to the people of Western Australia. I am sure that when the minister was the Mayor of Vincent, or serving with whichever government she decided to be involved in that suited her at that time, she felt it was okay to have a beautification project in Leederville or a main street project anywhere else in the city, but when it is outside the city, the minister calls it a petunia. That is unbelievable and highly offensive, and shows the minister's lack of understanding of how royalties for regions has assisted regional communities. I am sure that the minister is seeing that as she travels around the state and re-engages with regional Western Australia—since she may not have been there before. She certainly has not been in this Parliament since 2009. A lot has changed in that time, so we will give the minister time to catch up. We are very proud of what royalties for regions has delivered.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING PRESIDENT: Members!

Several members interjected.

The ACTING PRESIDENT: Members! The Chair, please! Thank you, honourable member; please continue. If people want to have a discussion, I suggest they do it outside the chamber.

Hon JACQUI BOYDELL: Thank you, Mr Acting President. We are very proud that the National Party and the Liberal–National government were able to deliver through royalties for regions nearly \$7 billion into regional Western Australia. That cannot be removed from the history of regional Western Australia and it is something that I will remain very proud of.

We all know that the regions generate the nation's wealth. People who live and work in those communities are no less deserving of health care, child care, twenty-first century communications or education than people in Perth who like renewed beaches and city spaces or facilities like the new stadium, Perth Arena or Elizabeth Quay. I love all those projects in Perth. They are fantastic and make Perth a gateway to the rest of Western Australia from a tourism perspective and they enable the people of Perth and the greater regions of Western Australia to enjoy absolutely fantastic facilities. Building all those facilities was the right decision for the government to make, but our regional communities also deserve investment in infrastructure that they believe beautifies their communities and delivers more viable and vibrant communities for people to live in and for their families to enjoy. I will never back down from that position.

As I alluded to earlier, we are being told by the government—even today in question time—that everything is under review. I understand that upon forming government, it has a right to take time to understand where things are at and to get up to speed on issues. We all accept that. However, the election was in March. It is now June and we still have no direction, particularly in regional Western Australia. It has been a shambolic approach, I have to say, because nobody I talk to in regional Western Australia has any understanding about the priority of regional development under this government, how that will play out and what projects will or will not continue to be funded. A number of projects are coming to an end and I think the government owes the people of regional Western Australia an answer to those questions.

Hon Peter Collier: Who's the minister?

Hon JACQUI BOYDELL: I am not sure. Is she in this house? I suggest to the minister that we need an answer.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING PRESIDENT: Members! It was going splendidly up until a few seconds ago.

Hon JACQUI BOYDELL: Just one answer would be nice, because that may start the formulation of a plan. Let us see how we can work with that. That would give some real indication of what is happening in the supersized ministry that the minister apparently has control of. I am not sure which minister has control of that super-ministry or super-department, but I am sure that that will play out in time. I look forward to getting an understanding of that.

There is a very real risk that this government will revert to the dark old days when city-centric thinking was its priority. I implore regional members of the government to please advocate for regional Western Australia when they have discussions with their cabinet colleagues. I ask them to meet with the Minister for Regional Development. I will try to do that also, although she may tell me no. However, I certainly will try to work with the minister because that is what we are here for—we are here to try to actually get an outcome.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING PRESIDENT: I am sure Hansard is having some trouble.

Hon JACQUI BOYDELL: I would like to start the process to get some idea about what the government's ideas are—if it just has one.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING PRESIDENT: Members! Just one second, please. I apologise for having interrupted you, but the Chair controls this chamber. There were too many interjections. I am sure Hansard is having a great deal of trouble making your contribution accurate in *Hansard*.

Hon JACQUI BOYDELL: I apologise, Mr Acting President. I did not hear you.

Members of the opposition ran a campaign during the state election about the terrible state of the budget and Western Australia's fiscal situation. They should not now pretend that they did not know that. Do not now pretend and say, "Oh my gosh! Things are so very terrible that we cannot make a decision." That is what the government has been voted into government to do: to make a decision. I would ask them to do that. I am exceptionally concerned that royalties for regions will be stripped of funds that were to be invested in regional Western Australia and that those funds will be reinvested into city areas. The minister knows—she knows that I know this—that she will be under extreme pressure to find a way to gut investment in regional Western Australia at the behest of the Premier, who wants to deliver Metronet. I ask the minister to make sure that she advocates for regional Western Australia, because I do not see that happening yet. I look forward to seeing that happen. It is an easy and lazy option for the government to use the money from royalties for regions to fund projects in densely populated areas like the city so it can appease the majority while forgetting about the minority who happen to live in regional WA.

I now want to comment on the state election. I start by thanking supporters of the National Party and its candidates and campaign team. We ran an exceptionally hard-fought campaign and the whole team worked together. It is not easy to run those sorts of campaigns, particularly when there is an unprecedented campaign by the Chamber of Minerals and Energy, and BHP and Rio Tinto in particular, running against us. It was incredible to watch, I have to say. We would not have run that campaign any other way. We believed that it was our job in government to bring an alternative to the table to help repair the budget, and we did that. We had an idea, we backed the idea and we funded the idea through our state election campaign. We still believe that there is an alternative for government other than cutting jobs, stripping funding from regional Western Australia and stopping funding for other projects in regional Western Australia because the government is too scared to have a conversation with the two big miners. What the Premier and what the Treasurer think about this issue are different. The Treasurer says that he likes the idea of a cash out. That was not the alternative we took to the election, but I applaud the Treasurer for recognising that an alternative revenue source is required by government. This stuff is hard. It is hard to make those decisions. I applaud him for openly and honestly putting that on the table. The very next day the Premier said that it was not on the table, so I am still not sure which way the government wants to go on that. Again, it cannot make a decision and it has a bit of a shambolic approach. I really look forward to seeing the government bring an outcome to the table, because at the moment there is not one. The government's only outcome is to tax mums and dads, increase their utility and electricity charges, and continue to ask them to pay. The government is not prepared to have, on behalf of the people of Western Australia, the hard discussions with BHP and Rio Tinto about them paying their fair share. As I said before, it is the Premier's job to act in the interests of this state, and I ask him to do so. It means he has to find an alternative to cutting services in regional WA, because that will also affect services in the city and will be felt tenfold in regional areas. I look forward to hearing about a plan and an alternative, because one is required.

The last election campaign really was unprecedented, particularly in the north of the state. I again applaud the efforts of our campaign team and our candidates in delivering the outcome we achieved.

I also want to touch on the GST, which is an issue I have spoken about in this house more than any other. There is bipartisan agreement in this house that there needs to be a change to the GST system. We are now hearing more people adding their voices to that argument and I note that now even BHP and Rio Tinto also believe there needs to be a change to that system. I am glad that the state is united on this issue; I think we have been for a while. I hope we will see some outcomes at the federal level for Western Australia on the GST issue, perhaps during the next federal election campaign, but I will not hold my breath. There are many varied and different

ideas about managing GST returns to Western Australia. In her address at the opening of the fortieth Parliament, the Governor also made some comments about the GST, and I applaud her for those comments, particularly as they related to the inequitable treatment of the state of Western Australia in the GST return.

The National Party has long called for a fairer GST distribution and we have been strong advocates for that. In 2010 Tony Crook, the former federal member for O'Connor, brought a motion to the House of Representatives to put a floor on the GST of, I think, 75c. He raised that issue in the federal Parliament.

Hon Alannah MacTiernan: Who actually signed the agreement?

Hon JACQUI BOYDELL: If the Minister for Regional Development was in federal Parliament at that time—I am not sure which government she was a member of at that time—I wonder what side of the house she would have voted on. I can tell her that none of her members voted in the interests of regional WA. They —

Several members interjected.

The ACTING PRESIDENT: Members! Order! I have never raised my voice in this chamber, ever, even when I was down there. I do not want to start having to do it here. Please, members, continue the debate, and try not to incite people.

Hon JACQUI BOYDELL: When that motion was moved in the House of Representatives, two members supported the 75c floor on the GST—Tony Crook and Bob Katter. Every other member of the House of Representatives voted against that motion, including members representing Western Australia. That was probably not a high point in the interests of Western Australia being represented in the federal Parliament.

Some seven years on from that time—that is a long time ago—this issue has continued to burn along, and we still see members representing Western Australia in the federal Parliament who are not prepared to tackle this issue. That is the greatest disappointment about this issue for regional Western Australia, as the government in this state tries to address it. We all know that it has long been an issue and it is now the Labor government's job to address it. We all know about diminishing GST returns to Western Australia and federal members who purportedly represent Western Australia not doing anything about it. That will probably play out in the federal election.

Hon Alannah MacTiernan interjected.

Hon JACQUI BOYDELL: I hope members who represent WA in the federal Parliament can find a way to make some change in this space, because the minister never did. I never heard her speak on this issue—not one time in the one term —

The ACTING PRESIDENT: Member, please address the Chair.

Hon Alannah MacTiernan interjected.

The ACTING PRESIDENT: Member!

Hon JACQUI BOYDELL: I will address the Chair.

I never heard the Minister for Regional Development, while she was a member of federal Parliament—I do not know which seat she had; she was there for a short time—make any public commentary on this issue. I am not talking about Liberal members and I am not talking about Labor members; I am talking about the issue of all members from Western Australia, in the Senate and the House of Representatives. I have said this about three times now, and maybe the minister is not listening, but I think it is disappointing that none of those members has been able to effect change in this space. I hope there is an opportunity during the federal election for Western Australia to have an outcome in this space. That will allow the Western Australian state government some breathing space. We all recognise that it is an issue that the state government does not have control over. It was an issue we faced in government and it is an issue that the Labor government will continue to face unless any Western Australian federal members have the capacity to make some changes. I look forward to seeing that.

I am passionate about representing the people of the Mining and Pastoral Region. My focus, moving forward, is to ensure that this region and all the other regions continue to grow under the leadership of this government, if that is going to happen. As I said, six months down the track I still have not seen a plan, but we hold out hope that we will see one. I hope that my regional communities will be a high focus of government and I hope to see them continue to beautify their main streets and to continue investment in local decision-making and projects run by local people. I look forward to continuing to talk to people in the Mining and Pastoral Region about their issues. That is my job and I really relish the position, as I know all members do. I look forward to continuing to do that in this Parliament.

I will finish my comments by again welcoming the new members. I look forward to your differing and diverse positions within this Parliament, even including the Minister for Regional Development—as a new member, I welcome you to the house! Thank you, members.

HON NICK GOIRAN (South Metropolitan) [8.29 pm]: I am pleased to rise this evening on the Address-in-Reply motion moved by Hon Dr Sally Talbot. It has not been too often in my eight years in this place that I have had the opportunity to agree with Hon Dr Sally Talbot, but on this occasion I certainly will support the motion that she has moved. It was particularly pleasing to hear Hon Dr Sally Talbot speak the words —

... beg to express our loyalty to our most gracious sovereign and thank Your Excellency for the speech you have been pleased to deliver to Parliament.

I certainly support that motion this evening.

In my remarks to the Address-in-Reply motion, I want to consider the outcome of the election and pass some reflection on that outcome. In my eight years in Parliament, this is the third state election campaign I have been involved in, so it is my first experience of being involved in a losing campaign. Having arrived in Parliament following the 2008 early election and being sworn in as a parliamentarian in 2009 and then having a very significant win in 2013, it is quite chastening, which might be the word to use, to experience what we did in the 2017 state election. In particular, what struck me after the March 2017 election result was its impact on certain individuals. In 2013, the Liberal and National Parties had a very significant win. Members will recall well the circumstances of 2013 when the then Prime Minister was Julia Gillard, which no doubt had a bearing on the election result, and my colleagues and I were very enthusiastic and naturally upbeat about the outcome of the election. As enthusiastic as we were that a number of new members were coming into the Parliament, I think it is fair to say that we paid no regard to the members who lost their seats. We were so busy celebrating our own campaign victories that we did not stop for a moment to think about the impact on members on the other side of the chamber. I guess this was particularly brought home to me after the March 2017 election around the state but also in the South Metropolitan Region, because several of my good friends and colleagues lost their seats. I want to acknowledge the contribution of all my colleagues who were unsuccessful in their campaigns and also each of the candidates for the Liberal Party who ran at the election and thank them for their cumulative efforts over an extended period.

As I mentioned, I lost a number of good friends and colleagues in the South Metropolitan Region, including Joe Francis, who was our candidate and the incumbent member for Jandakot; Matt Taylor, who was our candidate for Bicton, having been the member for Bateman; and, of course, Hon Phil Edman, with whom I served a full eight years in Parliament and who is a good friend. I acknowledge and respect the contribution of each of those former members and express my sympathies to their families and their staff on their election loss. However, I am conscious that, unlike the first sitting week in May, when there was an opportunity for retiring or defeated members of the Legislative Council to give a valedictory speech, there is no such opportunity for members of the Legislative Assembly to do that. In my remarks this evening, I want to dedicate the significant majority of what I say to two very good friends, Dr Graham Jacobs and Reverend Peter Abetz, who were also unsuccessful at the election and neither of whom would have had the opportunity to make a valedictory speech in the Legislative Assembly. Naturally, they had hoped that they would win, but were unable to do so. I hope in some way that my Address-in-Reply remarks this evening might properly reflect the type of remarks that those two honourable gentlemen might have made in their valedictory responses.

I particularly want to highlight those two good friends and hardworking colleagues for a number of reasons that will become obvious as I continue my remarks. At the outset, when I gave my inaugural speech in May 2009, one of the main topics I discussed was prostitution in Western Australia. At the time, that was particularly relevant because I was practising law. I heard that the then Labor government was proposing to legalise brothels in Western Australia for the first time and I had come to the conclusion that it was somewhat remarkable that any government of any persuasion could think that the single best thing to do for the citizens of Western Australia would be to legalise brothels. It infuriated me very much having done a volume of work with victims of sexual abuse, and it was that more than anything else that caused me to join the Liberal Party, subsequently get preselected and thankfully elected into the Legislative Council. Members who know the history of this debate will know that quite remarkably after the early 2008 election was called, there was insufficient time for the then legislation, which had scraped through the Legislative Council after some wheeling and dealing, to be proclaimed because the then Premier, Alan Carpenter, had rushed to the polls and forgot to tell his then Attorney General, Jim McGinty, that this would be the case, and the legislation never came to be. Unfortunately, much to my horror, prior to me becoming a member of Parliament, it was decided by my party during the early election campaign of 2008 that we would have a policy on prostitution, but it would be a lighter version than the Labor Party's policy. The Labor Party was going to legalise brothels everywhere; our policy was that it would just be in commercial and industrial areas. At the time, that was staggering to me and it certainly brought into sharp focus the realities of politics.

Part of the reason I want to pay tribute to the roles of Dr Jacobs and Mr Abetz is that more than anyone else those two are responsible for the current situation in which brothels are not legal in our state. Again, for those who are students of history and the passage of that legislation, the Prostitution Bill 2011, which was brought into the thirty-eighth Parliament, was never voted on. The single biggest reason that was the case was the principled

position taken by those two gentlemen. Under extreme pressure and duress, they held the line and said, “Sorry, we are not going to participate in this. We are not convinced at all that having legal brothels in industrial and commercial areas does anything positive for the citizens of Western Australia.” That issue is very close to my heart and it is probably the single biggest reason I suddenly became interested in politics. I pay tribute to those two honourable men for taking that principled stand. It is their legacy that has resulted in the situation we have in Western Australia today.

Although I thank them for their significant role in ensuring that they held the line on that critical issue, which is important for women, children and men in Western Australia, I also want to acknowledge Dr Graham Jacobs for another reason. In 2010 I was quite struck by an article in *The Sunday Times*. I have always remembered this article and was pleased to be able to find it in the last couple of days. On 19 December 2010, *The Sunday Times* produced an article titled “Political scorecard”. It is found on page 58 of that edition of *The Sunday Times* and states —

There was Troy Buswell’s sacking as Treasurer—and then his reinstatement to Cabinet this week. Premier Colin Barnett created heat with his airconditioning faux pas. In Ken Wyatt, WA boasted Australia’s first indigenous member of the House of Representatives, while Eric Ripper maintained a tenuous grip on the ALP leadership.

Boy, things have changed in seven years. In this article the relevant political journalist scores or rates particular winners and losers in politics in Western Australia. The person he described, if you like, as the biggest loser in politics in 2010 was none other than Graham Jacobs. This is what the journalist had to say about this honourable man —

Jacobs is WA’s biggest political loser in 2010. He has lost his job after just two years in the ministry and is in Esperance licking his wounds. Jacobs has lost a golden opportunity to make a mark and will be remembered for little else than sprinkler restrictions in winter —

I might add that we still have those sprinkler restrictions in winter and I do not hear anybody complaining about them. In fact, I hear a lot of people saying that they have been a most excellent initiative. Nevertheless, apparently that is all that this honourable man will be remembered for. The article then goes on to state —

and organising prayer meetings at Parliament House.

The prayer meetings that are held at Parliament House are not something I have ever talked about before in eight years in this place and it would not normally be customary for me to do so because I consider them to be a private matter. However, the reason I have chosen to mention them this evening is that it always struck me as bizarre that somebody would choose to suggest that a person is a loser because one of his legacies is the organising of a parliamentary prayer meeting. Dr Graham Jacobs was instrumental in organising those meetings each sitting week—at least for the time I have been Parliament, but I understand he did it well before then as well. They have been meetings that I have very much treasured. I have appreciated his willingness to coordinate those meetings. They are quite humble meetings held discreetly in Parliament and, as I say, they have not been something that we have been interested to publicise. But it is just unbelievable that a person could be, if you like, effectively pilloried for it and the article suggested that that will be his only legacy and what a loser he must be. I disagree with that so much that I have taken it upon myself to speak to the member for Moore, Shane Love, MLA, and he and I have agreed that we will co-host the parliamentary prayer meetings for this fortieth Parliament. To demonstrate that this is truly a non-partisan event, our guest for the first prayer meeting will be Hon John Kobelke, who of course is a very eminent and experienced former member of the Labor Party. I pay tribute to my good friend Dr Graham Jacobs. In fact, in my eyes this guy is a hero—far from it for him to be considered a loser. This man is a hero for having the courage and integrity to hold such an important and humble set of meetings weekly at the Parliament for an extended time, and I thank him for that.

I also want to make some remarks about another reform that will no doubt come about some time in this Parliament, and the catalyst for this reform will be the work done by Dr Graham Jacobs—that is, our Limitation Act in Western Australia. For newer members who may not be familiar with this issue, briefly, we have a significant problem with the Limitation Act in this state, particularly with respect to minors—that is, children under the age of 18. What is the problem? The problem is that those under the age of 18 are currently obstructed in their pursuit of their rights and justice. They are obstructed because terrible reforms, and I use the word “reform” very loosely, were passed if memory serves me correctly around 2004 or 2005. Previously these minors, these children, would have had six years in which they might be entitled to lodge a claim to pursue justice after they turned 18—from the age of majority onwards. After 2005 that was no longer the case. Indeed, they must claim within six years of the date that the incident occurred, and sometimes less than that. For example, if a five-year-old child suffers a particular set of events that might entitle them to put in a claim, they must put in their claim by the time they turn 11. It is incredible that in this state there can continue to be this level of injustice for children under the age of 18. It has been my longstanding view, and I have spoken about

this previously in the chamber, that minors should never be obstructed before the age of 18, and preferably people should have until the age of 24 to make that claim. They are some general remarks on my view about limitation reform. How this is relevant to Graham Jacobs and his legacy to the people of Western Australia is that this honourable gentleman brought in a private member's bill in 2015 called the Limitation Amendment (Child Sexual Abuse Actions) Bill 2015. That particular bill received a lot of publicity and created a lot of controversy last year. Interestingly, I assume that the new government will be getting cracking to bring in some legislation along those lines in the very near future. In fact, I am staggered that this legislation has not already arrived. The reason I am staggered that it has not arrived in the Parliament of Western Australia is that when I look back at the remarks made in October last year by the members I will mention, it seems extraordinary that no bill along these lines has been brought in by the new Labor government. On 13 October 2016 the now Attorney General, who at the time was shadow Attorney General, Hon John Quigley, as he now is, said the following —

This is all unnecessary. Let us just deal with the kernel of the bill. It is a very short bill for a law that has been adopted in other states of Australia—that is, to do away with the limitation period for actions brought by victims of child sexual abuse ... Let me make it clear that this bill could pass this afternoon. As publicly announced by the Leader of the Opposition, it is firm Labor Party policy to do away with the limitation period in cases of child sexual abuse. The legislation is quite simple; it contains only six clauses and we would not need to go into consideration in detail. This is a very short, clear piece of legislation that offers redress for people who have suffered the horrors of child sexual abuse.

...

There is no argument against this legislation—none. There cannot be any. All the other states have done it and the royal commission has already recommended it.

Hon Mark McGowan is now the Premier of Western Australia and of course at the time he was the opposition leader. One week later on 20 October 2016 he said the following —

The Limitation Amendment (Child Sexual Abuse Actions) Bill 2015 could be passed by this house today. It can go to the upper house today and be passed there and everything can be resolved.

...

The opposition says: let us deal with it today; let us ensure justice for the victims of child sexual abuse today. If this Parliament wants to be magnificent, decent and to set an example for everyone, let us deal with this today in both houses.

...

I will give the government this assurance: if it allows this bill to come on, we will support its passage today in this house and the other house—and it will be done. We will not hold the government up; we will have two speakers in each house. We will have quick efficient legislation dealing with the issue in the way the public wants it to be dealt with. I guarantee by five o'clock today that this bill will be passed in both houses.

The very honourable Graham Jacobs brought in an important private member's bill to do with child sexual abuse, and the then opposition—the Labor Party now in government—made some incredibly supportive comments. How else can I describe the remarks made by Hon John Quigley and Hon Mark McGowan in October last year? They wanted the legislation passed there and then. Apparently it was a simple piece of legislation, there was no reason for it to be held up, it was unbelievable that the government had not agreed to pass it there and then, and it should have flown through both houses in October last year. It is very interesting that in June 2017 there is no sight of this bill anywhere in the Parliament. I have searched high and low for it, and it is nowhere to be seen. Indeed, I asked a question on or around 11 May 2017 of the Minister for Education who was representing the Minister for Child Protection. I asked —

I refer to Labor's promise to introduce a bill that there be no limitation period in a civil action that relates to personal injury resulting from child sexual abuse.

(1) Has the minister or the department been consulted on the promised legislation?

The answer was no.

So, it is distressing to think that supportive remarks were made by the then Labor opposition in October last year, but if we fast forward to the time of it being in government with responsibility for progressing the matter, there has been no consultation with the Minister for Child Protection about a bill in favour of victims of child sexual abuse. There has been no consultation with that minister. I have said that I have searched high and low for any evidence of the bill; it does not appear anywhere in this magnificent building. I trust that the now Labor government was not making cheap, easy political points in October last year at the expense of victims of child sexual abuse. I trust that

that was not what was happening last year and that it was genuine in its support for the bill brought forward by Dr Graham Jacobs, and that it will, with expediency and haste, bring in the legislation that it was so in favour of in October last year. It can rest assured, as members from the other side will no doubt attest, that there is no prospect of me forgetting about it and allowing it to in any way forget about this important commitment. I again pay tribute to Dr Graham Jacobs for his magnificent legacy—despite what *The Sunday Times* might suggest: that it only has to do with sprinkler restrictions and, could you believe it, prayer meetings—of the other very significant issue of reforms for victims of child sexual abuse.

In my view, the now Labor government should not in any way interpret my remarks this evening to suggest that the only thing it needs to do for victims of crime is to pass a bill either identical or similar to that that Dr Graham Jacobs progressed last year—far from it. I believe that the now Labor government has a responsibility to take a position on the national redress scheme. This is something we have heard deathly silence from the Labor government about, and it is time for it to take a position and explain to the people of Western Australia and victims of child sexual abuse what its position is on the national redress scheme. For members who are unfamiliar with it, I draw their attention to the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse, which has tabled a number of reports. I particularly draw members' attention to the "Redress and Civil Litigation Report". That report contains 99 recommendations, but this evening I will draw members' attention to recommendations 85 through to 88, which read as follows —

85. State and territory governments should introduce legislation to remove any limitation period that applies to a claim for damages brought by a person where that claim is founded on the personal injury of the person resulting from sexual abuse of the person in an institutional context when the person is or was a child.
86. State and territory governments should ensure that the limitation period is removed with retrospective effect and regardless of whether or not a claim was subject to a limitation period in the past.
87. State and territory governments should expressly preserve the relevant courts' existing jurisdictions and powers so that any jurisdiction or power to stay proceedings is not affected by the removal of the limitation period.
88. State and territory governments should implement these recommendations to remove limitation periods as soon as possible, even if that requires that they be implemented before our recommendations in relation to the duty of institutions and identifying a proper defendant are implemented.

I call upon the McGowan Labor government to consider this report and explain to the people of Western Australia what its position is on the national redress scheme, because this is, in my view, a critical component of dealing with victims of child sexual abuse. It is insufficient to simply pass a piece of legislation to remove the limitation period; it needs to be done in the context of the national redress scheme and the various quanta of awards that might be available to victims of child sexual abuse.

I also call upon the now Labor state government to explain its position on the Criminal Injuries Compensation Act 2003. In my view it is, again, impossible to properly effect justice for victims of crime in this state without considering this piece of legislation. In the limited time I have this evening I will raise two minor points that should be easy fixes for the government if it wants to take them up. The first is with respect to section 31 of the act, which sets out the maximum payments that a victim of crime can claim. The maximum available in the current climate is \$75 000. That is for offences that took place after this act came into operation; the date of assent of the act was 15 December 2003. Disturbingly, it was \$75 000 in 2004, and has been ever since. So, in effect, for the best part of 13 years the statutory maximum available for victims of crime in this state has been \$75 000, with no indexation. My view is that the Labor state government could make an easy fix by ensuring there will be indexation of those awards into the future. A whole range of other areas of compensation are subject to indexation, but it is like there is a huge elephant sitting on the war chest of the Office of Criminal Injuries Compensation, ensuring that victims of crime cannot possibly get more than \$75 000 for each offence. That is the same as it was in 2004. It is now a record that the maximum amount payable has not been adjusted for 13 years. Previously, the maximum was \$50 000 from 1991 onwards. For a period of some 12 years the maximum was \$50 000 and it never changed. It then changed to \$75 000, and now we have this new record period of it approaching 14 years since the maximum was changed. The maximum has changed at different increments over the journey—after five years, after six years and after two years, and after another five years on another occasion. We have had this enormous period during which state governments of both persuasions have sat their carcass on top of this war chest at the Chief Assessor of Criminal Injuries Compensation to ensure that victims of crime are unable to get more than the \$75 000 maximum. That should change; it is unfair and it is unjust. A simple solution would be to ensure indexation for the future. Perhaps I will have more to say about that on another occasion.

The other thing that plainly needs to change, and I have talked about this as far back as my inaugural speech, is the gross injustice that occurs between section 13 of the Criminal Injuries Compensation Act and sections 16 and 17. In brief, if a victim of crime is unfortunate enough, first of all, to have a crime perpetrated against them and reports the matter to police, the police consider the crime worthy of investigation and charges are laid, and the Director of Public Prosecutions then says the case is good enough to go to trial, and at the end of all of that there is an acquittal, the victim cannot make a claim for compensation. If any of that criteria—to get the matter to trial and there is an acquittal—fails on the journey, the same victim of crime can put in a claim for compensation. It is grossly unfair that a person might have a case that is strong enough to go to trial but fails at the last hurdle because the standard of proof is beyond reasonable doubt; yet had they not been able to achieve that standard—for example if the DPP had dropped the charges or if the police said, “Sorry, we don’t think there is enough here to investigate”, or the perpetrator is dead—in any one of those situations the victim of crime can apply for compensation and be awarded it on the standard of the balance of probabilities. It is a gross injustice and I have been saying it for eight years. I hope the Labor government and the new Attorney General will take that up and bring some reforms in. As I say, I pay tribute to Dr Graham Jacobs for his initial work in this space trying to seek justice for victims of crime with regard to their common law right to pursue a claim against their perpetrators. I think it is one part of the solution for victims of crime. It needs to be more than that. At the moment we are seeing nothing on any of these fronts.

I note that I am rapidly running out of time. I mentioned at the beginning that I wanted to pay tribute to my good friends Dr Graham Jacobs and Reverend Peter Abetz for their excellent contribution for a long time in the Parliament—good friends that they are of mine—and I hope that members have some flavour for the types of things that I have appreciated that Dr Jacobs and Mr Abetz have done, including the prostitution bill. There is another matter I want to raise in the time that remains. I have basically entitled it under the heading of the Rally for Life. To give members some context, I heard some very meaningful and strong inaugural speeches last month. Even though I was not in the chamber, I read the *Hansard* of the inaugural speech of Hon Alison Xamon. I am pretty sure I was in the chamber for Hon Matthew Swinbourn’s speech, but if not I certainly read it in *Hansard*. I was also certainly in the chamber when I heard the speech of Hon Kyle McGinn. To the extent that there were similarities in those speeches, as best as I recall I heard or read on all of those occasions a plea for an industrial manslaughter charge to be available. I could hear the members’ passion because of the loss of life that has taken place and the injustice that has occurred and the lack of remedy that is available. What I want to say to those three members this evening is that I am happy to commit to them in this term of Parliament that I will make myself available to be persuaded on legislation that is needed on that topic because it involves the loss of life, if they will do me the courtesy of at least listening to another injustice with regard to loss of life and whether they might support me in this endeavour, which I have mentioned to members previously. It never ceases to amaze me that the Rally for Life that is held on the steps of Parliament on or around 22 May every year, and has been held now for 19 years, tends to attract no coverage from the media. This year 1 200 people were on the steps of Parliament. My experience is that not too many rallies at this place have 1 200 people. There is a rally usually with a couple of hundred people. One can be sure that there will be cameras there, it will be reported on the nightly news, and it will be reported in the newspapers and on the internet. When it comes to the Rally for Life, there is this overt media bias that manifests itself in the form of silence. That is incredibly distressing because I want to raise the case of 26 Western Australians who have lost their lives through no fault of their own. Members who have been here in the last couple of Parliaments will have some familiarity with this issue.

This matter has its genesis in questions asked by Hon Ed Dermer on 14 February 2011 when he uncovered, in questions that he asked in 2011, how many infants had survived an abortion in Western Australia. The answer was 14. Irrespective of a person’s personal view about pregnancy termination, it is incredibly important for people to understand that is not what we are talking about here. I understand that people have a wide range of views and different levels of emotion and passion with regard to pregnancy termination. What I am talking about here is a Western Australian born alive in a hospital in Western Australia. Hon Ed Dermer had uncovered that there were 14 of them. All 14 were provided no treatment. In other words, they were left to die. This was in 2011. I remember having a conversation with Hon Ed Dermer at the time. He indicated that he was looking to retire in the not too distant future and I asked him, “What will you do about this? It is unbelievable that we could have this situation.” We have first class medical care in Western Australia. It is staggering how 14 Western Australians could not receive the same level of health care as any other Western Australian. He said, “If you want to take it up, go for it.” Later that year, after questions from Hon Ed Dermer, a petition was tabled in this place with approximately 5 000 signatures. I cannot recall the exact number. It went to the Standing Committee on Environment and Public Affairs, as all petitions do. The committee responded to the petition in about November of that year indicating it was concluding its inquiries. I was staggered that the committee would be effectively shutting down this inquiry prior to an outcome. I urged the committee to reconsider and, thankfully, it continued the inquiry for a little longer. The committee said that it would keep it open a little longer but unfortunately, in 2012, the committee wrote to me to say that it had undertaken to provide further information about the 14 cases when it received any from the Minister for Health. There was this ongoing conversation happening, if you like, between the environment and public affairs committee and the Minister for Health. The Minister for Health said he needed more

time to get to the bottom of these 14 cases. The committee said, “Okay, no problems. We’ll tell you, Hon Nick Goiran, if any further information is provided.” Lo and behold in November 2012, one year later, the committee closed the inquiry. Members can find the summary of the committee’s report. Hon Kate Doust dissented to the closing of that particular inquiry. The committee concluded that the minister’s comments were that further research was needed before he could make further comment.

It staggers me to this day that a committee could shut down an inquiry midway when a minister says that further work needs to be done. I commend Hon Kate Doust for the courage she showed in dissenting to that. That was in 2012, about a year and a half after Hon Ed Dermer first uncovered these 14 deaths. Meanwhile, during this time, the Coalition for the Defence of Human Life wrote to the Ombudsman, who has jurisdiction over some child deaths in this state, only to be told that he could not investigate this matter because it was not within his jurisdiction. Around that time, in July 2012, I wrote to the Minister for Health to ask whether those deaths had been reported to the coroner, only to be told that was not the case. In fact, the Coalition for the Defence of Human Life then wrote to the coroner to report the 14 deaths, only for the coroner, in August 2012, to come to the conclusion that the deaths were not reportable. Everywhere we went on this, no-one wanted to talk about these 14 deaths. No-one wanted to talk about these 14 Western Australians who were provided no medical treatment. It was incredible that they survived. Yet, having survived the procedure that they were given—certainly through no choice of theirs—they were left to die. It is incredible, because in this state if a person dies in the back of a prison van, understandably and correctly, there is an outcry that there should be an inquiry into that matter, but if a baby dies on the floor of a hospital after an abortion procedure and incredibly has survived the procedure, no treatment is provided; there is no inquiry and no-one wants to talk about it. In 2011–12, the committee shut down the inquiry, the Ombudsman said it was not his jurisdiction and the coroner said it was not his jurisdiction.

By this time, we are getting to the 2013 state election and I am pretty exasperated. Hon Ed Dermer has retired, so I have to wait for the outcome of the 2013 election before I can continue to pursue this matter in Parliament. I certainly did that; and I asked a ream of questions. I encourage members supporting the government not to hesitate to ask questions. As a government member, they can still ask questions. I did it a lot in the last couple of Parliaments. I am still here, so it is okay to do it. I encourage members to ask questions. If there is a matter they are passionate about, they should pursue it and not allow anyone to suggest that they should not.

I have never revealed this before; this will be the first time I have mentioned it. It got to the point that I was summoned to a meeting with the then acting director general of Health and the following question was put to me, “What is it going to take for you to stop?” My response was that all I wanted was an answer with regard to the death of these children and that being told, “We are not going to report it; it is not our jurisdiction; we have no system to deal with this matter”, or there being silence, lack of transparency and no accountability was never going to satisfy me. Thankfully, in December 2013 I was afforded the opportunity to have an appointment in the office of the Minister for Health. I was given the opportunity to review every late-term abortion in Western Australia and the reason given by the panel as to why that abortion was justified. They gave me that information and said that the 14 deaths were somewhere in this pile of data. That was the best I could get. At the time I was grateful to get anywhere, having tried to pursue the matter for two and a half years, and if I was going to have to sift my way through the data, then so be it. To this day it is a mystery why they could not just provide a genuine response to why these 14 Western Australians were not provided the same level of treatment as any other baby. But that is what occurred. In the last Parliament I made a speech detailing the data I uncovered on that day.

To the extent there has been any improvement whatsoever in the system, I cannot speak for Hon Dr Kim Hames, who was the Minister for Health at the time, and I do not know whether he agreed to do this out of sheer exasperation of my constant questioning or he eventually came to the conclusion that this was a problem. That was the sense I got from him in conversations with him. Eventually he had a meeting with the panel that makes the decisions and implemented a regime that it report annually to the Minister for Health justifying all the decisions that it makes. The first of those reports was due out in August 2015, and two of those reports have been produced. They are not available because, of course, we could not possibly want transparency when we are trying to create an accountability mechanism! For clarity, we are talking about life-and-death decisions, and the panel that makes these decisions, for the first time in Western Australian history, now has to report to the health minister annually, but the report is suppressed. It will not be tabled in Parliament. It is top secret, and we cannot possibly hold these individuals to account. That does not wash. That is fake accountability. There is no transparency, and that needs to change. Since I have been pursuing this since 2011, members can be assured that I will continue to pursue it in the fortieth Parliament.

Sadly, I inform the house that those 14 Western Australians who died because no treatment was provided to them were not the only deaths. Remember that a baby born after 25 weeks’ gestation at King Edward Memorial Hospital for Women will get the best health care available on the planet. It is incredible what is done at that hospital, and I commend the practitioners who do that work. But if a baby of 25 weeks’ gestation is born alive after an abortion, they get no treatment. That is contrary to the law of this state. The law of this state says that

a person is a Western Australian citizen if they are delivered alive, breathing. That person is entitled to the same rights that you or I are entitled to. If we have an accident this evening and need to go to hospital, we will be provided world-class treatment in this state. It is a great privilege to live in Western Australia; it is an incredible place. Yet, for these 14 Western Australians, a different standard applied. That cannot be just. It is plainly unjust and there needs to be reforms. Sadly, the number is no longer 14. We now know that at least 26 babies were born alive and were provided no level of treatment. How do we know that? Because in 2015 I received answers to questions I asked as a government backbencher in this place. I am somewhat encouraged that when someone perseveres, eventually they can get some breakthroughs.

In March last year, I wrote to a committee of the other place, the Community Development and Justice Standing Committee. The chair of that committee at the time was Margaret Quirk, MLA. I wrote to ask the committee to inquire into the role of the coroner. How can it be that the coroner has no jurisdiction to investigate these deaths? To its credit, that committee and its chair, Margaret Quirk, MLA, the member for Girrawheen, took up that issue and raised it at a hearing with the coroner. Everything moves slowly in government and in the Parliament—it is incredible at times. I have been in this place when certain bills have flown through the chamber. Sometimes the priority that certain things are given is breathtaking, but when it is a serious matter things move very slowly, if at all. At the end of 2016, thanks to the work of that particular committee and of Margaret Quirk, MLA, the member for Girrawheen, the coroner reported that these matters could be considered reportable deaths. Interestingly, for those members who are still following, it is a different coroner from the one I referred to earlier. The one I referred to earlier said in 2012 that the deaths were not reportable. Fast forward four years, and Margaret Quirk asks the question of the new coroner and suddenly, guess what, those deaths could be considered reportable. That is great. We now know that the deaths could be considered reportable. Of course, they are. It is unbelievable that they were not in the first place. It is wonderful for the coroner to come along and say that they could be considered reportable, but it is of no use if nobody reports them.

To make matters worse, Madam Acting President, a memorandum of understanding—I think that is the correct and official term, or bilateral agreement, whatever the official title of the document is—between the Department of Health and the Department for Child Protection and Family Support refers to those two agencies speaking to each other when new-born infants are at risk. It is interesting that when I asked questions during the estimates hearings last year, the Department for Child Protection and Family Support indicated that it had never been advised of any of these 26 cases. Therefore, there is a catastrophic communication reporting failure for infants in Western Australia. There is no reporting to the Department for Child Protection and Family Support or the coroner. If neither the Department for Child Protection and Family Support nor the coroner is made aware that these Western Australians even exist, how can they act? I do not find fault with the Department for Child Protection and Family Support or with the coroner for not taking action, because they cannot take action if they are not aware that there is a problem. But there is a need, Madam Acting President, for urgent reform to this system so that these ongoing deaths—on average about one or two a year; it is incredible that they are born alive—to ensure that if they are born alive, the medical practitioners at the time immediately notify the Department for Child Protection and Family Support. How could there not be a child more at risk? If the role of the Department for Child Protection and Family Support is to have responsibility for at-risk kids, who would be more at risk than a child who has just survived an abortion procedure? It is incredible; as I say, there are only one or two cases a year, and the Department for Child Protection and Family Support is not there to look after them. They are the most at-risk kids in our state and the Department for Child Protection and Family Support never gets to hear about it. It is catastrophic non-communication and non-reporting. It needs to change.

We would hope that apart from just notifying the Department for Child Protection and Family Support, the medical practitioners on site would continue to provide the normal standard of care that any other baby would receive in that situation. That is actually what those Western Australians are entitled to. The medical practitioners do not get to choose which Western Australians get to have a certain level of care and others who get to have a lesser standard of care; they have to provide the same level of care to all. That is what I am calling for. I make these remarks because the two honourable gentlemen whom I spoke about earlier—Graham Jacobs and Peter Abetz—were, every year they were in Parliament, on the steps of Parliament House at the Rally for Life, along with a number of other excellent members, including you, Madam President. I pay tribute to those men for taking a stand on this issue. I know that they agree with me wholeheartedly that there is a need for reform in this area. I know that they agree with me that it is a given that in our community in Western Australia there is a divergence of views on pregnancy terminations. That is a given. Although I hold a view that there is a place for reform in this area, I acknowledge that there is no appetite in the current political climate for that to occur. I acknowledge that is the case. I am sad about it, but I acknowledge that is the case. We are talking about something different here. We are talking about Western Australians who are entitled to the full suite of health care services that are available; they deserve it as much as any of us in this place and they are not receiving it. It is a systemic problem, as identified by Hon Ed Dermer as far back as 2011, and it remains unfixed. I hope, Madam Acting President, that the new health minister will take on this issue. I am grateful that his parliamentary secretary is in the chamber this evening to hear my remarks. I hope she will take them up with the minister and

seek some form of redress and reform to the system so that there is no longer this communication breakdown. We cannot hide this issue any longer, Madam Acting President.

The PRESIDENT: Hon Nick Goiran, you will get used to it eventually. There has been a change.

Hon NICK GOIRAN: Thank you, Madam President. Thank you for your graciousness.

I hope that this matter will be taken up with the minister so that there will be some reforms.

To be a little more precise about what I would like to see in this area, I would like to see the following: I would like to see a directive, whether it be legislative or otherwise, that every infant who survives an abortion must be treated with the same standard of care as an infant who was born at the same gestational age. There needs to be a directive to the practitioners, because it has not happened on at least 26 occasions. It is unfortunate that there needs to be a directive, but we now know it is necessary. The second thing I am asking for is that a reporting mechanism—again, whether legislative or otherwise—be implemented so that when an infant survives an abortion, the Department for Child Protection and Family Support must be immediately notified. Thirdly, that a reporting mechanism, whether legislative or otherwise, be created so that when an infant survives an abortion but subsequently dies, the coroner is notified and given express power to investigate. I emphasise again that it should already be happening. It is outrageous that it has not been happening. Once again, I make the point that if this type of care or non-care—this neglect—had been found in the back of a prison van, there would be a massive call for an inquiry. There would be an inquiry and it would be undertaken. There would be recommendations and governments of both persuasions would be tripping over themselves to agree to every one of the recommendations. They would not hesitate to agree with the recommendations of an inquiry as sensitive as the matter of someone dying in the back of a prison van. That might happen if there were just one such instance; here I am talking about at least 26 instances. It is ongoing. It is one or two every year. It is a disgrace and it needs to change. I hope that in this fortieth Parliament we finally see some redress to the matter that Hon Ed Dermer brought to our attention—I thank him for that—as far back as 2011.

I conclude my remarks this evening by acknowledging those of my colleagues who were unsuccessful at the election. I thank them all for their contribution, as valued friends and colleagues. In particular, I honour the contributions of Dr Graham Jacobs and Reverend Peter Abetz for their longstanding hard work in these sensitive and difficult areas that they never shirked from and were willing to fight for on every instance. I consider them both to be not only friends, but also heroes for the courage they demonstrated in fighting on these particular matters.

HON COLIN HOLT (South West) [9.29 pm]: I also wish to rise to make some remarks in reply to the address by the Governor, who was gracious enough to come and open Parliament. I had an opportunity at the end of the thirty-ninth Parliament to thank our departing colleagues and wish them well. I take the opportunity now to welcome back the returning members on both sides of the house and also to welcome the new members coming into this place, who I am sure will see it as a great privilege and will take that privilege very seriously in all the matters that come before the house to be discussed on behalf of the Western Australians we represent.

I was just reflecting on the change of roles since the last election, and how members have changed sides. Members sit on that side of the house to implement government policy and to be in charge of the Treasury benches. Although members might come to this side of the house, they still have an important role to play in representing the people who elected them to this place. Whatever region members represent, they still have a role to play, and they should take that role very seriously every step of the way.

I find myself in a couple of interesting positions. I am the opposition spokesperson for housing, racing and gaming, forestry and, would members believe, women's interests! We heard quite a lot from Hon Dr Sally Talbot in her Address-in-Reply to the Governor's speech about women's interests in this place, and we have had quite a focus on the roles women play in this Parliament and the new ground they are breaking. It is interesting because both the Leader and the Deputy Leader of the National Party are female, and they are the only two women in our parliamentary party, yet they appointed me as the spokesperson for women's interests! I think that might be a bit of a challenge for me, but I am up for the challenge. It will be a challenge because it will be hard for me to put myself in the position of actually looking at the world from a woman's perspective, but I am sure there will be plenty of people to give me some advice on that as I go into it. However, I am more than happy to take up that challenge, to hear those views and to do whatever I can to put forward women's interests, not only in this Parliament but also in this state.

I remember going to a Bunbury Geographe Chamber of Commerce and Industry dinner at which the guest speaker talked about women in leadership. It was actually very, very good. At the end I posed the question, "What do you think about quotas, not just in leadership but in any sort of way where you set yourself a target that you're going to have a certain representation or a certain component of whatever it might be, maybe a sporting team?" Her response to me was that she thought quotas have a real role to play.

I thought about it after that; I am quite a reflective person. I remember listening to the cricket commentary about the same time. They talked about the quota in the South African team for players who came from a non-white

background. They actually set active quotas to make sure non-white players were represented on that cricket team. I thought to myself, “Does that mean they pick people who aren’t good enough to play in the South African cricket team? If they were to put everyone side by side and said, ‘Let’s pick the best team’, does that mean they are going to pick some people who aren’t good enough just because of the colour of their skin?” I thought that Cricket South Africa’s only response could be that it would have to put resources into developing the game amongst the non-white or coloured population. It would actually have to build the skills of those people to play cricket at the highest level so that when it went to pick a team, it would not pick players on the basis of colour, even though there is a quota system; it would pick players on the basis of their ability to play the game at the best level. I thought, “That actually makes a lot of sense to me. You actually put resources in, and you look for opportunities to promote people who can play the game as well as anyone else.”

I am very reticent about making the leap into women’s interests, but it seems to me that unless we are thinking about how we can promote people of other sexes, races or religious backgrounds to participate in political parties, we are probably not even going to think about quotas, let alone invest time in finding the right people to come and join our political teams. Undoubtedly, I would say that there are plenty of people out there who are not from my typical background—let us face it, I am a white, middle-aged male—who have plenty of skills and abilities to contribute to the arena of politics in which we find ourselves. The same goes for any other business, community, or local government—everywhere we look, we need the participation of a wide range of people from a wide range of backgrounds.

I just wanted to point out that I am the spokesperson for women’s interests in the Nationals —

Hon Sue Ellery: Are you really?

Hon COLIN HOLT: I am! I am looking forward to that challenge, like I said, but I am not going to repeat it. I am sure there will be plenty of advice coming my way, including from the Leader of the House, who I am more than happy to listen to for some advice.

Hon Sue Ellery: Happy to give it, my friend; happy to give it.

Hon COLIN HOLT: I am happy to take it!

I have been in this house for eight years—two terms—and I have been very privileged to serve on the government benches over that whole time. I came into this place on the back of a mood for change, especially in regional Western Australia, which the Nationals represent. In 2008 the National Party was, arguably, on its knees and about to exit the political arena, but we pulled through it and put forward some policies, as one does in election campaigns. We put forward some policies that had some momentum and acceptance amongst the communities we now represent. They said, “Let’s give these guys a go, to see how they can help out with regional Western Australia.” I have to say that during the period 2001 to 2007 regional Western Australia was actually not receiving much focus from the state government. That is what happens; there was a mood for change and people voted their representatives into this house and the other place to reflect that mood in the electorate. We all accept it; we accept it at every change in every election, and we accepted it in the election just gone. There was obviously a mood for change, and we accept it. We play our roles on either side of the house to ensure that the people we represent are well represented and that their views continue to matter.

I believe that through the implementation of the royalties for regions program we have, without a doubt, invested a large amount of funds into and put a large amount of focus on regional Western Australia. I was very interested to hear Hon Darren West’s contribution to the Address-in-Reply, which I think he will continue at some point. I interjected on him at the end when he was talking about regional representation and the fact that there are now 13 Australian Labor Party members who are regional members. I interjected to ask, “Does that mean you guys do not support changing how regional representatives are elected to this place?” When he gets back on his feet to continue his remarks, I look forward to hearing him address that. I would like to hear him give some indication to the people he represents in regional Western Australia about what he actually thinks about regional representation and the proportion of it that sits in this house.

In saying that, with regard to royalties for regions and the focus on regional Western Australia, I have no doubt in my mind that over eight years of implementing that policy, we have delivered some great outcomes for every community in regional Western Australia. I have often stood in this place and invited members from across the chamber to visit those communities and see what royalties for regions means for regional members, regional communities and regional people. I am sure they would hear the same things I hear—that there is now a feeling that regional Western Australia matters.

I have often talked about this in here, but for the benefit of new members, I think one of the biggest changes is the change of aspiration in regional communities that had ideas and goals to achieve without any real means to an end. They would often rely on the occasional chook raffle at the footy club to try to raise enough funds to get a project across the line. Royalties for regions created an environment in which those aspirations and goals are funded. I am sure if members asked those communities what that meant to them, they would say that is exactly

what it meant. There was a means to an end. All my work in the first term of government was with regional communities to see how we could make the opportunity real for them. It was a big program. We started from a zero base and it took a little while to bed it down and to find a way to meet all the aspirational needs of communities as well as the big projects that would add great economic and environmental value and social wellbeing for those communities. Did we get the balance right? I think in the majority of cases, yes. We can look at a range of projects across the board, and there might be some that we might think never met the mark and left the community in a worse state, but I would be surprised if it can be proved to me that there are many of them. Again, I welcome people giving me some feedback on whether that is the case. In eight years, with \$7 billion worth of investment and three and a half thousand projects, there is no way royalties for regions has not touched people's lives and I am absolutely convinced that it has changed people's lives for the better. I remember the debate in 2007–08 when the royalties for regions policy was floated by the Nationals and we did not find too much support across the political divide for it. That is fair enough. In a way it was a divisive policy because it certainly pitched regional Western Australia against metropolitan Perth.

Hon Adele Farina: You left out the South West Region in the ad for TV.

Hon COLIN HOLT: Did we? I think it was because when we looked at the map there were 48 seats in metropolitan Perth extending down to Busselton and 11 seats outside that region. That came about because there was a 48/11 reference that was about politicking and promotion of the idea. Hon Adele Farina has raised many times how the south west has been left out of the royalties for regions equation, but I would challenge that.

Hon Adele Farina: I am happy to have that debate with you on another occasion.

Hon COLIN HOLT: We can have that debate any time she wants. I am sure she will be batting for the Busselton Airport expansion, given some of the commentary that that project may be curtailed and that the \$56 million or so from the state could be at risk as a result of the review. That is a massive project for the south west and will set it up for the future. Everyone in that region worked hard on that project. They had a strong business case and they would not let go. We committed to it and it went through to cabinet. Everyone committed to it and everyone funded it in the budget. When we talk about it being put at risk, as a member for the South West Region, Hon Adele Farina should ask her own team how that can happen to the south west, specifically the Busselton Airport community, because it will bring huge economic benefits to them as much as to the state. We need another entry point to this state. We have been working on the Margaret River region brand for a long time now. It is world known and Australian known. Whenever I talk to colleagues over east, they want to come and see Margaret River. We need an entry point to Margaret River. In my mind, that project was well documented, had a strong business case, went through cabinet, got support and is funded in the budget. The funding needs to continue for that project. I look forward to Hon Adele Farina's advocacy, as a member for the South West Region who holds me to account on every project in the south west. Is she holding her own government to account in that space? I am sure there is plenty of discussion to be had on that.

Debate interrupted, pursuant to standing orders.

VETERANS — BRAVERY TRUST

Statement

HON TJORN SIBMA (North Metropolitan) [9.45 pm]: I draw attention to the plight of our military veterans and praise the good work of Bravery Trust; an ex-service organisation dedicated to assisting our veterans and their families in times of need. More than 5 000 military members in Australia transition out of the services each year. The transition can be very difficult for a number of these people. Injuries and illnesses sustained as a result of time in service can manifest in periods of financial hardship, unemployment, homelessness, mental health crises, and suicide, once on the outside. My personal view is that this is cause for national shame and embarrassment. I met recently with Mr Peter Fitzpatrick, the chairman of Bravery Trust, who briefed me on the trust's operations. Importantly, Bravery Trust does not duplicate or compete with the work of other military charities or associations. Rather, it has a simple defined mission: to help current and former members of the Australian Army, Navy and Air Force and their families who have suffered an injury or illness as a result of their service and are facing financial hardship.

Bravery Trust provides this help via three means; firstly, by providing urgent financial assistance, including for items such as food and fuel costs, utilities bills, and, rather depressingly, funeral costs; secondly, through providing access to financial planning services; and, thirdly and importantly, through a \$5 million education and training fund. The latter is particularly important in assisting ex-service people transition into the civilian workforce. The transition into the civilian workforce is made difficult by the fact that the extensive training and qualifications our veterans receive while in the service are not always recognised outside the military. Nor are the leadership skills and levels of maturity that are nurtured throughout a serviceperson's career well understood after they have taken off their uniforms. Our servicemen and women are expected to take responsibility very early on in their careers for the lives and welfare of their comrades and they are charged with the operation and maintenance of sophisticated equipment worth many multiples of millions of dollars. Ex-military people possess

skills and experience that make them an asset to any number of future employers. The fact remains, however, that many struggle to get a foot in the door for a job interview. Since its inception in 2012, Bravery Trust has aided more than 2 000 veterans and their families and dispersed more than \$2 million, \$1 million of which was spent in the last 12 months alone. Over \$100 000 is paid out in urgent assistance every month. It saddens me to say that demand for this service is increasing. I wish there was not a need for this kind of support. I therefore urge this chamber to remain vigilant about the unmet needs of veterans in our community, to recognise the essential work undertaken by non-government operations such as Bravery Trust and to work together across party lines so that we may serve those who served us.

COMMUNITY SERVICES — ASTLEY CARE — EXCELLENCE IN CARE AWARD

Statement

HON PIERRE YANG (South Metropolitan) [9.48 pm]: I would like to advise the house that Astley Care, a service provider to seniors and people with disability within the City of Gosnells, has been awarded the Excellence in Care award in the Small Provider Category by Aged and Community Service Australia. I learnt this news yesterday and I was informed by Ms Alice Hazebroek that the award was given to Astley Care last Friday. That is a great achievement. I want to congratulate the staff and the organisation for their dedication over the past 30 years for providing service to the seniors and people with disability in the Gosnells city area.

As a former member of the City of Gosnells council it gives me great pleasure to see that an organisation in my former workplace has received this prestigious award. I look forward to Astley Care's contribution over the next 30 years.

I wish to advise the house that I will be participating in the CEO Sleepout on 22 May. No doubt many members of this house and members of the other place have received my email. I think homelessness is a very sad issue. As I said in my first speech, we are an incredibly rich country, but on any given night we have 105 000 people in this country who are homeless, and that is a real tragedy. I am willing to be part of that small effort to raise some funds for homelessness. I certainly hope that next year I can approach members of this great honourable house and members of the other place to see whether anyone would be interested in joining me to participate and sleep as a homeless member of Parliament for one night of the year.

JOINT STANDING COMMITTEE ON DELEGATED LEGISLATION

Assembly's Resolution — Council's Concurrence

Message from the Assembly received and read requesting concurrence in the following resolution —

That the house agrees to the resolution of the Legislative Council referred to in Legislative Council Message 1, subject to the following amendment to which the Legislative Assembly requests the concurrence of the Legislative Council.

No. 1

Delete paragraph 10.8.

JOINT STANDING COMMITTEE ON AUDIT

Assembly's Message

Message from the Assembly received and read acquainting the Council that it had agreed to the following resolution —

- (1) That the terms contained in Legislative Council Message 2 for the establishment of the Joint Standing Committee on Audit be agreed to.
- (2) The Legislative Council be acquainted accordingly.

JOINT STANDING COMMITTEE ON THE COMMISSIONER FOR CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE

Assembly Membership

Message from the Assembly received and read notifying that the following members had been appointed to the Joint Standing Committee on the Commissioner for Children and Young People: Mr K.M. O'Donnell and Mrs J.M.C. Stojkovski.

House adjourned at 9.52 pm
