



# **Parliamentary Debates**

**(HANSARD)**

FORTIETH PARLIAMENT  
FIRST SESSION  
2017

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, 14 June 2017



# Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, 14 June 2017

**THE SPEAKER (Mr P.B. Watson)** took the chair at 12 noon, and read prayers.

## PAPER TABLED

A paper was tabled and ordered to lie upon the table of the house.

### TERRORIST ATTACK — PREVENTION

*Statement by Minister for Police*

**MRS M.H. ROBERTS (Midland — Minister for Police)** [12.01 pm]: I would like to update the Assembly on actions this government and Western Australia Police are taking to ensure that Western Australia is protected from terrorism. The recent events in Manchester, London and the Melbourne CBD are sobering. I want to reassure Western Australians that we are doing all that we can to prepare for and mitigate the risk of any terrorist attack in Perth. I have received numerous briefings from WA Police and the Australian Criminal Intelligence Commission. Since the Lindt cafe siege in Martin Place, the counterterrorism environment in Australia has changed significantly. It has challenged police enforcement across Australia, and WA Police has been studying the NSW Coroner's recommendations closely. WA Police has been proactively working with national counterterrorism partners such as the Australian–New Zealand Counter-Terrorism Committee, the Australian Security Intelligence Organisation, the Australian Federal Police and deputy commissioners for counterterrorism for all police jurisdictions. In addition, WA Police has been utilising the Counter-Terrorism Committee capability funds to purchase specialist equipment and focus on training police negotiators, forensics, bomb scene examination and response, and improving police surveillance.

WA Police is confident in its technological capacity to surveil and deploy in a range of counterterrorism scenarios. The WA Police negotiators unit has a cadre of nationally qualified terrorist negotiators. The unit is well resourced, with a specialist negotiators' truck. Negotiator technology and skills require continuous enhancement and WA Police is improving psychiatric capability to assist the negotiation teams. Joint training has been undertaken with South Australia Police, and WA Police continue to cooperate with the Australian Defence Force on call-outs. Regular exercises occur with the Tactical Assault Group West of the Western Australian Special Air Service.

Most recently, I can report that assistant commissioners and commanders completed a specialist course that considered the Lindt siege in detail, and visiting fellows spoke in relation to jihadist ideology, radicalisation to violent extremism and the current threat context in Australia. We will continue to act and prepare for any possible terrorist act in this state. We will remain vigilant. As a community, we must remain resilient and cohesive. Together we can counter violent extremism and prevent any terrorist attack.

### WHITEMAN PARK — LEAD LEVELS — DRINKING WATER

*Statement by Minister for Planning*

**MS R. SAFFIOTI (West Swan — Minister for Planning)** [12.04 pm]: I wish to advise the house about concerns regarding the quality of drinking water at Whiteman Park and a drinking fountain at Babblers Park in Bennett Springs. My office was advised on Monday afternoon by a media outlet that had commissioned testing and determined both locations had elevated lead levels in the water. At Whiteman Park the concerns focus on elevated lead levels in drinking water around the village and Mussel Pool areas. Water in those areas is sourced from an aquifer and filtered and treated on site. Meanwhile, the fountain at Babblers is supplied water by the Integrated Water Supplies Scheme. I was advised this morning that the Water Corporation's test results conducted this week reveal that there is no lead above health guideline levels in the water supplying the fountain. As a precautionary measure, the City of Swan has closed water fountains at the park and is conducting independent water tests within Babblers Park. I spoke to the mayor about this this morning. Upon notification on Monday afternoon of the alleged lead contamination, I took precautionary action and directed that these sources of drinking water be turned off until further testing had been completed.

The park can remain open, and staff at Whiteman Park were briefed about the matter on Tuesday. On Monday afternoon my office also contacted the City of Swan, which manages Babblers Park, and the offices of the Minister for Health and the Minister for Water. An independent laboratory is testing water samples from Whiteman Park. I have been advised that results should be available very soon. Upon receipt of these results, further action will be taken if required. The Department of Health has also offered to work with the park management to review the testing regime for the park. The health and safety of staff, volunteers, attraction operators and visitors to Whiteman Park is my paramount concern, which is why the water will remain switched off until we receive the results of the water sampling.

The Australian Drinking Water Guidelines state that based on health considerations for a two-year-old child drinking one litre a day over a long-term period, concentration of lead in drinking water should not exceed 0.01 milligram a litre. The Department of Health has advised that it would not expect a child who visited the site and drank water from the system from time to time to have any adverse health effects. The Department of Health reviewed water testing for Whiteman Park in 2007 and 2004. No issues were raised at that time in relation to testing. The Water Corporation has previously conducted tests for metals in the water being supplied to the Babbler Park water meter and those tests revealed no detection of lead above health guideline levels. Water Corporation tests for metals across the water supply system occur annually in accordance with Australian Drinking Water Guidelines.

### **BLACK HAWK TRAGEDY — TWENTY-FIRST ANNIVERSARY**

*Statement by Minister for Veterans Issues*

**MR P.C. TINLEY (Willagee — Minister for Veterans Issues)** [12.07 pm]: Twenty-one years ago this week, on Wednesday, 12 June 1996, 18 of Australia's bravest young men lost their lives in what has become known to all Australians as the Black Hawk tragedy. Members of the Special Air Service Regiment were in Queensland conducting counterterrorism training in the lead-up to the Sydney Olympics with the 5<sup>th</sup> Aviation Regiment. On day 2 of the exercises, a group of six Black Hawk helicopters was performing a difficult night training operation during which two of them collided and crashed in the High Range Training Area approximately 44 kilometres south west of Townsville. Eighteen soldiers lost their lives that night. Fifteen of those men were from the Special Air Service Regiment and three from the 5<sup>th</sup> Aviation Regiment. Today, 21 years on, we remember them. From the Special Air Service Regiment, they were Captain Timothy Stevens, Sergeant Hugh Ellis, Corporal Mihran Avedissian, Corporal Michael Bird, Corporal Andrew Constantinidis, Corporal Darren Oldham, Corporal Darren Smith, Corporal Brett Tombs, Lance Corporal Gordon Callow, Lance Corporal David Frost, Lance Corporal Glen Hagan, Lance Corporal David Johnstone, Trooper Jonathan Church, Trooper Timothy McDonald and Signaller Hendrik Peeters. From the 5<sup>th</sup> Aviation Regiment, they were Captain Kelvin Hales, Captain John Berrigan and Corporal Michael Baker.

The SAS Regiment has a unique place in the fabric of Western Australia. The first Special Air Service Company was formed here in 1957, becoming the SAS Regiment in 1964, and has been permanently based here for 60 years. It is part of Western Australia, and this was a loss felt by all Western Australians. The loss of life in the Black Hawk tragedy remains to this day Australia's worst peacetime military aviation disaster.

Lest we forget.

### **SUPPLY BILL 2017**

*Second Reading*

Resumed from 13 June.

**MS J.M. FREEMAN (Mirrabooka)** [12.13 pm]: I stand to speak on the Supply Bill 2017. We should all remember where Mirrabooka is because that is where the Metro Area Express light rail was going to go. I stood in this Parliament before the 2013 election when the Liberal–National government announced MAX. It went into the 2013 election with big fanfare and the then Premier said that it was worth buying in the area because the government was going to deliver a great light rail. I have said that before. My colleagues here over the last few days have raised the issue of MAX and its impact. The member for Perth raised the impact of MAX on the North Perth community. I want to put on record for the good people of Mirrabooka that although they feel betrayed, they know that the new Labor government has a clear process and a commitment to public transport, and it will not neglect the remaining need for efficient public transport in the central northern corridor. That need remains and was part of the business plans. Directions 2031 and the transport plan that the former Minister for Transport heralded in this place show that there is still a strong need for efficient public transport in that northern corridor. The Minister for Transport under the Labor government will take those things into consideration.

The track record of the Labor government in its commitment to Metronet will ensure that the people of Mirrabooka will not have to suffer the indignation of a government saying that it will deliver something, then saying maybe it will delay it and then saying maybe it will keep doing it. I remember being in this place when the former Premier told me, "Watch this space, member for Mirrabooka—it's going to happen". But the government never delivered it. We cannot do that to a community. I know the commitment that the Labor government has to transport. Its staged, considered and well-developed planning will ensure that those people in the central northern corridor, including the people of the electorate of Mirrabooka, will not be overlooked, because those issues still remain in our community. We heard about it yesterday when people spoke about travel times. Indeed there is no stronger indication of the need for good, efficient public transport than long travel times. We need to ensure that people have alternatives to hopping in their cars and driving long hours to reach their place of employment.

We all know the Supply Bill is an important element in our parliamentary system. Every 11 November we all remember the Whitlam era and that the blocking of supply was the cause of the government's dismissal. We all know very well the importance of ensuring that government continues. The financial capacity to continue the government's day-to-day activities is extraordinarily important. It is no less important to many of the people in Mirrabooka, whom I represent. Many of those people fled countries to come to a place of safety and security and good government with a bureaucracy that delivers to the community and is not beset with corruption. It is a great honour to be part of a Labor government that has those principles deep in its heart and soul. Delivering secure and good government so that people can get on with their day-to-day lives is something that we hold very dear. It is quite an interesting conversation that I often have with my constituents. They will come into my electorate office and talk about issues in their homeland and say that they know that in Australia that is not how things would happen.

Recently I have been in discussions with the community about the upcoming Liberian elections. People want a stable government that delivers good schools, infrastructure, transport, roads and health services to the community. They are so honoured to access those facilities in our stable democracy and they want to see them delivered in Liberia. I often say to them that it is an interesting juxtaposition because those who have lived for a long time under Australian governments become almost dismissive, abusive and critical of our stable democratic government. They almost denigrate it, yet many of the people whom I work with know how fundamental it is to how people's lives operate in everyday life. Stable democracy is fundamental to that way of life. It is good to be here debating the Supply Bill because we know that keeps the mechanisms of government going.

We saw terrible times in the United States when supply was stopped. We also saw how disruptive that was for people, who started questioning the system. Part of that is being able to respond, and this Labor government has responded to the needs of the community. In particular, for the people of Mirrabooka, we have responded by putting jobs at the centre and forefront of our government's strategy. Job creation is such an important aspect for the people of Mirrabooka. I tell new members in this place that in the last four years, at every opportunity I had, I stood and asked, demanded, begged and pleaded with the previous government to take note of the large unemployment rate in Mirrabooka. It all fell on deaf ears. I have told this story maybe once before, but I remember standing and delivering a grievance to the Minister for Youth saying that youth unemployment is at a critical point in the Mirrabooka electorate. I asked the Minister for Youth what he was doing in government to respond to this. I told him not to come back and tell me about cadets, but to tell me about what he is doing to address fundamental issues for people so that they can gain secure employment and prosper. He had seven minutes to respond to me. He took three minutes, and most of that time was spent speaking about delivering cadets programs into schools. That is a small illustration of how the previous Liberal government had no regard, no respect and no concern for the people who were doing it tough in our community and needed employment.

It is a great testament to the new Labor government that it has invested funds into the Newcomer Workforce Participation Project in the electorate of Mirrabooka. That will be running with the City of Stirling. It is based on a model from Toronto in Canada. As I have said, Balga-Mirrabooka has suffered from a really high unemployment rate of up to 21.5 per cent; one in five people were unemployed. That rate has dipped a bit but youth unemployment is still a serious concern. It has not dipped enough. I think it now sits at around 22 per cent. The Balga-Mirrabooka statistical area has a higher than average migrant population. In 2011, the census showed that 53.2 per cent of the total population was born overseas and 40.6 per cent of the population spoke a language other than English at home. The important investment of these funds in the Newcomer Workforce Participation Project will ensure the commencement of this innovative program.

It will establish an immigrant employment council, and it will then set about providing mentoring models, finding the capacity for people to get important skills, traineeships and work experience. The Toronto Region Immigrant Employment Council recently celebrated its tenth anniversary. It has matched 10 000 skilled immigrants with 6 500 volunteer mentors from a wide range of professions. It has been very successful. It is a credit to this Labor government that we have been able to deliver—to find something innovative, be local and deliver something on the ground. It shows that we are responding and understand the concerns of the community.

While I am talking about not responding to the community, I also want to raise the absolutely appalling situation of the Fair Trading Act 2010. The Fair Trading Act is now five amendments behind the rest of the country. To give a bit of background for members, the Western Australian Fair Trading Act provides the Western Australian consumer law, but in effect it is the Australian Consumer Law. Every time the Australian Consumer Law changes, we have to come in here and accept amendments. In every other state it is automatic. They have formed an agreement so that when one Parliament changes the Australian Consumer Law, it changes automatically in every other state. For some peculiar, odd, bureaucratic, red tape, inconsequential, frankly stupid reason, successive Western Australian governments have determined that we are going to lag and bring it in on each occasion, even though the consumer law has to be, given that we are one nation, the Australian Consumer Law.

In 2014, when we put the 2013 changes in place, I stated on record that I thought that red tape should no longer continue and that we had to come into the modern age and have the law adopted in the way that the rest of the country does. This lag is no benefit for consumers and small businesses in Western Australia. That is exactly what has occurred. I have spoken to the minister about this and said that that is how I think it should be. I have put that strongly to the minister.

**Mr P.A. Katsambanis:** What was his response?

**Ms J.M. FREEMAN:** He said that he will consider it. I hope he will consider it. I am now putting it on record again, member for Hillarys. I see no purpose in the federal Australian Consumer Law lagging in this way because of the inaction of the previous government's minister for consumer affairs. The member for Hillarys sat in the other house with the former minister, with his ineptitude and his incapacity to deliver anything to the people of Western Australia.

**Mr P.A. Katsambanis** interjected.

**Ms J.M. FREEMAN:** Five, not just one, are out of date. We are five amendments behind. That is an appalling record of the previous government. If the Labor government does not make it automatic, we certainly will not let it go to five amendments that lag behind because the previous government's minister was completely inept, incapable, slow and pointless, member for Hillarys!

**Mr P.A. Katsambanis** interjected.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Member for Hillarys!

**Ms J.M. FREEMAN:** Member for Hillarys, I am trying to point out the ineptitude, incapacity and complete uselessness of the previous minister, because we were five amendments behind. The member for Hillarys can stand up and berate me if our minister gets five behind, but that is just appalling.

**Mr P.A. Katsambanis:** It is five behind now.

**Ms J.M. FREEMAN:** After what the previous government did.

**Mr P.A. Katsambanis** interjected.

**Ms J.M. FREEMAN:** You are pathetic! The consequence is that the ACL of WA is out of alignment with the Australian Consumer Law in other jurisdictions.

**Mr D.J. Kelly** interjected.

**Ms J.M. FREEMAN:** Thank you, member for Bassendean. I am perfectly able to defend myself.

Several members interjected.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Members!

**Ms J.M. FREEMAN:** WA is out of alignment with the Australian Consumer Law in other jurisdictions as a result of the passage of five commonwealth amendment acts. Further proposals are before the commonwealth Parliament, so we could be six amendments behind. What sort of ineptitude is that for a government? What sort of incapacity to just do its day-to-day job is that for a government? No wonder Western Australians voted out the previous government. What is terrible about that is that it leaves open the exploitation of workers.

I want to talk to members about one of the worst exploitations that seems to be occurring in our community at the moment. Young workers who want to become gym attendants—providers of fitness training—are being forced into franchisee agreements to deliver their services. They are not contractors or casual workers and there are no independent contracts. They are being forced to enter into franchisee agreements. Let me call this gym in Floreat "Torn". It is not called Torn.

**Ms A. Sanderson:** Good name!

**Ms J.M. FREEMAN:** The gym's name is similar to Torn. If members think of Torn, they can think of something else that a person can do. Yes, members get why I have called it Torn. It gets young people in, beats them up and says, "Come on; you can be fitness trainers. We're really keen on getting these people fit and healthy in our community. You've got this training now." It signs them up with franchisee agreements. The franchisee agreements state that they can seek legal advice and should look at the code of practice. The agreements state that they could look at the disclosure document, the franchisee agreement and the Franchising Code of Conduct.

[Member's time extended.]

**Ms J.M. FREEMAN:** It basically signs them off, and when these young people ask whether they need to get that legal advice, the company says, "Oh, no; that's fine. Don't worry about that." This particular agreement—Torn is a "strength institute"—requires certain hours, certain training and wearing of the Torn uniform. It states

that there is a payment for a franchisee fee, a training fee, a rental fee and a marketing fee. It does not cover workers' compensation, public liability or insurance for plant and equipment, and when the worker soon discovers that it is not worth their time and they break the agreement, they have a penalty. They have to pay back their training fee, and it reduces by \$40 a week only when the worker delivers the fitness training to their clients.

The work of the franchisee is regulated by the national mandatory Franchising Code of Conduct and the code of conduct applies to the parties. This is a sham contract. But members should think about it. This is a young worker who is told that this is great and that they are going to become a part of this strength institute; it is going to be fantastic. They are all beefed up. They are there for three or four weeks and they are not making the money that they were advised they would. There seems to be more costs coming out than are coming in. The worker goes to the franchisor and says, "This is not working for me." The franchisor says, "You can leave, but you have to pay out the penalty." If the worker is lucky enough to come and talk to someone like me, I can say that it is a sham contract. That person was an employee and the franchisor was directing them in many ways. The worker needs to go to the Western Australian Industrial Relations Commission and tell it that it is a sham contract. Frankly, the worker is a bit scared about all those sorts of things, so they just walk in to the strength institute and say, "I've been told that this is a sham contract." The franchisor says, "That might be the case, but I'm going to take you to court anyway" or, "I'm going to report to the credit agencies that you have an outstanding debt." They are stuck in a situation that is particularly difficult.

The use of these agreements, and the capacity for us to make sure that we have the most up-to-date Australian Consumer Law and that we are working with Western Australian and Australian authorities to ensure franchisee agreements are not used in this appalling manner, is very important. I am grateful that we now have a Labor government that cares about workers, cares about small business and cares about good governance in this area.

**MRS L.M. O'MALLEY (Bicton)** [12.30 pm]: I rise today to acknowledge some local champions in the electorate of Bicton. Before I do so, I want to pick up on some of the things that the member for Mirrabooka said. In another life, I was a fitness instructor. I started out in the industry when I was in my early to mid-20s, at a time when an employee in a fitness facility was an employee. Over the years that I worked in the industry—an industry about which I was very passionate as a personal trainer and a fitness instructor—I saw a lot of changes occur. Many of the changes came down to one thing: it was just another example of the casualisation of our workforce over many years. I took some time off to have a family, and when I went back into the industry I needed to do some requalification and additional training. In that absence—it was a gap of probably five or six years—the industry had changed a lot. Courses are still available through the technical and further education system and, thankfully, with the freezing of TAFE fees, that is still an option for young people leaving school. However, I noticed that the onus had certainly moved to the trainers themselves—to the fitness professionals.

As the member for Mirrabooka said, it became more apparent that it was up to the trainers to almost create their own business. For people entering the fitness industry in their late teens and early 20s, that is a massive challenge. I think it is an absolute disgrace that it has got to the point, as the member for Mirrabooka explained, of a franchise situation. I can only imagine the confusion that those young people are now experiencing going into that workplace when all they want to do is help people get fit. People who are drawn to the industry are drawn there because, firstly, they want some flexibility in their workplace—the fitness industry certainly provides a very dynamic workplace in that regard—but, secondly, they want to help people. They want to spend their time helping people to get fit and to make important health changes, which, if we really look at it, is an important aspect of our whole health system. It is a critical and primary area of prevention of health issues. I acknowledge and thank the member for Mirrabooka for stepping up for her constituents in this regard. I am incredibly grateful that we now have a government that will put all workers' rights front and centre.

Turning now to what I was going to speak about, I acknowledge some unsung heroes in my community in the electorate of Bicton, particularly their efforts to protect the green spaces, river and foreshore that we are so very blessed to have in that electorate. Two-thirds of the electorate is bordered by the Swan River, and the open green space that lies adjacent to it is incredibly important for our community. It is a space where people come together, exercise their dogs, meet up, enjoy passive recreation or simply find a little bit of silence and peace as an antidote to the noise and increasing busyness of our lives. I take this opportunity to pay tribute in particular to the local environmental groups that are such a strong feature of the electorate of Bicton. They are groups made up entirely of volunteers. They spend hours and hours, week in and week out, down at the foreshore weeding and ensuring that the foreshore is protected, not just for us now, but also for those generations to come. We have seen an awful lot of impact on the foreshore in the electorate of Bicton over the past few years. As a local government councillor, I was very aware of the issues around the Point Walter Reserve. Major revetment work was done by the local council over the last year or two to ensure that the impact of continual erosion would not undermine that precious foreshore area too greatly. It is an area that sees people from not just the electorate of Bicton; people from right across Perth come to enjoy those open spaces and passive areas.

One of the major threats that the electorate of Bicton faces along the foreshore is the increasing threat of encroaching foreshore development. I would like to acknowledge and thank in particular the members of the Alfred Cove Action Group, the City of Melville Residents and Ratepayers Association Inc, the Swan Estuary Reserves Action Group Inc, the Friends of East Fremantle Foreshore, the H4 zone action group and the many members of the electorate of Bicton who have all come together to voice their concerns to me, and also express their opposition to the development of a mechanically generated wave facility, which is deemed to be located at the Melville Bowling and Recreation Club site extending into a reasonable section of Tompkins Park. Regarding the environment and the potential impact in particular, a great number of concerns have been raised. The current location of the site has a minor low-impact development—the Melville bowling club, which is adjacent to Tompkins Park—and alongside the A-class reserve in Alfred Cove. The area is lined with mudflats and intertidal vegetation that provide shelter and rich foraging for many animals and birds. Of particular note are the migratory birds that travel from as far afield as Asia and Siberia. Approximately 33 of the species are protected under international agreements. It is not just the environmental aspects that the residents are concerned about. The location has Canning Highway running alongside it, which already suffers from quite a lot of congestion. The new development is deemed to be a large facility that, being a commercial enterprise, will need to attract a large number of patrons. There are a great many concerns around the capacity for the area to sustain that.

The groups have expressed their dismay at the threat that the changes could pose to the fragile ecosystem of the cove. The other concerns are around the loss of green space. They tell me that there has been what they believe to be a lack of a thorough investigation into alternative options for the site. For example, could the current facility, the Melville bowling club, which to all intents and purposes is a community hub, be expanded to incorporate some other activities that would be more in keeping with the community aspirations that were identified in the community strategic plan of the City of Melville? The number one aspiration for our community is having access to green open spaces.

Yesterday I was joined by 40 members of local community groups and concerned individuals. I met them on the steps of Parliament House. They came to present their petition for tabling in the other place. Those wonderful people put aside a good deal of time to come up to Parliament and I thank them for doing so. Two petitions were tabled yesterday with a collective total of 6 266 signatures. I acknowledge the efforts of the members of my electorate who not only came along yesterday, but also have spent many, many hours over the past several months talking to other community members and expressing their concerns and finding out about the concerns of other members of the electorate on this issue.

I am incredibly honoured to be standing in this place, having been recently elected as the representative and voice of the people of my electorate of Bicton. I thank them for allowing me the opportunity to be here and to be the voice that raises their concerns, particularly at a time when this issue has just transitioned from a local to a state one. Having been a local government councillor, I have been part of that transition and part of the journey of those people in my representation of them at, now, two levels of government.

I would also very much like to acknowledge the important role in the community of the current tenants of the site—Melville Bowling Club. I would like to congratulate the bowling club on its integrated and inclusive community model that invites local sporting and community groups to share its buildings and surrounds. It provides a home for many groups that do not have their own facility. As I am sure many members who have been involved in local sporting groups et cetera are aware, there may be a venue to play at—for example, in my electorate netball is played at Frank Gibson Park, East Fremantle—but my daughter's netball team, Palmyra Rebels, for example, does not have its own facility or home. So her club, like many, many clubs in our community and right across this state, relies on a facility like Melville Bowling Club to host it for its functions et cetera. The generosity of Melville Bowling Club helps many other groups to thrive, and in some instances to simply survive as a club. Melville Bowling Club has been under enormous pressure over the past several months due to its impending relocation to a renovated Tompkins Park facility—a relocation based on a determination that the club is in decline. However, despite these challenges, the club continues to be an important community asset, and one that adds great value to the lives of its members and the wider community of Bicton. This value can be captured in a snapshot of a year's activity. The total number of bowls played over the past year is 19 538, there were 167 community functions—I think I attended at least six or seven—and 12 765 community members attended these functions. The total membership, which includes pennant and a hugely growing proportion of social members, is currently around 650. Some of the community functions held at Melville Bowling Club include wakes, fundraisers and junior sporting club end-of-season events. Without this venue, local clubs like the Melville Lakers Netball Club and Palmyra netball club would be greatly challenged to find an affordable location for their clubs. I take this opportunity to extend a thankyou to Melville Bowling Club on their behalf.

The club also faces the all-too-familiar challenges of crime, with recent break-ins at the club resulting in vandalism and theft. The club relies on mostly cash bar transactions, as many older clubs do, and I am incredibly pleased to have been able to provide funding within our local projects, local jobs funding initiative of \$25 000, which will help to modernise some of the club's cash handling activities so that it can start to work towards transitioning to a card-based system, thereby reducing its risk of becoming a target for that kind of theft.

At this point I would also like to acknowledge the Minister for Police for her work to reduce crime in our communities since taking on the role. I am confident that my community will be a safer place under this government.

The local projects, local jobs funding initiative is assisting at the grassroots level in Bicton. It is helping many local champions like our junior sporting clubs, including Attadale Junior Football Club, Attadale Netball Club, Bicton Junior Cricket Club, Bicton Netball Club, East Fremantle Junior Football Club, East Fremantle Tricolore Soccer Club, Melville Lakers Netball Club, Melville Mariners Tee-Ball Club, Palmyra–Bicton Little Athletics, Olympia Little Athletics Club, Palmyra Junior Football Club, and Palmyra Rebels Netball Club. I hope I have not forgotten any, because I am sure I will hear about it if I have.

To conclude, the local projects, local jobs funding in Bicton has made and is making an incredible difference from the grassroots level right up to some of the larger funding commitments. All those sporting clubs will receive \$6 000, which does not sound like a lot but it will mean they can buy new footies and netballs and maybe a couple of training goalposts for their netball or whatever. I am incredibly fortunate and thankful to have been able to assist in that regard. Our local champions can take many, many different forms and can include sporting committees, umpires, the presidents and vice-presidents of our junior sporting clubs. They do the most incredible work on a voluntary basis to keep their clubs going, and I am incredible honoured to have been given the opportunity to assist them in ensuring the sustainability of their clubs now and into the future.

**MR A. KRSTICEVIC (Carine)** [12.46 pm]: I just want to make a very short contribution to the second reading of the Supply Bill 2017. I did have a very quick chat about this with the Treasurer. I just wanted to ask him a question, because we are supporting this bill and will not go into consideration in detail. Maybe the Treasurer could clarify one point for me.

On clause 4 the explanatory memorandum reads —

This clause authorises the Treasurer to use the moneys granted under Clause 3 for the purposes of funding any services pending those services being voted by the Legislative Assembly during the 2017–18 financial year. By convention, and as recognised in the Second Reading speeches of previous Supply Bills, the services to be funded are the works, services and purposes approved either under the most recent Appropriation Acts, or one that is not provided for by an appropriation by an Appropriation Act for that year as approved under section 27(1) of the *Financial Management Act 2006*.

Can the Treasurer clarify for me, based on that explanation, whether once this bill goes through the Treasurer can spend or allocate the money to anything he likes, as long as it is contained in the budget appropriation in September 2017?

**Mr B.S. Wyatt:** Yes, that is right. So this bill allows us to, but it is the budget that will appropriate the moneys.

**Mr A. KRSTICEVIC:** That is correct. So, for example —

**Mr B.S. Wyatt:** As to the second part—you asked me a question and I just want to emphasise the point—the services to be funded are the works, services and purposes approved by the current year’s budget or for what will be appropriated in the coming September. At the moment it is the core services under the current budget.

**Mr A. KRSTICEVIC:** Yes, but, for example, if the Treasurer decided to—I do not know—start delivering on some election promises after this bill goes through Parliament, nothing can stop the Treasurer spending that money on that purpose as long as it is contained in the budget in September when it is approved by Parliament.

**Mr W.J. Johnston:** Or otherwise authorised by the Parliament.

**Mr A. KRSTICEVIC:** I am not talking to the member for Cannington.

That is correct—or otherwise authorised by Parliament.

**Mr B.S. Wyatt:** Anything we appropriate has to be authorised by Parliament, and only then can moneys granted by way of supply be allocated.

**Mr A. KRSTICEVIC:** That is correct. So, from that point of view, effectively the Treasurer can spend the money on whatever he likes as long as it is authorised by Parliament in September.

**Mr B.S. Wyatt:** As long as Parliament authorises it.

**Mr A. KRSTICEVIC:** That is correct.

**Mr W.J. Johnston:** That’s the whole point!

**Mr A. KRSTICEVIC:** That is the whole point. That brings me to the second point. The member for Cannington gave a long speech yesterday. I wrote down the words that the member for Cannington used a number of times here. He said that the Supply Bill allows the continued expenditure of the money of the state on items that have already been authorised by Parliament. If we are sitting here in August and the government decides to

spend money on one of its election commitments that is not in last year's appropriation but is in the September budget, then it is authorised in Parliament in September. The explanatory memorandum says that anything in the 2017–18 financial year —

**Mr W.J. Johnston** interjected.

**Mr A. KRSTICEVIC:** I am not talking to the member for Cannington! I am talking to the Treasurer. I am talking to someone who is more intelligent.

**Mr W.J. Johnston:** Yes, but you don't understand what you're talking about. This is how stupid you are.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Minister!

**Mr A. KRSTICEVIC:** You are very ignorant. I am asking the Treasurer for his opinion.

**Mr B.S. Wyatt:** I cannot give you an opinion, of course, but I can try to answer your question.

**Mr A. KRSTICEVIC:** I am saying that if the government decides that today it wants to implement any one of these elections promises that is not authorised in any budget, it can say that once the Supply Bill goes through it is going to spend \$1 billion on Metronet, and it can start digging or do whatever it wants to do. It has not been approved by Parliament, but it will be approved when the budget goes through in September.

**Mr W.J. Johnston:** Only if it's in the budget!

**Mr A. KRSTICEVIC:** The member for Cannington is agreeing with me! He is saying that is okay as long as it is approved in September. He made a big point about the fact that the opposition was talking about Labor's election promises and was asking how they were funded and saying that they were not costed. He said it was inappropriate for us to ask how the money would be spent, but he said that it allowed the continued expenditure of the money of the state on items that have already been authorised. He said the government can spend money on things that have not yet been authorised, but will be authorised in the budget.

**Mr W.J. Johnston:** No, you can't. Until it is authorised, you can't spend it.

**Mr B.S. Wyatt:** No; only appropriations that have gone through the Parliament can I then use this money for. We are having a circular argument here.

**Mr A. KRSTICEVIC:** I am just trying to understand this.

**Mr B.S. Wyatt:** There is a process going on now—that is, the budget process—that will then appropriate moneys to programs and projects across all areas of government.

**Mr A. KRSTICEVIC:** Can the Treasurer explain the anomaly with clause 4 of the explanatory memorandum, which states —

This clause authorises the Treasurer to use the moneys granted under Clause 3 for the purposes of funding any services pending those services being voted by the Legislative Assembly during the 2017–18 financial year.

**Mr B.S. Wyatt:** For example, the budget that is currently in place voted to pay wages and programs, and things like that. That is what the Supply Bill can be allocated to, but anything else we can only appropriate once the Parliament has appropriated it, and that will happen on 7 September, or when the budget is presented.

**Mr A. KRSTICEVIC:** The Treasurer is saying that the explanatory memorandum states that the government cannot —

**Mr W.J. Johnston:** You don't get it!

**Mr A. KRSTICEVIC:** I do get it. I am reading what the member for Cannington said about the past and what the explanatory memorandum says about the future. Yesterday, the member for Cannington was giving the opposition a hard time for asking about Treasury forecasts and funding, and he was saying how inappropriate it was for us to be raising that at this time and that we needed to talk about the Supply Bill.

**Mr W.J. Johnston:** That is what you're supposed to do.

**Mr A. KRSTICEVIC:** We had members on the government side talking about things in their electorate.

**Mr W.J. Johnston:** Because it's a general debate!

**Mr A. KRSTICEVIC:** Now it is a general debate! The opposition cannot bring up in general debate election promises and how the government is funding things, but government members can talk about grass growing in their electorates if they want to. It is interesting that that is the case.

**Mr B.S. Wyatt:** Member, I think you might find that was in response to the amendment to bring in, effectively, a budget process around it.

**Mr A. KRSTICEVIC:** It was, but his speech was in the general context of the Supply Bill.

**Mr W.J. Johnston:** No, it wasn't; it was about the amendment.

**Mr A. KRSTICEVIC:** I know it was about the amendment, but the member was talking about the Supply Bill.

**Mr W.J. Johnston:** I was explaining why the amendment was dumb. And it is so dumb you didn't even vote for it!

**Mr A. KRSTICEVIC:** That was my purpose. That is how petty you are. You are a very abusive individual. Your behaviour is very disrespectful.

**Mr W.J. Johnston:** Why didn't you vote for your amendment?

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Minister for Mines and Petroleum, please let the member for Carine finish.

**Mr A. KRSTICEVIC:** The minister still thinks he is in opposition. He is still acting like a child! It is ridiculous. Grow up! For God's sake, how old are you?

**Mr W.J. Johnston** interjected.

**Mr A. KRSTICEVIC:** How old are you? Listen to what you say and how you say it!

*Point of Order*

**Mr S.A. MILLMAN:** I wonder whether the member for Carine can address his remarks through the Chair, rather than to the Minister for Mines and Petroleum directly.

*Debate Resumed*

**Mr A. KRSTICEVIC:** Thank you very much! I am thankful for your protection from the Minister for Mines and Petroleum, and I will!

I was asking this because we are not going into consideration in detail, so I was a bit unsure what was being said and I thought I would ask someone intelligent in the Parliament, rather than someone who knows how to swear and jump up and down.

**Mr W.J. Johnston:** When have I ever sworn in this place? The only person I know who has sworn in this place is the Leader of the Opposition.

**Mr A. KRSTICEVIC:** I am not talking to the member for Cannington anymore. Can you give us some protection?

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Minister for Mines and Petroleum, will you please keep it down.

**Mr A. KRSTICEVIC:** I wanted a clarification from the Treasurer over whether there was some confusion there.

From the Treasurer's point of view, he does not see any reason that money that is approved in the September budget will start to be spent any earlier than that; is that right?

**Mr B.S. Wyatt:** I don't see any anomaly with clause 4, if that's what you're saying.

**Mr A. KRSTICEVIC:** From that point of view, the Treasurer is saying that things that are election promises that were not in the previous appropriation bill will not be funded out of this money prior to them being put in the budget in September?

**Mr B.S. Wyatt:** That's right.

**Mr A. KRSTICEVIC:** That is all I wanted to know. I just wanted a bit of clarification from someone who knows, rather than from someone who thinks they know.

**MR W.J. JOHNSTON (Cannington — Minister for Mines and Petroleum)** [12.56 pm]: I was not interested in speaking today in this debate on the Supply Bill 2017, but I will take three minutes to repeat exactly what I said last night and to go back over this. The member for Carine runs out of the chamber for obvious reasons: he does not want to know why he is wrong! Let me explain this again. The government is only permitted to spend money authorised by the Parliament. There is a separate question of supply—that is the right to issue a cheque; it is not what the cheque is written for but the actual fact of writing the cheque. That is what supply is.

Last night the opposition moved an amendment—not to the bill but to the second reading of the bill. The opposition wanted to restrict the Parliament's right to grant supply based on having an explanation about authorisation. They are two separate matters. The opposition did not move an amendment to the bill; it moved an amendment to the second reading debate. The second reading is the right of the Clerk to stand and read the bill a second time. Again, it beggars belief that the Liberal Party spent eight years in government and its members still do not understand the standing orders of the Parliament or what it was they were doing when they were passing legislation. I say again that it is very simple: the government may only spend money on individual items authorised by the Parliament. If that authorisation happens in the future, of course, the government will be allowed to do that because the Parliament, at some future time, authorises that expenditure. It is fundamental to the Parliament: a Parliament cannot restrict a future Parliament. That is so fundamental to what we do that it

beggars belief that we even have to discuss it. Let us assume that at a future date the Parliament authorises new expenditure, it will only happen after a debate. That is the opportunity for the opposition to deal with the underlying expenditure. That is why the opposition's amendment was so stupid. That is why members opposite did not even vote for it themselves. The idea of delaying supply is so mind-numbingly stupid that nobody ever does it. In fact, it has only happened once or twice in Australia's history—once in New South Wales in the 1920s, and in Canberra in 1975. In fact, the Australian Constitution was amended after the 1975 debacle to prevent it ever happening again. That is how dumb the opposition is! Members opposite just do not get it. No wonder the member for Carine ran out of the chamber the moment he finished his speech. Apparently he does not want to know this; he does not want to learn! He has been a member for eight years. He and I were elected on the same day. I would have thought that after eight years he would know the standing orders of the Parliament and the role of each of the bills that come before us, yet he does not. It is bizarre.

**MR M. HUGHES (Kalamunda)** [12.59 pm]: I rise in support of the Supply Bill 2017. I have been interested to hear the debate so far, particularly the contributions made by members of the opposition about supply. From my simple understanding, we are really discussing the means by which the government can secure the ordinary machinery and activity of government for the intervening period. I am pleased to contribute to this debate. Members will be aware that I come late to this Parliament in terms both of my age and the time of my preselection. I was not preselected until 3 December last year, and needed to work quickly to understand my electorate, which I continue to do. I am very attracted by the electorate, having lived in Darlington for the past 15 years. In fact, I had the former member for Kalamunda as my member of Parliament in this place.

There was an interesting aspect to the campaign, and I am not sure whether members present would be aware of similar activities in their own electorates. During the course of polling day I took the opportunity to visit every polling booth. Most of them, as members would be aware, tended to be co-located in schools. Around the schools I saw banners proclaiming that only John Day could build a performing arts centre and only John Day could reconstruct Lesmurdie Primary School. I cannot quite remember what John Day was going to do in Parkerville, but I had a mind to recollect that occasion one Saturday. I often go to Bunnings in Midland, and occasionally I would see Hon John Day there. It never occurred to me that he was in fact secretly acquiring the physical means by which he could repair Parkerville Primary School, rebuild Lesmurdie Primary School and, perhaps, even go so far as to do something about the shocking state of the special education resource centre that was co-located at Kalamunda Senior High School. I decided that if I was unsuccessful in being elected, perhaps I would take the time to lend a hand to the re-elected member for Kalamunda to assist him in those very worthwhile projects. Of course, all that was election spin, was it not? All these promises that the former government was making were part of building up the electorate to restore some semblance of credibility in the eyes of the public before the 11 March election. During the course of my visits around the electorate I managed to visit the principal of Kalamunda Senior High School. She expressed some great surprise that suddenly she was going to be given something in the order of \$3 million towards a performing arts centre. She had no knowledge whatsoever about where that came from.

We bring to this Parliament a mature party that, during the course of its time in opposition, has set about thinking seriously about the ways in which it could make a significant contribution to the betterment of this state, under Mark McGowan as Premier, and here we are beginning that process. Members will be aware that I was a schoolteacher. The focus of my activity was on my school in Mirrabooka. I acknowledge the fact that as principal of John Septimus Roe Anglican Community School, I looked interestingly at the prospect of having a Metro Area Express light rail station outside my school. In fact, my school council made a submission to the previous government proposing to give up part of the school's oval for a new centre development to provide a transport hub, and for the school to acquire some adjacent land. That was taken up with some degree of interest, but it was all fiction. That is a sad thing about my experience as principal of the school—taking seriously what the government had in prospect about the location of MAX light rail. It never happened. In contrast, Metronet will be legislated, and we are looking forward to the way in which it will provide stimulus to the economy and bring about job creation. I will not go over that too much this afternoon.

Being a latecomer to the process of the election, and having the focus of my attention for the past 21 years in Mirrabooka and Beechboro, inevitably I did not have the same kind of engagement as other members in this place with their electorates, where they have been working for a significant period with various community groups. However, I have been able to engage quite quickly with all the local authorities. I have met with the presidents and chief executive officers of the Shires of Mundaring and Kalamunda, and the deputy mayor and chief executive officer of the City of Gosnells, indicating to them that I and my colleagues in the East Metropolitan Region are intent on engaging with all the local authorities in furtherance of their objectives for their communities. It has also been my great pleasure to sit down with various ratepayer groups to discuss their concerns about their engagement with local authorities. It is my intention at some stage to talk with the Minister for Local Government about the grave concerns that ordinary people have about the delegated authority provided to officers within each of the local authorities on applications for development, and the ability for the officers to make deemed provisions about which applications comply with building codes. That often sets

neighbour against neighbour, particularly when there is no opportunity for third-party appeal rights. This is something I want to pursue further in the time I have in this place.

I have also been pleased to sit as a member of the public, holding the title of a member of the Legislative Assembly, in the public galleries of the local authorities in Mundaring and Kalamunda, and to engage with people who have particular concerns bringing petitions before the local authorities. It is a stark contrast, they say, with their experience of the previous member for Kalamunda, notwithstanding the fact that he was a minister for much of his time. People are delighted to have a local member of Parliament who is prepared to take an interest in their particular concerns, which operate at the individual level rather than at the macro level, although macro level decisions often affect people quite adversely.

I am also pleased to say that volunteering in the electorate of Kalamunda is evident at every corner I turn. I have had the great pleasure to meet with people from the Kanyana Wildlife Rehabilitation Centre, which looks after more than 2 600 animals a year. It accepts sick or damaged creatures brought to its doorstep and returns them to the wild. The centre was in a position of having to renegotiate its contract over Department of Parks and Wildlife land. It was a great delight for me to be able to represent its interests to the relevant authorities as the member for Kalamunda. The Kalamunda and Mundaring men's sheds are well known to me, as is the Darlington Sports and Recreation Association, in organising some assistance towards its pavilion. I might add that the previous member, Hon John Day, made an offer of something like \$75 000, I believe, towards the project of providing a pavilion. Under the local projects, local jobs program—I noticed that the member for Carine was waving a document about the promises that Labor had given ahead of the election—I had made a pledge of something in the order of \$100 000 towards building that pavilion. It was obviously a bipartisan approach to this particular project, because it was with great pleasure that I attended the turning of the sod at which Hon John Day enthusiastically took one of three spades to turn the sod on that development. I hope that opposition members are not too appalled by that prospect and wag their fingers at the Treasurer should he dare to advance that payment ahead of bringing down the budget.

I would like to let the member for Bicton know that I have taken a recent interest in bowling in a theoretical sense because I have been very honoured to take on the role of patron of the Kalamunda bowling club. Who knows, I may develop skills. I have noticed that coming up soon in South Australia is an inter-parliamentary bowling club activity. If I chance my arm, we might be able to organise a group to go.

I have about nine minutes to go. As part of my engagement with the community, I have met with the Bibbulmun principals' network group, which operates in the Kalamunda part of my electorate rather than the Mundaring part, to talk about its concerns across the board with the way in which primary and secondary schools in the area are experiencing constraints under the existing operations of the department. I have also met with the principals of Mundaring Primary School, Parkerville Primary School, Kalamunda Primary School and Gooseberry Hill Primary School, and accepted memberships on the boards of Lesmurdie and Kalamunda Senior High Schools and the Kalamunda Secondary Education Support centre. Anyone who knows me from my time as principal of John Septimus Roe Anglican Community School will recognise that I am a strong advocate for children with disabilities and the need to include them in mainstream classes. In fact, I dedicated almost 21 years to ensuring that we did that at that school.

The Kalamunda Secondary Education Support centre, which is co-located at Kalamunda Senior High School, is experiencing very poor conditions. It cannot be called a centre. The teachers do their planning and preparation in the corridors. There is some discussion about bringing an additional transportable classroom onto the site. The students have to find vacated mainstream student classrooms to find a teaching space, such is the timetable of constraints that exists. I hope I am making myself clear about the problems they are facing. I know that money is short. We know of the problems we are experiencing with what we might regard as the structural difficulties of our revenue stream. Both sides of the house can agree on the problems we are experiencing with the GST carve-up. However, I am going to advocate very strongly that within this term of government, if nothing else gets done in Kalamunda, and there are other needs as well, we do something about that situation. Those children deserve better. If it requires a bit of a pinch and tuck across the electorates, I hope that I will get some support from my colleagues on maybe changing the rollout of projects that are nominated in part of the document that the member for Carine was waving before the house. Those children deserve better than they are getting. I am very pleased that the Minister for Education and Training has accepted an invitation to visit the electorate in August. She will visit Kalamunda Senior High School and the co-located education support centre. We will also be looking at Lesmurdie Primary School and I hope I get the opportunity to take her to see Walliston Primary School too. The principals are very excited about the prospect of the minister coming. They were pleased that I was prepared to attend their forum meetings on a regular basis. They said that they do not expect me to work miracles because they are used to having very little done in their electorate after the previous government and their previous member. However, they expect to have a member who is interested in what they are doing and who is prepared to listen to and advocate for their concerns. That is exactly what I am doing with the Minister for Education and Training.

I could go on but I want to talk about the provision of aged care within the community, which is in desperate need. In doing so I would like to compliment the work of Hon Ken Wyatt, AM, MP, who initiated the Kalamunda Aged Care Committee and provided a foreword in that committee's report. He is equally concerned about the provision of aged care within the electorate. I concur with his introduction to the "Residential Aged Care Options in the Kalamunda Shire" report that was published in October 2015, in which he states —

Arguably the largest challenge we face lies in distribution of aged care services and facilities. We do not want to break up families, split apart couples and destroy communities by providing services that require people to undertake arduous travel to see their loved ones.

The aged-care situation in Kalamunda is at a critical stage.

I probably will not need an extension of time. I will try to conclude in the next three minutes.

This report's background information casts back to 2011 and indicates that at that time there were 257 aged-care beds in the electorate of Kalamunda and a shortfall of 191 beds, which was likely to grow to a shortfall of 435 beds in 2021. The report talks about a growing gap between the supply and demand for aged-care facilities, particularly at the nursing care level. We need to do something about the provision of high-need beds in the electorate of Kalamunda. Having talked to Ron Carey, a former City of Swan councillor who chaired a similar committee for the City of Swan, there is a recognition that we need to bring about an adequate supply of aged-care beds over the foreseeable future across the East Metropolitan Region. I have made some representations to the Minister for Planning about two particular developments in the Shire of Kalamunda that I would like to advance. I will not mention them by name this afternoon, but maybe there will be a further opportunity for me to ask questions of the minister about them tomorrow.

I am delighted to be the member for Kalamunda and to be solidly engaged in pursuing the agenda of the McGowan government. I look forward to engaging further with my community and bringing about the realisation of a number of issues that have remained un-tackled and unaddressed for the last eight years.

**MR S.A. MILLMAN (Mount Lawley)** [1.18 pm]: I rise to speak on the Supply Bill 2017. I do not propose to go over a number of the issues that I raised during my first speech in this place, but there are a couple of issues that to my mind will be forever pertinent to not just me but everyone who has the privilege of sitting in this chamber. Day after day, in my experience, the members in this chamber have wrestled with difficult, complicated and pressing problems. We have seen members in this chamber turn their mind, attention and energy towards tackling those problems in a way that realises the potential of Western Australia and provides the best for the citizens of this state.

We have the great privilege of living in a parliamentary democracy, which means that we can bring a bill like this Supply Bill before Parliament and the people of our respective constituencies know that we will do the responsible thing—ensure the passage of this bill and ensure that the business of government continues. There was some extensive debate yesterday and again this afternoon about the purpose of this bill and perhaps, more appropriately, I look forward to the contributions from all members, particularly those members opposite, when debating the budget later this year.

Before we get to that budget process, there are a number of matters pertaining to the electorate of Mount Lawley that should be reflected on in my speech to the chamber this afternoon. The first thing that I will say—it is in line with what I said earlier about the privilege of being in a parliamentary democracy—is that we won in a relatively decisive election result. I know that all those members who sit on the government benches and, I am sure, many members who sit on the opposition benches worked very hard in consulting with their communities in advancing a positive program in what they thought were the best interests of their communities and the best interests of the state. For my own part, in the electorate of Mount Lawley, the way in which we ran the campaign was to identify relative local issues that were of concern to the community, to consult with the community and then to formulate policies that would tackle those concerns. When we first went out doorknocking, people were worried about privatisation, the rising cost of living and the cost of electricity prices, overcrowding in local government high schools, congestion and access to good-quality public transport, and preserving our architectural and built heritage. It is true to say that I am very grateful, very honoured and very privileged to live in Mt Lawley. It is definitely one of the most salubrious parts of Perth, but it is thus because so much effort and attention has been put into preserving the architectural heritage of the suburbs that make up the electorate. In that regard, I would like to commend the work of the Mount Lawley Society and its president, Paul Collins, and its immediate past president, Hon Tim Hammond, MP, member for Perth. This organisation focuses on making sure that the suburbs of Mt Lawley, Menora, Coolbinia and Inglewood remain terrific places to live, work, visit and do business.

Once we had identified those problems that I have outlined, it was a very straightforward matter for us to go back to the drawing board and arrive at policies that would alleviate those problems. On the issue of congestion on the roads through the electorate of Mount Lawley, such as Flinders Street, Wanneroo Road, Fitzgerald Street, Alexander Drive and Beaufort Street, it was quite clear to me and my campaign team that we needed a significant investment in a congestion-busting infrastructure project like Metronet. We need to make promises

on public transport that are achievable and realistic, that inspire the imagination of the community and that unlock the potential of the state. When people look at our plan for Metronet, they can see that it ticks all those boxes. By building a railway line from Morley to Ellenbrook, we will alleviate congestion on the roads through my electorate. By investing in an extension of the Joondalup line to Yanchep, we will alleviate congestion on Wanneroo Road.

We took a promise to the election to build an inner-city high school to alleviate the overcrowding that was already occurring at Shenton College and Churchlands Senior High School—overcrowding that was a tidal wave about to break over Mount Lawley Senior High School and have potentially significant adverse pedagogical consequences for students at that school. Having listened to the community, we have come up with a brilliant proposal to build a brand-new school at Kitchener Park, which will have immeasurable benefit in alleviating that problem of overcrowding in these schools. The reason we identified this problem and the reason we formulated a policy, and then amended the policy and landed on a policy that will deal with overcrowding, is that a core Labor value is providing quality public education to the people of Western Australia. Unfortunately, after eight and a half years of neglect, we were left with a legacy of significant overcrowding in schools in the western suburbs and the inner city.

The next issue that was regularly canvassed with me in the campaign was the current state of Western Australia's finances. I am sorry to say but, unfortunately for members opposite, the people I spoke to realised that the then government of the day had become addicted to its profligate spending. The people I spoke to knew that unless there was a dramatic and drastic change of direction—the sort of change that can be achieved only by a change of government—the situation would only get worse. We confront a significant problem. The debt that this state carries is bigger than it has ever been before. We can stand here and say that there is a problem with our GST distribution and that is fine, but I implore not only members on our side, but also members opposite to give due consideration to what can be done by this chamber and Parliament to address this issue. Surely by working together and figuring out what can be done, we can discharge that sacred duty we have to the people of Western Australia to do the right thing.

Yesterday, complaints were made by members opposite that we had come up with election policies that were going to cost some \$5 billion to implement. Once again, it saddens me to say this but it is true: the ideology that shaped and drove the way in which members opposite previously implemented their financial decisions has now been discredited. Their attack on our election promises fails to understand two fundamental tenets: first, this is a parliamentary democracy whereby citizens get to decide how they will be governed, and the citizens have voted overwhelmingly for us and our program; and, second, sometimes money needs to be spent on significant infrastructure projects to make the economy function more efficiently—on projects like Metronet and, hopefully, an outer harbour at Kwinana, on reinvesting in schools, and on expenditure like freezing TAFE fees so that more people can access quality post-secondary education and have the skills and experience they need for the jobs of the future. I read the other day that 65 per cent of the jobs that our children in primary school will do have not even been invented yet. That sort of statistic should give us pause for thought. Now is not the time for us to divide on and bicker about issues of ideology. Now is the time for us to come together to do things. I am very proud to be spending \$20 000 on a robotics program at Mount Lawley Primary School. These initiatives will help the students at those schools develop the skills and expertise they need to apply when they come to perform those jobs of the future.

Government has an essential role to play in making people's lives easier, but also in making them more fulfilling. Members can hear from my tone that I am not necessarily one to invoke narrow partisanship. In that regard, one of the things that we are spending money on is the Alexander Park Tennis Club. What could be better than spending money on refurbishing the local tennis club to encourage people to participate in sport and recreation? This money is going to be supplemented, therefore multiplied, by money being contributed by the local council—that is, the City of Stirling. Two dollars together is better than one dollar from the state government doing one thing and one dollar from the local council going in the opposite direction. I commend the City of Stirling and the state government for their contributions to the Alexander Park Tennis Club. It might interest members to know that it just so happens that my predecessor, the former member for Mount Lawley, is a member of the Alexander Park Tennis Club. Members can rest assured that I will put aside partisanship and I will even encourage the expenditure of money that will directly benefit Hon Michael Sutherland in his—I was going to say retirement—post-election period.

Our election commitments also involve spending money on things like the sump on the corner of Wellington and Flinders Streets in Yokine. Unfortunately, this unsightly water sump, controlled by the Water Corporation, is in a fantastic location. The City of Stirling came to us during the election campaign and asked if we were elected whether we would be prepared to lobby the government for an investment to turn this sump into a local park. This is a fantastic contribution to the local community because it will reinvigorate and re-enliven the whole area. All of a sudden, the industrial wasteland of this sump will be revitalised into a terrific local park, which will be a fantastic amenity that everybody will be able to use. Once again, this is a co-contribution from the state government and the City of Stirling.

Members will remember that I spoke about the magnificent diversity of the Mount Lawley electorate in my first speech. I commend the work of an aged-care provider in the community by the name of Umbrella Multicultural Community Care. Although it is not based in Mt Lawley—it is based in Bedford—it does a significant amount of work throughout the Mount Lawley electorate. Umbrella brings together people from multicultural backgrounds, many of whom have English as a second language, and provides them with a space where they can meaningfully participate in social and recreational activities. I am very proud to be a supporter of Umbrella. I also commend the work of our local community-based childcare centres: Meela Child Care Centre, Mount Lawley Child Care Centre and the Marjorie Mann Lawley Day Care Centre. These community childcare centres are supported by their local councils, and will also receive support from the state government. I am very privileged to have the fantastic radio station RTRFM located in Mt Lawley. Part of our election commitment is to allocate funding to RTR so that it can reinvestigate its operations and hopefully retain local managers and programmers in order to preserve employment.

I commend the work of the fantastic local sporting clubs in our community. As many members would be aware, sporting clubs provide a fantastic forum for members of the community to come together and engage with their neighbours, families and friends. Let me do it like this. We have a number of terrific parks in the Mount Lawley electorate and over weekends those parks are full of people participating in games and activities. At Hamer Park on any given weekend in the winter, people can see the Mt Lawley Football Club Hawks seniors and the Mt Lawley Inglewood Roos Junior Football Club. During the summertime, people can see the Mt Lawley–Inglewood Cricket Club. Over at Yokine Reserve, people can see the Coolbinia Bombers Junior Football Club, the Coolbinia West Perth Amateur Football Club Falcons, Yokine cricket clubs and various other sporting organisations. All this activity is going on in an area where there is a fantastic adventure playground. I am very proud to say that we will be making a contribution towards the upgrade of the Coolbinia Bombers' facilities and providing them with a contribution to purchase additional equipment. I place on the record my appreciation for the fantastic work done by my colleague the member for Morley in negotiating this.

At the northern end of the electorate, just on the other side of Morley Drive, is Dianella Open Space, which is used by the Inglewood Little Athletics Centre and the Dianella White Eagles Soccer Club. It is a fantastic location that is well utilised by both of those groups and also by people in the wider community. It was a great privilege for me to be able to attend the Dianella White Eagles soccer match with my good friend the member for Forrestfield on Saturday afternoon to see the game between the Dianella White Eagles and Forrestfield United Soccer Club. I place on the record just how proud I am of the Dianella White Eagles who won that game 4–2, despite getting off to a slow start against Forrestfield. For a moment there I thought that Pricey might have our measure.

Through the issues I have canvassed in my short speech this afternoon, members can understand just how vibrant the Mount Lawley electorate is and just how much a revived, passionate and committed government will invest in our local community to make a significant difference for the benefit of all our constituents. That is something of which I am and will remain forever proud.

**MS J.J. SHAW (Swan Hills)** [1.35 pm]: I rise to support the Supply Bill 2017. This is a really important budget for the people of Swan Hills because I do not think that there is a community that had been more let down by the previous Liberal government than the people of Swan Hills, particularly the people of Ellenbrook. We all know about the promises made to the people of Ellenbrook and how badly those people were let down—the promises around heavy rail; Metro Area Express light rail, which indirectly would have benefited my community; and then the absolute insult of the solution of a nine-kilometre bus lane to help the people of Ellenbrook. The issues of the people in Ellenbrook are well documented. The Housing Industry Association released some statistics this week. In the last 12 months, Ellenbrook has grown by 9.2 per cent. It was the third-fastest growing suburb in Perth. Between 2006 and 2011 the population grew by 79 per cent. Even in the last three years, the population has doubled in that part of the world. We have had rapid population growth, but we have not had the services and infrastructure required to support that community. In March, the people of Ellenbrook said enough is enough. I am a proud advocate for the Supply Bill and the projects that Labor has committed to deliver to try to alleviate these shocking infrastructure problems that my constituents experience.

As many members know, Lord Street is the main arterial road between Ellenbrook and the southern parts of the electorate. About 14 000 cars use Lord Street every day, and the traffic jams are very often two and a half kilometres. It can take 25 minutes to traverse five kilometres and the people of Ellenbrook are sick to the back teeth with this absolutely horrifically inadequate transport infrastructure. The McGowan Labor government is getting on with the job of finally sorting out that situation. One of the first commitments we made as part of our Metronet policy was for the duplication of Lord Street; a project that is well and truly overdue. We will duplicate Lord Street and create a dual carriageway to link Gngangara Road to Reid Highway. As part of the project we will establish a Park 'n' Ride facility at the top end that will facilitate linkages between Joondalup, Ellenbrook and Midland and allow the people in my electorate to traverse between the eastern and western suburbs to access hospitals, education facilities and Centrelink. It is amazing that people in a suburb with a population as big as

Ellenbrook—41 000 people—do not have the ability to access essential services using functional public transport. We intend to change this; we will introduce better quality public transport. I am proud to be part of the McGowan Labor government that will do that. Many flow-on benefits will come from easing congestion on Lord Street in particular. Although it is not in my electorate, but in the neighbouring electorate of West Swan, I am excited about the easing of congestion it will bring to West Swan Road, which is a prime tourist destination and it employs a number of people in the electorate of Swan Hills. I think the Minister for Planning has been the greatest champion for public transport and road infrastructure solutions. I want to acknowledge the hard work and effort she has put in, and her untiring advocacy for these issues. It will be a great thing when she finally gets to turn the first sod on the construction of the Lord Street duplication. We can compare that to the nine-kilometre bus lane that was the rapid bus transit system and the ongoing broken promise of the Ellenbrook rail line.

**Mr S.A. Millman:** Shame.

**Ms J.J. SHAW:** Shame, indeed, member for Mount Lawley, but you know all about broken promises on public transport.

Our solution for Lord Street will also enable us to undertake preliminary works for the Ellenbrook rail line, and I look forward to seeing that project come to fruition. It will benefit not just my electorate of Swan Hills but also West Swan and the member for Morley's electorate will stand to gain from it. It is indicative that when we look at the way the seats fell throughout the East Metropolitan Region and the northeast corridor, it is now a sea of red because the people were tired of their infrastructure requirements being so wholly ignored and unacknowledged.

Delivery of the Morley–Ellenbrook railway line into Ellenbrook will complete our town centre. It will create a bustling, thriving town centre. There will be intelligent planning solutions with mixed-use facilities. There will be a lot of activity and a lot of jobs will be delivered into the area. It will really complete the area. It is about time we had a government that was genuinely committed to delivering better solutions for Swan Hills. In addition to the paltry level of infrastructure investment for the people of Swan Hills, there has also been an abject lack of service provisions to the area. This includes aged-care facilities and also an issue that is particularly close to my heart, which is support for youth. Our commitment to deliver mental health and youth suicide services to the electorate of Swan Hills is one of the things I am most proud of. It is a highly relevant issue. It is a well-documented and growing problem in my electorate. As part of my initiation into becoming the member for Swan Hills, as I went around and met every one of my local parents and citizens associations, I was horrified by the number of times that principals and P&C associations mentioned the rising levels of anxiety, stress and isolation that children are feeling. That is because we are so remote and so un-serviced out there, and this needs to change. I am proud of the commitment we made to increase youth suicide and mental health services. The development of a dedicated youth facility in Ellenbrook, in the electorate of Swan Hills, is the other commitment I am particularly proud of. It will be a place where kids can go and hang out and socialise. It may be a bit of a refuge from domestic violence, which is certainly a growing problem in Swan Hills.

Another commitment we made to young people in Swan Hills is the establishment of a child and parent centre. The north east metropolitan area is the only part of Perth that currently has no child and parent centre. What was the former government thinking! It is the fastest growing part of the metropolitan area and it has no child and parent centre. I find that absolutely astonishing.

**Mr C.J. Barnett** interjected.

**Ms J.J. SHAW:** The member for Cottesloe had eight and a half years.

Several members interjected.

**Ms J.J. SHAW:** If the member for Cottesloe were not so focused on his vanity projects, perhaps he would have taken the time to respond to the needs of young people in my area!

Several members interjected.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Members!

**Ms J.J. SHAW:** How dare the member for Cottesloe sit there and catcall me across the chamber when he has failed my community for such a long time! How dare he, indeed.

Several members interjected.

**Ms J.J. SHAW:** The gall, Madam Acting Speaker!

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Members!

**Mr C.J. Barnett:** You'll learn.

**Ms J.J. SHAW:** I will tell you what, I have learnt from observing the way you operate and I am determined never to conduct myself and not listen to people in the way that you have!

Several members interjected.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Members!

**Ms J.J. SHAW:** I have learnt never to be as arrogant and as out of touch, and in a complete state of denial about what my community is demanding of me.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Member for Swan Hills. Thank you, members.

**Ms J.J. SHAW:** The other commitments that we made to young people in the electorate of Swan Hills were about EduCare. For people who live in an outer metropolitan seat, as I do, it is a long way to get in to work every day. Particularly at a time when families are struggling and they really need to rely on two incomes, it is important for people to be able to drop their kids off before and after school at high-quality facilities and for them to know they are in a safe place. It is important that parents are doing only one drop-off in the morning. For people who live in remote areas of the metropolitan region, having access to facilities like EduCare is really important. I think it will be a wonderful thing that will really benefit the people of Swan Hills.

Another commitment that reflects my professional background, in which I regularly geek-out on all things energy, is our Science in Schools policy. In primary schools, we will establish dedicated science labs. I cannot tell members how important I think it is for us to introduce a spark of interest in science at a time before science and technology typically become gendered. It is really important that we get girls interested in science and get people really engaged and involved in science at an early age because that can set us up really well for the future. This is particularly at a point when, over the longer term, we need to think about economic diversification and the industries of the future. I am very excited about that policy. One of the first gigs I got as a preselected candidate was to go up to the hills with Minister Ellery and the Premier and we announced the Science in Schools policy at Gidgegannup Primary School. It is a tiny school that is a couple of kilometres down the road from my house. It is an absolutely beautiful school. The staff are doing a fantastic job. It is great to see that even in a relatively remote school, there is still a focus on getting science into schools and getting kids interested in it.

As a remote part of the Perth metropolitan area, the establishment of urgent care clinics and medihotels are the other real benefits that my electorate stands to gain from the current budget. Although it is a metropolitan seat, my seat extends all the way up past Morangup, which is nearly halfway to Toodyay. Believe me, with 982 square kilometres, I have done a lot of petrol miles, and it is a very long drive from the outer reaches of my electorate, up past Bullsbrook in some instances, to the closest hospital, which is Midland Public Hospital. The ability for people to stay overnight proximate to hospital facilities, and have their loved ones close to them if need be when they have to travel such a long way, will really benefit people in Swan Hills. The ability to access closer urgent care clinics and not have to travel all the way down, deep into the metropolitan area, for not-quite-so-serious medical ailments will also benefit the people of Swan Hills.

I acknowledge some of the issues that my colleague the member for Kalamunda raised about aged-care facilities. That is very problematic in my part of the hills. There is quite a bit of overlap and commonality between the issues that people in Mundaring experience and those of the people in Mt Helena and Chidlow. I think it is wonderful that the government intends to examine opportunities to increase the availability of land for aged-care facilities and ways to accelerate the development of those facilities. They will most certainly benefit the people of Swan Hills. The other thing I think is quite interesting regarding aged care is the Strata Titles Act reforms that this government will propose. I hope they will strengthen the rights of our seniors to participate in processes that affect strata title, particularly for aged-care facilities. I hope it will provide more strength for the elderly who sometimes find they are completely disempowered in aged-care facilities and not particularly able to participate in processes. I look forward to seeing how that bill develops and how those measures will be implemented over time. I look forward to seeing the rights of aged people in my electorate effectively championed and protected. The other important and interesting part of those proposed reforms is that they allow common title to assets in subdivisions and property developments, which facilitates the installation of things like common solar panels and battery technologies that are available to offset the energy costs of all people who decide to reside within subdivisions or strata title properties. That is just one example of the ways in which this government will facilitate the innovation economy and will finally look to genuine opportunities to diversify our economic base and to create the opportunities of the future.

It is absolutely disgraceful that in 2013–14 there was a 53 per cent drop in employment in renewable energy industries in Western Australia. We have the lowest number of full-time equivalents in renewable energy activities of any Australian state. This is at a time when the International Renewable Energy Agency currently states that 7.7 million people worldwide are employed in renewable energy industries, and that by 2030 that number will double. What have we done? We have gutted our industries capability from an abject lack of leadership in energy policy and a blinkered vision on old industry structures. We have not been able to turn our minds to the opportunities of the future, which is an absolute disgrace. I really look forward to being part of a government that will focus on those new industries and will have research programs aimed specifically at renewable energy technologies and batteries. It will work with those technologies and look at those dynamic

opportunities that we really should focus on. We now have a government that is delivering a range of macro policies that will have incredible benefits on a micro level in every electorate in this state. I thank the McGowan government for the leadership that it is showing and the benefits it will deliver to the people of Swan Hills.

**MS A. SANDERSON (Morley — Parliamentary Secretary)** [1.52 pm]: I apologise for rising a little bit slowly. I was taken by surprise through the member for Swan Hills finishing up very rapidly. I have enjoyed members' contributions to the second reading debate on the Supply Bill 2017 and I rise to make my contribution to the debate. I want to talk about one of the major projects that affect my electorate of Morley—that is, the NorthLink project. NorthLink is a combined state and federal project that I believe was instigated by the previous federal Labor government in conjunction with the previous state Liberal government. It was designed to ease congestion, which is pretty chronic, along Tonkin Highway and to provide a clear route through Swan Hills and West Swan up to Muchea. I want to touch from my perspective on how much of that project was handled in my electorate and my community by the previous government.

I will start with the incidents around Hampton Park Primary School, which is literally the school that the previous government forgot in its NorthLink planning. I think this case is demonstrative of how the previous member for Morley approached his electorate in that he had very little knowledge of what was going on in it. I attended a parents and citizens association meeting at that school about seven to 10 days before I was due to have my baby. I was expecting it to be my very last work commitment, and I had promised my partner that it would be and that I would not do any more. I attended the meeting, which was packed. I was surprised at that because it is often hard to get six or seven true believers in a room at P&C meetings. This meeting had a full turnout of parents and the principal. The main issue they wanted to talk about was the looming closure of the pedestrian tunnel underneath Tonkin Highway from their school. Seventy per cent of the school's student catchment lives on the other side of Tonkin Highway from the school. Main Roads and the then government, in their wisdom, had decided to close the tunnel and that there would not be another tunnel. They also decided to close all the car parking available. That was where all parents parked because 70 per cent of the catchment came from the other side of Tonkin Highway. Parents were deeply concerned, and no planning had been put in place by the department or the government to get kids across what was going to be a massive construction area and eventually a six to eight-lane freeway. I would like to say that planning was inadequate, but planning was completely absent. At the very last minute, Main Roads suggested some buses and then it suggested that kindy children could be walked through the construction site and eventually across the giant roundabout that would be built there. It suggested that it was perfectly fine and that it was perfectly happy with that.

The parents were deeply concerned about the ongoing viability of the school because, quite frankly, a lot of the schools in my electorate are older schools that struggle with enrolments. When many schools are now independent public schools able to take children from outside of catchment areas, parents were deeply concerned about future enrolments at this school. Parents would have to make a choice between sending their children to a school that they could walk to, cycle to or be driven to or making their children cross an eight-lane freeway. This was a serious crisis for the school. The principal and the P&C president told me that they had made numerous representations to the then local member, to the government and to the department about the issue but had heard literally nothing back from them. They were desperate because construction was imminent and there was no plan to get kids to the school. In opposition, we had few avenues available to us to influence government policy, one of which was to create a lot of noise and sound around an issue. Therefore, I and the member for Bassendean—whose electorate most of the kids came from—organised a group of parents one morning outside the tunnel. We thought that there would be about 10 to 20 parents but there were literally 100 parents outside the tunnel. Those parents were angry and had been let down because the government had completely ignored the school. In fact, on a number of the released NorthLink maps, the school did not even appear; it had dropped off the map. The government had done no planning at all for the school.

It was not until we had created a bunch of noise, ended up on the Channel Nine morning news, and raised the issue in Parliament that the former member for Morley and the former minister realised that this was an issue and eventually came to the party. It took that much time for them to do that. They came with a very poor proposal, I have to say. They landed at a community meeting at which the minister did not front up. He sent Main Roads representatives with a plan to walk the children across a massive intersection. These will be the biggest intersections ever seen in Western Australia. The plan was that it was perfectly fine and perfectly safe for parents to walk their children across the intersection or get them to ride their bikes through the intersection every morning. It was completely unacceptable and the community said, no, it was not acceptable at all. To give the government credit, it agreed to and came back with a plan for a pedestrian tunnel. That was the first major failing of community consultation. The school said that it had not been engaged in the consultation process at all.

Moving further up the electorate along NorthLink along Tonkin Highway, there is the issue of Lightening Park access. Lightening Park is a significant community asset in the seat of Morley. It was opened around 20 years ago by the then mayor, John D'Orazio, and the City of Bayswater. It is highly utilised by people outside as well as inside the electorate. The very successful football team, the Noranda Hawks, operate out of the park as their

home ground. It is used for T-ball events and a range of other football and soccer events. People come from north, south, east and west to that significant community asset and sporting field. There are only two ways to get in and out of Lightning Park Recreation Centre—off Tonkin Highway and off Reid Highway. An ironclad commitment was given to the residents around Lightning Park in Noranda that they would always remain open and not be subject to high volumes of traffic in and out in intense times, particularly on weekends and evenings, accessing that park. There is literally a very, very narrow road network around that park. A community consultation process was engaged in.

Debate interrupted, pursuant to standing orders.

[Continued on page 896.]

### QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

#### PERTH CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL — PRACTICAL COMPLETION

**124. Mr W.R. MARMION to the Minister for Health:**

I refer to the briefing note that the minister received on 12 April described as “Joint Briefing Note for the Treasurer and Minister for Health”, and titled “Perth Children’s Hospital — Practical Completion”. Can the Minister for Health confirm that he undertook practical completion of the hospital on the basis that lead is, and I quote, “a minor defect”?

**Mr R.H. COOK replied:**

I would like to thank the member for the question because I, too, am wondering why I am spending so much of my time cleaning up the mess left behind by the people on the other side. I, too, am wondering, as we peel more layers off the onion, at the level of incompetence shown in relation to the Perth Children’s Hospital project. We took practical completion of this hospital project because we are taking control. The Premier made serious commitments about the hospital. First, that we will take control; we have done just that. Second, that we would be absolutely transparent with the people of Western Australia. I have tabled documents in this place and provided documents in public via websites and so forth over the past few weeks, so that the public, too, can just see what a hopeless bunch the Liberal Party was in government.

The third commitment made by the Premier was that we would fix the lead problems, and we are undertaking that very task. This is not a simple process. It is one in which we have had to narrow the potential sources of the lead, and it is one whereby we now have to undertake the phosphate treatment process in order to get the water to the level required. I am very pleased to advise the chamber that we are making some good progress on that testing, and I very much look forward to the Chief Health Officer being able to, in the very near future, certify the hospital water as safe for the sick kids who will ultimately be using it.

But we will not open this hospital until it is safe for patients. We will not compromise the safety of kids’ health in this state. But one thing we will do is be transparent with the people of Western Australia. We will take control of this project and we will fix up the mess you mob left behind.

#### PERTH CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL — PRACTICAL COMPLETION

**125. Mr W.R. MARMION to the Minister for Health:**

I have a supplementary question. Will the Minister for Health now admit that he took practical completion of Perth Children’s Hospital against the advice he would have received that lead was a major defect, and he considered it a minor defect and took practical completion?

**Mr R.H. COOK replied:**

We took practical completion on the advice of the departments running this particular project. Part of that advice was that we could mediate and mitigate the issues in relation to the water in a manner consistent with the contract arrangements for the hospital. One of the things that practical completion allows us to do is get more staff onto the hospital site. While we have more staff on the hospital site —

**Mr B.S. Wyatt interjected.**

**Mr R.H. COOK:** Yes, because under practical completion we, essentially, take control of the site from the construction company.

While we have more people on the site, we can begin in earnest the commissioning process for the hospital. The importance of that is that we want to have this hospital open as soon as possible. We want it open as soon as possible, and the quickest way we can do that is to make sure that we can begin the commissioning process as quickly as we can. We cannot finalise that process until we have access to the full facilities of the hospital, such as usable water content. However, in the meantime we are making good progress. We are looking forward to this hospital being open to continue to provide world-class health care for the people of Western Australia, and we are desperately looking forward to resolving all these issues left behind by the previous government.

## STATE FINANCES

**126. Mr R.R. WHITBY to the Treasurer:**

I refer to the state of the budget and claims by the opposition that Western Australia is in a better situation now than it was before the election. Is that true; and, if not, what is the situation?

**Mr B.S. WYATT replied:**

I thank the member for Baldivis for that question. I hope he has recovered from his car park dust-up with a former Premier last night!

The member will be surprised to know that the state of the finances has not improved since the state election. I was surprised, members, when last night we were debating the Supply Bill 2017 and amendments to that bill when the shadow Treasurer made the point that, and I quote —

I find it somewhat concerning that the current government is blaming the rate of GST return and royalty income for the dire financial situation the state is in, ...

The first point is that I am not blaming those; I am blaming the performance of the previous government on the state of the finances. But then the shadow Treasurer went on to make this point —

... yet this government is not worse off in terms of its GST share and it is better off on iron ore royalties.

I can only assume that the shadow Treasurer when in cabinet was going in and standing on his head—when everything was up it was up, and down was down and revenue was surging! Anyone who can think the finances of the state have improved has not been listening since the state election, and has not been following the obvious. I note the shadow Treasurer referred to, as his proof of evidence, the *2016–17 Quarterly Financial Results Report* for March 2017—therein lies his argument. This is not a document to which the former government should hold itself accountable. Let me tell you that right now. This document, members, is the first document that shows the state's net-debt-to-revenue ratio is now above 100 per cent. It is the first financial document to show the net-debt-to-revenue ratio above 100 per cent. I remind those members who have not been around so long that the previous Labor government had a net-debt-to-revenue ratio target of under 47 per cent; we are now at 103 per cent, thanks to the information provided in Treasury's most recent quarterly report.

But I remind the shadow Treasurer what has happened since the *Pre-election Financial Projections Statement*—a writedown of revenue of some \$2.6 billion. The shadow Treasurer says royalty revenue is up—no, royalty revenue is down by some \$882 million. When the price of iron ore goes from above \$60 per tonne to about \$53, as it is today, that will have an impact on the finances. It is lower than projected. Despite what the shadow Treasurer said—“not worse off in terms of its goods and services tax share”—there is another \$800 million in reduced GST expectations across the forward estimates; a combination of the pool, yes, but also lower than expected relativity. Land tax is down another \$325 million, and that will probably have an impact again in 2018–19, and of course the commonwealth budget has taken some nearly \$500 million extra out of our budget in respect of the spending in both health and education.

But I want to make a particular point. The dire financial situation we are in has been left to us by the Liberal–National Party coalition when it was in power. When I look at the projected revenue for 2016–17, all the way through to the end of the current forward estimates—2019–20—we are expecting revenue increases of around 16.5 per cent. In the former government's first full year in power—one year—it had revenue increases of over 13.5 per cent. All the way through to 2012–13, the former government had revenue growth of 32 per cent—32 per cent! But what did it also do? It increased net debt from \$3.6 billion to \$18.5 billion! That is what the former government did in its first term. Revenue was surging at rates we will not see again in my political lifetime, yet the former government managed to also increase net debt out to \$18.5 billion as at 2012–13. And now this document that the former government think paints a picture of the finances being actually better is showing that the net-debt-to-revenue ratio, for the first time, is above 100 per cent. The reality is that because of the dire financial situation left to us by the former government we now have to make decisions that we are being critiqued about, surprisingly, by the former boss of the Institute of Public Affairs around wages policy and in a number of other areas. We are now in a scenario of having to respond to the mess that the former government left, despite warning after warning that it was exposing the state's finances to the downturn —

Several members interjected.

**The SPEAKER:** Leader of the Opposition, every day I have to get you up! The question has been asked; just let us hear the answer.

**Mr B.S. WYATT:** That was despite the fact that the former government was warned by all of us on this side year after year that the assumption that iron ore prices were here to stay at record highs and that it was exposing the state to this and tying the hands of future governments, which it has done. Let me be clear: a \$2.6 billion revenue writedown since the *Pre-election Financial Projections Statement* has happened. It is not something I am making up. It is not something I am dreaming of. It is simply the reality.

**Dr M.D. Nahan** interjected.

**Mr B.S. WYATT:** Go and read the finances, former Treasurer, Leader of the Opposition.

**Dr M.D. Nahan** interjected.

**The SPEAKER:** You might say there is no evidence, but I have evidence. I am calling you to order for the first time, Leader of the Opposition.

**Mr B.S. WYATT:** Leader of the Opposition, the reality is that we are dealing with the financial situation you left to us, and the fact that you spent a career critiquing former governments that kept net-debt-to-revenue levels well below what you left to this government highlights the record for which you will be held to account.

#### PERTH CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL — PRACTICAL COMPLETION

##### **127. Mr W.R. MARMION to the Minister for Health:**

I refer to the minister's announcement almost two months ago on ABC radio, on 21 April, that the phosphate flush will be completed in one to two weeks.

- (1) Has the flush been completed?
- (2) Is the lead issue now resolved at Perth Children's Hospital?

**Mr R.H. COOK replied:**

- (1)–(2) I thank the member for the question. The phosphate treatment process certainly began around the time the member mentioned. It is not a process that you do one day and then leave it from there on. It is a process, and the initial flushes were done over that period, then we go back and test to see how it is going and then subsequent flushing is required. I have said that the phosphate treatment process is working, but we have not got to the point yet that we are happy with the results. We have achieved around an 89 per cent confidence rating but we need to get around 95 per cent before we are happy to move forward. The fact remains that we continue to treat the pipes in the phosphate treatment process. It is showing good progress, but we are not yet at the point at which we are happy with the outcome.

#### PERTH CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL — PRACTICAL COMPLETION

##### **128. Mr W.R. MARMION to the Minister for Health:**

I have a supplementary question. Does the minister now accept that he prematurely accepted practical completion of the Perth Children's Hospital and will he table the advice he received on whether he should accept practical completion or not?

**Mr R.H. COOK replied:**

No, I do not accept that assertion at all. We accepted practical completion for a whole range of reasons and understood, and understand today, that the water issue is one that remains outstanding and we continue to work assiduously both with the major contractor and with strategic projects and asset sales in the Department of Treasury. From that point of view, I will be happy to provide the shadow Minister for Health with a full briefing on these issues so he can be fully abreast of them.

#### FAMILY AND DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

##### **129. Ms J. FARRER to the Minister for Prevention of Family and Domestic Violence:**

I refer to the more than 55 000 reports of domestic violence incidents last financial year. What is this government doing to support victims of family and domestic violence?

**Ms S.F. McGURK replied:**

I thank the member for Kimberley for the question.

Before I answer that question, on behalf of the member for Cockburn, I acknowledge the students of Mater Christi primary school who are here today. Welcome, and I hope you find this question time instructive, or at least entertaining—one of the two!

The prevention of family and domestic violence is an important and crucial issue. We know that women and children in our communities bear the brunt of the cost of family and domestic violence. I have mentioned in this house before that WA has the second-highest rate of reported violence perpetrated against women in Australia and is second only to the Northern Territory. Today the Premier announced that this government, as the largest employer in this state, would be providing its employees experiencing family and domestic violence with access to 10 days' paid leave a year. It is an important commitment that we took to the election in a suite of commitments to respond to the considerable issue we have of family and domestic violence. As WA's first Minister for Prevention of Family and Domestic Violence I am very honoured to take on that issue.

I am proud that, as an employer, this state government is showing leadership on this issue by giving employees leave when they need it most. That paid leave sends a clear signal that the McGowan government is taking domestic and family violence very seriously. This particularly goes for those public sector workers in regional areas who might need to take leave for an extended period to seek legal advice, attend court appearances, or get medical assistance and the like, when they are particularly in need of that assistance, so this leave will come in useful.

I was surprised to hear the Leader of the Opposition say that the announcement of this leave was a rushed announcement. Of course, the former government had eight and a half years to support victims of family and domestic violence and did nothing. If fact, it was 2010 —

Several members interjected.

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Girrawheen, your own member is on her feet.

**Ms S.F. McGURK:** It was 2010 when the first provision was made for family and domestic violence paid leave as a workplace entitlement. This government had its entire period in office of eight and a half years to support victims. Even when we look at other employers who put in an entitlement to paid leave, the former government had over seven years to support victims of family and domestic violence as a model employer, but it did nothing. We are the last state in the country to support its employees in that respect. We are the last state to give them that support. The Leader of the Opposition might say, “Goodness me, the McGowan Labor has been rushed in its implementation of support for family and domestic violence paid leave”, but the former government had eight and a half years in government, and seven years from the first implementation of paid leave, and it did nothing. I know it is a novel idea to honour an election commitment, but that is what we are doing today, and I am very proud to announce it.

#### BUILDING INDUSTRY

##### 130. Ms M.J. DAVIES to the Treasurer:

I refer to the concerns of the Housing Industry Association outlined in today’s *The West Australian* that the Treasurer plans to destroy the building industry. Can the Treasurer today rule out further cuts to the first home owner grant and stamp duty exemptions for first home buyers?

##### Mr B.S. WYATT replied:

I am flicking through my documents to find out my plan to destroy the building industry! I assure all members of this house, anyone from the housing industry and, in fact, any Western Australian that I have no intention of destroying the building industry. It is not an intent any Treasurer would bring to a reasonable responsible government. I support the building industry. The building industry employs a lot of Western Australians and, indeed, is expected to do so. I understand the concerns of the housing industry and I think it is probably a fallout of the government’s decision to end six months early the first home owner grant boost. The first home buyer grant stays and will continue to stay. I want to emphasise that I do not want to destroy the building industry. I think it is an important industry; it does and will continue to not just employ a lot of Western Australians but also train a lot of Western Australians, and that is something we in the Labor Party are committed to.

#### BUILDING INDUSTRY

##### 131. Ms M.J. DAVIES to the Treasurer:

I have a supplementary question. Can the Treasurer today rule out further cuts to the first home buyers’ grant and the stamp duty exemptions for first home buyers, or is it his preference to destroy confidence in the building industry and slug young Western Australians because it is an easier fight to win than confronting the state’s two big mining companies for a 25c fee?

##### Mr B.S. WYATT replied:

There it is; there it is!

Several members interjected.

**The SPEAKER:** Members!

**Mr B.S. WYATT:** Yes, I know; I am waiting for Bill Murray to walk in here and start *Groundhog Day*.

I do not want to either destroy the building industry or to destroy confidence. I do not want to do either.

**Ms M.J. Davies** interjected.

**Mr B.S. WYATT:** I’ll come back to that, just wait. I do not know, Mr Speaker.

**The SPEAKER:** Leader of the National Party, I call you to order for the first time.

**Mr B.S. WYATT:** I do not want to destroy the building industry, and I do not want to destroy confidence in the building industry. I have made an announcement that the government has made a decision about the boost. There

is a budget being developed. I am not going to go into what is in and what is out between then and now, but let me say this: I think the member might have seen my comments in the story today. I am acutely aware of the importance of the building industry to Western Australia. I am acutely aware of that, and I want to protect that as much as I can, in a way that is supportive of the industry and a sensible use of taxpayers' dollars. That is what I said when I announced the early cessation of the boost.

**Ms M.J. Davies** interjected.

**The SPEAKER:** Leader of the National Party, I call you to order for the second time. You asked a question. You do not ask a question and then give the answer.

**Mr B.S. WYATT:** Just to underline the point, I certainly do not want to destroy the building industry.

#### NAVAL SHIPBUILDING PLAN

#### 132. **Mr Y. MUBARAKAI to the Minister for Defence Issues:**

I refer to today's advertisement, both in *The West Australian* newspaper and on its website, from the Liberal Party that suggested Western Australia is getting 50 per cent of the work on the federal government's naval shipbuilding program. Is this true; and, if not, what is the situation?

**Mr P. PAPALIA replied:**

I thank the member for Jandakot for the question and welcome him formally on the occasion of his first question. It is a wonderful and refreshing thing to see new representation in Jandakot and the elevation in the representation that the people of the electorate receive.

It has come to my attention that the federal Liberal Party here in Western Australia appears to be concerned that there may be some perception within the Western Australian electorate that perhaps Western Australia is not getting a good deal when it comes to shipbuilding and expenditure by the federal government on ship and submarine building. I am glad that that is the case, because I have been at pains in the lead-up to the election and subsequently, since I have been appointed as the first Minister for Defence Issues in this state, to educate people and try to convey the message that the Turnbull government, in the course of about a week, announced in the order of \$89.5 billion worth of ship and submarine construction and that \$86 billion of that money is going to South Australia. That is \$86 billion out of \$89.5 billion. I feel for the federal Liberal Party in Western Australia. I understand that it is feeling a bit sensitive at the moment, and a little bit vulnerable, and I can understand how it can see that that might not be a good message to come to Western Australians, noting how they are already feeling about the goods and services tax.

This sort of ad—I will seek to table these after I have used them, if you do not mind, Mr Speaker—that we saw firstly in the weekend newspaper as a double-page spread, I am reliably informed, costs in the order of \$83 000, to achieve a page 2 and 3 double-page spread.

**Mr S.K. L'Estrange:** Are you in opposition?

**Mr P. PAPALIA:** Does the member support this ad?

**Mr S.K. L'Estrange:** Yes.

**Mr P. PAPALIA:** Okay, good.

What happened was that when the Western Australian Liberal Party realised that Western Australians are not quite as silly as the party was hoping and do not buy the idea that \$86 billion going to South Australia and \$3 billion to Western Australia is a good deal in the financial analysis, it chose to use a different analysis. What it has chosen is numerical analysis. It has gone down to the number of hulls. We beat South Australia in the number of hulls. We are building 54 hulls in Western Australia, and only 31 in South Australia, and therefore we win. There is a small problem with the numerical analysis. Welders and steel fabricators are interested in the size of the build; they are actually interested in the size of the hull. A Pacific patrol boat has a displacement of around 162 tonnes. The future frigates, all of which are being built in South Australia, are about 3 800 tonnes, which is about 32 times bigger than the ships being built in Western Australia. Just because we have more hulls does not mean we get a better deal. Can members imagine the Liberals on the bridge of a battleship at Jutland? "I say, sir, Jerry seems to have an awful lot of dreadnoughts out there today." "Never mind, we've got a whole lot of Pacific patrol boats. We've got hundreds of Pacific patrol boats. We outnumber them with Pacific patrol boats. It's all a good deal."

Several members interjected.

**The SPEAKER:** Minister, I am sure you are getting to the end of this.

**Mr P. PAPALIA:** We shift from the number of hulls, which we win on, to being equal with South Australia, because if we do an analysis on the states that are building ships —

**Mr S.K. L'Estrange:** What are you doing about it?

**Mr P. PAPALIA:** Do you want me to tell you?

We are 50 per cent of the states that are building ships. That is a great deal—50 per cent of the states that are building ships. The member opposite asked what I am doing about, and I can tell him.

Several members interjected.

**The SPEAKER:** Members! Minister, I am sure you are getting to the end of this.

**Mr P. PAPALIA:** I can tell the member that last week I went to Canberra and met with the federal Minister for Defence Industries.

**Mr S.K. L'Estrange** interjected.

**Mr P. PAPALIA:** The member met with the minister in the car. When he was in the car, did he raise the share that Western Australia was getting of the ship build? Did he propose any alternatives? We proposed that they build frigates both in South Australia and Western Australia. We also proposed that they modular build the ships here and in South Australia. We also proposed that they build the superstructure here and the hulls in South Australia, all of which were rejected by the member's mates in Canberra. However, I was feeling generous towards Minister Pyne, because we had a very warm meeting in his office, so we offered some alternatives. We suggested that he look at creating a special operations hub here in Western Australia to exploit our leadership in cybersecurity and special forces, and mine countermeasures. We gave alternatives. The only question is: does the member for Churchlands support our proposals and Western Australian industry?

PERTH CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL —  
CONSTRUCTION, FORESTRY, MINING AND ENERGY UNION ACTIONS

**133. Mr P.A. KATSAMBANIS to the Premier:**

I refer to last month's decision of the Federal Court to impose penalties of over \$250 000 on the Construction, Forestry, Mining and Energy Union for industrial action at the Perth Children's Hospital, which delayed the project. Will the Premier ban all ministers and parliamentary secretaries and their staff from meeting or communicating with this rogue union, like he has with Brian Burke?

**Mr M. McGOWAN replied:**

The answer is clearly no.

PERTH CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL —  
CONSTRUCTION, FORESTRY, MINING AND ENERGY UNION ACTIONS

**134. Mr P.A. KATSAMBANIS to the Premier:**

I have a supplementary question. Is the Premier 100 per cent confident that the Construction, Forestry, Mining and Energy Union has not engaged in any activities that may have further delayed construction of Perth Children's Hospital?

**Mr M. McGOWAN replied:**

I remember last year when this issue was raging and the former Premier who is sitting over there, the member for Cottesloe, praised the CFMEU for uncovering asbestos in the roof spaces of Perth Children's Hospital. Perhaps in future, my friend ought to think before he asks dumb questions.

WORKERS' COMPENSATION AND INJURY MANAGEMENT ACT REVIEW —  
DECEASED WORKERS

**135. MR S.J. PRICE to the Minister for Commerce and Industrial Relations:**

I refer to the review into the Workers' Compensation and Injury Management Act 1981. How is this government responding to look after families of deceased workers, and why was action not taken sooner?

**Mr W.J. JOHNSTON replied:**

I thank the member for Forrestfield for the question. We all know that he is a strong advocate for working people, which contrasts with members opposite who do not care for working people.

In 2010, there was a legislative review of the Workers Compensation and Injury Management Act. In 2013, WorkCover released a discussion paper that the former minister tabled in the upper house in 2014. What happened then, member for Forrestfield? Nothing! Nothing happened with recommendations to improve benefits for working people in this state. This government has acted on those recommendations and we are increasing the benefits available to the family of deceased workers in this state from \$304 000 to over half a million dollars, and we are increasing the benefit for dependent children from \$58.10 a week to \$133 a week. We are also fixing the defective definition of "de facto" in this legislation that was ignored by the previous government. It is now 94 days since the election and we are acting on these issues.

I draw the attention of members to the fact that last year there was a death on a work site on Adelaide Terrace. A 27-year-old German woman fell 13 floors because she was allowed by her employer to work without a safety harness. The death of that unfortunate German backpacker who had no specific training for the industry has not been properly compensated because the former government did not take action when it accepted the recommendation to act in 2014. I also point out that there were two fatalities in East Perth in November 2015. Two Irish workers on a building site were crushed by a falling concrete panel. The de facto partner of one of those workers did not qualify as a dependent spouse by a matter of days under the archaic legislation that the former government took no action to repair. In 2014, the then government was told that if it wanted to protect working people, it must take this action. After an extensive four-year process that included employers, insurance companies, unions and other people in the industry, the government was recommended to act—and for three years it did nothing. Those individual people have suffered directly because of the lack of care from that former minister and those members opposite. Those members have to bear that cross for the rest of their lives. If they had acted as they were told they should have, those workers' families would have been more adequately compensated. No amount of money can ever compensate a person for the death of a loved one in these sorts of tragic circumstances in which builders allow a German backpacker to work without safety equipment or other temporary entrants into the country to have lunch in an unsafe environment. That is exactly what happened in the case of those two accidents, and you, members opposite, are responsible for that. The de facto partner of a worker who was killed has received no compensation because members opposite did not act or do their job. I have no idea what the former Minister for Commerce was doing, but he was not doing his job. Three years ago he received that recommendation following extensive consultation with the agreement of employers and insurers; everybody agreed to it. It took the Labor government under the leadership of the current Premier to act on this matter, and I am proud to be the minister responsible for those actions.

POTATO MARKETING CORPORATION — LEGAL PROCEEDINGS

**136. Mr D.T. REDMAN to the Premier:**

This question was asked in the upper house and the Premier chose not to answer it there. In the interests of accountability, I ask the Premier the same question in this house. I refer to the potato industry and related matters.

- (1) Did the Premier or his representatives make any written commitments to Mr Tony Galati or his nominated companies prior to the 2017 state election that if elected they would drop any civil action by the state against Mr Galati?
- (2) Will the Premier table copies of all correspondence between him and Mr Galati related to civil action by the state against Mr Galati?

**Mr M. McGOWAN replied:**

- (1)–(2) The answer to that question is: not to my knowledge. I have no recollection of signing any letters and I have no knowledge of anyone else signing any letters. That is the situation with any written correspondence. I want to repeat to the house that I do not agree with prosecuting people for growing potatoes. I notice that the Liberal Party is relatively quiet on this issue because it probably agrees with me that prosecuting someone for growing potatoes was a ridiculous consequence of an archaic law. The only people pursuing this issue are members of the National Party; it is a strange thing to pursue. Mr Galati, like him or love him, is a major employer of people in Western Australia. He employs hundreds if not thousands of people in Western Australia in his fresh food supermarkets and retailers of various descriptions, and on his farms and the like. For some reason, the National Party seems to hate Mr Galati. I do not hate Mr Galati. I support people employing people in Western Australia and I am not going to pursue prosecuting people for growing potatoes. As I have said before in this place, I think the member needs to answer the question about why he gave the potato growers \$14 million in compensation and then wanted to see someone prosecuted for growing potatoes.

POTATO MARKETING CORPORATION — LEGAL PROCEEDINGS

**137. Mr D.T. REDMAN to the Premier:**

I have a supplementary question. Where is the justice for those who did not break the law?

**Mr M. McGOWAN replied:**

Where is the justice? The previous Liberal-National Party government gave 70 potato growers or thereabouts \$14 million of taxpayers' money and they can still grow potatoes. They are free to grow as many potatoes as they like, as often as they like and they can sell them in the marketplace, as do broccoli, watermelon and cucumber growers. What an archaic group of dinosaurs these National Party members are! Look at them. They call themselves the party of agriculture, yet they want to deny people the right to grow potatoes. What is clear is that Labor is the party of agriculture because we support people growing potatoes. We want to see people growing potatoes.

**Mr V.A. Catania** interjected.

**The SPEAKER:** Member for North West Central, I do not think there are many spuds up your way, but I call you to order for the first time.

**Mr M. McGOWAN:** I want to see them growing potatoes on the beaches, on the landing fields and everywhere across this wide brown land of courageous people. I want to see that Australians have the right to grow potatoes, as they always should have.

#### TRANSPORT SYSTEM — CONGESTION

##### **138. Ms J.J. SHAW to the Minister for Transport:**

I refer to the survey released today by the Australian Automobile Association that shows that my constituents in Aveley spend 75 minutes a day stuck in traffic and those in Ellenbrook almost an hour. What is this government doing to address the Liberal government's neglect of our transport system and to improve congestion?

##### **Ms R. SAFFIOTI replied:**

I thank the member for Swan Hills. Is it not a refreshing change to have a member for Swan Hills who is pro infrastructure in this state? I think the member for Swan Hills might be pro the Ellenbrook rail line. Is it not a refreshing change for this house to have a member for Swan Hills who is pro public transport and pro an Ellenbrook rail line?

Several members interjected.

**The SPEAKER:** Members! Face the Chair, minister.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** Member for Swan Hills, of course, we are starting our planning for the Ellenbrook rail line. We have good commitments and are delivering key changes in the area. The duplication of Lord Street will help serve the residents of Ellenbrook and Aveley. We have the full duplication of Reid Highway, which will basically break the bottleneck that is there and has been created over years.

**Mr D.C. Nalder:** NorthLink.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** I am about get to it. It was with great pleasure that I was out there last week to turn the sod for the NorthLink project. The federal member for Pearce was at that press conference. It is funny that the opposition is claiming that it is its project, yet the federal member for Pearce seemed to claim credit for everything. This is how he claims the NorthLink project began.

**Dr M.D. Nahan** interjected.

**The SPEAKER:** Leader of the Opposition!

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** Who was it first funded by? Can anyone guess? That is right; federal Labor first funded that project. I acknowledged in that press conference that the contract was signed under the previous Liberal government, but the federal member for Pearce claimed entire credit for the project. I will go through what he said. How did the project come about, according to the federal member for Pearce? He claimed that he recalled five years ago going for an early morning run with the then opposition leader, Tony Abbott. His run with Tony Abbott created that project! It is quite funny that a federal government that is so committed to business cases claims that a run with Tony Abbott caused a \$1 billion project to be funded. We went through it. He is now a convert to the Yanchep rail line. In early March, he said that there was no business case for the Yanchep rail line and that it was not a priority, but now it was his idea. What did he say about the \$2.3 billion package—the one that the current opposition said could not be delivered? The federal member for Pearce played the key part in securing the \$2.3 billion deal. He is a genius! I always thought that he was the key source for the Leader of the Opposition. Do members remember what he said? He said that a key Liberal Party source told him that the deal would not be done to secure the PFL funding.

There is one project that I hope the federal member for Pearce changes his mind on, given his electorate includes the suburbs of Dayton, Brabham and Ellenbrook. What project do I hope the federal member for Pearce changes his mind on? It is the Ellenbrook rail line. I know the current opposition cannot bring itself to commit to that project.

**Mr S.K. L'Estrange** interjected.

**The SPEAKER:** Manager of opposition business, please!

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** It cannot commit itself to support that project. We see the member for Scarborough not supporting the Ellenbrook rail line. The Leader of the Opposition hates Ellenbrook and hates the concept of the Ellenbrook rail line. I hope the federal member for Pearce, who now has created the idea that he accepts total responsibility for the \$2.3 billion deal for the Yanchep rail line and NorthLink, is now a convert and supports the Ellenbrook rail line.

## SYNERGY — COMPETITION

**139. Mr D.C. NALDER to the Premier:**

I refer to the attack by the Australian Manufacturing Workers' Union's state secretary, Steve McCartney, on the Treasurer for preparing Synergy for retail competition by cutting costs, and I quote —

This is not the policy, it's not the party platform, ...

What is the policy on Synergy—the AMWU policy or the Treasurer's policy?

**Mr M. McGOWAN replied:**

We indicated before the state election that we are not the party that is going to privatise monopoly electricity utilities. We were very clear about that prior to the state election. We are very clear. Members opposite lost the election.

**Mr D.C. Nalder** interjected.

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Bateman!

**Mr M. McGOWAN:** I note that the member for Bateman did not have the courage to stand in the electorate of Bicton.

Several members interjected.

**Mr M. McGOWAN:** In hindsight, that was a good decision. The only way that the member for Bateman could stay in Parliament was if he had a seat with a 25 per cent majority. That is the only way he could remain here.

Clearly, I support the Treasurer and, clearly, our policy is not to privatise monopoly electricity utilities.

## SYNERGY — COMPETITION

**140. Mr D.C. NALDER to the Premier:**

I have a supplementary question. Given the government's commitment to opening up Synergy to competition, will the Premier be splitting Synergy into two gentailers or is he committed to the AMWU position of doing nothing?

**Mr M. McGOWAN replied:**

I do not know where the shadow minister is getting his various concepts from, but the opposition had eight and a half years in government. It did not progress. In fact, it brought Synergy and Verve back together and reduced competition. That was the policy of the opposition.

I will be very clear with the house and we have said it a number of times.

**Dr M.D. Nahan** interjected.

**The SPEAKER:** Leader of the Opposition, please!

**Mr M. McGOWAN:** We do need to increase fees and charges because of the shocking budget situation that the Liberal Party has left us in.

**Dr M.D. Nahan** interjected.

**The SPEAKER:** Leader of the Opposition, I give you plenty of opportunities. Now I call you to order for the second time.

**Mr M. McGOWAN:** We do need to increase fees and charges because of the shocking budget situation that we have inherited from the Liberal Party.

Several members interjected.

**The SPEAKER:** Members!

**Mr M. McGOWAN:** I think the people of Western Australia understand that the Liberal Party was the most shocking economic and financial manager in the history of the state. I think that some members opposite are embarrassed about the performance of the previous government and the legacy that was left to us. We are determined to improve the situation on behalf of the people of Western Australia, but in doing so, there is going to be some pain. We were very clear prior to the election about our position on privatisation. That has not changed.

## DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIVE SERVICES — BUDGET

**141. Mr B. URBAN to the Minister for Corrective Services:**

I refer to the Department of Corrective Services budget that was left in an absolute shambles by the Liberal-National government. What is the current situation?

**Mr F.M. LOGAN replied:**

I thank the member for Darling Range. If anybody in this house knows about the shocking state of affairs with the finances of the Department of Corrective Services, there is no better person than the member, given his background in adult corrective services. He knows a lot about this issue.

As the Premier has just indicated, what the government has inherited is nothing short of a financial mess across the board, including in the Department of Corrective Services. I have raised a couple of these issues before—once in the house—and I will raise them again, and I will add to those issues. The black holes that we have inherited from the previous government are just unbelievable. Going into the election, the Liberal Party promised a new prison. After the election, the Leader of the Opposition continued to promise to build a new prison. He indicated that he had money in the budget to build it.

**Dr M.D. Nahan:** No, we didn't.

**Mr F.M. LOGAN:** Yes, he did. He indicated that he had money in the budget to build the new prison—\$650 million. As the former Treasurer knows, there was no money there. Like everything that he did before, it was smoke and mirrors. All that was allocated to that new prison was \$1.2 million, member for Hillarys—not \$1.5 million, but \$1.2 million. So far, nothing has been done in that space—not a thing.

**Mrs L.M. Harvey:** Because you sacked the commissioner.

**Mr F.M. LOGAN:** Did the member say that I sacked the commissioner?

Several members interjected.

**Mr F.M. LOGAN:** Is that what the member said? That is outrageous.

**Mrs L.M. Harvey:** I wasn't listening to you.

Several members interjected.

**Mrs L.M. Harvey:** Well, where is James McMahon?

**Mr F.M. LOGAN:** I am sure that he is enjoying life. He told me he —

Several members interjected.

**The SPEAKER:** Members, let us get on to the question, please.

**Mr F.M. LOGAN:** I hope that the former commissioner is enjoying life.

**Ms R. Saffioti** interjected.

**The SPEAKER:** Minister for Transport, I call you to order for the first time.

**Mr F.M. LOGAN:** I hope that the former commissioner is getting on and enjoying his life.

**The SPEAKER:** I hope you are getting on with your answer, too.

**Mr F.M. LOGAN:** I am getting on with the question myself.

I will go to some of the other issues that we have inherited from the former government. There is \$5.3 million in unfunded trailing commitments in youth justice in the Kimberley, \$142.5 million in unfunded prison growth, \$2 million committed to youth justice innovation improved justice programs, which is again trailing funding but there is no money, and I even need nearly \$40 million just to keep the lights on. I have to go to the Treasurer and seek nearly \$40 million for the Department of Corrective Services' budget just to keep the lights on. That is over \$800 million in black holes that the former government delivered to our government in just one portfolio. It is disgraceful, and former government members should hang their heads in shame. It is going to take a long time to sort this mess out, and it comes at a time when we have record prison population growth. The former government has delivered to the people of Western Australia an absolute basket case when it comes to the finances of the Department of Corrective Services.

**The SPEAKER:** Members, that is the end of question time. I want to make a statement. Each day I try to get six questions from the opposition and five from the government. If a member does not stand up in time, from now on, they will miss out. You know what you have to do; you stand and you have to say "Mr Speaker". If you just stand, I will not acknowledge you. You have to stand and say "Mr Speaker"; that is part of the protocol. Does everyone understand that?

Members: Yes, Mr Speaker.

**The SPEAKER:** Listen and learn.

**ECONOMICS AND INDUSTRY STANDING COMMITTEE —  
INQUIRY INTO AIRFARE PRICES ON REGULAR PUBLIC TRANSPORT  
AIR ROUTES IN REGIONAL WESTERN AUSTRALIA**

*Statement by Speaker*

**THE SPEAKER (Mr P.B. Watson):** I have received a letter dated 14 June 2017 from the chair of the Economics and Industry Standing Committee advising that the committee has resolved to conduct an inquiry with the following terms of reference: that the Economics and Industry Standing Committee will inquire into and report on matters relating to airfare prices on regular public transport—RPT—air routes in regional Western Australia. In particular, the committee will evaluate the factors contributing to the current high cost of regional airfares; impacts that high-cost regional airfares have on regional centres from a business, tourism and social perspective; impacts of state government regulatory processes on the cost and efficiency of regional air services; actions that state and local government authorities can take to limit increases to airfares without undermining the commercial viability of RPT services; actions that airlines can take to limit increases to airfares without undermining the commercial viability of RPT services; and recent actions taken by other Australian governments to limit regional RPT airfare increases. The committee will report to the house by 28 November 2017.

**SUPPLY BILL 2017**

*Second Reading*

Resumed from an earlier stage of the sitting.

**MS A. SANDERSON (Morley — Parliamentary Secretary)** [2.55 pm]: I rise to continue my contribution to the Supply Bill 2017 debate. Before we were interrupted for question time, I was outlining some of the issues that have been created by the handling of the implementation of the NorthLink project around the Morley electorate, in particular the eastern side of Morley; obviously, where it runs. I went over the atrocious handling around providing school access. Moving further up the project, along Tonkin Highway, we get to access into and out of Lightning Park, which is a significant sporting facility. The residents around Lightning Park were given a significant commitment by the government of the day and the City of Bayswater that they would not be subject to large volumes of traffic in and out of the facility, and that they would retain ingress and egress to that facility via Tonkin and Reid Highways. That has not been the case with the NorthLink project. The project embarked upon a number of community consultation processes. They set up a group that included residents, counsellors, and officers of Main Roads and the NorthLink project, and canvassed a number of options. The plans provided to the group would essentially eliminate that access into Lightning Park, and people wanting to get into the park would have to go through residential streets in Noranda. Residents were very unhappy but they understood that they had little option other than to share the load of that traffic. Credit to the residents; they worked together with the City of Bayswater to try to come up with a plan in which every road would share the load so that not one particular street was particularly disadvantaged. That plan was ingress through Della Road off Benara Road and egress only out of Maxwell and Cardwell Avenues onto Crimea Street. Those who live locally will know the roads I am talking about. They are very flat, wide roads and the opportunity for speeding and hooning is rife. There are lots of parks and children; they are usually very quiet residential streets.

The former member for Morley—credit to him—wrote to all the residents outlining this plan. I remember having a chat with him about it and he was also very disturbed about the way the plan had been implemented. He had checked with all the relevant government departments that the plan was ingress only to Lightning Park and egress only via Maxwell and Cardwell Avenues. After doing his due diligence, he checked and then he wrote to all those residents stating that this was the plan that was going to be implemented. The City of Bayswater wrote to all the residents and stated that this was the plan that was going to be implemented. Main Roads wrote to all the residents under the NorthLink project outlining that this was the plan that was going to be implemented. The plan that was implemented was not that plan. Essentially, the plan that was implemented was ingress only via Della Road. That residential street copped a fair bit of traffic but not as much as all the cars coming in and out of Cardwell and Maxwell Avenues. I want to give members an example of the scale of the traffic. These are usually very quiet streets, but if there is a large game—for example, the T-ball championships—the City of Bayswater traffic counters, which it laid out, indicate that, on average, 70 cars go up and down that street on a quiet day but on a busy day, 880 cars go up and down that street. That turns it into a really busy street. It is not a quiet residential street any more, and it is not just one street; it is a number of streets going in and out of the park.

A chap came to my office who was very upset. He was getting nowhere with the government and he had gone back to the former member and also to NorthLink WA. He showed me the records of his meetings and that it was not what was meant to be implemented. Residents were angry so we called a community meeting and I turned up to a street corner one Wednesday evening, I think it was, to 100 people. I kid you not; there were 100 people. Normally, 10 to 20 people might come to one of these meetings but there were literally 100 people. The residents were deeply angry about what had occurred. From that, Labor made a commitment that it would retain the slip-road out of Lightning Park. We made representations to both the City of Bayswater and NorthLink

WA that we wanted to retain the sliproad. Given the scale of the works, where the works are and that the contract had already been let as part of phase 1, it was not possible. From looking at the site myself, I saw it was not possible. The road would simply run through where the slip-road needed to go. Given that the area where the slip-road goes was relatively untouched, we therefore made a commitment of almost \$3.1 million to build the slip-road out of the park so that cars can go in via Della Road but they will not come out via residential streets. They will exit via the slip-road. I was very pleased to make that commitment. We are in the process of honouring it. There were a lot of concerns.

It is a little bit galling being lectured from the other side about how we might manage the budget, quite frankly. There are lots of concerns about where all this new money for commitments might come from. This is money from the project. This is money that the Minister for Transport found to be underspent, which the previous government was going to transfer out of the project. We believe that that money should be spent in the area to deal with the issues that the project created. This is not the only issue. I am talking simply about the issues in my electorate but there are issues further up towards Bennett Springs and further down towards Bassendean. It has really been a badly handled project from the community's point of view. If members look at the clearing that has been made and the scale of the intersections that will essentially be right on people's doorsteps, they will see that they are enormous. Noranda will literally be on top of spaghetti junction. That is not the kind of suburb that many of those people bought into 30 or 40 years ago. I acknowledge progress and I recognise that progress needs to happen but I do not think that progress always needs to happen in the form of large roads. I acknowledge that this will create huge productivity gains for local businesses. It will also create jobs and there are absolutely significant and tangible benefits to it. But, it is very stressful and trying for the residents whom I represent, who live along the NorthLink corridor. They are constantly subject to a barrage of dust and sand and they have lived under a film of dust and sand for the last 18 months. I had to negotiate with the contractor for 40 metres of shade cloth to be put up periodically. Initially, it said it would not do it and I had to threaten to go to the local paper before a bit of shade cloth was put up. This is a \$1.3 billion project. I know that the previous member had similar issues. Frankly, I can see the next four years of my time as the member for Morley will be dealing with the numerous issues for constituents along the NorthLink project to make it a liveable place next to these enormous junctions and a very big road.

The rail line to Ellenbrook is another commitment that ties in to NorthLink. Frankly, I would rather have had a rail line eight years ago than a NorthLink through the electorate, but we will now have both. My constituents, the people of Morley, are very, very excited about rail. A lot of the people who commute from Ellenbrook and spend 75 minutes a day travelling from the electorate of Swan Hills drive through Morley and create a lot of the congestion around the suburbs that I represent. We need to give those people better transport options and better ways of getting in and out of the city. It is ridiculous in this day and age. To be perfectly honest, I doorknocked prolifically, as every member on this side of the chamber did in the election, and I met one person who said we do not need a train line. I applauded him for his honesty but every single other person whom I spoke to said the rail line was way overdue and much, much needed because the congestion is ridiculous. That was apart from one single person who said that we did not need a train line.

A government member: Was his name Colin?

**Ms A. SANDERSON:** No, but he was a solid Liberal voter and, credit to him, he was sticking with them. You have to have some people stick with you, no matter how bad it gets.

I want to touch on Metro Area Express light rail because it was a significant commitment at the last election. It is true that "fully funded, fully costed" was a lie.

[Member's time extended.]

**Ms A. SANDERSON:** We heard from the Leader of the Opposition that when it came to making difficult decisions, the former government did not want to borrow the money for MAX. He said that in Parliament yesterday. When it came to making tough decisions, the former government was not prepared to borrow the money for MAX; therefore, it was not fully funded and fully costed. People believed the former government, particularly those who live in Dianella and Nollamara because that is exactly where it would have run. It is well recognised by the previous government and by Infrastructure Australia that the corridor from Alexander Drive to Mirrabooka is one of the most underserved public transport corridors. The member for Mount Lawley will agree with me that it is deeply underserved and it is almost worse with the realignment of the bus services—the so-called fast buses that the previous government put into place—bus 970 and bus 960. The previous government cut one of the most important local bus services for people in Nollamara. For over 50 years, bus 354 has run in Nollamara. It is very popular and everyone knows it. We had hundreds of signatures on a petition to keep this bus service and it was cut. The previous government claimed it had consulted residents and told everyone what was happening. The consultation was pitiful and amounted to a stall at Mirrabooka shopping centre where it told people about the fantastic new bus 970 that would run up and down Flinders Road and Wanneroo Road, but it did not tell anyone it was cutting bus 354.

The previous government told no-one it was cutting the 354. For my constituents who use that bus service, most of whom are very elderly, that is their entire independence. Lorna, who is well into her 80s, relied on the 354. She used it three or four times a day. She is independent and she looks after a daughter who has significant needs. She used it to do her shopping and go to the doctor. She does not want to go to Mirrabooka shopping centre because it is too big. She likes to go to the local shopping centre, which also supports our local small business people. She has now lost her independence. When I last saw her, she said she had stopped going out, and that is a tragedy. When we measure these services, they are public transport. It is a service; it is not a business. I recognise that it needs to be viable but, when we do the numbers and when the Public Transport Authority or the government sits down to work out the figures, we have to look at who uses the services and why. They are people on very low incomes in Nollamara. People on fixed incomes and benefits, seniors and pensioners are missing out most on that very important bus service.

MAX light rail was not only a great fib to the electorate; it was also a \$28 million waste of money because the former government spent the money developing it. We could do with that \$28 million now, quite frankly. It is an absolute disgrace. It has made it difficult for every member in this place and every government post to look voters in the eye and say, "We will deliver this." It has made it harder. Every time a government breaks a promise, it gets harder and harder for the next government. It gets harder to have that conversation. The level of cynicism at this election was off the charts because of the way that constituents were treated by the previous government. It was absolutely so hard to cut through the, "You'll never do it; you'll never do it!" I can tell members and the community of Western Australia that we are focused on our commitments. That is notwithstanding how difficult these financial circumstances are, and they are appallingly difficult. It is not a lot of fun to be in government with financial circumstances the way they are, but we are absolutely committed to delivering on our election promises.

One of the key election promises for Morley is the Walter Road–Wellington Road intersection. Anyone who lives near the area or goes to the Galleria Shopping Centre or Coventry Village will know it well. It is an absolute bottleneck. I am led to believe that the City of Bayswater insisted on that particular traffic management formation—it has not denied it to date—but its implementation of a series of traffic lights around two very busy shopping centres has, essentially, choked the area. On a Saturday it takes 20 to 25 minutes to drive through that intersection. People drive around it; I drive around it. My electorate office is right in the middle of it, and I drive all the way around the backstreets and, essentially, do a 360-degree turn around it to get to my office. It is very bad. That is a major challenge for local businesses in my and surrounding electorates because it is the meeting point for the Cities of Morley and Maylands. Lots of local people run and own businesses around there, and the people who live around there do not shop there. They do not shop at Galleria or Coventry because they cannot get anywhere near it. They go to Noranda or Dianella, or they go further away from that bottleneck. We committed \$1 million to address the problems at that intersection and are working with the City of Bayswater to achieve that. I am looking forward to being able to do that as a matter of urgency. The City of Bayswater would like to wait until the redevelopment of Galleria has further progressed. I do not think it can wait that long; I think it needs to be addressed immediately.

The other major challenge for businesses, residents and schools in my area is the appalling internet service. We have a pretty bad sob story in the electorate of Morley, particularly Noranda, but we are not alone. It is also pretty bad in the other outer suburbs. Noranda and Morley are particularly bad. Although Dianella and Nollamara are not great, they will be getting the national broadband network slightly sooner. In Noranda, if it rains, the internet and telephones stop; that is how bad the infrastructure is. If it rains, everything cuts out. Last year Noranda was not even on the rollout time line for the NBN, and we have made it to the second half of 2019 for the rollout. Our schools cannot function. Morley Senior High School has to shut down parts of the school to run the media class. That is completely ridiculous in this day and age. We cannot do anything without the internet. We cannot access most services—government or education—without the internet. On a very wet and stormy night at the end of last year I hosted a forum with Tim Hammond, the federal member for Perth, and 120 people attended. We saw zero advocacy—zero advocacy—on the NBN from the previous government; nothing at all, particularly in the metro area. There was absolutely no acknowledgment of how critical this infrastructure is to our future economy and our education. Just because someone does not use a computer does not mean it is not important. Just because a ribbon cannot be cut on it or it cannot be opened as a piece of infrastructure does not mean it is not critical to how we will operate in the future. NBN is absolutely critical to that.

In November last year I wrote to the federal Minister for Communications and outlined all the issues. On a good day, if we are lucky, we will get one megabit per second download in Noranda—not enough to even watch Netflix. I wrote to the minister and outlined that we are losing businesses to Malaga. We are losing businesses from Morley—particularly printing businesses that need to download large files quickly. They have packed up and moved. I have recently met a number of businesspeople who have said they cannot operate in Morley. One businessman has even bought his own giant wireless tower to put on his premises and will start his own wireless company and charge almost cost price to support other local businesses. It is that bad. The issue with wireless is that if people live behind a hill, they will probably not get it, so geographically it does not suit everyone. I wrote

to the minister in November but got no response. I still have not even had a response—not even a courtesy acknowledgement of the letter. In April the Minister for Innovation and ICT, Hon Dave Kelly, wrote to Senator Fifield, outlining concerns about the lack of NBN rollout in Western Australia, but to date there has not been even an acknowledgment or a response that I have seen.

The treatment that Western Australia is getting on the NBN rollout is pretty poor; it is pretty average indeed. We need, as part of the rollout in Noranda, Morley and any other suburb, fibre to the kerb. Fibre to the kerb is the only program that will provide reasonable internet access for people in the suburbs. For an area such as Noranda or Morley, fibre to the node will be useless; it will literally be useless. There will be fantastic speeds to the node, but if someone lives 300 metres from the copper network, it will slow it right down. It is the great shame that billions of dollars have been spent on infrastructure, only to then completely limit its capacity just at the doorstep. I understand that NBN Co is seriously looking at fibre to the kerb, because the feedback that it has received so far about the rollout of fibre to the node has been very bad. I am certainly looking forward to the NBN oversight committee visiting Western Australia in July so that I can put our view, but NBN Co's view is that it has been so bad that it is now looking at rolling out fibre to the kerb. I implore NBN Co and the state government to do that, and I know that this state government will take an active, diligent role in advocating for a proper, good rollout of NBN in Western Australia.

Before I finish, I will briefly touch on what I think are some of the most important assets of the Morley electorate; that is, our local schools. We have some fantastic schools in Morley. Most of them have been around for many years—30 or 40 years—and it shows. They are a little tired and need lots of maintenance. I always feel a little jealous of some of the new outer suburbs that get brand-new schools because our schools do require lots of maintenance. In the debate on Perth Modern a few weeks ago, I think the member for Cottesloe outlined that north east corridor schools are probably those that require the most work. I acknowledge and agree with that; my electorate is part of that. John Forrest Secondary College—my old high school—will get a \$50 million revamp under this government. I believe it will start in 2019. It is well overdue. The woodwork rooms are exactly the same as they were in 1988 when I was there. They probably have the scrawlings that I managed to do on the woodwork desks. There is a desperate need for redevelopment in a growing area. I am really proud to be part of that.

Morley Senior High School will get \$1.5 million towards an undercover area; Weld Square Primary School will get a new admin block; and North Morley Primary School will get a much-needed new library. These are incredibly challenging times, but we are focused on overcoming the cynicism of the electorate on politicians and political parties delivering, and we are very focused on delivering our election commitments.

**MR C.J. BARNETT (Cottesloe)** [3.18 pm]: It has been interesting to listen to some of the contributions of members, particularly new members, and all I would say is welcome to reality. Government is not easy. Indeed, as I have said before in this chamber, there is absolutely no circumstance under which Western Australia can avoid a significant budget deficit. That applied during the time of the last two or three years of the Liberal–National government, and it applies today for the current government. If there is no alternative—no circumstance under which a significant annual deficit can be avoided—there is no circumstance under which the government will not see debt rise. That is the harsh and simple reality, so welcome to it.

There has been a lot of discussion about broken promises of the previous Liberal government. I have publicly said yes, we failed to meet our commitment on the Metro Area Express light rail. I have said that publicly for the last 18 months. The reason for that was simply the collapse in the financial position of the state through both the goods and services tax share, particularly iron ore, but also other royalties, that left the state in a position in which we could not deliver that project. I regretted that. There were also considerations about the route of the project, and opposition from the City of Perth about it going through the city and the like. But we made two major transport commitments: the Forrestfield–Airport Link rail line, which is six months into construction, and MAX light rail.

I would be interested to know which other election commitments the Labor Party considers we failed to deliver.

**Mr J.R. Quigley:** Yanchep rail.

**Mr C.J. BARNETT:** We did not commit to Yanchep rail.

**Mr J.R. Quigley:** Yes, you did. I have read out the *Hansard* when the former Minister for Transport committed to it in this chamber.

**Mr C.J. BARNETT:** No, he did not.

I remind members of the things that we said. I am not saying that there are none. Members should go back to what we committed to as a government in 2013 and look at what was delivered. I publicly concede that we could not deliver MAX light rail in any sort of responsible way, and I regret that. One of the reasons for that was the change in policy of the federal government when Tony Abbott became the Prime Minister and shifted the direction away from public transport to roads. Members can go back and look. I think that it is all history but they will find that virtually everything that I committed to as the Premier in 2013 was delivered, completed or underway. That is the reality. However, that is history and that is not what I want to talk about today.

I want to make some comments relating to the environment. Everyone is concerned about the environment. I would claim that the Liberal–National government did an extraordinary job of expanding the conservation estate of Western Australia. There are now 100 national parks in Western Australia.

**Mr C.J. Tallentire:** There were 99 national parks before you came to office, so you added one.

**Mr C.J. BARNETT:** Yes, but listen.

The greatest achievement, not necessarily only of the government, on the environment in Western Australia—certainly since the Second World War and probably forever—was the protection of the Kimberley. The job is not finished but with Camden Sound, Roebuck Bay, Eighty Mile Beach, Horizontal Falls and the Mitchell Plateau, it is clearly an area of global significance. It is one of the world's great wilderness areas and it was protected during the time of the Liberal government. It was not a matter of simply drawing lines on maps. We committed and spent around \$100 million on science and conservation and the employment and training of Aboriginal workers as rangers and the like in the Kimberley. There is still a lot more to be done. The Kimberley is something like twice the size of the state of Victoria. It is a vast area and there is a lot more to be done. I would say that that is probably the state's most significant environmental achievement. It is not finished, and I hope that this government will continue with that work.

I want to talk about something that also relates to our conservation estate—that is, the Abrolhos Islands. I have never set foot on the Abrolhos Islands, much to my regret. I hope to correct that one day. I have flown over the Abrolhos Islands, I am familiar with them and I have read a lot of reports about them and looked at all sorts of images. However, let me say a little bit about the Abrolhos. As the member for Geraldton and the Acting Speaker (Mr R.S. Love) would know well, the Abrolhos Islands consists of 123 islands. That is a large number of islands when we think about it. Only about 10 per cent of the islands—21 islands, I think—have any sort of infrastructure on them. Primarily, they are shacks and the like relating to the fishing industry. It is a fairly pristine environment. The Abrolhos Islands are important for a number of reasons. It has been a major area for the rock lobster industry. There was some habitation of the Abrolhos—it had a school at one stage and all the rest of it—when the cray fishermen tended to live on the islands during the season and fish from there. That does not happen to any great extent now but the shacks survived. A number of fishermen have leases over whole islands, although they are very small islands. That is the history. The Abrolhos Islands continue to be an important area for the fishing industry.

It is also incredibly important environmentally. It is a major breeding ground for a variety of seabirds, and is a major area of coral reef. Indeed, it is the most southerly coral reef in the entire Indian Ocean. There are all sorts of marine and terrestrial life and the like; I think that is self-evident. It also has an extraordinary history that, as members would know, is related principally to the wreck of the *Batavia*, the Dutch trading ship, in 1629. It is a story that even Hollywood would not believe. It is a story of shipwreck, mutiny, murder, executions, escape and rescue. An absolutely extraordinary story took place on that remote island that is part of the Abrolhos group, as it is known today. It also has heritage. The fishermen's shacks—a bit, perhaps, like Ledge Point—are interesting and a great bit of Australian. They have value in themselves, though not is all ideal in that respect. The Abrolhos Islands have some tourist activity but they have enormous tourism potential. The representative members would know better than I, but at the moment people go out there fishing and the like. Some of the cray fishermen who have leases over islands may not use them for crayfishing, but I am sure they go over there, have holidays and enjoy that environment. Not many people from elsewhere get to the Abrolhos. To the extent that it has developed, the tourism industry is very limited. Indeed, apart from the odd fisherman or the local boatie who might go out there, I fear that the Abrolhos could become somewhat of an enclave of the very wealthy. With their large boats and private aircraft, they can go to and from the islands, which very few people have access to or could even contemplate or afford to visit. The Abrolhos Islands are fragile, special and unique. They need to be not only protected, but also available in a safe and proper way to a wider section of the Western Australian community and visitors to this state.

As a former Minister for Tourism, I took quite a bit of interest in the midwest coast. It seemed to me that most of our tourist activity had been, quite logically, directed to the south west of Western Australia and then to the Kimberley, which can be more expensive to visit. The midwest coast is a holiday destination for Western Australians, particularly from Perth. It is close, people can drive there, it is affordable and it has a great deal of potential. There are destinations like the Pinnacles. People go there in their hundreds of thousands—I am not quite sure why but they do—but they do not stay. They drive there, have a look and drive back to Perth.

The Abrolhos has the potential to become the iconic tourist location and destination of the midwest coast. It needs an identity. Although it will probably always be fairly expensive and difficult to get to those islands, particularly in windy conditions, the Abrolhos stands out to me as the iconic identity or drawcard for the wider midwest coast, Geraldton and midwest area.

**Mr C.J. Tallentire:** What activities do you suggest people do there?

**Mr C.J. BARNETT:** I will get to that.

The previous government, largely at my instigation, decided that the Abrolhos Islands should become a national park. I announced that at a Liberal Party state conference back in August 2016, and I worked closely with the then Minister for Environment. A lot of issues had to be resolved. The most fundamental was that the Abrolhos Islands were under the management of the Department of Fisheries. There are historic reasons for that. The activity was basically fishing activity—commercial rock lobster activity. But today in 2017, why would we have a unique 123-island group with unique biodiversity, huge potential and a fragile environment managed by Fisheries? I do not criticise Fisheries; that is the way that it happened historically. People have told me that there are signs on the islands stating that people cannot stay overnight or that they cannot go to certain sections. They are not in any way conducive to attracting people to visit the Abrolhos Islands in a proper way to see what is there. Part of the plan to create a national park was to transfer management of the Abrolhos Islands from the fisheries department to the conservation agency—the Department of Parks and Wildlife. It was an entirely correct and long overdue measure. There were concerns from the fisheries industry, and we accepted that, but the two departments—Fisheries and Parks and Wildlife—under a bit of direction, worked cooperatively and resolved the issue. It was resolved that the islands would be under the management of the Department of Parks and Wildlife—there are 123 islands—with the exception of 21 that had fishing activities on them, and they would remain under the management of the Department of Fisheries. That was a compromise. The marine environment beyond the high-water mark, as it was finally resolved, would remain under the management, essentially, of Fisheries. The two agencies got to the point at which they would work together, but fundamentally it would be a national park under the Department of Parks and Wildlife. It deserves to be, on all those historic grounds, and on conservation and biodiversity grounds.

**Mr C.J. Tallentire:** But this is a marine environment, member.

**Mr C.J. BARNETT:** Yes, I know, but the two agencies would work together, and that is a big step forward. The commercial fishing will continue, but now the Department of Parks and Wildlife will be working with the Department of Fisheries to make sure that the area is protected and that the rock lobster industry is sustainable and managed properly. It is well managed; I compliment Fisheries on continuing to have that viable industry.

Contrary to what has been implied by this government, the work was done on all those issues to the point that in November 2016 the previous government's cabinet formally resolved to create the Abrolhos Islands national park. The process was nearly complete. The final stage would have been the gazetting of that national park. It has been suggested that no work had been done, but that is completely false. A great deal of work had been done, and I urge this government to continue and complete the gazetting of the Abrolhos Islands national park. It is the responsibility of this generation to protect that unique environment.

Obviously, more would need to happen, and it is not all that exotic. There is not much on the Abrolhos Islands. For visitor accommodation, camping facilities could be developed, or it might be that floating accommodation is favoured to protect the environment. Those sorts of matters still need to be resolved, but some facilities for tourists are needed. There need to be toilet blocks and a water supply, which must be done in a way that is not damaging to the environment. In the first instance, however, the first thing that needs to be done on the Abrolhos Islands is to clean up the rubbish—old buildings, stuff left behind over decades of fishing and visitation, and asbestos in significant amounts. To do that, probably the only piece of infrastructure immediately required would be a jetty, so that the rubbish can be removed from those islands. The cost of that may be \$2 million. In the future, other bits of infrastructure might be built, particularly if accommodation is to be allowed on the islands, and that issue is yet to be resolved, but the initial commitment required to protect that unique environment is very little.

I was surprised and disappointed when the current Minister for Environment announced in Geraldton that this government was not going to proceed with the Abrolhos Islands national park. I can think of no reason for making that decision. Even if this government thought that it could not afford \$2 million for a jetty, it could be deferred. I can accept that. Any development on the islands is going to be very slow because they are just not ready to have people visiting. Surely the process of setting up the national park can be completed. Environmental and conservation responsibility dictates that that should happen. Why would this government step away from it? I know that the Department of Fisheries probably preferred to keep the islands under its control, but it had agreed. Why would the government not proceed with gazetting a national park and then allowing the rubbish to be removed and protocols to be put in place about the extent to which tourist activity can take place there? I do not know whether the decision of this government was just the minister's decision; I do not know whether it was a cabinet decision. It should be a cabinet decision, if that is what the government is going to do, because the previous government had made a formal cabinet decision to establish the Abrolhos Islands national park. If the government is not going to do that, it should at least make a cabinet decision and explain it to the public.

**Mr P. Papalia** interjected.

**Mr C.J. BARNETT:** I will answer the member's question and respond to his comment in a moment.

This is important, and not only for conservation. It is important to develop some tourism activity around the Abrolhos. I will conclude with this comment: just think what we would have in Western Australia. We have 14 000 kilometres of coastline, and all of it is beautiful. Travelling north from Perth, we would have the Abrolhos Islands national park, with all the extraordinary history, romance and tragedy attached to it, and that unique environment. A little bit further up the coast is Shark Bay, which is World Heritage listed. Go a bit further and there is Ningaloo, also World Heritage listed. Go a bit further and there is the Burrup Peninsula and the world's greatest concentration of ancient rock art. Go further and we get to the Kimberley. Where in the world, in a safe environment, would there be such a line, if you like, of unique environmental assets—a huge potential for this state? For some strange reason this government seems to have just quashed the final piece—the Abrolhos. I cannot see any sensible reason why the government would do that.

**Mr C.J. Tallentire:** Do you support the fish habitat protection zone in your electorate?

**Mr C.J. BARNETT:** Yes, I do.

**Mr C.J. Tallentire:** It is a very good conservation initiative, and that is what the Abrolhos has.

**Mr C.J. BARNETT:** In fact, I played a direct role in establishing that, as a local member of Parliament, when I was first elected. The seahorses are protected at Cottesloe; that is where they abound.

**Mr P. Papalia:** I understand that the cabinet submission was made with respect to declaring that the intent was to create that park, but was money allocated to enact that park being created?

**Mr C.J. BARNETT:** There were all sorts of proposals once the park was established.

**Mr P. Papalia:** But there is a cost.

**Mr C.J. BARNETT:** There is very little cost in creating a national park—virtually none. What I just said was that although there were plans and proposals for infrastructure, that was not agreed by the government, because I do not think the islands were at that stage, but one thing that we would have pursued, had we been re-elected, was the construction of a jetty for the initial purpose of removing the rubbish. There is asbestos and other rubbish all over those islands.

**Mr P. Papalia:** There are costs associated with that.

**Mr C.J. BARNETT:** Of course, but even now, if this government did not want to build a jetty, that would not be critical, but there is no reason why the Abrolhos Islands —

**Mr P. Papalia:** There is no money.

**Mr C.J. BARNETT:** No, but we do not need money of any great significance to establish a national park. It is already managed by Fisheries.

**Mr P. Papalia:** You do if it's got asbestos.

**Mr C.J. BARNETT:** There are Fisheries people there, and there are Parks and Wildlife people working there, but, yes, it would start with cleaning it up, of course. But why would the government not establish the national park, and give a clear signal that this area is to be protected? I cannot understand why this government has not done that.

**Mr C.J. Tallentire:** The marine environment is the most significant one there, not the terrestrial, and that's what you want to protect.

**Mr C.J. BARNETT:** Yes, and all the protocols need to be put in place. I am not saying the job was finished, but the government should start by gazetting it and declaring it a national park. I would not open it up to widespread tourism yet; it is not ready for that, but in the future it could be. I do not know how many people could sustainably visit that island, but I would like Western Australians to be able to visit the Abrolhos, not rich people with big boats and helicopters, because they are the only ones going there apart from the local fishermen, and that is not good enough.

**MS C.M. ROWE (Belmont)** [3.38 pm]: I rise today to contribute to the debate on the second reading of the Supply Bill 2017 and to make some comments that are particularly pertinent to my electorate of Belmont. I would like to start by congratulating the McGowan Labor government on all its commitments, particularly to my area of Belmont. One issue that came up time and again across the electorate when I was out doorknocking during the campaign was, of course, jobs. I mentioned this in my inaugural speech. People were genuinely concerned about their job security. They were also concerned about unemployment and underemployment, and this was causing deep concerns about their ability to make ends meet. I am really pleased that one of the major focuses of this government is about jobs and job creation. I am particularly pleased with the commitment to increase the number of apprenticeships—that is particularly important in my electorate—as well as the creation of 10 000 jobs across WA. Another important element of Labor's commitment that is very important to my electorate is the commitment to local content in major government projects. This is important because it is a lifeline to many of the local manufacturing groups across my electorate and on the outskirts of my electorate,

including Kewdale, Welshpool, Hazelmere and South Guildford. The local content component is one of the major differences between Labor and Liberal, and certainly at the election it was a critical difference. Labor took to the election a promise to have local content as part of our mandate and part of our agenda on government projects; whereas, as we all know, even the Perth Stadium bridge, which is in my electorate, was something that could have created local jobs for our manufacturers here in Western Australia, particularly in my electorate, and that was a missed opportunity by the Liberal government because it was sent overseas to be built.

Another commitment I am proud of locally is the commitment by the Minister for Police to extend the operating hours of the Belmont Police Station. Before this announcement, the police station in Belmont was closing at 4.00 pm. Unfortunately, crime is a big issue across my electorate and people were saying to me when I was doorknocking and on the phone to them that they did not feel safe in their homes and they certainly had reservations about security in their community. Those concerns went across the board in our electorate. When I heard those concerns I fought really hard to make sure that we got additional police resourcing. I am pleased with the announcement and that it is now being implemented. The Belmont Police Station operating hours have been extended to 7.00 pm each day. That is an additional three hours a day. I know for a fact that many, many locals across the electorate welcome that and see it as a good step in the right direction. It is the first step and it is an important step. I look forward to working closely with the police minister over the coming four years to make sure that we work hard to tackle the issue of crime and get safety back as a priority for our community.

An important industry in the electorate of Belmont is, of course, the racing industry. It is an integral part of our community and is part of the fabric of our local area, especially given that in the electorate we have two racecourses. It is also home to many people who work in the industry and who have worked in the industry for their entire lives, including jockeys and many trainers. I acknowledge, in particular, my good friend John Lugg, who has been a trainer for many years and who is a local as well. I was really proud of the Labor Party and Mark McGowan coming out during the election with their commitment —

[Quorum formed.]

**Ms C.M. ROWE:** As I was saying, I am really proud that the Labor government has come out strongly supporting this very important industry in my electorate. It is also great for the industry to have a minister who understands the importance of this industry. Labor committed \$200 000 per annum on an ongoing basis to promote the Perth Racing Masters Carnival, both across the nation and abroad. This is indicative of how the new Labor government views racing. We can see clearly that this is not only an integral part of tourism in WA but is also one of the most important employers in the state because it employs so many people, both in my electorate and across the state. Indeed, it is one of the largest employers in the state. I am proud of the Labor government for supporting the racing industry on such an ongoing basis. I look forward to working closely with the Minister for Racing and Gaming, Mr Papalia, and making sure that we continue to support this vital industry in Western Australia.

Since being elected in March, I have made my way around to many of the local schools, community groups and sporting organisations across the electorate of Belmont. I am always energised after meeting with our local school leaders in particular because they are obviously such a vital part of our community, educating our children, and of course our children are our future. Since being elected, I have visited many local schools and have met with not only the principals but also the P&Cs. I am always proud of the innovation they employ to make sure that they can meet the needs of the students and families in their school community. We are lucky in Belmont to have such dedicated and talented teachers in our state schools in particular. However, given the boom that the previous government presided over, I cannot help but feel that our local schools should have received their fair share. In the last eight years, the Liberal government did nothing but accumulate record levels of debt, yet there was absolutely no investment in local schools in Belmont in the last five years. Local parents, principals and teachers have all expressed their concern at the state of our local schools in Belmont. Now our state government is left with empty coffers and record debt because the last Liberal government chose not to prioritise schools, particularly in Belmont.

It is important to highlight some of the issues that schools in my electorate are dealing with and the effects the previous government's total lack of investment and further cuts to funding have on the ability to meet those great needs. The first of the major issues is neglect by the previous Liberal government of infrastructure in our local schools. I have searched high and low through all the budget papers and media releases of the last five years. I cannot see a single investment in schools in the Belmont electorate. I have come up totally empty-handed. I am proud that the McGowan Labor government is investing \$7.48 million across our state schools in Belmont; that is, every single public school will receive funding. When compared with the previous government's neglect of the schools in Belmont for the past five years, this is remarkable. And it was neglect.

A recent article in *The West Australian* of 23 May 2017 titled "Ceilings fall five times at schools" states —

Ceilings in public schools have collapsed five times in the past two years, the Education Department has revealed.

Three of the incidents were in classrooms during school hours when children were present.

The previous State government last year announced that 320 schools with plaster glass ceilings at risk of collapse would be inspected and assessed, 12 months after a five-year-old boy was taken to hospital with minor injuries when part of a ceiling caved in at Medina Primary School in February 2015.

Further on the same article refers to Belmay Primary School, which is in my electorate of Belmont, as follows —

And a ceiling gave way at Belmay Primary School, Cloverdale, during school holidays last month, in a drama classroom that inspectors missed when they did the audit last year.

Luckily for Belmay Primary School this roof collapsed during the school holidays. I have since visited the school and spoken with staff, the principal and the deputy principal, and they said without any doubt that if this had happened during school hours and students were present, they would have been badly injured, all because of ageing infrastructure, a lack of regular maintenance and a completely inadequate audit process.

Again this comes back to my point about the lack of priority for our schools in the east, particularly in Belmont. Another local school in my electorate has raised an issue with me about a dilapidated toilet block on its school grounds. This school has had the toilets removed but the block remains. I went on a tour of the school and I was shown this block. The roof of this toilet block is all but collapsing. The school raised this with the former Liberal member for Belmont and the Department of Education. The roof is extremely dangerous—it looks very precarious. Although this was raised with the former member and the department, nothing has been done. No resources were provided by the former government to rebuild or demolish and remediate the site. Unfortunately, I see this time and again with ageing infrastructure because of the lack of investment in our schools by the previous government. It scrimped on maintenance schedules, which then blew out and Belmont kids have paid the price.

I am really proud to stand as a member of this government that is committed to invest in every single public school in my electorate. I would like to go through those investments and highlight what each school is getting across my electorate. Firstly, Belmay Primary School, which I just spoke about, will receive funds for hardcover and junior play areas. Belmont Primary School needs an urgent upgrade to its netball court so that the kids have a safe surface to play on. Carlisle and Redcliffe Primary Schools will also receive funds to go toward the upgrade of their netball–basketball courts. Kewdale Primary School has a fantastic parents and citizens association with great advocates like Anita Kidd, who spoke to me about the need to have integrated small nature play areas, so I am really proud that we are able to assist with those. Cloverdale Primary School will also receive funding for the installation of a nature play area. Rivervale Primary School will receive funds to complete the upgrade of its playground and play equipment. Every single state primary school in the electorate of Belmont will receive \$50 000 for infrastructure that will not only improve the school, but also create local jobs. Then of course there is Belmont City College; the only public high school in my electorate. I am extremely proud to know that a \$7 million performing arts centre will be built that coincides with the college offering drama as a year 12 subject.

**Mr D.A. Templeman:** Where is that?

**Ms C.M. ROWE:** At Belmont City College. This performing arts centre is really critical to the students at Belmont college because they have outgrown their current facilities. The principal and deputy principal at that school raised this matter with me and said that they have more students wanting to do year 12 or the Australian Tertiary Admission Rank drama subject than they can accommodate. This is a really welcome announcement. The school and the community are really excited by this; I certainly got that sense when I was out doorknocking and telling local residents about this announcement during the campaign. I know that the school is excited about the centre. It will also be a great asset for the community as a whole because other state primary schools in the community and community organisations will be able to use it when it is not in use by the college. This government has also committed \$80 000 to upgrade the gymnasium and its toilet rooms for the school. Unfortunately, they are completely inadequate at the moment, so this will go a long way to improving those facilities as the school has a lot of young students who participate in sporting activities.

Of course, it is not just the buildings that build a great school; well-resourced classrooms with adequate teaching and social support also play a part. When I was on the doorsteps during the campaign, I was surprised at the level of anger that a lot of people had around the cuts that the last government made to the education assistants in classrooms. It affected not only the parents, but also the grandparents because they could see how vital it was to the students and teachers to have that one-on-one support in the classroom. The previous government really underestimated the issue because there was a lot of community outcry, certainly in Belmont. It is fantastic that the Labor government has said that it will go a long way to restoring those education assistants back into the classrooms. This will provide that vital one-on-one attention that so many students need. We can all see how that is crucial to help our students.

Many factors can have a positive or detrimental effect on a child's learning capacity; for example, their home life. Are they exposed to domestic violence, substance abuse or other disruptions? Does the family experience

poverty or persistent unemployment or underemployment? Are they from a migrant community where English is their second language? Are they Indigenous or do they have additional cultural considerations to their learning? Do they need extra support to achieve their best? Do they learn better in a different way from other children? These are all issues that affect schools in each of our electorates, but they certainly and profoundly affect mine. I have been going around to schools and have spoken with principals about these issues that complicate the learning and social interaction of Belmont kids. I am aware that each day there are children in my electorate who are presenting to school with major anxiety disorders, including post-traumatic stress syndrome because of exposure to domestic violence and other profound social issues in the home. Schools are supporting students with more complex social issues than ever before, and without education assistants all our kids will suffer.

[Member's time extended.]

**Ms C.M. ROWE:** We recognise that those who struggle at school suffer, but so do those students who are really bright. They may fail to reach their full potential because they do not have that nurturing element of a one-on-one interaction with an education assistant in the classroom. Under the previous Liberal government, the ratio of education assistants fell in 2013 from one education assistant to 37 students, to one education assistant to 42 students in 2016. Our government has committed an additional 300 education assistants across the state, 50 Aboriginal and Islander education officers and an extra 120 teachers. This government understands that education assistants have an important role in the education of all our students. They assist with numeracy and literacy, and they also assist in the preparation of classes and provide that vital one-on-one support. They support not only our students, but also our teachers.

Our commitment to education does not stop there. One of the first actions that this Labor government did was to fulfil its promise to freeze TAFE fees. Nearly 40 per cent of students at Belmont City College go on to do TAFE training. It is a very important pathway for many young people in my community. Under the previous government, we saw hike after hike in TAFE fees, which ended up being in excess of 500 per cent. This meant that there was a really large drop-off across the state of enrolments in TAFE. It simply became out of reach to go to TAFE, particularly for the young people in Belmont. If we are going to grow our state economy and ensure that our young people have decent, well-paid jobs, we need to make sure that we do not put up barriers between them and the training that they need to secure those jobs.

I would now like to talk about the local jobs and local projects funding. This is another initiative that the Labor government has committed to and has already started to roll out, and I am really proud of that. Through the local jobs, local projects initiative, we will not only deliver great funding commitments to many community groups in our electorates, but also create more jobs in our area. Importantly, it will also go a long way to support some of the pillars of our community; that being community and local sporting groups. Where would we be without these groups that bring us all together? For example, the Belmont Bombers and the Belmont Junior Soccer Club come out every weekend and of course they rely on volunteers almost 100 per cent. I am very proud of these commitments that the Labor government is providing and I would now like to go through some of them in our community. We are committing \$80 000 to the Belmont Bombers for extra lighting at their training facility at Forster Park in Cloverdale. I know this is something that the club is particularly excited about, especially its very hard working president, Mike Brotherton. We are giving \$35 000 to the Belmont Cricket Club for extra lighting and new astroturf.

Debate adjourned, pursuant to standing orders.

## TRADE UNION MOVEMENT

### *Motion*

**DR M.D. NAHAN (Riverton — Leader of the Opposition)** [4.00 pm]: I move —

That this house notes that the trade union movement represents just 9.4 per cent of Australian workers; expresses concern that despite the minimal representation of Western Australian workers by trade unions, the current state government is overly represented in its cabinet by union members; expresses concern at the vast sums of workers' money contributed by unions to supporting the election of the McGowan government; and condemns the Community and Public Sector Union–Civil Service Association of WA for its mute response to the massive cuts the McGowan government is imposing on the public service.

From its history, the union movement and the Labor Party have been one and the same. Indeed, I think, essentially, a long time ago the union movement in Queensland set up the Australian Labor Party, so it is no surprise that they are indeed one and the same. Back then, and for many generations, the union movement was broadly representative of not just the public sector, but also the private sector in Australia and Western Australia. As a result of that broad representation of the workforce, the union movement received special treatment and privileges in the community legislatively and otherwise. It was seen as the representative of the workers—of the little man—and the organisers of their voice. Over the decades, that voice has changed its perspective and its

strength, and the representativeness of the union movement has waned significantly. In Western Australia, the union movement now represents 7.3 per cent of the private sector workforce. That is an exceedingly small share. Its share of the public sector workforce is also in decline. It is held up largely by privileges that the union movement has to access confidential information of the workforce; nonetheless, it is also on the line. As the representativeness of the union movement has changed—in fact diminished—it has been able to retain its special privileges and change its focus from being a member-based organisation to a political campaigning organisation because of its links to and power and influence over the ALP. These are simply facts.

Again, I want to emphasise that the union movement represents just 7.3 per cent of the private sector workforce in Western Australia and its representation is very narrowly based on a few industries, particularly construction, and the public sector. Increasingly, the unions have not focused on representing members as much. Some obviously do. United Voice does, but others get their influence through the ALP. They have also increasingly focused not on representing their members, being the voice of members and getting their influence from large membership numbers, but, rather, on special privileges and power achieved by getting the ALP into government around the nation. That is just the reality.

There are a couple of important issues. If a union movement retains its influence in the public through legislation, through privileges on committees, through a voice in the community, through funding and through other aspects of influence by getting the ALP elected, it does that to get payback. It campaigns for the ALP to get something in return. It is payback. It retains its power, gets on committees, gets contracts and gets funding. That itself is a concern.

Also, as I said, the union movement is increasingly public sector dominated in both public trading enterprises and the general government sector, but it is also representative in certain industries. If the union movement is increasingly public sector dominated and is increasingly relying on its influence through the ALP, it will push ALP governments to increasingly focus on hiring more public servants and employees, giving better conditions, retaining ownership over situations that are more conducive to the unions' perspective and increasing wages, and I will go through that in a minute. In other words, it pushes ALP governments to be large-government focused. Of course, it is no secret that these are concerns. Repeatedly, Labor leaders from Kevin Rudd and Alannah MacTiernan to others have voiced concerns about the changes in the union movement and its increasing influence over the Labor Party. The union movement controls preselections. If government funding is taken away, the union movement largely funds the ALP, at least from the reports that we have been provided. We know that a lot of the money that is provided for parallel campaigns is never reported, and I will comment on that later. The ALP is largely funded by and selected by, and increasingly staffed by, the union movement.

**Mr P.A. Katsambanis:** A wholly-owned subsidiary.

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** It is a wholly-owned subsidiary. In fact, the McGowan government is the most union dominated ALP government in recent memory, with 71 per cent of its ministers having direct affiliation with a union.

**Mr J.E. McGrath:** In Australia or WA?

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** In WA. There is a 71 per cent union affiliation in cabinet, yet the unions represent 7.3 per cent of the private sector workforce. That is a profound imbalance. Indeed, it is a worrying imbalance.

**Mr D.J. Kelly:** Do you have nine per cent representation in your cabinet?

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** Of what?

**Mr D.J. Kelly:** Of unions. You have none. Is that an imbalance?

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** Yes. We have a broader section of the community. We can see this imbalance increasing. Let me go through some examples. This is early days. I remember when I was Treasurer and I had responsibility for the Government Employees Superannuation Board. GESB Super is the superannuation of choice and necessity for some public servants. It is a very well run organisation. It is vital to all public servants. It was a requirement of the act some time ago that the Government Employees Superannuation Board have two union representatives. The people who represented the unions were chosen by the union movement. The government had no input on or veto power over the choice of those members. Sometimes I was told that the union appointees would learn the ropes and the issues or would have skills and would represent the wider public sector well. I had an appointee to the Government Employees Superannuation Board—I will not mention her name—who had never had a real job in her life; she came directly from university and had worked for a union as a part-timer whilst at university. She was appointed to GESB with no qualifications and no background. She had a position that required her to make decisions over the future retirement funding of hundreds of thousands of Western Australians. Why? It was because she was nominated by the union movement.

**Mr D.J. Kelly:** She came straight from university?

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** She was a student! She had had student jobs but she had never had a professional job. Before she came to GESB, she had only had student part-time jobs.

**Mr D.J. Kelly:** I'm just curious as to what her tertiary qualification was.

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** She had no background and she was put on the board by the union. Further, I was told, but I cannot verify this, that the money she was paid did not go to her; it went to the union. This applies to a whole raft of government institutions.

Members opposite might like to say that in the past unions represented most of the public sector and in the past one could find people in the union movement who had the qualifications, background and experience to be on the board of GESB, but, in this case, the union movement's representation of the public sector, although still large, is shrinking and the appointment simply was not qualified and the money went to the union. It was absolutely ridiculous.

**Mr D.J. Kelly:** What was her tertiary qualification?

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** She had no background to be on the board of directors of Western Australia's largest superannuation fund—none whatsoever! It was an illustration that the union movement really did not care about the future retirement funding of many of its members.

That is just one example and there is a whole raft of other state government institutions in which the legislation put in place by the Australian Labor Party requires union appointments. With many of those appointments, the money does not go to the representative—they do get costs—it goes to the union. This is wrong. Maybe way back when, when the unions represented broad-based groups in the community, that was justifiable, but it is not now. This illustrates that the union movement is very keen to get its power through ALP-elected representatives rather than memberships. Union membership is waning and the only way it can acquire influence is through political power.

A major transformation in the union movement over recent decades has been its loss of representation in probably the wealthiest sector of Western Australia—that is, the mining sector. Of course, the union movement retains a great deal of significance through the construction sector, which I will come to later, but the mining sector is largely union free. I might add that since the unions have lost their control or influence or standing in the mining sector, mining sector wages and conditions have done nothing but skyrocket. Work safety on mine sites, particularly in recent years, has also improved significantly. This transformation has been driven not so much by management, but by the workforce. The workforce has chosen to leave the unions behind, because workers largely agree with their employers that the best thing for them in terms of wages and conditions is a vibrant, profitable and internationally-focused employer rather than a union intermediary. It is the holy grail of the union movement in Western Australia to conquer back that territory. There is not only large membership—for some unions it is baseload membership—there is also a very high level of income in terms of campaigning money and fees. This is an issue that we will have to worry about with the McGowan government. Again, the McGowan government is the most union-dominated government in recent memory with 71 per cent of its members and many of its staff affiliated with unions. Most of them have been chosen by the unions and if they do not do the right thing, the unions have the power to veto them or to “de-preselect” them. In the eight-plus years I have been in this house we have seen Labor Party members jettisoned. Even though they performed well in the house, the unions overthrew them.

**Mr D.J. Kelly** interjected.

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** One of the areas of the union movement that we have to watch is work safety. One of the areas the unions, through the ALP, will try to get leverage over in the resources sector is workplace safety. It is a very important area; indeed, we have structured workplace safety and given a great deal of influence over to the Department of Mines and Petroleum. Essentially, we have a related but special focus on workplace safety in mines for a couple of reasons. It is a big industry and it is a dangerous industry. Successive governments have wanted the industry to adopt and inculcate a work safe environment in all its activities and its focus. Therefore, through the Department of Mines and Petroleum, we worked with the firms to do that. It has been slow, but steady and successful. There is still more to go, but I think any reasonable person who goes to the mines or the resource sector, whether it is the oil or gas sector, or the iron ore or gold industries, and talks with the human resources people, the bosses or the people on the ground, such as the mining engineers, will see that work safety is imbued in its DNA. It has been a great achievement and we cannot let it fold or allow it to deteriorate, because mining is an inherently dangerous industry and it is our most important industry for exports, growth and, indeed, employment growth overall. We have done that largely without the union movement. That has been achieved largely without the union movement.

Several members interjected.

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** I will say that the union movement was onside.

**Mr D.J. Kelly:** Were you here during question time?

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** Yes.

**Mr D.J. Kelly:** There was eight years of inaction on occupational health and safety.

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** It was done largely without the union movement. I know it is a mountain that members opposite want to climb and claim, but they cannot. They are trying to claim it and reclaim it, and those are the tools that they will use through the McGowan government. Today, or yesterday, the minister announced the Commissioner for Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare, who is a former head of UnionsWA. This is the type of stuff we will watch further to see whether the government allows unions to penetrate excessively or undermine in any way the reforms put to work safety in the mining sector.

Another important area that illustrates the influence of the union movement over government policy—maybe my colleagues will highlight this further—is uranium mining. Uranium mining has been an interesting issue with the ALP and the unions generally. With the exception of Western Australia, the debate about uranium mining in state ALPs has gone by the bye, as they all support uranium mining. Of course, South Australia has the largest uranium mine in the world. The ALP federally has given up the debate on uranium mining and will allow it to happen just like the mining of any mineral resource and has done away with the two and three-mine policies, and, quite rightly, it has moved on. However, for some reason—I think I know why—the Australian Labor Party here has always had a problem with it. Last time the ALP was in government, it banned uranium mining. When we came into government in the 2008 election, we committed to allowing uranium mining and the ALP whinged about that. There was a lot of exploration that created a lot of jobs. It has the potential to create many more jobs. Of course, the price of uranium oxide is now very low and it does not justify mining, but if the price picks up, we had the industry in a state in which it could expand. Western Australia has a huge proportion of the world's uranium stockpiled in known deposits. In fact, I have been told it is the largest in the world. Members opposite are against uranium mining. I could never understand why the state ALP was so strongly against uranium mining, but during the last campaign we found out from the current Minister for Mines and Petroleum that the McGowan opposition was committed to allowing any of the uranium mines that had approval to go ahead, but it would not allow any more. It was a grandfathering exercise. The question was: what is approval? There is a litany of approval processes at both the state and, eventually, the federal level. It was left vague. As questions were asked of the minister, he was increasingly strong that if the mines got approval before the election, they would be approved, and I believe that four got approval of some sort. Right after the election, the minister indicated that that is what would happen. However, the Australian Manufacturing Workers' Union then came out and said, "No way." Mr McCartney said, "No; that's not ALP policy. That's not what's going to happen. The minister's wrong; we'll see to that." In other words, the head of a union vetoed a minister and overrode a clear election commitment. People in the industry accepted this begrudgingly—they would have liked it to be open—and were committed to expansion, investment and drilling. When we asked the minister who was right—him or McCartney—he said that no decision had been made. There are many ways to interpret that. It might mean that he does not know. It might mean that he will ask McCartney about it or that he might be negotiating. It was a clear case of a person who is not elected to this house, and who has great sway over the Labor Party, vetoing a government election commitment. That is a very dangerous event and there are others. I think my colleague the member for Bateman will address this more clearly.

There was also an issue with the AMWU and the Treasurer. The Treasurer is trying to come to grips with energy policy, which is fair enough. I hope he is doing a good job—so far, so good. He said that he wanted to have a commitment to go to full retail contestability. Right now, the structure is that Synergy has a monopoly on any house or business that consumes less than 50 megawatts. It loses money and is heavily subsidised by the state. In the rhetoric, there are some problems with the argument, but this is not the time for debate on those. The Treasurer has voiced the view that he will increase prices by a figure in the vicinity of 15 per cent over two years. That will really hurt a lot of households. Last year, the Leader of the Opposition, now the Premier, decried us for being vicious and aggressive when we raised prices by 3.5 per cent. He is suggesting a fivefold increase on that, but that is a different issue. In the run-up to the last election, the Treasurer had essentially no energy policy because a 50 per cent renewable energy policy was abandoned during the campaign. I debated this with the shadow Minister for Energy at the time and explicitly asked whether he had a commitment to retail contestability. He said, "No. I'm thinking about it. I kind of like the Singapore model, which wound it back." The minister had a policy, but the Treasurer and the Minister for Energy were forming policy, maybe in cabinet or maybe the minister by himself, but the minister also voiced his views publicly, which is what he should do, about moving to full retail contestability, and in that case increasing prices by 15 per cent. Again, the AMWU came out and said, "No way. That's not ALP policy. If he wants to do it, join the Liberal Party. This is outrageous; he won't do it!" Today, we asked the Premier who was right. He did not even know what Synergy did. He said that the government would not sell the monopoly. The sale was not the issue. There was no mention of the sale or selling any part of Synergy. Obviously, the Premier got it confused with Western Power; I do not know why. The Premier could not say who would decide—the AMWU or the Minister for Energy—on something as fundamental as retail contestability. More importantly, the government is proposing, as reported in the media, to increase electricity prices by 15 per cent over two years on the basis that Synergy goes to full retail contestability, and the unions are vetoing it. That is how it appears to us. It appears the AMWU has veto power

on energy policy. It is outrageous; it is ridiculous. If the government does not go to full retail contestability because the unions have vetoed it and prices are increased by 15 per cent, do members opposite know what? They are turning Synergy into a taxing mechanism on behalf of the AMWU.

Let us go through some other examples. One of the real issues is the increasing public sector dominance of the union movement. The union movement has been much more able to retain its public sector membership than its private sector membership. This state, of course, has been bleeding in the private sector. All sorts of programs have been tried to retain membership or get it up, but they have not worked. In the public sector, it can be done in a number of ways. One of the ways, which operates in my office as Leader of the Opposition, is that the private details of new private sector employees are given to a union. Details of Leader of the Opposition office employees, who are Liberal Party staffers, are given to a union. The union then calls them and says, “You should be a member of the union.” The unions are given phone numbers, addresses and other details that in any other industry would be totally illegal to give to a third party. It is not the case that the workers went to the union and said, “Listen; I want to talk to you.” The unions got those details from somebody—I suppose it was the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, but I do not know—and they called workers to tell them to become members. This is outrageous behaviour. It is a release of confidential information. In the past, when virtually everybody in the public sector was a member of the union, it might have been acceptable, but it is not now. To my knowledge, if I go to a hospital and I want to send my private health details to, let us say, a doctor, I have to give the hospital permission to send that information, even though it is for me. In this case, somebody in the government—I think it happened under the Liberal government too, but I am not sure—gave a union private details of staffers in the Leader of the Opposition’s office. That is outrageous behaviour. That is one way in which unions can sustain their membership.

**Mr D.J. Kelly** interjected.

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** That is one way for the Labor Party to sustain its membership.

**Mr D.J. Kelly** interjected.

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** Of course, in certain circumstances, we can envisage that —

**Ms S.F. McGurk:** Will you take the interjection?

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** No, I will not.

**Mr D.J. Kelly** interjected.

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** Yes.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Members, I have tolerated a lot of shouting across this house. I have been waiting for someone to ask to interject, and I have just heard the member with the call say he will not take an interjection. That indicates to me that it does not matter how much you yell, I am going to keep standing up and stopping the debate. So, please, listen. The Leader of the Opposition has the call.

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker.

Several members interjected.

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** I know what the government has to do; it is here to defend the unions. I understand that. I understand the union backgrounds of those who have spoken. I understand that. I understand their background, I understand their support base, but this is a debate. I understand why those members are here and who they are here for, but this is Parliament and we have a right to speak. These are difficult issues for members opposite; I understand that.

Several members interjected.

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** I get back to my point. We can see through history the influence of unions on Australian Labor Party governments. Look at the current Victorian government. It a one-term government so far that took over from a Liberal government that had put in place substantial changes to the cost structures of the Victorian public sector. The Andrews government has been in there a number of years, it is struggling in the polls now—I think it is down. The polls are 45–55; it looks like it will be a one-term government. That is the state of politics around the world, and members opposite should note it. In the latest budget —

Several members interjected.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Members, that is enough! You are not meant to be having a debate amongst yourselves; we are listening to the member on his feet. Enough!

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** In the latest budget wages growth was 7.3 per cent, with inflation of less than two per cent. The circumstances in Queensland are that the previous Liberal–National government undertook a major transformation of the public sector; I think it basically reduced the public sector by 14 000 people or something of that vicinity. The Palaszczuk government was elected, marginally, on the basis of —

Several members interjected.

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** Yes, it was. It has a very small margin. That is it; it does.

It won on the basis of replacing some of those workers. But in a very short period of time it has grown the public sector by more than Campbell Newman reduced it, with public sector wages growth in the vicinity of eight per cent.

I turn to the Rudd–Gillard–Rudd government. Again, we saw very rapid growth and expenditure there. Part of it was the stimulus action, and part of it was a very major expansion in the public sector. An example I give that is really pertinent to the government across the house is the Disability Services Commission. That was a creation of the Gillard government—it is bipartisan now—and it was to be funded out of an additional Medicare levy that was put aside for a while. The government decided to set up a large national bureaucracy and put it in Geelong, because Geelong was struggling from the demise of the auto industry. The government initially concentrated on two things: a computer system that was struggling; and, more importantly in the first instance, the growing of public sector employment by way of the Disability Services Commission, before it actually had a patron, I might add, or a client.

**Mr D.J. Kelly:** What; like Fiona Stanley?

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** There were 11 000 people in the Disability Services Commission. In other words, the National Disability Insurance Scheme was largely about job creation for the first five years of production in a marginal, Labor-held seat in Geelong. That is the pressure the ALP has various unions put on it. I could go across the board.

I turn to the Gallop–Carpenter government. This is an interesting one because it is clear in certain areas and unclear in others. When the Gallop government came in in 2001—I remember it very clearly—the economy was in recession. It inherited a very lean government; no-one could criticise the Richard Court government of bloating the public sector or excessive taxation. It had the lowest effective tax rate in the country. The Gallop government committed to a review of the public sector. John Langoulant ran it, it went on for quite a few months, and the government reduced the number of bureaucracies by a substantial amount and built these large super-bureaucracies—à la the current McGowan government. The then government used that to, in part, clear out what it perceived to be Liberal-oriented public servants; some of them probably were. Some of them who I knew from my days in the public sector were actually Labor-leaning, but they worked well with the Richard Court government so they got the job. That was a mistake.

The Gallop government built these bureaucracies. Initially, the bureaucracy did not grow very significantly. But after that was done the bureaucracies became more and more turgid, more and more top-heavy, and they parachuted in a whole bunch of advisers to actually talk with each other rather than meet with clients. Over the seven years of the Gallop government the size of the public sector grew by 22 per cent. That was actually before the huge increase in population. Salaries started growing, and so in the last full year of the Gallop government salary growth was 10 per cent. In 2008–09, which was a combination of the Carpenter government and the Barnett government, salary growth was 14 per cent, according to the March 2017 report of government. There was a combination of massive increases in employment and very large increases in wages. When we came over—this is the secret that people opposite have for quite a few years been trying to hide—under its watch wages and salary growth was unprecedented, both in terms of the number of public servants and wages. It is a simple truth. Part of that was responding to demand and part of it was responding to the influences on the ALP to get more members and higher wages and better conditions in the public sector. The Labor Party, which is one and the same with the union movement, could do nothing but deliver it, and it did. In fact, it often bragged about it.

Several members interjected.

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** Under our watch, what has confused the current government to some extent is that we were, until very recently, exceedingly generous to union employees in the public sector. Under our period of government, a senior teacher—I think at the top rank—saw their wages grow by 70 per cent.

**Mr D.J. Kelly:** So you were a union-dominated government, were you?

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** From the lowest to the highest—70 per cent. By the way, that is a 35 per cent real increase.

**Ms S. Winton** interjected.

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** See, one of problems the government has with its members—this will haunt it over the next four years—is that they have been imbued with this rhetoric that we duded teachers. We gave them a 70 per cent increase in wages and employed 6 000 more! Now, if that is called dudding, please dud me!

**Ms S.E. Winton:** How many of them are —

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** We employed an extra 2 000 education assistants and gave them significant wage increases. Our proportion of education assistants per student is 50 per cent above any other state. In some cases it is 75 per cent above other states. We went out there and funded the education system, disability services, mental health, health and police like no other government. Members opposite might say, “Oh, it’s because you’re union-dominated”; no, it was because we were responding to demand.

**Ms S.E. Winton:** But you maxed out the credit card!

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** We were responding to demand. That is the problem: on one hand they say we did not give enough to the teachers; now they say we maxed out the credit card. They need to get their rhetoric right, because the Labor Party is in government now and it has to be responsible for its own rhetoric. But I have been diverted. Over the past few years, with the reduction in revenue and the tighter fiscal position, we have placed real restraint on the growth of expenditure in the public sector. It is not easy, because we still have to deliver the services. We froze the overall size of the general government sector from June 2012. There has been no increase in the overall size of the public sector since then, despite population growth. We did that through a range of hiring restraints and also 5 000-plus voluntary redundancies in the public sector. We turned around and employed 5 000 extra frontline employees. We revamped the public sector. We shifted the focus of the state wage position from inflation plus, to inflation at 1.5 per cent, and we negotiated successfully with the unions. The unions told us that they usually negotiated with us, and the only thing they wanted to trade off was the duration of the enterprise bargaining agreement. They wanted it to end after the next election, because they told us they were hoping that there would be a change of government and the next government would be more union friendly.

Also at times—it was on record in the media—I was pushing for something like the present government has done. I thought about a freeze altogether for a long time. It is in the media. I thought about a range of other things. I think someone came up with a scheme very similar to that of the present government, of a fixed sum of about \$1 000 a year. I brought it to my colleagues, but if we had done that, there would have been mass shutdown of the public sector—hospitals, schools, police and public transport.

**Mr W.R. Marmion:** Marching in the streets.

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** There would have been mass marching on the streets and shutdowns. We simply could not afford that. We cannot afford to lock people out of hospitals, trains, buses and schools. The union movement made it quite clear that if the previous government did what the present government has done, it would take to the streets, so we did not do it. We went to 1.5 per cent, and we negotiated a range of EBAs that end soon. Just about every EBA was negotiated with a shorter period, so that the unions could get renegotiation under what they hoped would be a new government. That was what they got. The government has inherited that, and it will have to deal with it.

I support the government's wages policy, and I guess I am jealous that the government was able to do it with hardly a whimper from the union movement. There was a strike somewhere, but it was not at Parliament House. Did anyone see the unions going anywhere? I did not. I heard they were on strike somewhere. Maybe they were on strike at Cottesloe Beach. I read some tweets that they were a bit unhappy and were having discussions and were a bit disappointed, but good on the government. I guess what the union movement is saying is that only the ALP can screw it over, and that is what it has done. It has done the right thing, because wage restraint is absolutely needed, because our public servants are the highest paid in the country. We needed those wages to sustain essential services at that level, but population growth has slowed and wages in the public sector are simply not sustainable, so the government is doing the right thing. I do not want to sound like sour grapes but I am quite impressed with the government's wages policy. I wish I could have done it, but I could not, because the unions would not allow us to do it. However, they will come back and ask for something more, and that is what I am worried about.

**Mr P.A. Katsambanis:** What's the payback?

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** What is the payback? There would be a payback. The unions invested an unprecedented amount of money during the last election. There will be election funding reports, but they will represent only a small fraction of the amount of money and resources the union movement put into that election. We saw the unions campaigning and advertising heavily. On the Sunday before the election, on Channel Seven, between 7.00 pm and 8.00 pm, every ad was a union ad. Kerry Stokes must have been smiling. It was unprecedented. There were not many union people in my electorate, but down at the Canning pre-poll there were hundreds of union people who had flown over from the eastern states to campaign. They were being paid and put up in hotels. An unprecedented amount of money was invested in the present government by the unions, and they will demand payback. They were not doing it because members opposite have good smiles.

**Mr B. Urban:** I have.

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** Maybe.

They will want payback, and what will it be? Let us see. We have been watching that very carefully.

There is another issue here, and it is the real issue to some extent. Over time, the union movement has had a rich history in Australia. It has had, until now, a profoundly positive impact on the body politic and the values of Australia. I readily admit that. However, there is now a culture, in an increasing number of unions of not just thuggery but criminality. All members have to do is google "CFMEU" and look at the civil and criminal actions against it. Over 100 Construction, Forestry, Mining and Energy Union operatives have been or are under investigation for civil and criminal wrongdoing, on over 1 000 different issues.

Several members interjected.

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** I can tell from the behaviour of members opposite that they are trying to deny this, but it is obvious. It is a cancer in the union movement, and the Labor government is unable to do anything about it because it is not in control—the unions are. I remember, right before the election, a video was flying around social media of a CFMEU organiser in Perth talking to a bunch of his workers, or his delegates, I am not sure. He was using language one cannot use in this place, saying that if Labor Party politicians do not do what the union wants, the union owns them and it can change them.

Several members interjected.

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** I will send it to members, if they want. Also, we read in the paper that the CFMEU is now merging with the Maritime Union of Australia, another militant organisation, to effect greater influence over the ALP. If members opposite are not worried about the influence of criminal behaviour in the union movement, and the influence of these people over them —

Several members interjected.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I acknowledge that the Leader of the Opposition has brought a fairly heated topic to the house. Members and ministers—not looking in your direction, member for Cannington—please do not yell across the chamber. The member has only 12 minutes left; give him the floor.

**Ms S. Winton** interjected.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Wanneroo, I call you for the first time. You do not yell across the chamber when the Deputy Speaker is on her feet.

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** I know that this is hard for the Labor Party. Certain of its major leaders have raised this; it is not the first time. It is probably tough for the government to take from a Liberal opposition leader, but it is real. A question was asked of the Premier today. Yesterday, the Premier came out and banned ministers from interacting with Brian Burke. Good on him for that. I do not know whether Brian Burke is active in the Labor Party anymore. I do not know whether he is, but the government does not want him to be. Some of us have been around long enough to have seen his actions and his impact on the Labor Party repeatedly over 30 years. I guarantee that the government, for its own good and the good of the state, does not want him influencing its ministers. The question was about Brian Burke. He went to jail a long time ago for a crime that he has amended for. He went to jail, and that was a long time ago. He is an individual citizen and I am sure, as I read in the paper, he is unhappy about certain things he has done, so we will leave him alone. The Premier banned interactions between him and ministers. but when asked today whether he would do the same thing for the Construction, Forestry, Mining and Energy Union, which is active now and doing these types of things, he waffled and refused to answer. He said no, basically. I think the word was “no”. I can tell the government that its concern is not Brian Burke, although it should be cautious about that; it is the influence of a small group of people in the union movement who focus largely on using their influence, through the Labor Party, to get to the coffers and powers of government. If they undertake behaviours when interacting with members opposite that are like those that take place in workplaces, we are all in danger. Some members of the government cannot see this because they were put there by the same people. I understand that some of them are blind to this issue because they have no choice. Some of them are essentially delegates from the CFMEU; they are basically delegates who were put there by the union. But the union’s actions are not appropriate for them to be influencing members of Parliament, let alone getting representation; they simply are not. The government should be leery of them. It can break loose, which I encourage it to do. We brought this motion forward because during the last election, as I indicated, we had no idea how much the union movement paid for the Labor Party’s campaign, but it was phenomenal.

**Mrs J.M.C. Stojkovski:** How much did the business community pay for your campaign?

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** Not as much as the Labor Party’s campaign. It had the support of the business community. This time it had the business community firmly in hand. Labor got them; we lost them. Fair enough. We are trying to get them back. It was not so much the money that the union movement gave the Labor Party to spend; it was the parallel campaigns that went on.

**Mr B. Urban:** What about the banks?

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** The banks did not give us anything. The major banks have had a positive policy of giving nothing, but equally to each party, for a long time. Now they give nothing.

We saw huge parallel campaigns going on, but the real problem for the public of Western Australia is that none of that parallel campaigning is transparent—none of it—even though in some of the campaigns members had been actively involved. The education union campaigned very hard—in pictures on the web at least—doorknocking and telling the troops. It campaigned and spent the money of hardworking teachers on campaigning for the Labor Party. The unions used that money by giving it directly to the Labor Party at least, but also on parallel campaigns. Do you know what? The public has no transparency of that expenditure whatsoever,

and I suspect that the membership does not either. Before or during the campaign, the Labor government in Queensland decided to come forward with a policy of transparency in election funding. We have had debates about this in this house before. I think it is a good idea. One of the issues was to make funding to the Liberal Party by organisations such as the 500 Club transparent—that is fair enough; I agree—and also capping funding. That is fair enough; I agree. It will truncate election funding altogether, but so what. One thing that the Labor Party will always avoid, and we will not avoid, is making transparent and maybe capping the amount of parallel funding that goes on between the ALP and the union movement in political campaigns. It is as outrageous as political campaigns in the United States—that is, trying to avoid different types of funding. It is the same methodology. Parties receive certain money from the government on a per vote basis, which is clear. There is funding that is transparent and reported, and then there are all these secretive little groups providing parallel funding through the union movement that coordinate their campaigns explicitly with the campaign in ALP headquarters. None of that is transparent. It is not transparent to the public, to the electorate or, I suggest, to the union membership. It is a huge amount of money and it might not be used ethically. That is the real challenge of electoral funding reform and one that I personally will pursue. It is one that members opposite will be very quiet about. If the unions want to fund the ALP, they should just give it the money. It is a lot. The Labor Party out-funds us any day of the week. The big money in the last election was with it, particularly if we put all the unions in. The Labor Party would out-fund the Liberal Party six or seven to one. The big money was with Labor and it knows it. This time it had not only the unions, but also the big side of town.

One of the issues with this, which I will pursue, is trying to get greater clarity about the various interactions between the ALP and the union movement to make sure that their interactions in terms of support, funding, projects, positions on boards, positions with staffing and positions on various decision-making boards are transparent. Increasingly, the ALP and the union movement are one and the same. They have huge access to money influence and they probably have the most concentrated influence on the body politic of Western Australia and in Australia. Most of those interactions are hidden and non-transparent.

**Mr B. Urban:** Workers!

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** Unions have 7.3 per cent of the private sector workforce; 93 per cent of the private workforce are no longer union members. Many of those who are members are forced to be members. The union movement has shrunk. If the government is not concerned about some of the criminal behaviour and the declining ethics in the union movement, that is fair enough. That is why we have the Corruption and Crime Commission and various other regulatory bodies. I imagine that the government will get rid of the code of conduct that dealt with lawlessness in the building sector. Established in, I think, the Department of Commerce was a group of people to oversee and administer that code of conduct. I assume that the government will chop that. The Construction, Forestry, Mining and Energy Union will have told the government to get rid of it, if it has not already gone. There has been no word about that. I am sure that the government will maintain the very special privileges the union movement enjoys, but, mark my words, the union movement is no longer a membership-focused organisation; it is focused on sustaining its influence over a shrinking minority of people by influencing the government. The union movement will use the powers of government to sustain itself. In no other area of politics does a small minority of people have such an influence not only in what the government does, but also in the selection of ministers. Government ministers have been largely chosen based not on ability or seniority but on union affiliation. There are certain people in this place who deserve to be a minister, who have been here and who have delivered, and who are not.

**Mr P. Papalia** interjected.

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** The Minister for Tourism knows who they are; there is more than one. The government may have won by a landslide but the biggest concern the public of WA has with electing a Labor government is the excessive power that gives the unions. We will see what that is over the next four years.

**MR D.C. NALDER (Bateman)** [5.02 pm]: The motion before us today is that this house notes that the trade union movement represents just 9.4 per cent of Australian workers. The opposition has been pointing out that the union movement represents 71 per cent of ministers in the cabinet. I am going to talk about that influence and commentary about that in the press since the election. The number one concern in the broader community that has been expressed to me is that although the public has liked and enjoyed the government's rhetoric in these early days, they are concerned about the union movement's influence and whether the government can and will deliver on pre-election commitments and post-election rhetoric. Some things have occurred that have increased that level of public concern with the influence of the union movement. Following the election, the Maritime Union of Australia's Western Australia branch secretary, Chris Cain, said that the Premier owed the union some cabinet seats.

**Ms S.E. Winton:** Christy Cain.

**Mr D.C. NALDER:** I stand corrected. She said that the Premier owed the union some cabinet seats. There is no question that that has been delivered. This government has the highest number of former union leaders and officials of any WA Labor government since World War II and the highest representation of unionists in the past 70 years.

**Ms S.E. Winton:** How many of us?

**Mr D.C. NALDER:** It is the highest in the past 70 years. We know that 71 per cent of the McGowan cabinet has union ties. That is almost 10 times the proportion of trade union membership in the WA private sector of 7.6 per cent, according to the 2017 Australian Bureau of Statistics. When we look at that, we see it is not only among ministers; we see the same influence in the roles being offered to chiefs of staff and other staff members in the ministerial office.

In addition to the concerns that are continuing to grow in the public arena, I refer to some of the commentary that has followed comments by certain ministers. Hon Bill Johnston, the Minister for Mines and Petroleum, said immediately after the election on 27 March that uranium mine projects approved by the previous government would be able to proceed. Consider then the comments by the Australian Manufacturing Workers' Union on ABC radio on 18 April 2017 in an interview by Bridget Fitzgerald, that, according to my notes, stated —

The Mines Minister, Bill Johnston, has sent a statement to the ABC this morning saying 'Labor's position regarding the uranium mining in WA hasn't changed since 2012. Only mines approved prior to the 2017 State election will proceed'. ... do you have any issue with those four mines ... and it is four projects that are essentially given the go ahead ... do you have any issue with those proceeding?

STEVE MCCARTNEY

**I have an issue with every one of them proceeding, because we don't believe they've got the go ahead.**

BRIDGETTE FITZGERALD

What do you think they're lacking?

STEVE MCCARTNEY

They're lacking a series of things ... all we've really got it is some approval. A couple of things wrong with this whole debate, in mind view, right; one is there is no economic argument to even start these things ...

That is the sort of commentary from the AMWU on uranium mining proposals. In March the minister said that it was categorical that those mines that had been given prior approval would be allowed to proceed. When asked in this chamber whether they would be allowed to proceed, the minister stated —

I will give no guarantee of any such thing.

**Mr W.J. Johnston:** That's not what I was asked.

**Mr D.C. NALDER:** I am directly quoting *Hansard* —

I will give no guarantee of any such thing. All projects in this state are subject to the will of this Parliament, and this Parliament keeps the right to make decisions on the future of any project in this state.

If what the minister said on 27 March matches what happens, I will eat my hat. The comments by the minister on 27 March were categorical that these projects would be allowed to proceed. There were no ifs, buts or maybes. All of a sudden it is uncertain because the AMWU has stepped in and said, "We don't like this. We don't agree with this policy. We actually don't like uranium mining and therefore we are telling the Labor government that it's not going to happen." Yet the Labor government said it would accept the umpire's decision on the four mines that had been approved and they would be allowed to proceed. We are already seeing a level of union influence, whereby at one moment in an election campaign the Labor Party was stating that the mines would be allowed to proceed if they had previously received approval but post the election, and because of the influence of the AMWU, the Labor government is now saying, "We're not really sure. We don't think they will be. We don't think they've ticked all the boxes at this point in time." The rhetoric has changed fundamentally.

I will also move to what has occurred off the back of questions without notice I asked the Treasurer today. I express some surprise, because I would say that the Treasurer has misled Parliament in the past 24 hours. The first comment I draw members' attention to is his comment yesterday about Treasury costings for the Liberals in 2008 that were not subject to analysis. I have copies of the Treasury costings for the Liberal Party and the Labor Party for 2008, 2013 and 2017. Both parties submitted those costings in 2008 and 2013, and the language on what constitutes analysis by Treasury is exactly the same right across the board. The only costing that Treasury never had was from the Labor Party in 2017. There is also commentary about royalties and the GST, but I will elaborate on that further when I speak in the third reading debate of the Supply Bill. The Treasurer said in question time that he had not said that the GST and royalties were influencing the government's financial position and that other things were being taken into account.

I will actually bring forth the quotes that both the Premier and the Treasurer have made regarding these issues, but that is for a later date. The purpose today is to share with the house the comments the Treasurer made

regarding Synergy, and then the commentary from the Australian Manufacturing Workers' Union. The Treasurer went out in public and said —

... I want to get to a position where Western Australians can start making a choice about who provides them with their electricity," ... "You are seeing it already with gas, that competition has quite a dramatic impact on bills. That's where you see real pressure applied on costs—when there's a competitive market. That's what I'm trying to achieve."

He also said —

"The right policy outcome, that is competition, may also be likely to have a negative balance sheet outcome — that is Synergy's value," ... "It's effectively a transfer of value to consumers. In terms of the overall economy, competition and lower power prices is a good thing."

Then the AMWU came out and absolutely slammed the Treasurer's comments. In an interview with *The West Australian* on Monday, 22 May, the Treasurer said he —

... wanted to end State-owned power provider Synergy's monopoly over the residential electricity market "sooner rather than later".

Steve McCartney from the AMWU said —

... the Treasurer's statements went against Labor's position and the clear mandate given at the March state election.

"This is not the policy, it's not the party platform, it's just the Treasurer completely out of bounds, making it up as he goes along."

"Our members, and countless others in the community made it very clear in voting for this Labor government how they felt about the Liberal agenda, and to have the Treasurer running around saying it would be 'wonderful' to follow the plans of the previous Liberal government is an absolute slap in the face to those people."

"If Treasurer Wyatt wants to follow Liberal party policy, maybe he's in the wrong party."

I have never heard anything so insightful from the unions about one of the Labor Party's ministers. It begs the question: who is running the government? That is at the heart of this motion today. During question time, I asked the Premier who he supports. Is he supporting the Treasurer or the AMWU? The Premier turned around and first talked about Western Power. I do not know where this Western Power commentary comes from when we are talking about Synergy. I am sure that the Premier understands the difference between Western Power and Synergy and the difference between generating power, retailing power and transmitting power, but he did get confused a bit in comments about gentailing. Anyway, Western Power, as we all know, is about the transmission of power; it has nothing to do with the generation or retailing of power. But he started to make the inference that this was about Western Power and that we lost the election. He then went on to this strange and crazy thing about me and the seats of Bateman, Bicton and Alfred Cove. What that had to do with the question, I have no idea. Obviously he feels a little bit threatened by that question; that is how I would interpret it. These claims by the AMWU are absolutely outrageous. It is incumbent on the government to put the AMWU back in its place. The government should show the community of Western Australia that it has some spine and tell the union to mind its own business. We will have confidence in the government of Western Australia when it can say that this is the policy for Western Australia and it is not the unions that are running government. The Minister for Mines and Petroleum has started to back off on uranium mining and we are seeing this vague approach in response to the questions about Synergy and what the Treasurer has said. The government is trying to avoid answering the question and being clear and concise for the people of Western Australia, which is what Western Australians deserve. People do not stand for cheap shots and political campaigning in the federal election that we have started to see in the last 24 hours. We saw that today. The campaigning that the government did in question time today was a disgrace. We want to see a government that is not controlled by unions and has the authority and the autonomy to make decisions on what it has been elected to do. That is not what we are experiencing. Every time this government comes up with a policy, if the unions do not agree with it, they come out and slap government members down. Not once have I seen the Premier stand up to the unions and tell them to back off because they are not running this state. That is what we expect of leadership and from this government. Members opposite have so many ties into this Parliament, that for those who are not tied, it is a real risk. These factional influences —

**Mr P. Papalia** interjected.

**Mr D.C. NALDER:** Here we go. Factional influences through the unions are dictating to government members how they act and operate, and they cannot handle the truth. They are demonstrating that they do not have the courage or the spine to stand up to these unions and let them know their place. Government members should show that they have the courage of their convictions to represent the people of Western Australia in their own right without these people pulling the levers behind their back and telling them how to think and operate and support. That is what we want to see; that is not what we are getting.

**MR S.K. L'ESTRANGE (Churchlands)** [5.16 pm]: The key concern surrounding this motion and debate is that unions no longer actually represent the workers. I know that members opposite think that unions represent workers, and a lot of members in this place who are members of unions in good faith think that they are doing the right thing by workers. They have a genuine desire to serve their constituencies with this philosophy of union involvement for the worker. I am advised that the reality is that unions represent only 9.4 per cent of the workforce. What I want to know is: who represents the rest of the workforce?

**Ms S.E. Winton:** I represent everyone in Wanneroo.

**Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE:** If the member is representing her constituency, good on her—that is why she is here. I commend her and every member of this place for representing their constituencies because that is our first and foremost job. The member's role as a member of Parliament is not in dispute. The concern in this debate is the influence of unions over the functioning of government and the public sector, and how business is coordinated and conducted by the private and public sector in Western Australia. That is what we are on about here, because we are concerned that there is a heavy influence of union involvement in the current crop of members of Parliament in government. That is a fact. By virtue of the government's membership, that is not in dispute; we know that.

**Ms S.E. Winton:** Give me an example.

**Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE:** I will get to an example in a minute, member. Just give me a chance to get my speech started; it would be much appreciated. I have about 30 minutes ahead of me so if the member waits and listens, she might learn something. She has been here for two seconds, but she seems to know a lot.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr T.J. Healy):** I ask you, member for Churchlands, to talk to the Chair—and can other members please listen in silence; thank you.

**Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE:** I thank you for your protection, Mr Acting Speaker.

I will read this point that was made in *The Weekend Australian* some time ago, but it is a point that started to deal with where the unions were headed. It was made by Judith Sloan in *The Weekend Australian* of 31 October 2015. She makes the point —

The real point is that trade unions in Australia have become less industrial organisations committed to enhancing the welfare of their members and more political bodies used by ambitious university graduates to secure political careers or well-paid positions at the Fair Work Commission and other government agencies.

Given this, it is hardly surprising unions fiercely resist any watering down of their influence within the Labor Party.

No greater example do we have than that over 80 per cent of the current members of Parliament in Western Australia have a strong affiliation with the union movement.

**Ms S.E. Winton:** And I'm proud of it. What's the point?

**Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE:** The member is obviously proud of it; she is one of them. That is not in dispute, member. We know the member is proud of it; otherwise, she would not be here representing a union. We have got it.

The point is that only 9.4 per cent of the workforce are members of the unions. So who is keeping an eye out for the rest? Why should so much power be vested in this group of people who come from a union body politic that represents only 9.4 per cent of the workforce? It is remarkable.

**Ms J.M. Freeman:** We represent the people who elected us, just like you.

**Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE:** Maybe the member for Mirrabooka was not here when I said that the role of members as advocates for their constituency is not in dispute. We are all here to do that. The point we are making is that for those members who are wedded to the union movement, the unions may well tell them how to vote on certain things. Yes, members have their community responsibilities to their constituency; that is not in dispute. But when decisions of government are before cabinet and the unions start influencing the outcomes of those decisions, it goes beyond representing constituents; it then becomes influencing the outcomes for Western Australia. The member for Mirrabooka knows very well that that is the case.

Several members interjected.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Members, please listen in silence. Member for Churchlands, if you spoke to the Chair, they would be less likely to respond.

**Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE:** Robust debate is a function of Parliament. I am interested in some interjections, but there are times when they are pointless. I am going quite okay, but thank you for your offer of protection again, Mr Acting Speaker.

I will talk about the comment of the Maritime Union of Australia's state secretary, Christy Cain. Let me tell members something that he said quite recently. On 13 March, just after the election, there was an ABC news item titled "Unions call for seats at Mark McGowan's cabinet table". It reports that when Mr Cain was asked whether he thought the Premier-elect owed unions some cabinet seats, he said, "Yes, I think he does." That is why I am saying that it is of concern. A group of unions is able to influence a new government that is forming to ensure that it has union representation on it, but, remember, it represents only 9.4 per cent of the people.

Paul Murray was onto this.

**Mr P. Papalia** interjected.

**Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE:** I have no idea what the member's interjection has to do with my debate right now, but let me continue.

**Mr P. Papalia** interjected.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Minister!

**Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE:** Paul Murray made the point on 1 March this year, just prior to the election, in an article titled "Hypocrisy clouds poor policy". It states —

... a new Labor faction which plans to link a disparate bunch of previously warring unions will emerge after the election to challenge the power of the dominant United Voice bloc.

It's all about who "owns" McGowan should Labor get elected and has some urgency because the unions think that is a certainty.

Paul Murray was onto this concern. We know that there is over 80 per cent membership. We know that the United Voice bloc is the biggest bloc in the Parliament, closely followed by the Australian Manufacturing Workers' Union. The concerns for the wider community are how this will influence government policy. That is what we are alluding to in Parliament today.

The most significant aspect of concern is that it creates an environment of uncertainty for the economy of Western Australia. No better example of that exists than the current Labor government's position on uranium mining. I heard some backbenchers interject, "Oh, no, here we go again." It is a serious concern to the people of Western Australia if, on the one hand, a party goes to an election saying one thing and then, on the other hand, once elected it starts implying another, particularly if, when it is implying the other, the dots can be joined between a union leader's point of view and the outcome of that change. That is when it starts to become a real concern for the people of Western Australia, particularly the people of Western Australia who are investing in that mines sector. Let me try to help join the dots.

**Mr P. Papalia:** Do you want a crayon?

**Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE:** No, member. I am quite capable of explaining this to members, but I do appreciate his offer of support. This is the Labor Party's 2015 policy platform, which no doubt would have been drafted with the union movement. Paragraph 269 states —

The platform recognises WA Labor's long and continuous opposition to Uranium Mining.

That is pretty clear. It is not ambiguous at all. There it is. Then we move forward to the election and just after the election, the Minister for Mines and Petroleum —

**Dr M.D. Nahan:** Which one?

**Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE:** The current mines minister. This was reported in the *Kalgoorlie Miner* of 25 April this year, after the election —

Bill Johnston said the Labor position was clear, and that Vimy Resources' Mulga Rock, Toro Energy's Wiluna Uranium Project and Cameco Australia's Yeelirrie would be allowed to go ahead, along with Cameco's Kintyre project in the Pilbara.

There we go; we have a mines minister who is doing the right thing by the mines. He is supporting it. Just remember, members, it is not a position of the 2015 policy platform. He has gone against the policy platform of 2015. We applaud that position.

**Ms S. Winton** interjected.

**Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE:** Hang on a sec, member for Wanneroo; just listen in. I am getting there; I am joining the dots.

**Ms S. Winton** interjected.

**Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE:** The member for Wanneroo needs to listen. The AMWU's state secretary, Steve McCartney, was quick to say that the minister had been misquoted and there was no way in the world that

projects would be able to go ahead. How does a person external to the cabinet say that a minister has been misquoted? How does that happen? Member for Wanneroo, listen in; here is the fourth dot. Is the member ready? The unions are rapping the minister on uranium and *The West Australian* reported —

Premier Mark McGowan is facing the first big internal test of his leadership after left-wing unions lashed out at Mines Minister Bill Johnston over what appears to be support of four uranium mines.

That was in an article by Daniel Mercer and Nick Butterly in *The West Australian* of Tuesday, 18 April 2017.

We are joining the dots. The policy platform was one thing, but the minister went to an election saying another. After the election, the unions said that his position was wrong. Now the minister is starting to backtrack on the position going into the election. This is what we are saying. We all have different backgrounds.

**Ms J.M. Freeman:** You are doing the bidding of uranium mining companies.

**Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE:** I am actually not. Member for Mirrabooka, I am making a point of the influence of unions to change the decision-making process of cabinet. That is the concern I have. Obviously, it will have a very negative effect on that sector of the economy if uncertainty ensues as a result of those changes and it will impact upon investment decisions.

Let me move away from talking about the mining sector to something completely different—something that the member for Wanneroo is passionate about, which is schools. The Liberal–National government embarked upon the independent public schools program. It was a highly successful program. It caught the imagination of school communities throughout Western Australia. Many of them were very keen and quick to jump on board to improve the governance of their schools and have more community involvement in the governance of their schools. It was highly successful. What was Labor's 2015 policy platform on independent public schools? Let me read it to members. The Labor Party's position is in a section of its policy document—for new Labor members who might not have seen it, it is a big red document. It is a big red book with a lot in it!

Several members interjected.

**Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE:** Yes, it has a lot of ideas.

**Ms S. Winton** interjected.

**Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE:** Let me tell the member about this idea, because I have no doubt that she will be keen to tell her school communities in Wanneroo about it. Let me tell members this idea. There is a section called “Returned to Government” and paragraph (z) states that it will —

Immediately cease any further roll out of the Independent Public Schools program;

That was under the heading “Returned to Government”. The document states that if returned to government, the independent public school rollout would immediately cease.

Several members interjected.

**Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE:** That is the policy.

**Ms J.M. Freeman** interjected.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Member for Mirrabooka!

**Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE:** Hang on a second; let me join the dots! Now let us look at the State School Teachers Union of WA position on IPS. Surprise, surprise; let us look at this. Under the heading “Independent Public Schools”, it states —

While remaining fundamentally opposed to the Western Australian Independent Public School (IPS) model ...

The policy platform aligns with the union platform. We have not yet seen the Labor government demonstrate whether it will go back on its IPS policy, but the track record to date on how the Labor government has communicated with the education community is appalling. There is no better example than the consultation, or lack of, with the Perth Modern School community on its Education Central policy. There was zero consultation for a complete change and then the government decided, after hearing the backlash, to go back on its plan and change it.

**Ms J.M. Freeman** interjected.

**Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE:** That is for another debate, member for Mirrabooka. The point I am getting at is that consultation is not a strong component of the way members opposite govern and I will watch very closely how they handle the independent public school system that was set up by the Liberal–National government in Western Australia. I think that members opposite will slowly start to unravel it and pull it back and I think they will acquiesce to the demands of the State School Teachers Union of Western Australia. I think we will see one of the most outstanding education initiatives in this state's history go down the toilet.

Several members interjected.

**Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE:** That is what I think, but I hope I am wrong.

**THE ACTING SPEAKER (Mr T.J. Healy):** Manager of opposition business, I again remind you that if you speak through the Chair, there will be fewer interruptions from members and I would always remind members to please listen in silence.

**Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE:** Thank you, Mr Acting Speaker, for your support once again.

Let us move on. I gave an example from the mining sector and I flagged a concern in the independent public schools arena. Let us move on now to the relationship the new Labor government will have with companies that deal with government projects and government procurement. How will that play out in the future? Labor's policy platform in that arena is quite alarming. I will need to spell this out for members who are new to this place because it is important that they understand what these procurement policies are about. I will read from the policy document, which states —

A WA Labor Government will review all procurement policies and practices to ensure the following:

- (a) That preference in awarding contracts is given to those companies that are prepared to work within the Labor Governments industrial relations framework; that is, which have a positive approach towards the rights of trade unions and their members and respect the right of employees to become members of the appropriate union ...

That is the first point. It goes on to state —

Several members interjected.

**Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE:** Member, I will accept that interjection because, remembering what I said earlier, only 9.4 per cent of the workforce belong to a union.

**Dr M.D. Nahan:** It is 7.3 per cent in Western Australia.

**Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE:** The Leader of the Opposition says that 7.3 per cent of the Western Australian workforce belong to a union, yet we have a policy around procurement that states that it has to abide by Labor's view that the unions need to be involved. It goes on to state —

- (c) That all successful tenderers for cleaning contracts in Government owned buildings will be signatories of the United Voice "Cleanstart Principles".

[Member's time extended.]

**Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE:** That is an insightful statement in this policy document. It states that all successful tenderers will be signatories of the United Voice "Cleanstart Principles". If they are not a signatory to the principles of United Voice, which is a union, does that mean they will not be able to tender?

Several members interjected.

**Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE:** Will they not be able to tender?

Several members interjected.

**Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE:** What I am getting at is: why can the best company not get the job based on its performance, regardless?

Several members interjected.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Members!

**Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE:** They are getting upset. I know there are a lot of United Voice members here, Leader of the Opposition. Let me go on. The policy document states —

Further WA Labor expects that such companies will ensure any sub-contractors will also comply with these provisions.

WA Labor will introduce mechanisms, systems and practices within government departments and authorities which are capable of implementing and policing the above, including effective contract management and audit processes to ensure compliance with this policy throughout the relevant domestic supply chains. WA Labor notes the value in the use of relevant Trade Unions to assist in the audit of these successive contracts throughout the relevant supply chains.

The unions are now auditing government supply chains! This is in Labor's policy platform. Where was that in its election media? Millions of dollars were spent on advertising. I remember filling up my car with petrol at the local service station and watching Premier McGowan's advertisements rolling, rolling, rolling while I filled up the car. I thought: God, you cannot avoid this guy. He is everywhere. He is on billboards, on the telly, on the

radio and at the service station! He was everywhere. It was like *Where's Wally!* But Wally was everywhere; he was right here. It was unbelievable! I saw none of this in any of those ads.

Several members interjected.

**Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE:** Listen to this; it is the last bit. I will wrap up soon, but I know the member for Wanneroo is enjoying it. The member for Wanneroo is having a great time! There is a lot, but this is important. The policy document goes on —

Further a WA Labor Government will ensure that there is a willingness by government departments to exercise this power.

In the policy platform, the Labor government has tied its departments to the union movement under its watch.

**Ms M.M. Quirk:** And the problem is?

**Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE:** That is a beautiful segue to my wrap up, member for Girrawheen. The problem is this: Labor's policy platform is clearly heavily influenced by the union movement. That is indisputable and it is very obvious. It is actually written —

**Mr W.J. Johnston:** What's the party called? We are the Labor Party.

**Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE:** Let me finish. The member for Cannington is correct; it is the Labor Party, but unions do not represent the broader Western Australian community, with only 9.4 per cent national representation. As the Leader of the Opposition said, it is 7.3 per cent state representation. Why does this union stranglehold exist over a Labor-held Parliament and cabinet when unions do not represent the broader community? That is our key concern. The broader Western Australian community is not interested in unions; it is interested in a fair go. They are aspiring, entrepreneurial, motivated people who want the best for themselves and for their kids; they do not want to be constrained by unions telling them when they can and cannot work. They are not interested in that. It is concerning that 80 per cent of our Western Australian members of Parliament are affiliated with unions, which is out of step with the 7.3 per cent union membership in Western Australia that the Leader of the Opposition told us about. It is out of step.

**Ms S.F. McGurk** interjected.

**Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE:** We are only three months in, member. We know and we have examples and we are already seeing unions publicly putting pressure on Labor to abide by its policies. If a Labor minister steps outside that policy framework, they are whacked; they are told in the media that they got it wrong or have been misquoted. It is like the puppeteer with their hand up the puppet's back; the puppet got it wrong and it needs to go out and say it again this way.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Members, I hesitate to repeat —

Several members interjected.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Members! Please direct your comments through the Chair, thank you very much.

**Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE:** Thank you, Mr Acting Speaker; your protection is wonderful. I have been enjoying it greatly.

The key concern is that it is creating uncertainty. When a government says one thing and is heavily influenced by a union operative to say another and starts saying another thing, it creates uncertainty throughout the community of Western Australia, uncertainty for investment decisions in projects throughout Western Australia, uncertainty on building and construction sites, and uncertainty linked to government procurement. That is why the heavy influence of the union movement on the new Labor government is of concern to us in this place.

**MR Z.R.F. KIRKUP (Dawesville)** [5.43 pm]: I would like to start my contribution to the debate on this motion tonight with some indulgence from the house to extend my thanks to retiring state director Andrew Cox.

Several members interjected.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr T.J. Healy):** Members!

**Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP:** He was a great state director during a difficult election campaign. I extend my thanks to him and I wish him well in his ventures in Canberra. My thanks also go to retiring Senator Chris Back for his contribution to Western Australia since he was elected in 2009. I wish Chris, Linda and his family well in retirement from public life.

I know that I am a freshman in this place, but it is remarkable to see the rabble on the other side of the chamber protesting so much over such a routine contribution from the opposition, which is often in the position to have to highlight the scandalous dark links of unions with the Labor Party.

**Mr B. Urban** interjected.

**Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP:** My father is not a unionist at all. I am glad the member for Darling Range raised that point because I will get to it in just a moment.

I do not doubt the importance of unions to the Labor Party. I do not even doubt the importance of unions' contributions to our national history. I think there have been times since their inception, I think, in 1891 when they have contributed much to protect workers' rights and to improving standards of occupational health and safety.

Several members interjected.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Members!

**Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP:** As I said, I do not doubt their contribution to our nation's history, but, similarly, I have been personally affected by an element that exists within the union movement—in the militant construction union that is the Construction, Forestry, Mining and Energy Union, in particular. The member for Darling Range did say that my father was a unionist. No, he was in fact petitioned to become a unionist, but when he could not afford his ticket, or, indeed, refused to pay for a ticket, they came back the next day to the construction site in Midland where he was an apprentice and told him that he had to buy a ticket from them or he would not work. He refused again. They came back a second day, I think it was, and told him that if he did not buy a ticket, they would return and make sure that they beat him up.

**Mr P. Papalia** interjected.

**Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP:** Thank you very much.

**Ms A. Sanderson:** Was it a real job?

**Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP:** A real job—that is right.

In any case, my father, who was an apprentice plumber on the site, refused to buy a ticket. The very next day the unionists came back and they assaulted him; they beat him up. Ever since then, within him there was an attitude that he would never support the Labor Party or, more importantly, support a party that was aligned with the militant construction union.

**Mr M.P. Murray** interjected.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Minister!

**Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP:** Indeed, my family's contribution—indeed, my experience —

**Mr M.P. Murray** interjected.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Minister!

**Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP:** Come on now. Right you are.

**Mr M.P. Murray:** Ask him how many times he voted against a pay rise.

**Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP:** Okay. I cannot and I will not at this point. I appreciate that members opposite are protesting much for their departing union puppetmaster and I appreciate their hostility in this case.

Several members interjected.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Members! Members, thank you.

**Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP:** Look at them fire up. My relationship with construction unions is not limited to my father's experience; it was also my experience. In the summer of 2015–16, I had the good fortune of being a concrete formworker on two hotel sites that my employer BGC was constructing—the Aloft Hotel in Rivervale and the Westin hotel in the CBD.

**Mr M.J. Folkard:** Was it your first job?

**Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP:** It was not my first job, but I appreciate the interjection. It was certainly an odd job.

Several members interjected.

**Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP:** My time in the construction industry, although limited, gave me enormous respect for those who risk their lives every day, with which I am sure all members in this place would agree.

**Mr M.J. Folkard:** I see callouses on your hands.

**Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP:** I appreciate that. Mr Acting Speaker.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Member for Dawesville, I do apologise. Members, please listen to the member in silence. Again, as I told the member who spoke before you, if you speak through the Chair, I will make sure that members listen to you in silence.

**Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP:** I will try my best, Mr Acting Speaker.

I am also cognisant of the point about the two deaths on the Jaxon Construction site in East Perth raised by the member for Cannington during question time. I was also working on the construction site at that time and I can promise all in this place that when we heard about those awful, awful deaths on site, it muted our energy during the day. It was saddening for all of us there. It absolutely has an effect; it is an awful thing. I hate to see any worker killed on a construction site, and we should do all we can to ensure that we mitigate that risk. A number of times I was in dangerous and potentially harmful situations during my time on site. I was knocked over by a concrete prop. Not callouses, but one of my fingers was crushed —

Several members interjected.

**Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP:** I am glad members opposite all deride it, but it is indeed an experience —

**Mr M.J. Folkard:** It was because your sunglasses were fogged up and you couldn't see what you were doing!

**Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP:** These are dangers that all construction workers face on a daily basis. They are all dangers. I hope all in this place do everything they can to mitigate the risks to construction workers going forward.

My experience is not limited to concrete formwork, but my experience with the Construction, Forestry, Mining and Energy Union on a daily basis as I arrived at work was consistently that I was hassled to become part of that union. I was called a scab when I was not.

**Ms M.M. Quirk** interjected.

**Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP:** It is an affiliated site; the member for Girrawheen is quite right. But that did not stop the union from standing out the front and ensuring that every single time we went to work, we were hassled to join that union. That behaviour does not happen in any other modern workplace in Western Australia. To be frank, I find it absurd that we have, at this point in time, the various leaders of the CFMEU who have been convicted of assault, trespass, contempt of court and industrial law breaches and have a longstanding history of bullying, intimidation, standover tactics, thuggery and making threats against anyone who gets in their way, and they are part of the Australian Labor Party!

Several members interjected.

**Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP:** I find it staggering that a union operates as an effective legal mafia and, as such, continues to have a significant role in our state's governance and democracy.

Several members interjected.

**Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP:** This is not the story of an organised —

Several members interjected.

#### *Point of Order*

**Dr A.D. BUTI:** I seek your ruling on the member reading from his notes. This is not a speech that can be read from his notes. It is not his inaugural speech.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr T.J. Healy):** Are they speaking notes, member for Dawesville?

A member interjected.

**Dr A.D. BUTI:** He is not allowed to do that!

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Are they speaking notes?

**Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP:** Copious notes, Mr Acting Speaker.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** They are copious speaking notes —

**Dr A.D. BUTI:** But he cannot read from them!

Several members interjected.

**Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP:** I will go back!

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Members! The member has a contribution to make; he is reading from copious speaking notes. Thank you.

#### *Debate Resumed*

Several members interjected.

**Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP:** I will table the laptop later, shall I?

**Mr D.A. Templeman:** Table that laptop!

**Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP:** This is not an organisation that I can imagine one of two major political parties in our democracy should have an affiliation with—and yet it does. Moreover, the concern I think we should all have in

this place is that the CFMEU wants to grow and increase its power over the Labor Party, with a prospective merger with the Maritime Union of Australia. With that merger, the CFMEU will seek to fight as hard as it can to increase its influence over the Labor Party. That is, no doubt, made worse by the fact that it has recently formed what is the historic bloc called “Progressive Labor”! It seems that the Transport Workers’ Union of Australia, the shoppies, I think it is, the Australian Workers’ Union, the MUA and the CFMEU are all getting together to try to stop the dominance of United Voice.

**Mr P. Papalia:** Are you in Mathias’ bloc or faction?

**Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP:** I am not a part of any faction, minister, but I appreciate the minister’s interest in this.

Several members interjected.

**Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP:** I am not at all, minister! I appreciate the minister’s intense interest in my life at this point, but he is quite wrong.

It seems to me that the important power that United Voice has had for more than a decade is seeking to be countered by a group that has put aside substantial ideological leanings to exert its influence over the composition of candidates it sends to an election, and those cabinet ministers.

The unions have a say in the make-up of the Australian Labor Party; we know that. I do not doubt that. I think that at times it has contributed important milestones to our history. Indeed, I think it has contributed important and good members to this place. I consider the member for Morley to be at least a very close associate of mine, and I think she is a great envoy of United Voice.

Several members interjected.

**Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP:** That is right; I said an associate, member for Darling Range!

But imagine a circumstance when a body—an organisation—with such a history of illegal activities of being so immoral, unethical and abusive could have a say in who stands for an election, and, moreover, who becomes a minister of the Crown. I might be a freshman member to this place, as I mentioned before, but I do not doubt that the unions, effectively, own the Australian Labor Party. This should be a concern for all of us in this place, and moreover the concern that there seems to be a possible change of ownership in the offing. A rogue, militant construction union, which, as I have outlined, has proudly ignored the rule of law, is trying to become the new owner of the Australian Labor Party.

**Mr P. Papalia:** Stop reading your speech!

**Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP:** They are copious notes, minister.

It wants to offset its declining membership base by increasing its influence over the cabinet and government.

As I said at start of my speech, I do not doubt the importance of unions to the Labor Party. I do not doubt the importance of unions for their contribution to our nation’s history. I think we all know in our heart of hearts that the CFMEU is not the face of modern unionism in Western Australia. We all know as well in our heart of hearts that it has a sordid history that should be rejected by all people in this place.

Several members interjected.

**Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP:** With that, I invite all members in this place to join the opposition in expressing our concern about the unions’ growing influence, and join us to particularly reject the CFMEU. In such a small effort, we will show to the rest of the world that those members stand in rejection of hostility, aggression and militant unionism, and stand with us for all that is just, right and moral.

**MR S.J. PRICE (Forrestfield)** [5.56 pm]: I am not the lead speaker on this motion, but I feel I have a bit to contribute. It may come as no surprise to those opposite that, yes, I have a union background, and, yes, I have had a long history with the union movement. I want to correct some of the misinformation that has been spoken about in the last hour and a half or two hours.

**Mr S.K. L’Estrange:** Which one, member?

**Mr S.J. PRICE:** Probably each and every one of you who has spoken.

**Mr S.K. L’Estrange:** Which union were you with?

**Mr S.J. PRICE:** Sorry; yes, it was the Australian Workers’ Union—absolutely.

**Mr S.K. L’Estrange:** Thank you

**Ms M.M. Quirk:** Apparently your research was extensive!

Several members interjected.

**Mr S.K. L’Estrange:** I was just making sure it was on the *Hansard*, member for Girrawheen, and I just got it.

**Mr S.J. PRICE:** Just to be clear before I start, some very unsavoury comments were made about a couple of my close friends. There was a lot of commentary about Steve McCartney, secretary of the Australian Manufacturing Workers' Union. Steve is one of the most passionate people who could be found in the union movement, and he is someone you would definitely want in your corner when you have an issue on the worksite and in negotiations on behalf of members. I put in that same bracket Christy Cane. Opposition members have sat here and run Christy down on numerous occasions, and it is absolutely disgraceful.

**Mr S.K. L'Estrange:** We are quoting what he said in the paper.

**Mr S.J. PRICE:** No, but the commentary that went with that. He is one of the best people we could have in the union movement, and he is doing an absolutely fabulous job in one of the most dangerous industries in this country. He is constantly under attack by you on the other side and your friends in the industries to try to get rid of the MUA—and it is disgraceful.

I would also like to congratulate the Minister for Commerce on the appointment of Stephanie Mayman as chairperson for the Commission for Occupational Safety and Health. Once again, the opposition had a shot at Stephanie's history within the union movement. She is one of the most experienced people to take on that role. She worked for the WA Occupational Safety and Health Tribunal for 10 years, she was a founding member of the WA WorkSafe commission, she was a commissioner of the Western Australian Industrial Relations Commission—members opposite may not realise we have two jurisdictions that operate in this state—and she was also secretary of UnionsWA from 2001 to 2004. She has a wealth of experience.

**Ms J.M. Freeman:** She is an absolute champion campaigner on asbestos.

**Mr S.J. PRICE:** Absolutely. It was a fabulous appointment, and I commend the minister on that.

I will go back because I am a bit confused. Members opposite said 71, 73 to 80 per cent of us have union links? Can they tell me which one it is, because it should be 100 per cent! The Labor Party did come through the union movement. To correct the history of, I think, the member for Dawesville: the Labor Party was actually formed in 1891 on the back of the Australian Workers' Union, which was the Australasian Shearers Union which was formed in 1886 in Ballarat. Then, in 1891, after a shearers' strike in Queensland, 13 members were committed to either three or five years of hard labour on St Helena Island. At that point, the working men and women of this country decided to form the ALP. There is a long history there, but if members are going to quote it they should get it right.

I will now go back and talk about safety in the mining industry. The Leader of the Opposition brought up some very important points. I am not sure whether he has any understanding about my background, but apart from working in that industry, when I was employed by the union, in my role as secretary I sat on a number of committees. These were government committees, and I will start by talking about one called the Mining Industry Advisory Committee. It is a statutory committee set up under the WorkSafe legislation. It consists of a tripartite arrangement between the government, the industry and the unions. I was one of three union members on that committee. The other two were a representative of the CFMEU mining and energy division, which represented the coal industry, and a representative of the AMWU. Our job on that committee was to make recommendations to the minister about safety issues associated with mining. It sits under the resource safety section of the Department of Mines and Petroleum. It still exist today and still plays a major role in identifying, developing and publishing many of the guidance notes for the industry to help meet its safety obligations under the regulations.

Not only that, as we had an unfortunate spate of fatalities—I think between 2013 and 2014 there was a period of about two years when we killed in excess of 10 people in the mining industry—there was a very big focus on what was going on within that industry. Unfortunately, it was concentrated on a couple of the big operators, and there was a distinct difference between the ways they operated. As a result of that—the member is right in what he said—safety in the mining industry improved significantly, but it was not without union involvement. Safety in the mining industry improved because we took a different approach, and we ended up implementing a user-pays system, for which the industry paid based on the number of man-hours worked. The levy was placed on that to generate income that then allowed the Department of Mines and Petroleum to employ more appropriately qualified inspectors. That focus on improvement led to increased safety on those worksites and ultimately, even though we are still killing people, we are not killing people as often as we used to, which is a good step forward but not far enough.

We are also working towards implementing a new reporting requirement and adopting an offshore safety regime that they called the safety case regime, which allows companies to put forward a plan to manage their own occupational health and safety risks on-site. That is ongoing, and it is good work that needs to be continued. At the same time, there was a national approach to improving occupational health and safety in the mining industry. That was called the national mine safety framework. Western Australia, being one of the main mining states in Australia, was a big player in that along with Queensland. I think there is a little bit of mining in Victoria and something down in Tasmania but apart from that, WA was one of the predominant parties to that.

**Mr P.A. Katsambanis:** There is mining in every state of Australia.

**Mr S.J. PRICE:** Yes, but once again we are talking quantity. We continued on, and as part of that process a committee was established called the Ministerial Advisory Panel. I sat on that as well, along with a number of other union and industry representatives. MAP was doing some absolutely fabulous work on streamlining safety regulations and requirements in the mining industry, and ensuring that there was consistency across the country. We would look at the best regulations, the best guidelines, and the best code of practice at a particular mine site anywhere in the country to cherry-pick the best safety approach to be applied across the country, in particular in Western Australia. I am not sure whether that is still going, but the previous Minister for Mines and Petroleum was a strong supporter of it, and once again it was a step forward. Do not discount the role that the union movement has played in improving safety in the mining industry in this state; it is wrong to do that.

The next area that the Leader of the Opposition touched on was superannuation. It takes quite a brave man to come in here and talk about the union movement's involvement in superannuation, when we compare industry superannuation funds with commercial superannuation funds.

**Mr D.C. Nalder:** The latest results are not that good.

**Mr S.J. PRICE:** It is challenging for everyone, but industry super funds on average have returned more than commercial super funds. The boards of the industry superannuation funds have equal representation between industry and the union movement. To say that there are positions on boards for union representatives and not say that there are an equal number of positions on the boards for company representatives is not a fair representation of what is going on. I was on a superannuation advisory committee. Once again, three union members were on that board along with three industry members.

**Ms S.F. McGurk:** The Chamber of Commerce.

**Mr S.J. PRICE:** The Chamber of Commerce was one of them.

**Dr M.D. Nahan:** What super fund was that?

**Mr S.J. PRICE:** Australian Super—no small one, with nearly a \$100 billion under management, one of the best and one of the biggest.

**Mr P.A. Katsambanis:** Did you pay your fees back to the union?

**Mr S.J. PRICE:** I was not paid a fee. This was an advisory board.

**Dr M.D. Nahan:** That was the fund that wanted to buy Western Power.

**Mr S.J. PRICE:** Such a big superannuation fund looks around the globe to invest its money, so it would be interested in anything that pops up.

Once again, we cannot forget where superannuation funds came from. They were established through the union movement, and they have allowed hundreds of thousands of Australians to save for their retirement, and without the union movement we would never have started that.

The other point I wanted to touch on before I get into what I wanted to speak on, was that members opposite made a number of comments about the CFMEU and the MUA. Those two unions represent their workers absolutely fabulously in the most dangerous industries in this country. Just because members might not agree with how some of them look, and may not like how some of them sound, they do a great job representing workers in absolutely dangerous industries. The member for Dawesville has experienced and realised how dangerous those industries are.

I will get back to a couple of other points about the motion. When we talk about union density within the country, the opposition has pulled up this rubbery figure of 9.4 per cent.

**Dr M.D. Nahan:** It is from the Australian Bureau of Statistics.

**Mr S.J. PRICE:** Yes, they are ABS figures, but for what? They do not give us all the information that we are looking for.

**Mr P.A. Katsambanis:** If you do not like something, you just ignore it.

**Mr S.J. PRICE:** No, absolutely not—the exact opposite. Those same ABS figures show that union density across the board, when private and public sector membership is not separated, is closer to 16 per cent. Let us talk numbers. If we are talking around 16 per cent, we are talking about 1.6 million Australians. That is not an insignificant number. It is absolute rubbish for the opposition to say that 1.6 million Australians are unrepresentative and that they are not important enough.

**Ms S.F. McGurk:** It is the largest organisation.

**Mr S.J. PRICE:** That is right.

The opposition has talked about the make-up of the Labor Party. I am a proud union member, and always have been during my working career and always will be. On this side of the house, there is not only members of the union movement, whether it be past employees or current members, but also teachers, police officers, ex-defence force personnel and even a couple of lawyers.

Several members interjected.

**Mr S.J. PRICE:** We will not hold that against them. We also have small business people as well. The members for Jandakot and Pilbara are Indian-born small business men who moved to Australia and who ran successful businesses before coming to this place. Worst of all, we have a lot of parents on this side of the table! How dare we have parents here when they should not be here! We have a significant number of female members. Unfortunately, when I look to the other side of the chamber, which is the same side I am on because we cannot all fit on the other side, there are two female members.

**Mrs L.M. Harvey:** Proportionally, we are doing okay.

**Mr S.J. PRICE:** Yes, it is 13 per cent.

We are truly representative of the voting public of Western Australia. The opposition tries to single out one aspect of our party's make-up and says that we are not representative. That is a very flawed approach.

The final point I want to touch on is a comment by the member for Hillarys a few days ago, just after we were doing maiden speeches. From *Hansard*, the member for Hillarys said —

It is interesting that people on the government benches, even as late as yesterday, were coming to this place and kissing the ring of the union leaders who they are here to represent.

When I hear those sorts of comments—I do not know; it must be my background—I conjure up pictures of *The Godfather* and the mafia. There is only one person in this chamber who reminds me of Don Corleone and he is not in here at the moment. When the opposition wants to talk about who has been running the state and how they have been doing it, members need to look closer to home.

**Mr B. Urban:** Backbencher.

**Mr S.J. PRICE:** Absolutely. The member for Dawesville made a comment about a past unionist who behaved badly, got caught and went to jail. I am surprised he knows who he was talking about because I am guessing it was quite a while before his time.

The motion refers to the influence of the trade union movement within cabinet, but the debate essentially has been all about us. I would like to finish by referring to part (4) of the motion, which condemns the Community and Public Sector Union–Civil Service Association of WA for its mute response to massive cuts. The opposition has just demonstrated that its side of the chamber does not know much about campaigning! There are many ways of campaigning, negotiating and achieving an outcome. Running a campaign is certainly not the only form of negotiation available to people. If the public sector union is not happy, and just because we are not reading it in the paper, does not mean it is not doing anything. There are different aspects to campaigning that achieve outcomes. You guys failed quite dismally at the last election; hence the outcome. But to say the public sector union is not doing anything and is mute is certainly overstepping the mark and demonstrates the opposition's lack of knowledge of the union movement.

**Dr M.D. Nahan:** They have protests, but not at Parliament House.

**Mr S.J. PRICE:** But that is how to campaign: build up to it and have a strategy—all the things that the Leader of the Opposition might need to learn about before the next election—to achieve the outcome you are looking for.

**Mr D.C. Nalder:** Mislead people.

**Mr S.J. PRICE:** I do not think so.

**Mr D.C. Nalder:** Change the position after the election.

**Mr S.J. PRICE:** That is not it at all.

I conclude by saying that it is obvious that those on the other side of the chamber do not really know what they are talking about, and their slight of the union movement is absolutely disgraceful. We represent working Australians generally and working Western Australians.

[Member's time extended.]

**Mr S.J. PRICE:** We represent all electors and workers in Western Australia. The opposition has referred to union density, but it did not refer to the tens of thousands of people who benefit from union agreements. There have been major construction projects in the north west, and, yes, union membership may be down, but the number of people who worked on those projects and benefited from union agreements would collectively be into

the hundreds of thousands of people. The union movement looks after not only those in the union, but everyone. We certainly need unions to maintain the balance we have to have within the workplace to protect workers and the occupational health and safety of everyone who works in this state.

**MS A. SANDERSON (Morley — Parliamentary Secretary)** [6.17 pm]: I rise to contribute to the debate on the motion moved by the opposition that refers to trade union representation in the government. Is it not astonishing that of all of the issues pressing the state currently—record unemployment; low wage growth—this is the motion that has been raised in private members' business as the highest priority that the opposition can find to debate? We have record use of methamphetamine, the worst rates of domestic violence in the country, we are getting ripped off by the goods and services tax allocation, and we have an appalling rollout of the national broadband network, yet this is the best the opposition can come up with. This is its priority. When we are talking about representation, credit where credit is due—men are well represented on opposition benches. If they want to talk about representing the community, they should see what opposition benches look like from this side. It is paltry. There are two women on the entire opposition bench in here, and there is only one female Liberal Party member in the upper house. It is embarrassing. The opposition should be embarrassed. It is a disgrace. The opposition lets absolutely everyone down with that appalling representation of women. Then we hear the ridiculous argument from members opposite about representation on merit. Do Liberal Party members know what that says? It says that there are two women of merit in the entire Liberal Party of Western Australia—and one in the upper house! What an insult to all the women in the Liberal Party and in Western Australia. It is an absolute disgrace. Federally, it is no better. It is embarrassing. It is excruciating. The community is deeply disappointed. Something has to be done to fix it. I do not care if the Liberal Party does not adopt quotas. Whatever you do, fix it. It is bad, and the Liberal Party will continue to be in the wilderness if it does not represent the people.

If we want to talk about diversity, we have Aboriginal people on the Labor benches. We have Indian and Chinese-born people, and we can always do better. This is representative of the community and all those people bring their experiences to Parliament, regardless of whether they are members of or associated with trade unions. This is about what we bring as representatives to Parliament and the broadness of those views is what matters in the Parliament. The federal Parliament is no better for the Liberals; it has 13 women out of 63 in the House of Representatives.

**Mr D.J. Kelly:** It is a disgrace.

**Ms A. SANDERSON:** It is a disgrace and that the women continue to defend it is incredibly embarrassing. Good on those women like Sharman Stone who stand up and say that it is wrong, that it is not working and that we need to change what we are doing. Good on those women who stand up for all women in the country who want better representation of their views in the Parliament. The Liberals have six female senators out of 23 in the Senate.

**Mr P. Papalia:** Chosen on merit.

**Ms A. SANDERSON:** They were all chosen on merit; only six women in the entire country are meritorious. What an insult that is to the Liberal Party membership. What an insult that is to all the conservative women in this country. They do not make it past the glass ceiling or the concrete ceiling that is somewhere in the Liberal Party and says that they are not good enough to represent the Liberal Party in the Parliament.

**Mrs L.M. Harvey** interjected.

**Ms A. SANDERSON:** So they can make the tea and be president of the divisions. They can run the meetings—that is terribly generous, but they are not good enough to be in the Parliament and to have a seat at the decision-making table. The community has rejected the Liberal Party's view of representation in the Parliament. Members opposite talk about unions and what unions represent. Let us look at what unions are today. I think members will find that they are not made up of mostly men in construction. Most unionists are actually women aged between 35 and 65 years and working in the health and services sector—that is what a unionist looks like. There is this total obsession with one small portion of the movement. If members opposite looked at the growth areas or those areas that are highly represented, they would see that Roy Morgan Research released earlier this year in January outlines how public administration and defence, community services, electricity, gas and water, and transport and storage are the most unionised industries, and most of those industry workers are female. Education professionals, health professionals, protective service workers—this is very tiny writing here—electro technology and telecommunications trades, clerical office and support workers, health and welfare support workers such as occupational therapists and physiotherapists, and administration clerks in all the hospitals that the previous government privatised over the last two terms of government are made up of mostly women. Women are members of unions because it is women who get a rough deal in the workplace. They see the value in membership because it is the unions that work to close the pay gap and protect their penalty rates. It is the unions that fought for paid maternity leave when we were the only one of the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development nations bar America that did not have a publicly funded paid maternity leave scheme. It was the unions that drove that campaign. Women are bearing the brunt of casualisation, of less and

less permanency in the workforce. It is women who are clustered into low-paid industries, and that is what is feeding the pay gap. It is women who will bear the brunt of this opposition's support of the penalty rates cut.

**Dr M.D. Nahan:** The penalty rate cuts were put in place by Bill Shorten.

**Ms A. SANDERSON:** Rubbish! From next week, 700 000 people will have their pay cut, and they will be mostly women who work in retail and hospitality. It is pretty appalling to see the previous Premier waving the flag for pay cuts for low-paid workers: "Yes we support that". Before the election, Colin Barnett was very, very clear about his support for cuts to penalty rates. A report from the ABC stated —

Premier Colin Barnett confirmed he would seek to have the WA Industrial Relations Commission review pay rates for workers under the state system, a day after the Fair Work Commission announced changes for people under its jurisdiction.

Another report stated —

The Premier said it was not fair that hundreds of WA small businesses had to pay double and sometimes triple ... wages on Sundays and public holidays when most big business chains had traded away penalty rates in deals with unions.

That was absolutely not true—it is outrageous. It is the women who are bearing the brunt of that, and opposition members support it. I do not back away from my support or this government's support of penalty rates.

**Dr M.D. Nahan** interjected.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Yes, member, you have made your point. She is not taking that interjection. Move on.

**Ms A. SANDERSON:** These are mostly casualised industry workers on low pay, who will be on a further reduced low pay. They are the members that many members on these benches have represented before coming into the Parliament. I proudly bring my principles of fairness and equity and of fighting for what is right to the Parliament. I am very proud to maintain those principles in the Parliament, and it is possible to do both. The areas in the union movement that are actually growing are in what will be an exploding health care and services sector. We will have a massive ageing population. We are rolling out a National Disability Insurance Scheme, so there will be a huge number of childcare, aged-care and disability support workers. All of those sectors are unionising. Most of the large providers in the disability sector in WA are unionised. Those unions have lifted the standard of living for those workers who are doing incredibly important work. The unions will provide the certainty and the base by which any disability insurance scheme succeeds because they will have provided a high quality and stable workforce. The workers will not be churned over on casualised contracts and short-term employment. Those workers will actually get good, quality support.

I will now look at the structure of the union movement and the head of union movement. We have heard a lot about being picked on at building sites and someone having their fingers squashed by a concrete panel on a building site after working on the site for about five minutes. Let us look at the people who run the union movement. In Western Australia the head of the union movement is Meredith Hammat, a woman. She is a fantastic advocate for working people across the spectrum.

**Mr P.C. Tinley:** Who was her predecessor?

**Ms A. SANDERSON:** Before her it was our very own minister Simone McGurk, who was also a fantastic advocate for working people. Who have we got at the head of the union movement nationally? Sally McManus and Ged Kearney, two women from services unions. It does not quite fit in with what opposition members are saying about being picked on at union sites. The result of having strong connections to the union movement and working people is that we actually have a connection to the community. Unions are made up of people, not a third-party entity, and we talk to those people and those members. That results in the kind of policy that was announced today on family and domestic violence leave for public sector workers. The Labor government has implemented that policy because it is about not only supporting the people who work for the state government, but also seeing the bigger picture that is broader than just dollars and cents. It is about maintaining for those women their access to employment and money, and their economic and physical independence. We have also seen the kind of policy that was announced by the Minister for Commerce and Industrial Relations on the entitlements for deceased workers. The previous government sat on that report since 2014—what an absolute disgrace! One woman who would have qualified by almost two days missed out on that payment. Members opposite should hang their heads in shame for that. It is ridiculous.

We will see an increase in permanency in the public sector, because permanent workers provide better service and they provide more certainty in employment and in schools. Those workers deserve financial security. They deserve to know when their next pay cheque is coming. Education assistants deserve to know whether they will have a job in term 2 or term 3. Workers deserve to know whether they can get a mortgage. If a person has a steady job, they have the confidence to spend. Cutting permanency, cutting penalty rates and increasing insecurity in the employment market just increase insecurity in the economic market. People do not want to spend. They do not want to participate economically. They are too worried about the next pay cheque.

Yes, there is representation of the unions through members on this side. There is representation of women and people with a non-English speaking background. There is a broad representation and we are very, very proud of that representation.

**MR P.A. KATSAMBANIS (Hillarys)** [6.30 pm]: I rise to associate myself with this motion and to support this motion. It is an important motion at the start of a new term of government, because it highlights the very narrow sectional interests —

Several members interjected.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms J.M. Freeman)**: Members, we have had a reasonably quiet debate. Let us not start the first minute of the speech with heckling. Wait for a bit, heckle a bit, I will shut down the debate and then we can go on.

**Mr P.A. KATSAMBANIS**: Thank you, Acting Speaker, for your protection.

As I was saying, the motion is important because it highlights the very narrow sectional interests that are represented within this government and within the governing party of our state. It raises alarm bells about the next four years. Today in question time, the Premier had an opportunity to highlight to the people of Western Australia that he would govern for all the people of Western Australia and in the best interests of the people of Western Australia. He had the opportunity to condemn the militant Construction, Forestry, Mining and Energy Union, not just because I say that it is militant, but because of the actions it has taken to deliberately harm the best interests of this state and the people of this state, in particular its actions during the construction of Perth Children's Hospital.

**Mr B. Urban**: Where's your proof?

**Mr P.A. KATSAMBANIS**: I will give the member my proof. If he just waits, he will get it. Do not take it from me. I will quote the commissioner of the Australian Building and Construction Commission, Mr Nigel Hadgkiss. On one occasion, around 400 people blockaded the main entrance, preventing a large concrete pour involving 45 trucks. Another time, the main entrance to the site was glued shut. In another incident, the union organised a blockade preventing 200 workers from entering the site to perform work. That type of action is not the action of cuddly, teddy bear-wielding, loving unionists who care about and nurture the interests of this state; this is a rogue, militant trade union costing the people of this state money and time in the opening of a hospital. Forty-five truckloads of concrete amounts to a lot of money and hundreds and possibly thousands of working hours lost when that concrete has to be returned unused. Gluing locks shut is the highest form of thuggery possible and, of course, physically blockading workers and stopping them from getting on-site when they want to work is, again, not exactly cuddly and carey-sharey. It is clear that this rogue union deliberately went about delaying the construction of Perth Children's Hospital.

In Parliament today, the Premier had a choice: he could have supported the people of Western Australia and the sick kids who would like to move into new premises—we know there are a number of issues around that hospital, but one of them is the delay in construction—or he could have supported the CFMEU. Quite clearly, he chose the CFMEU. He put the interests of this rogue, violent union ahead of the interests of Western Australians. He was given a choice to condemn the union, but he chose to support this union. I remind members that even people like Kevin Rudd and, in the past, Bob Hawke have dissociated themselves from militant building unions—the old Builders Labourers Federation, the Building Workers Industrial Union and the CFMEU in their time. The Labor Party has been known to take a step back in the past and look after the interests of the entirety of the people, rather than the narrow sectional interests of their union masters. It is just that this Labor Party led by this Premier in this state in this term has chosen not to do so. That will be to the detriment of our state, because it shows that, when given a choice, this government will always put the interests of the trade union movement first.

As we have heard in this debate and as we know from public debate generally, the trade union movement is diminishing in numbers. We can quibble about the numbers and we can pick apart the statistics, but the Australian Bureau of Statistics is the arbiter on this. It is an independent body that gathers statistics and has been running this series on the trade union movement for decades, not over a couple of years, and it has continually shown in the last 20 or 30 years a collapse or slump in trade union membership. Trade union membership is not only less than one in every 12 workers in the private sector, but also only around four in 10 workers in the public sector—that hot bed of unionism—which is just as important. The majority of public sector workers in Western Australia and across Australia do not belong to a trade union, even in the highly unionised public sector. In the private sector, if we take out the effective closed-shop no ticket, no start unionism that is forced upon predominantly young casualised workers and working mums in the retail sector through the two large supermarket chains, the union membership would be even lower than seven or eight per cent. Members know that, and the Minister for Commerce and Industrial Relations ought to know it better than anybody else because he has been privy to that for quite a while. It is an effective no ticket, no start. He knows as well as I do that if those employees were given a real choice, union membership of the particular union that he is affiliated with would collapse as well.

As the member for Morley said, some unions are increasing their membership. The Australian Nursing Federation in this state is increasing its membership, but I do not need to point out to anyone on the other side of the chamber that the Australian Nursing Federation is not affiliated with the ALP in Western Australia. Not only that, at the election, it did not just campaign against the Liberal Party; it campaigned against the Labor Party too and took out front-page advertisements in *The West Australian* urging people not to vote for the Labor Party. Is it any wonder that a union that is not affiliated with the ALP and campaigns against the ALP is increasing its membership? Perhaps other unions could look at that and wonder how they could increase their membership.

It is interesting that, in talking about industrial accidents, the member for Forrestfield did not talk about industrial accidents or about injuries on worksites, but used the pejorative term “killing people” on more than one occasion. It is the class war—suggesting that employers and, by extension, members on this side of the house somehow do not care about the lives of workers and, at worst, deliberately set up worksites to injure, maim and kill people. That is a despicable slur. Members opposite know it is untrue and it is used only to perpetuate the class war that their side of politics wants to wage against employers and genuine working people in this state. Members opposite should carefully consider their words on that because I do not know any employer who has ever been happy about an industrial accident. To make it even worse, when a member of this house stood up and talked about an industrial accident that happened to him, the protectors of the working class—the people who usually stand up for injured and maimed workers—ridiculed that member, and laughed at him just like the Minister for Commerce and Industrial Relations is doing now.

**Mr W.J. Johnston** interjected.

**Mr P.A. KATSAMBANIS:** Once more, it proves that the trade unionists on the other side of the chamber care more about virtue signalling than the reality of what happens on worksites.

**Mr W.J. Johnston** interjected.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Minister!

**Mr P.A. KATSAMBANIS:** That is what the member for Cannington does. He comes in here and preaches and pontificates but when the rubber hits the road and someone talks about an industrial accident that happened to them, he laughs and he scoffs.

**Mr W.J. Johnston** interjected.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Member, I would ask you to talk through the Chair.

**Mr P.A. KATSAMBANIS:** As I was saying, members on the other side —

**Mr M.P. Murray** interjected.

**Mr P.A. KATSAMBANIS:** Member for Collie–Preston, Minister for Sport and Recreation, do not talk about trade unions because we know what the trade union movement’s sellout of working men and women —

**Mr M.P. Murray** interjected.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Members!

**Mr M.P. Murray:** You’re a grub!

*Withdrawal of Remark*

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr T.J. Healy):** Member, I ask you to withdraw that comment.

**Mr M.P. Murray:** I withdraw.

**Mr S.K. L’ESTRANGE:** The minister needs to stand up to withdraw.

**Mr M.P. MURRAY:** I withdraw.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Thank you, minister. Again, direct your comments through the Chair and I will make sure that members listen to you as silently as they can.

*Debate Resumed*

**Mr P.A. KATSAMBANIS:** The trade union movement used to proudly stand up for working men and women in industries such as construction, forestry, mining and engineering. Today, the trade union movement puts fashionable interests such as shutting down coalmines ahead of the working men and women in seats like the member for Collie–Preston’s seat. I know that in his heart of hearts, the member for Collie–Preston wants to stand up for those people.

**Mr M.P. Murray** interjected.

**Mr P.A. KATSAMBANIS:** I know he does. I am giving the member a compliment.

**Mr M.P. Murray** interjected.

**Mr P.A. KATSAMBANIS:** In his heart of hearts, the member wants to stand up for those people, I know he does, but his union masters have told him to embrace a 50 per cent renewable energy target. They have told him that is what he will do and he will get his comfy seat. They told him not to worry about his working men and women who will lose their jobs in Collie.

**Mr M.P. Murray** interjected.

**Mr P.A. KATSAMBANIS:** That is what the member is doing.

We then come in here and hear about industry super funds. The industry super funds have resisted tooth and nail the notion that the members of those funds should have the right to elect their directors. They have resisted it tooth and nail because —

**Mr W.J. Johnston:** The banks will not let that happen.

**Mr P.A. KATSAMBANIS:** I will pick up that interjection, Minister for Commerce and Industrial Relations. Every large Australian bank—that is, the big four—is a publicly listed company. Who elects the board of directors of publicly listed companies? It is their members, their shareholders. When Labor members come in here and talk about industry super funds, they are denying their members the right —

Several members interjected.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Ministers! Member, can you please speak to the Chair so I can give you protection. Members, please listen to the person speaking in silence. All comments need to come through the Chair as a way to facilitate the debate so that members can make their contribution.

**Mr P.A. KATSAMBANIS:** Thank you, Mr Acting Speaker.

As I was saying, when people come in here and talk about the industry super funds, they do not want to talk about the uncomfortable truth that they are denying members of industry super funds the ability to choose who represents them on their board—who makes decisions on their behalf.

Several members interjected.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Members!

**Mr P.A. KATSAMBANIS:** More importantly, there is a really important reason that they do that.

*Point of Order*

**Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE:** The member for Burns Beach is not on his feet giving a speech, but I am finding it difficult to hear the member on his feet with all the interjections going on behind him.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** I do concur. It is very important that Hansard record the debate. I ask members to listen in silence.

*Debate Resumed*

**Mr P.A. KATSAMBANIS:** The reason that trade unions and the Labor Party do not want to see industry super fund members directly elect their directors is that —

**Mr W.J. Johnston** interjected.

**Mr P.A. KATSAMBANIS:** I am not listening to that.

It is because in many cases—not all—the union-appointed directors pay part or all of their directors' fees, which are fees taken out of members' funds, back to the trade union, and this is documented. Despite their fall in membership, the income of the trade unions rises—surprise, surprise. Where are they getting their income from? They get it from all these other non-union activities. That money either gets funnelled directly to the Labor Party or is used in the third party campaigns that the Leader of the Opposition was talking about. It is their slush fund. The superannuation savings of ordinary Australians are being used by the trade union movement and its mates in the Labor Party as a slush fund. One of the people over there—I did not pick up who and I apologise; I would like to give them credit—mentioned the sole purpose test. In an interjection, the member for Forrestfield mentioned the sole purpose test. I wonder how the sole purpose test of superannuation funds applies to the use of members' money to campaign against a supposed policy, which has not even been introduced, about the banks having more access to superannuation that I see on loop when I turn on the television late at night. I wonder how those advertisements meet the sole purpose test. I do not think they do and I am sure that will be determined.

That is the debate we are having. We are having a debate about the fact that this Labor Party in this state is a wholly owned subsidiary of the trade union movement—a very narrow group of people who are not representative of the best interests of Western Australians. The member for Morley talked about penalty rates.

**Mr M.P. Murray** interjected.

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Collie—Preston!

**Mr P.A. KATSAMBANIS:** Penalty rates are an interesting topic, because we know that there are unions like the shoppies—the Shop, Distributive and Allied Employees Association of WA. I do not want to get it wrong, so correct me if I am wrong.

[Member's time extended.]

**Mr P.A. KATSAMBANIS:** We know that the shoppies, and unions like the AWU in the time of Bill Shorten, traded away penalty rates to the big end of town—the large corporations—to the detriment of small businesses. A person who is running a small cafe, an IGA supermarket or a small family-owned pharmacy, cannot compete on a level playing field with the big boys. We know that big unions and big business get together to create big government. It is like the people inside the house in *Animal Farm*. It is like Napoleon and his mates inside the house in *Animal Farm*. That is exactly what it is. That is what this government is putting together in Western Australia. It is early days—it is very early days. We heard the member for Churchlands talk about the interesting correlation between the State School Teachers' Union of WA's position on independent public schools and the Labor Party's policy position on independent public schools.

**Mr W.J. Johnston** interjected.

**The SPEAKER:** Members!

**Mr P.A. KATSAMBANIS:** It is not —

Several members interjected.

**The SPEAKER:** Members! You have the opportunity to speak. Let the member have his say. Thank you.

**Mr P.A. KATSAMBANIS:** It is not what is happening today. It is not what will happen tomorrow. It is what will happen over a period of four years. Why did the Labor Party not come out and adopt the position of the teachers' union to abolish the IPS system? It is because the Labor Party knows that the IPS system is popular. We have already heard members in this house talk about how they have been put onto the boards of their local independent public schools. I think that is a fantastic idea. It is great. I would encourage everyone to do that. That is what the boards of independent public schools are there for—to enable community leaders, including members of Parliament, to be represented. However, members of the Labor Party cannot eat their cake and have it too. They can either say they will continue to support these schools 100 per cent, they will fully resource them, they will continue to provide professional development, and they will allow other schools to enter the program if they want to do so, or they will stand condemned by their inaction. They will be condemned by the fact that they have a secret plan to abolish the independent public school system. The IPS system has been very popular and successful. It has led to better outcomes for all our public schools, in particular the schools in lower socioeconomic areas—the schools of the people we are here to look after.

Government members should not come into this place and wax lyrical about how they are not controlled by the trade union movement. I do not have a lot of time today, unfortunately, but I could talk for hours and hours on this. I want to focus on the discussion that was had earlier about the creation of “Progressive Labor”—the joining together of the disaffected, let us call them, right-of-centre unions in the Labor Party with the extreme militant left-wing unions in the CFMEU and the MUA —

**Mr D.J. Kelly:** The what and the who?

**Mr P.A. KATSAMBANIS:** The CFMEU and the MUA. I am sure the minister knows them. I know they are probably not factional friends of the minister but I am sure he knows who they are.

**Mr D.J. Kelly:** Do you have any factional friends?

**Mr P.A. KATSAMBANIS:** It depends on which day of the week it is! I know that when members come in here and say Christy Cain does a great job, Mick Buchan does a great job —

**Mr B. Urban:** That is pronounced Buchan.

**Mr P.A. KATSAMBANIS:** I cannot do that accent, so I will not try! Okay!

**Mr B. Urban:** Please get it right!

**Mr P.A. KATSAMBANIS:** As members would know, given my name, I have heard every pronunciation of my name, so I apologise in advance if I cannot do the accent as the member can do it. He might be from the same town; I do not know.

**Mr B. Urban:** Is he from Newcastle?

**Mr P.A. KATSAMBANIS:** I have no idea. The member can tell me. He is the member's mate. When members come in here and say, “These guys do a great job”, I need to go through a compendium to check which union they are on, because they are either praising them or they are in fear and dread of them! We know that this government—this Premier—is controlled by United Voice and the unions coalescing around UnionsWA and the leadership of the Labor Party, who are Mick Buchan; I am sorry if I cannot pronounce it —

**Mr B. Urban:** You got it right that time!

**Mr P.A. KATSAMBANIS:** There we are—the member is teaching me how to pronounce it, too!

Whether it is Mick and Christy Cain, we know that their alliance with the right-wing unions is all about gaining additional control in the ALP. Who will they get that additional control from if they are successful? I see the Minister for Commerce and Industrial Relations smirking—we will see what happens! The minister will probably be able to tell me what happens, although occasionally the bush telegraph comes down our way and lets us know, but not always accurately.

**Mr D.J. Kelly:** Is it a phone call in the middle of the night?

**Mr P.A. KATSAMBANIS:** I can tell members that when they are seizing control, they are not going to be seizing control from the Liberal Party, they are going to be seizing control from United Voice. They are going to be seizing control from the people who got most of the government members there. The frontbench know, but for newer members: we are opposition. Do members know where the enemy is? The enemy is not on this side; we are not the enemy, we are the opposition. The enemy is there on the government's own benches. When I hear praise of Christy Cain and Mick Buchan and the rest of them, I flick through the book and think: Oh, that is Australian Workers' Union praise; yes, that is praise. They are clapping them and cheering them on; they are wishing them for better to hopefully give them all a better place in the sun within this large backbench than they have right now. But if I see it comes from United Voice or the Australian Manufacturing Workers' Union, I see genuine fear because the success of the proposed merged entity and the success of this new left-right alliance—"Progressive Labor", progressive left-right; all that sort of stuff—will mean the demise of United Voice and the AMWU. So, when the Premier came in here today and said, "No, I'm not banning the CFMEU", the Premier knows that he —

**Mr W.J. Johnston:** He was never asked that!

**Mr P.A. KATSAMBANIS:** I asked him a couple of hours ago whether he is banning contact with the CFMEU; banning contact with ministers—like he did with Brian Burke. Brian Burke has served his time—I do not know the man, never met him; he has never sent me an email! I do not know; I had better go home and check whether he sent an email on some other email address, but —

**Dr M.D. Nahan** interjected.

**Mr P.A. KATSAMBANIS:** I do not know. We will have to have a look.

I do not know the man. He served his time, he is selling a book—good on him—like other booksellers. I remember Hon Jim Cairns at Prahran Market: for years and years and years he was selling his book from a little table. He was a small businessman. In retirement, the left-wing Jim Cairns became a small business man, selling books on the open market. They all see the light eventually, Mr Speaker. Burkie, I think, was always pretty good on markets—not so much open markets, he just liked his own little deals.

**Mr P. Papalia** interjected.

**Mr P.A. KATSAMBANIS:** When the Premier is standing up for the CFMEU, I guess it is probably a combination of a little bit of respect for his trade union compadres, and a hell of a lot of fear about what will happen if their numbers rise. They have made it very clear.

Of course, who will be left out of this battle? The ordinary Western Australian workers and people. We will see unleashed the greatest wave of industrial disputation we have seen in decades. Yes, it would be treachery on the people of Western Australia at a time when jobs are not exactly plentiful, and the government has been a beneficiary of that, and at a time when the economic cycle is at or near its lowest point. This is the time that a trade union movement will try to trash more jobs in a grab for power within the Labor Party. Make no mistake, I do not oppose trade unions.

Several members interjected.

**Mr P.A. KATSAMBANIS:** I do not oppose trade unions vociferously advocating for the interests of their members. That is what they were set up to do. When they do it properly, they get rewarded. I talked about the Australian Nursing Federation earlier in my contribution; it is being rewarded.

Debate adjourned, pursuant to standing orders.

*House adjourned at 7.00 pm*

---

### QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Questions and answers are as supplied to Hansard.

#### HOUSING — MINISTER'S MEETINGS

**2. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Minister for Housing:**

Between 17 March 2017 and 10 May 2017 has the Minister met with:

- (a) representatives of Keystart; and
- (b) representatives of the Country Housing Authority:
  - (i) for (a)–(b); if yes:
    - (A) what dates did those meetings occur;
    - (B) who attended those meetings;
    - (C) what was the nature of those meetings; and
    - (D) where were the meetings held?

**Mr P.C. Tinley replied:**

(a)–(b) Yes.

- (i) (A) (i) 28 March 2017.
- (ii) 20 April 2017.
- (B) (i) Hon Peter Tinley AM MLA  
Simon Ward, Chief of Staff  
Glyn Yates, Chairman, Keystart Board  
John Coles, CEO Keystart  
Kay Hammer, Policy Adviser
- (ii) Hon Peter Tinley AM MLA  
John Coles, CEO Keystart  
Glyn Yates, Chairman, Keystart  
Simon Ward, Chief of Staff  
Kay Hammer, Policy Adviser  
Nicole Matrai, Policy Adviser
- (C) (i) Initial briefing and Office visit, meeting staff.
- (ii) Keystart Lending Historical and Future.
- (D) (i) Keystart Home Loans, 2 Brook Street, East Perth.
- (ii) Ministerial Office.

#### EDUCATION — MINISTER'S MEETINGS

**16. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the minister representing the Minister for Education and Training:**

Between 17 March 2017 and 10 May 2017 has the Minister met with:

- (a) representatives of the Building and Construction Industry Training Board; and
- (b) representatives of the five TAFEs:
  - (i) for (a)–(b); if yes:
    - (A) what dates did those meetings occur;
    - (B) who attended those meetings;
    - (C) what was the nature of those meetings; and
    - (D) where were the meetings held?

**Mr P. Papalia replied:**

- (a) Yes.
- (i) Wednesday 22nd March 2017.
  - (ii) Hon. Sue Ellery, Mr Ian Hill, Mr Alan Jackson, Mr Rod Clark.
  - (iii) Meet and greet.
  - (iv) Dumas House.
- (b) Yes.
- (A) (i) Thursday 13<sup>th</sup> April 2017.
  - (ii) Friday 21<sup>st</sup> April 2017.
  - (iii) Tuesday 2<sup>nd</sup> May 2017.
  - (B) (i) Hon. Sue Ellery, Ms Elizabeth Carr, Ms Wendy Dunne, Hon. Samantha Rowe.
  - (ii) Hon. Sue Ellery, Prof. Bill Loudon, Prof. Bryant Stokes, Ms Mary Walford, Mr Ian Smith, Ms Wendy Dunne, Mr Kris Doherty.
  - (iii) Hon. Sue Ellery, Ms Michelle Hoad, Mr Kevin Doig, Mr Bill Swetman, Mr Duncan Anderson, Ms Terry Durant, Ms Wendy Dunne, Mr Kris Doherty.
  - (C) (i) Meet and greet.
  - (ii) Meet and greet.
  - (iii) Meet and greet.
  - (D) (i) Dumas House.
  - (ii) Dumas House.
  - (iii) Dumas House.

## MINISTER FOR HOUSING — PORTFOLIOS — WANNACRY COMPUTER VIRUS

**52. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Minister for Housing; Veterans Issues; Youth:**

In respect of the Minister's portfolio responsibilities for departments, agencies, boards or publicly owned corporations:

- (a) how many computers were infected with the ransomware program called 'WannaCry':
- (i) was any payment made to decrypt any computers as per the ransom;
  - (ii) why were the infected machines not patched to prevent this from occurring; and
  - (iii) what actions have been taken since the infection to prevent this from occurring again in the future?

**Mr P.C. Tinley replied:**Housing Authority

The Housing Authority advises:

- (a) Nil.
- (i)–(iii) Not applicable.

Department of Local Government and Communities

The Department of Local Government and Communities advises:

- (a) Nil.
- (i)–(iii) Not applicable.

## MINISTER FOR POLICE — PORTFOLIOS — WANNACRY COMPUTER VIRUS

**62. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Minister for Police; Road Safety:**

In respect of the Minister's portfolio responsibilities for departments, agencies, boards or publicly owned corporations:

- (a) how many computers were infected with the ransomware program called 'WannaCry':
- (i) was any payment made to decrypt any computers as per the ransom;
  - (ii) why were the infected machines not patched to prevent this from occurring; and
  - (iii) what actions have been taken since the infection to prevent this from occurring again in the future?

**Mrs M.H. Roberts replied:**Police

- (a) Nil.
- (i)–(iii) Not applicable.

Road Safety

None.

- (a) Nil.
- (i)–(iii) Not applicable.

MINISTER FOR POLICE — PORTFOLIOS — EXPENSES

**79. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Minister for Police; Road Safety:**

In respect of the Minister's portfolio responsibilities since 17 March 2017 for departments, agencies, boards or publicly owned corporations:

- (a) how much has been spent on professional print services;
- (b) how much has been spent on pens and pencils;
- (c) how much has been spent on newspaper subscriptions;
- (d) how much has been spent on journal or publication subscriptions;
- (e) how much has been spent on media monitoring;
- (f) how much has been spent on alcohol;
- (g) how much has been spent on coffee machines, coffee or coffee pods;
- (h) how much has been spent on office plants;
- (i) how much has been spent on paintings, posters, artwork or decorations; and
- (j) for (a)–(i) will the Minister provide a breakdown for this expenditure by description, type, and quantity?

**Mrs M.H. Roberts replied:**

The considerable detail required by the member would require the diversion of Police and Road Safety resources.

If the member has a more specific concern that he thinks warrants the diversion of Police and Road Safety resources, I would ask him to put that specific question on notice.

MINISTER FOR POLICE — PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

**130. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Minister for Police; Road Safety:**

Since 17 March 2017 has the Minister had any media, public speaking, communication, presentation, leadership or organisational training, and:

- (a) if yes:
  - (i) what was the course;
  - (ii) which individual or company provided the training;
  - (iii) what is the cost of each training session or course;
  - (iv) where was the training session or course held; and
  - (v) who requested the training; and
- (b) if no:
  - (i) does the Minister have any media, public speaking, communication, presentation, leadership or organisational training scheduled?

**Mrs M.H. Roberts replied:**

- (a) (i)–(v) No.
- (b) (i) No.

## MINISTER FOR HOUSING — UNION CONTACT ADVICE

**137. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Minister for Housing; Veterans Issues; Youth:**

- (1) Has the Minister or any of their Ministerial staff been provided any direction, instruction or advice from the Premier or Premier's office relating to contact with the:
- (a) Australian Manufacturing Workers' Union;
  - (b) Australian Meat Industries Employees Union;
  - (c) Australia Rail, Tram and Bus Industry Union;
  - (d) Australian Worker's Union;
  - (e) Breweries and Bottleyards Employees Union;
  - (f) CEPU Communications Workers Union; CEPU Electrical Union;
  - (g) CFMEU Construction & General Division; CFMEU – Mining Division;
  - (h) Community and Public Sector Union;
  - (i) Finance Sector Union;
  - (j) Food Preservers Union;
  - (k) Maritime Union of Australia;
  - (l) National Union of Workers;
  - (m) Shop, Distributive and Allied Employees Union;
  - (n) Transport Workers' Union;
  - (o) United Firefighters Union of WA;
  - (p) United Voice; and
  - (q) the Western Australian Prison Officers' Union of Workers?
- (2) If yes to (a)–(q):
- (a) what was the wording or nature of the direction, instruction or advice;
  - (b) who provided the direction, instruction or advice;
  - (c) who received the direction, instruction or advice;
  - (d) how was the direction, instruction or advice disseminated; and
  - (e) if the direction, instruction or advice was via letter or email, please table the document?

**Mr P.C. Tinley replied:**

- (1)–(2) The Premier and his office have not issued any directions on contact with unions.

## MINISTER FOR HOUSING — LOBBYIST CONTACT ADVICE

**153. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Minister for Housing; Veterans Issues; Youth:**

Has the Minister or any of their Ministerial staff been provided any direction, instruction or advice from the Premier or the Premier's office relating to contact with any individual or company on the Register of Lobbyists and if so:

- (a) what was the wording or nature of the direction, instruction or advice;
- (b) who provided the direction, instruction or advice;
- (c) who received the direction, instruction or advice;
- (d) how was that the direction, instruction or advice disseminated; and
- (e) if the direction, instruction or advice was via letter or email, please table the document?

**Mr P.C. Tinley replied:**

- (a)–(e) Neither the Premier nor his office have issued instructions regarding any individual or entity on the Register of Lobbyists.

The Department of Premier and Cabinet and by extension the Premier expects that all Ministers and staff adhere to the Ministerial Code of Conduct and the Public Sector Commission Code of Conduct and Code of Ethics regarding lobbyists.

## MINISTER FOR POLICE — LOBBYIST CONTACT ADVICE

**195. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Minister for Police; Road Safety:**

Has the Minister or the Ministerial Chief of Staff provided any direction, instruction or advice to their Ministerial staff or Agencies relating to contact with any individual or company on the Register of Lobbyists, and if so:

- (a) what was the wording or nature of the direction, instruction or advice;
- (b) who received the direction, instruction or advice;
- (c) how was the direction, instruction or advice disseminated; and
- (d) if the direction, instruction or advice was via letter or email, please table the document?

**Mrs M.H. Roberts replied:**

All staff are required to adhere to the Public Sector Commissions Code of Conduct and Code of Ethics regarding contact with lobbyists.

## MINISTER FOR POLICE — BRIAN BURKE — CONTACT

**263. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Minister for Police; Road Safety:**

Has the Minister or Ministerial staff met or had any contact with any Mr Brian Burke since 17 March 2017, and if so:

- (a) what are the dates for each meeting or contact;
- (b) who was contacted;
- (c) what was the nature of the contact;
- (d) where was each meeting held;
- (e) who was present at each meeting; and
- (f) what was discussed at each meeting?

**Mrs M.H. Roberts replied:**

(a)–(f) No.

## MINISTER FOR POLICE — PROPERTY DEVELOPERS

**280. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Minister for Police; Road Safety:**

Has the Minister or Ministerial staff met or had any contact with any property development companies or property developers since 17 March 2017, and if so:

- (a) what are the dates for each meeting or contact;
- (b) who was contacted;
- (c) who made the contact;
- (d) what was the nature of the contact;
- (e) where was each meeting held;
- (f) who was present at each meeting; and
- (g) what was discussed at each meeting?

**Mrs M.H. Roberts replied:**

As at 31 May, neither myself nor my Ministerial staff have held any meetings with respect to my portfolio responsibilities with property developers.

## MINISTER FOR HOUSING — COMMUNICATIONS GUIDELINES

**287. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Minister for Housing; Veterans Issues; Youth:**

- (1) Will the Minister advise whether guidelines for communications and dealings between the office of the Minister and respective portfolio agencies have been finalised pursuant to Section 74 of the *Public Sector Management Act 1994*; and if not, why not?
- (2) If yes to (1), will the Minister table the formal document; and:
  - (a) if not, why not?

**Mr P.C. Tinley replied:**

- (1) Yes.
- (2) [See tabled paper no 317.]

## MINISTER FOR POLICE — UNION MEETINGS

**314. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Minister for Police; Road Safety:**

- (1) Since 17 March 2017 has the Minister or any Ministerial staff met with any of the following organisations:
- (a) Australian Manufacturing Workers' Union;
  - (b) Australian Meat Industries Employees Union;
  - (c) Australia Rail, Tram and Bus Industry Union;
  - (d) Australian Worker's Union;
  - (e) Breweries and Bottleyards Employees Union;
  - (f) CEPU Communications Workers Union; CEPU Electrical Union;
  - (g) CFMEU Construction & General Division; CFMEU – Mining Division;
  - (h) Community and Public Sector Union;
  - (i) Finance Sector Union;
  - (j) Food Preservers Union;
  - (k) Maritime Union of Australia;
  - (l) National Union of Workers;
  - (m) Shop, Distributive and Allied Employees Union;
  - (n) Transport Workers' Union;
  - (o) United Firefighters Union of WA;
  - (p) United Voice; and
  - (q) the Western Australian Prison Officers' Union of Workers?
- (2) If yes to (a)–(q):
- (a) what are the dates for each meeting;
  - (b) where was each meeting held;
  - (c) who was present at each meeting; and
  - (d) what was discussed at each meeting?

**Mrs M.H. Roberts replied:**

As at 31 May 2017, neither I or my staff held any meetings with respect to my portfolio responsibilities with the above list of unions. I meet regularly with the West Australian Police Union of Workers.

## MINISTER FOR POLICE — JOHN GANGELL

**404. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Minister for Police:**

Is John Gangell employed in your Ministerial office, and if yes:

- (a) what position does he held in your Ministerial office;
- (b) what is John Gangell's salary and is he paid any additional allowances; and
- (c) has John Gangell declared any conflicts of interest with the Minister, the Ministerial office, the Department of Premier and Cabinet or the Public Sector Commission?

**Mrs M.H. Roberts replied:**

- (a) Yes, Policy Advisor.
- (b) Level 5, Public Service and Government Officers General Agreement 2014.
- (c) Yes.

## POLICE — METHAMPHETAMINE ACTION PLAN TASKFORCE

**410. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Minister for Police:**

- (1) I refer to the Labor's election commitment to establish a Taskforce to oversee the implementation of the Methamphetamine Action Plan which would include representatives from the Department of Health, Mental Health, Education, Police, Judiciary and Corrective Services and business leaders and subject matter experts from the non-government sector, and ask:
- (a) What was the date of the first meeting of the Taskforce;
  - (b) What action items came out of the meeting; and
  - (c) Which business leaders and experts outside of government are on the taskforce?

- (2) If there has been no meeting of the Taskforce:
- (a) When is the first meeting scheduled; and
  - (b) Who has been invited to be part of the Taskforce?
- (3) Who is the lead Minister responsible for the State Government's Methamphetamine Action Plan?

**Mrs M.H. Roberts replied:**

- (1)–(3) The establishment of the Taskforce does not fall under my portfolios.

POLICE — PUBLIC SECTOR REVIEW

**413. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Minister for Police:**

- (1) Has WA Police briefed you about what will be the impact of the public-sector review which aims to cut spending across every department, and?
- (2) If yes, what was that advice?
- (3) If no, why have you not requested a briefing?

**Mrs M.H. Roberts replied:**

- (1)–(3) The Premier announced a Service Priority Review on 4 May 2017 which will be conducted over a five-month period. As Minister I regularly meet with the Commissioner of Police and other senior officers and discuss current issues.

The review is not expected to have a significant impact on WA Police.

MINISTER FOR POLICE — SOCIAL MEDIA ACCOUNTS

**474. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Minister for Police; Road Safety:**

- (1) Does the Minister operate a Twitter account:
- (a) If yes:
    - (i) who has access to the Twitter account; and
    - (ii) who is responsible for the content on the Twitter account?
- (2) Does the Minister operate a Facebook Account or Page:
- (a) If yes:
    - (i) who has access to the Facebook Account or Page; and
    - (ii) who is responsible for the content on the Facebook Account or Page?
- (3) Does the Minister operate a Instagram account:
- (a) If yes:
    - (i) who has access to the Instagram account; and
    - (ii) who is responsible for the content on the Instagram account?
- (4) Does the Minister operate a Snapchat account:
- (a) If yes:
    - (i) who has access to the Snapchat account; and
    - (ii) who is responsible for the content on the Snapchat account?

**Mrs M.H. Roberts replied:**

- (1)–(4) The Minister uses Twitter and Facebook, and has responsibility for both.

MINISTER FOR POLICE — ADVISORS

**525. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Minister for Police; Road Safety:**

With respect to staff employed in your Ministerial office as at 19 May 2017:

- (a) how many (by headcount) advise the Minister on policy matters:
  - (i) what is their name, title and policy responsibilities; and
- (b) how many (by headcount) advise the Minister on media matters:
  - (i) what is their name, title and media responsibilities?

**Mrs M.H. Roberts replied:**

- (a) 3.
- (i) R Sackville-Minchin, Chief of Staff, L Clarke, Principal Policy Adviser and J Gangell, Policy Adviser.
  - (ii) Nil.
  - (iii) N/A.
-

