



# **Parliamentary Debates**

**(HANSARD)**

FORTIETH PARLIAMENT  
FIRST SESSION  
2017

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

Thursday, 15 June 2017

# Legislative Assembly

Thursday, 15 June 2017

**THE SPEAKER (Mr P.B. Watson)** took the chair at 9.00 am, and read prayers.

## PAPERS TABLED

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

### WORLD BLOOD DONOR WEEK

*Statement by Minister for Health*

**MR R.H. COOK (Kwinana — Minister for Health)** [9.01 am]: I rise to inform members of the house that it is World Blood Donor Week and 14 June was World Blood Donor Day. This year the blood service is not only thanking blood donors, but also asking those who make only one donation a year to make another. Figures show that 40 per cent of all current donors make only one donation a year. In contrast, only 10 per cent of donors make four or more donations annually. If every once-a-year blood donor in Australia committed to making one extra donation a year, we would have access to an additional 181 000 donations. For many in the community the desire to give blood is there, but they are unable to do so due to the deferral policies that protect our blood supply. Deferral policies are based on the latest medical information available, which is regularly reviewed. The Australia Red Cross Blood Service has brought forward a review into its deferral policies that will begin in 2017. One of the more recent changes to deferral policies occurred last year, when it reduced the deferral for people who had recently received a tattoo from six months to four months. I encourage all members—like myself—who have been prevented from giving blood in the past to contact the blood service and find out whether they are now eligible. Giving blood is the “gift that saves lives”, so let us get donating.

### SHIRE OF EXMOUTH — CORRUPTION AND CRIME COMMISSION REPORT

*Statement by Minister for Local Government*

**MR D.A. TEMPLEMAN (Mandurah — Minister for Local Government)** [9.03 am]: I rise to inform the house of the current state of play in respect of the Shire of Exmouth. Members will be aware of the findings of the Corruption and Crime Commission’s “Report on Matters of Serious Misconduct in the Shire of Exmouth” released on 2 May this year. The council of the shire was suspended following the hearings by the Corruption and Crime Commission into allegations of serious misconduct by a number of officers in the shire. The commission recommended that consideration be given to the prosecution of a senior officer of the shire, and identified a “stunning indifference” by the council to the ratepayers of Exmouth in failing to discipline senior officers. I travelled to Exmouth and met with all the suspended councillors on 29 May. I had a very productive meeting with the existing councillors in which I expressed my concerns about how they could go about restoring the community of Exmouth’s confidence in local governance. On 30 and 31 May, all five remaining councillors resigned from their positions on the Shire of Exmouth, with one councillor having resigned in November 2016. The resignations are a positive step forward in ensuring that good governance is restored. The commissioner, Mr Ian Fletcher, has agreed to extend his tenure until the local government elections in October 2017. The local government elections are an important opportunity for the people of Exmouth to take advantage of the democratic process and have their say about their community’s future. I thank all councillors for putting the community first and allowing the process to move forward. The undertaking by the McGowan government was to improve the relationship between local government authorities and the state, and this visit to Exmouth exemplifies that undertaking.

### WORLD ELDER ABUSE AWARENESS DAY

*Statement by Minister for Seniors and Ageing*

**MR M.P. MURRAY (Collie–Preston — Minister for Seniors and Ageing)** [9.05 am]: I rise to inform the house that today is World Elder Abuse Awareness Day. Governments and organisations in societies across the globe are acknowledging that elder abuse is unacceptable. Elder abuse is any act that causes harm to an older person within a relationship of trust, such as family or friends. There are many types of abuse, including physical, financial, emotional, sexual, social and neglect. Elder abuse remains underreported. Research tells us that up to 12 000 older Western Australians may be experiencing elder abuse today. The shame associated with declaring that their own loved ones are causing them harm prevents them from seeking help. It is not fair or acceptable to assume that because a person has not spoken out or acted to stop it, that it is okay—nor is it fair or acceptable when we know that abuse is occurring to leave it to the person experiencing it to sort it out for themselves. Today I am pleased to announce this government’s support of a review of the elder abuse protocol

guidelines. The protocol guidelines were developed by the Alliance for the Prevention of Elder Abuse to assist organisations and individuals to respond to elder abuse. This review will see the guidelines updated to inform agencies and individuals of the new and existing support services available and best practice strategies to respond effectively to elder abuse. Much has changed in the community since the previous edition. There are greater pressures on many to meet increasing costs of living. However, placing undue pressure on older family members is not the answer. Many of us are still not quite sure what to do when we witness or suspect elder abuse, but doing nothing allows the abuse to continue. The updated elder abuse protocol will deliver a much needed resource to service providers and the wider community. I ask all members to encourage their constituents to call the WA Elder Abuse Helpline or Advocate for advice if they or their friends are experiencing elder abuse. Like many of my parliamentary colleagues, I am wearing the purple ribbon for World Elder Abuse Awareness Day to highlight this issue.

### LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY — OFFICIAL PHOTOGRAPH

*Statement by Speaker*

**THE SPEAKER (Mr P.B. Watson):** I remind members that the official Parliament photograph will be taken at 2.00 pm today. If you are not here, you will miss out; there will be a gap at your seat that will not be filled. The photograph will be taken at two o'clock before we start the afternoon session.

### MARMION AVENUE — TRAFFIC CONGESTION

*Grievance*

**MR A. KRSTICEVIC (Carine)** [9.07 am]: My grievance today is directed to the Minister for Transport. Several of my constituents have raised issues with me about congestion at intersections on Marmion Avenue, in particular at Reid Highway and Karrinyup Road. At Reid Highway there are two right-turning lanes but only one lane can cross over Marmion Avenue from east to west onto North Beach Road. Vehicles wanting to cross over Marmion Avenue have to queue in the middle lane behind the right-turning traffic and wait for several light changes even to make it to where the right-turning lane veers off and allows them to access the lane going straight ahead. Frustrated drivers lose patience and swerve dangerously around traffic to get to the lane going straight ahead. The green light allows very few vehicles to cross Marmion Avenue at each change—and if one vehicle is a truck, almost no other vehicles get across before the lights change to red, when there is a long wait as Marmion Avenue traffic is given priority. An extension of the green light timing as well as a combined “right-turn/straight-through” lane would go a long way to generally improving traffic flow at this rather inadequate intersection.

One of my constituents is so frustrated by the amount of time he wastes sitting at these lights that he has timed the green light interval for traffic going west. One change interval was eight seconds, one was 12 seconds and another was 17 seconds; the intervals are not even consistent. Likewise, going east, the light changes were short but as there are already two lanes, it is not so bad. Also, at Karrinyup Road it can take three sets of traffic light changes to get across Marmion Avenue. We all understand that Marmion Avenue needs to be given priority, but crossing traffic should also be allowed to clear at each change. There needs to be a much longer green light for roads intersecting Marmion Avenue, bearing in mind that drivers have a reaction time of a couple of seconds if someone is alert and longer for daydreamers to get their car rolling. A 12-second green light lets about six cars through at that intersection. Once traffic is flowing, obviously cars get across very quickly. An increase from 12 seconds to say 30 seconds would probably allow five times the number of cars across. This would clear the banked-up traffic significantly, as the time taken to mobilise would also be reduced. A longer green light for both west and east traffic at Reid Highway and Karrinyup Road would not impact adversely on Marmion Avenue traffic and would be very positive for the crossing at those intersections. It would also reduce driver frustration, which is a major cause of risk-taking and accidents as drivers try to beat the lights. On Saturday morning at about 7.30—so not rush hour—my constituent tried to cross Marmion Avenue from Reid Highway heading west. He was fourth in the queue when the lights stayed green for eight seconds. Six seconds had elapsed before he was able to enter the intersection and a total of seven cars got through, with the last not completing the crossing before the lights turned red. I wrote to the former Minister for Transport to suggest that this middle lane be modified to allow straight-through traffic as well as right-turning traffic. I also suggested that an additional lane be constructed approximately 200 metres along North Beach Road on the western side of Marmion Avenue to accept the through traffic and to allow vehicles to proceed more quickly and safely across Marmion Avenue. He responded as follows —

As you would be aware, North Beach Road is a local road under the care and control of the City of Stirling. Any modification to the westbound approach to the intersection would require Council's agreement to fund the duplication of North Beach Road.

I am advised by Main Roads subject to successful modelling and the City of Stirling's agreement to fund the works on North Beach Road, Main Roads would be supportive of the suggested modification to allow right turn and through vehicle movements from the middle lane.

I got excited and wrote to the City of Stirling to advise it of Main Roads Western Australia's support for this upgrade, only to receive the following response —

Notwithstanding MRWA's agreement in principle, it should be appreciated that the proposed works on North Beach Road are intended to alleviate the perceived congestion and safety problems on the Reid Highway approach which is a MRWA road. From the City's perspective, the North Beach Road approach to the intersection operates satisfactorily and any upgrades to this road are not a priority item for the City to address.

Consequently, if MRWA considers that the current operation of the Reid Highway approach is unsatisfactory, it is MRWA who should be conducting the relevant modelling and then, if warranted, design and construct any upgrades to the intersection at their own cost.

As members can see, we have reached a stalemate with the upgrade of the Reid Highway and Marmion Avenue intersection, as the City of Stirling is not prepared to pay for modifications required to North Beach Road. I have also received yet another complaint about this intersection, this time with regard to traffic heading north along Marmion Avenue and wanting to turn right into Reid Highway. The person wrote —

The turn off lane travelling north on Marmion Ave to turn right onto Reid Hwy is way too short and there will no doubt be more serious accidents if this is not changed. Further up Marmion at Hepburn and Whitfords this is currently being done, however, Reid Hwy exit is way more congested with large trucks etc.

**Mr P.A. Katsambanis:** That was good work.

**Mr A. KRSTICEVIC:** It was. The letter continues —

There is a rarely a time when there traffic is not forced to sit in the main lane and cars are forced to make dangerous manoeuvres to continue their route straight ahead.

The right-turning lane at this intersection needs to be extended to alleviate this problem. I wrote to the minister on 13 April 2017 on this second issue and am still awaiting a response. In summary, the Reid Highway and Marmion Avenue intersection is causing my constituents great frustration on many levels. Main Roads needs to reassess the intersection with a view to upgrading it as suggested as soon as possible. I would appreciate it if the Minister for Transport could advocate for these modifications on behalf of my very frustrated constituents as well as many other people in the northern suburbs. I thank the house for its attention.

**MS R. SAFFIOTI (West Swan — Minister for Transport)** [9.13 am]: I thank the member for Carine for his grievance and for outlining the concerns of his constituents and road users about congestion. As we all know, congestion is a frustration that many people experience across the suburbs. I understand the issues that have been raised and I will go through some of the advice that has been put to me. However, I will further investigate, in particular, the concept of changing the lane into both a right-turning and straight-through lane as suggested by the member. I will go through some of the advice that I have received on the whole issue of the timing of traffic lights. It is an interesting debate. Some changes were made by the previous government. There is always a debate about who gets priority and how long people should have access. I know a lot of work was done on modelling to try to reduce congestion by allowing more time for people on the major routes and less time for people connecting to those major routes. I know that some of the figures and promotions done by previous ministers suggested timesavings, in particular for those going along some of those major routes. Of course, that has an impact on those who want to access those roads, particularly when there is a build-up of traffic trying to get onto that main road. I know that across the suburbs it sometimes takes two or three changes of traffic lights to access major roads. That is an issue.

I will read through some notes on work done by the previous government, and I acknowledge the work that it did. The notes state that Main Roads has completed a signal-timing review of Marmion Avenue, which includes an analysis of the intersections at Karrinyup Road and Reid Highway. The results of the timing review show a journey timesaving in the am peak of two minutes and 23 seconds, or 10 per cent, for southbound traffic on Marmion Avenue, and a seven-second, or 0.8 per cent, saving for northbound traffic. Some of this information was released in the last term of government. The results of the overall program across the metropolitan area have been very positive, with some routes on the network experiencing travel timesavings of more than five minutes, or 27 per cent. The analysis showed overall that the changes were positive, but I do understand that across the network there are some isolated impacts, particularly at some intersections and especially when those intersections or roads have not been equipped for longer waiting. That is another issue. Sometimes there is a significant build-up of traffic or sometimes one lane is not able to operate because people are banked up trying to turn, so two-lane roads effectively go down to single-lane roads. I understand the concern. I will ask Main Roads to look at that issue, given the analysis done by the member's constituents.

In relation to the upgrades to the intersections, as part of the Reid Highway upgrade project the westbound left-turning lane prior to the intersection of Reid Highway and Marmion Avenue has been widened and extended for approximately 120 metres. This allows additional vehicles to turn left onto Reid Highway. I know the

member is looking particularly at the right turn and all those issues, so I will ask Main Roads to look at whether that middle lane could go both straight and turn right, and also the idea of pedestrian signal facilities at Karrinyup Road and Marmion Avenue. I acknowledge that North Beach Road is a City of Stirling matter, so both the state and the local government are reluctant to fix this because they both believe that the other is responsible. I will again see whether we can approach the City of Stirling to work with it to try to achieve a better result.

**Mr A. Krsticevic:** I have every confidence in you getting a positive outcome with them.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** Thank you very much, member for Carine; I am very keen to achieve outcomes. I will take that on board. I will particularly investigate that lane-turning issue. I will see what we can do about the timesavings, but as I said, there is always that trade-off between who experiences the timesavings. I acknowledge that there are many instances when we have not equipped the side traffic and the roads carrying that side traffic. That sometimes creates greater congestion for vehicles trying to access the main roads. It also depends on who is being measured. As I said, on one road we are doing really well to reduce congestion, but there is an issue with trying to access the main roads from side streets.

**Mr A. Krsticevic:** I think the Reid Highway–North Beach Road crossing is an important one. Really, duplicating North Beach Road on the other side by even 100 metres would make a huge difference there.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** Maybe we can create a win–win situation between the City of Stirling and us. If we help out the City of Stirling with some other things, it could potentially chip in on this one. I thank the member for his grievance; we will see what we can do.

## AGED CARE — SHIRE OF KALAMUNDA

### *Grievance*

**MR M. HUGHES (Kalamunda)** [9.18 am]: My grievance is to the Minister for Planning concerning aged care in the Shire of Kalamunda. It is appropriate that on World Elder Abuse Awareness Day I bring to the attention of the house a situation that has arisen over time in Kalamunda; that is, a deficit of aged-care places, particularly for those in need of high-care support in aged-care facilities. I met with the minister on 5 April, and I thank her for responding very quickly to me during the early work that she was doing following her installation as the Minister for Planning; Lands. I brought to her attention the concerns that we have about the absence of adequate aged-care facilities in the Shire of Kalamunda. In doing so, I would like to acknowledge the significant work that was undertaken by the Shire of Kalamunda on residential aged-care options under the chairmanship of Hon Ken Wyatt, MP. Its report looked at needs that had been identified as early as 2008. Current information would suggest, based on Australian Bureau of Statistics data and the population projections available, that the population aged 70 years and over is expected to increase from 4 976 in 2011 to approximately 8 530 in 2021. That time is not far away and we are in a position in which the current provision for aged care within the electorate is in the order of 247 places across five providers. I understand that one of the providers, Valencia Nursing Home, will possibly take up the option of increasing its licence by about 80 beds, but we cannot be sure of that. As far back as 2009, Hall and Prior was identified as a provider that could provide additional aged-care places; it has them available. We are well aware that in January this year, during the course of the election campaign, a sod was turned and there was some prospect of that facility coming onstream. It was identified in the report as being available and operational from 2017. Clearly, that is not the case. I am interested in whether the minister has any information on the likelihood of Hall and Prior establishing that facility.

I am also aware that there are two scheme amendments, one of which is for Gavour Road in Wattle Grove. I acknowledge that Wattle Grove is in my colleague's electorate of Forrestfield. The instigation of a scheme amendment was proposed as far back as 2009 and was not accepted by a previous Minister for Planning in 2012. That application was subsequently resubmitted in 2014 with changes and it has been on the minister's desk for some time—not during the course of the current minister's tenure, but prior to that. Surprisingly, no action was taken by the previous government, although that scheme amendment was available. The other contentious issue is the Wilkins Road amendment. Surprisingly, during the course of the election campaign, the former minister was quite able on the death knock to advise that she was going to recommend that the government change a conservation area under the Department of Parks and Wildlife to be an urban zone. I recognise that the shire put forward that proposition in 2011, given that it was highly unlikely that the Gavour Road development would proceed.

My constituents face a critical shortage. It is estimated that we will require an additional 435 residential care places by 2021. By my estimate, even if we include the 80 beds that are perhaps available through Valencia, and the possibility that the High Wycombe position will change with Hall and Prior actually putting something on the ground, we will still be left short of 200 beds.

My request to the minister on 5 April focused on two matters. The minister needs to expedite the determination of the Gavour Road scheme amendment that was initially refused in 2012. Following the scheme amendment process being commenced in 2009 and it being resubmitted in 2014, having not been determined at that stage,

can the minister advise whether this is likely to occur? I also asked the minister to take stock of the appropriateness of the recommendation to move the land at Wilkins Road, Walliston, from the Department of Parks and Wildlife into the urban zone, given that this is a controversial recommendation. It has divided my community between those who wish to conserve the environment and the availability of regional parks, and the aged-care community, which very much wishes something had been done earlier and which sees this as being the only viable alternative should the Gavour Road development not proceed. In light of the situation, is the minister in a position to advise my constituents on the progress of the metropolitan region scheme amendment 1271/41 regarding the Wilkins Road reserve and that for lot 500 Gavour Road, Wattle Grove? Given the continuing need to provide residential care in the shire, I seek the minister's immediate assistance in identifying and facilitating access to land in the Kalamunda township and close by for the purposes of aged care as identified in the matrix that is included in the "Residential Aged Care Options in the Kalamunda Shire" report. If I need to, I am more than happy this morning to table that report. I would be very grateful if the minister could enlighten my constituents on the prospects of aged-care facilities being provided.

**MS R. SAFFIOTI (West Swan — Minister for Planning)** [9.25 am]: I thank the member for Kalamunda. Yes, we met very early on in my role as Minister for Planning. I also acknowledge the member for Forrestfield. Both members have independently come to me about the issue of aged care in the community. It has been a vexed issue in Kalamunda and there is always a debate about not only how much aged care is needed but also where. People want to age in place, so people in the hills want to have appropriate aged care close to their home, but I acknowledge that people down the hill also need aged care. Both members have been very active in wanting solutions for their communities, and I acknowledge them. I also acknowledge the work of the Shire of Kalamunda. I met with the Shire of Kalamunda this week to discuss this issue and it has been very proactive in trying to identify sites. As the member for Kalamunda raised, the Wilkins Road location recommendation was as a result of a lot of other areas not moving forward. That is one area that the shire highlighted, but I will talk about that issue in a moment.

In that discussion with the Shire of Kalamunda, we identified a number of other sites that have not moved forward and I am keen to move those forward, particularly the sites in Forrestfield. The member for Forrestfield raised the possibility of doing something with some old government land and also identifying sites further up into the hills. Aged care in the community is something that we raised as a major issue in opposition, to give people not only a real choice about where they live, particularly later in life, but also the ability to stay in their community where they know the local shops, doctors and services. It is a big issue, and one area in which Western Australia has not done well is that we constantly did not take up the bed allocations that the federal government gave us. From a whole-of-government perspective, it puts a lot of pressure on our hospital system too. It is an area that both the Minister for Health and I want to continue to work on because it not only gives people a better chance to age appropriately in their community, but also really assists in managing the health budget. When people live by themselves, they may stay in hospital a bit longer just because they do not have care at home; therefore, having aged-care facilities is very important.

As Minister for Lands, as well as Minister for Planning, one of the government's policies is to identify land throughout the community that the industry calls "lazy land"—that is, government-owned land that is not being used for a specific purpose—and consider how to facilitate further development of that land. The aged-care industry put to me that as we continue to urbanise, asking it to purchase urban-zoned land on the scale that is required to get the economies of aged-care facilities is very difficult. That is something that is prohibiting development.

Turning to the specifics of the member's grievance, he asked about the Hall and Prior facility. I asked the Shire of Kalamunda about the progress of that. I understand there is still some work being done to ensure the financing of that. All the planning hurdles have been crossed, but there are still some issues with that development. On the issue of Gavour Road, I have met with the Shire of Kalamunda. We have considered it and we are asking for and are supportive of that proposal proceeding. I have asked the Shire of Kalamunda to look at some modifications and I am waiting for those to come back to us. The planning changes will include provisions to ensure the quality of future facilities and a limit to the number of independent living units that may be developed onsite prior to the construction of a nursing home. Of course, there are also conditions to ensure that suitable effluent disposal is provided on the site.

In supporting this amendment—we understand that this created a lot of community debate—all public submissions have been carefully considered. Once the modifications have been made by the shire, the amendment will be returned for my approval. As I said, this is one of the government's first moves to deliver on its election commitments to remove the impediments for aged-care providers. This is one thing that will facilitate that outcome. That is one part of the matter, but there are a number of other options. I understand that the Minister for Health will be visiting Kalamunda tomorrow with the member for Kalamunda to look at the Kalamunda Hospital site and what can be facilitated on that site more generally. That makes a lot of sense when we have excess land around an institution.

After our meeting on 5 April, I asked for some urgent advice about the site on Wilkins Road. One of the advantages of being Minister for Planning and Minister for Lands is that I get a whole-of-government view about what is happening. Some significant concerns were raised with me that highlighted the fact that even if the approval goes ahead, it is unlikely that such a facility would be constructed. We did not want to go through a process whereby we create expectations. This site comes with a number of outstanding issues—for example, native title issues that are still unresolved and other new constraints due to bushfire management. All these constraints would create further delays and result in not delivering the aged care that people want.

**Mr M. Hughes:** They would create uncertainty, yes.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** Yes. I know that it was approved by the previous government and submitted to the Governor. I am looking at how we can revoke that planning change and not go ahead with it because, ultimately, I do not want to create uncertainty and build up people's hopes for something that will not be delivered. I do not think that site is suitable; we think that other sites on government-owned land will deliver better opportunities faster.

### FLOODING — BOYANICH PROPERTY

#### *Grievance*

**MR R.S. LOVE (Moore)** [9.32 am]: My grievance is to the Minister for Transport, who seems to be very popular this morning. I am glad that she has taken the time to be here.

The Great Northern Highway forms part of the national highway network and provides a strategic freight link between Perth and the north of Western Australia, Darwin and the Northern Territory. I wish to raise the concerns of the Boyanich family, a hardworking orchardist family with land adjacent to the Great Northern Highway, four kilometres north of the town of Bindoon. Five times in the past 15 years, the Boyanich's property has been flooded following heavy rains that resulted in water flowing in a westerly direction towards the Brockman River. The water is directed through three culvert sets under the Great Northern Highway, one of which coincides with the southern boundary on Settlement Road and another on the northern boundary shared with the church property next door. The middle culvert harvests water over several hundred metres of catchment and then directs that water under the road, which then flows and spreads out over a 400-metre wide stream across the Boyanich's paddock, taking with it fences and reticulation from the citrus grove, and depositing weed seeds, manure and rubbish picked up in the water flow from the road verges and upper catchment.

Most recently, two rainfall events in January 2016 and January 2017 resulted in flood damage to the Boyanich's property. It tore up the reticulation for the citrus grove, deposited 10 centimetres of mud in the sheds and destroyed cardboard used in the packaging of fruit. Fortunately, Mr Boyanich was able to minimise damage to his sheds by opening the doors on either side of these sheds, allowing the water to wash through. Cleaning up after a flood event such as this takes Mr and Mrs Boyanich many weeks to painstakingly restore the irrigation to the citrus grove and address the many weeds that establish themselves amongst their fruit trees. Mr Boyanich says that these three culverts under Great Northern Highway are not maintained or cleaned out. The water has flowed over the Great Northern Highway in the past when the culvert did not have sufficient capacity. Mr Boyanich is also concerned about the volume of water passing through these culverts and that one day an unsuspecting child may get caught in this flow. Mr Boyanich says that the water can be up to 1.4 metres deep when it leaves the culvert. Local knowledge indicates that these flooding events have become problematic since Great Northern Highway roadworks a number of years ago north of Bindoon interrupted the natural flow of water. After rain, the water flows under the highway and then without direction across the Boyanich property.

My grievance to the Minister for Transport is that Main Roads Western Australia refuses to acknowledge that these flood events are a problem and it has not offered Mr and Mrs Boyanich any assistance to address this issue and prevent similar damage from occurring in the future. Main Roads has quite simply suggested that Mr and Mrs Boyanich should raise their shed onto a more substantial pad so that it is lifted higher off the ground.

Consultation with the landowners indicates that drainage would be their preferred option. Mr Boyanich has suggested directing the flow of water via one or two drains to the Brockman River rather than the water spreading across such a broad area once it has passed through the road culverts, damaging orchard infrastructure in its path. Mr and Mrs Boyanich continue to sustain damage resulting from road infrastructure that is adjacent to their citrus grove.

The minister will know that my staff contacted Main Roads regarding this matter and the response was forwarded to me via the minister's office. Having personally inspected the site and discussed the history of the situation with Mr and Mrs Boyanich, I can see why they are dissatisfied with the response that they have received. Yes, there is a natural flow of water from higher pastoral land on the other side of the highway to the east, but the highway itself interrupts that flow, which then hits the highway as a sheet of water flowing across a broad swathe of land. It is then collected and concentrated into a torrent flowing under the few culverts. This intense flow then goes across the middle of the Boyanich property. I can see no evidence that there ever was a natural watercourse through the middle of the Boyanich paddock, as claimed by Main Roads. There is no

evidence of a dry gully or defined stream anywhere except from the effect that is periodically caused by the direct interference of the Great Northern Highway and its culvert system. There is a drain on the south of the property into which the southern culvert flows, but that is problematic given the volume of water running into that drain from time to time and its limited capacity. I think Main Roads has also acknowledged problems with the number of driveways and small pipes et cetera that interrupt that drain. I ask the minister to consider directing Main Roads to recommence consultations with the landowners in a more genuine manner to resolve this situation. Once again, I thank the minister for her time in taking this grievance.

**MS R. SAFFIOTI (West Swan — Minister for Transport)** [9.37 am]: I thank the member for the grievance and for attempting to give me some notice of it—that is very kind. I have a briefing note that probably outlines a similar history to what the member outlined in his speech today. I have requested that Main Roads Western Australia meets—to put it right up-front—Mr Boyanich and the Shire of Chittering to see what can be done to try to sort through this issue. I have the history of the matter, but, as I said, it is pretty much what the member outlined. As the member knows, significant flood damage was sustained to the property. Having grown up on an orchard, I know what impact not having effective irrigation and other issues can have on one's livelihood. I know that flood damage was sustained on this property during unusual and extreme flood events in 2016 and 2017. Main Roads has advised me that there was a site visit and it was clear that the flooding events caused damage to Mr Boyanich's property. I suppose the question is: who is responsible for that damage? I have notes about some modifications to the property, the level at which the shed is built and the impact of the flood on that shed from it not being high enough. As I said, I have all that history but the member has raised a concern on behalf of his constituent. I will take on board the responsibility of asking Main Roads to revisit the issue and meet with Mr Boyanich and the Shire of Chittering to see what can be done to prevent such damage from occurring again.

### SMALL BUSINESS — TOURISM

#### *Grievance*

**MR J.N. CAREY (Perth — Parliamentary Secretary)** [9.39 am]: I wish to raise a grievance about the renewal of our city, small business and tourism. I have to say that my favourite minister other than the Minister for Planning —

**Ms R. Saffioti** interjected.

**Mr J.N. CAREY:** It is not a grievance to her. I love planning issues—members might have picked that up by now. My other favourite minister is the Minister for Tourism; Racing and Gaming; Small Business. I say that because those three portfolios are actually critical to the City of Perth, and I will explain why.

**Mr J.E. McGrath:** Do you have a racetrack in Perth?

**Mr J.N. CAREY:** It is not just about racing. The key issue is that we are experiencing incredible times in the city, but not in a good way. A recent story in *The Sunday Times* demonstrated that vacancy rates for businesses across the city were double the figures we saw during the global financial crisis. This is a terrible time, partly because new whiz-bang shopping centres are being developed across the metropolitan area and people are choosing to leave the city. A Bankwest report by Curtin University showed some extraordinary figures: the number of small businesses per 1 000 of population declined by 24.6 per cent from 2011 to 2016. This is what is happening in the City of Perth. In addition, I have had numerous meetings with small businesses and hotels that are concerned about what is happening in the city and the kind of experience that people are having. Small business is dying in the city. There are vacant shops, dead streets and a lack of activity. I ask this question of members: what kind of tourism experience does someone have when they leave the Hyatt Regency or Duxton Hotel? It is pretty terrible. There is no coffee, unless it is from a convenience store. The area is dead—and this is a serious concern. People from the hotels in the west end have come to me, frustrated about the lack of a vigorous approach by the City of Perth on this matter. They want to see a clear plan and strategy for our city; they want to know how we can revitalise it. There are a number of issues here: small business is suffering, there is a lack of a clear and coherent plan for tourism for our city, and there is also red tape.

I will give an example because this is one issue that I am passionate about. I show members a picture, which is poorly printed on my 1995 colour printer. We see this around the world in places like Paris and London where streets are activated. What does small business see in Western Australia and Perth? Can members guess? They look at this and they see enormous red tape. This was the situation during my time at the City of Vincent. Businesses would have to pay to get approval for a pot plant. They would have to pay to get approval for a bench. The council would come out and inspect it and charge them for it. On top of that, the council would charge them a regular fee each year. Some councils will charge for each chair. We have a total scheme that is creating a disincentive to activate our city. I am proud that as the Mayor of Vincent the council abolished alfresco fees and brought in an online self-assessment system. I note that the City of Perth approach is in the opposite direction. It is classic City of Perth that a motion to abolish alfresco fees for small business has been put forward twice and twice the council has rejected it. I note that it is a Liberal majority council—everything but cutting red tape for small business.

**Mr J.E. McGrath:** Don't blame us, please.

**Mr J.N. CAREY:** Members should be very clear: we have a Liberal majority-run council, with all Liberal members voting against cutting red tape for small businesses that are doing it tough at a most difficult time. The Labor council of Vincent slashes it. What do we need to do to bring this together? Hotels in the city are demanding, first of all, a clear tourism strategy for the state—a clear brand for Western Australia and Perth. But they also want to see a clear tourism strategy for the city itself. One way of doing this—I find it extraordinary that it is 2017 and this is not being done in the city—is to have clear tourism precincts for the city so they have their own identity. This is occurring all around the world: Melbourne, London, New York and San Francisco have clear precincts that are dedicated and branded, with marketing and active precinct management. This is what we need in Perth. In Perth at the moment there is Northbridge, which is probably identified, and that is about it.

**Mr J.E. McGrath:** King Street.

**Mr J.N. CAREY:** Yes, I will take King Street, but the hotels in the west end are saying that they need a clear and identifiable precinct that they can push and say, “Come to the west end.” For East Perth, call it the “east village”. I do not have all the ideas on this. Let the businesses, the residents and the property owners decide. Some people are stepping forward and saying that they will not wait for this. I applaud the work of Adrian Fini, who has come forward and said that the hoteliers are deeply concerned so they will create the historic heart. They have said that that is what they will do. They have got the property owners together and they will put in \$3 million to drive a clear brand—a clear destination in the city. Again, I note the classic City of Perth response. I always say that it is like the episode of *Little Britain* when the computer says no. Adrian Fini goes along to the City of Perth and it says, “You can't do that. We can't have mobile planters. You can't do all this beautification because it might be a public liability risk.” It is extraordinary. I look forward to the minister's response on how we can create that urban tourism experience.

**MR P. PAPALIA (Warnbro — Minister for Tourism)** [9.46 am]: I thank the member for Perth for his grievance and commend him for his vigorous engagement and advocacy on behalf of not just the small businesses in his electorate, but also the bigger players. He is absolutely right. If we look at what the last election was fought on, if we consider the central components and if we strip away some of the more divisive issues like Perth Freight Link or Western Power, it was all about jobs. Key to our response to that part of the discussion was tourism. The Labor Party elevated tourism to front and centre of the political debate in April last year when we released our plan for jobs and tourism as a critical pillar to our response for creating jobs. Perth city is an essential part of attracting people to Western Australia. It is the first place visitors from interstate or overseas will encounter, and we need to do everything we can to make ourselves competitive, make the city attractive and assist the businesses located in the City of Perth to be successful, because if they are successful, they employ people and we all benefit.

The truth is that right now—the government and I are very sensitive to this—small businesses and particularly hotels, people operating in the hospitality sector, are really doing it tough. They are confronting some very difficult times. Hoteliers in Perth right now, or anywhere in Western Australia for that matter, are worried. I encounter the management of these places regularly and the first thing I say to them is that the government knows that and its response will be focused on addressing it.

I commend the member for Perth for his suggestion on the precincts for Perth. Clearly, it works in other parts of the world. It enhances the amenity and ability for tourists to find their way around and to identify parts of the city that they might wish to visit through a branding exercise, and it is not something that costs a lot of money for the state government. I welcome the suggestion and I look forward to working with the member and with businesses in the Perth city to try to achieve that outcome because I think that would be a benefit and improvement to what we are offering at the moment.

The state government has committed to an extension of destination and marketing events funding. If we consider what state governments can do to bring people to Western Australia, there are two key elements. The first element is destination marketing—looking at our target markets and spending money on partnerships or promotions engagement with wholesalers to get people to come here from interstate and overseas. The second element is funding events that draw in people.

We have committed to an increase in funding of \$85 million a year for those two activities. Not only that; we have committed to a certainty of that funding so that Tourism WA will know that it has \$85 million a year for those two activities into the foreseeable future. We have said \$425 million will be dedicated to those two activities over the next five years. That means that those people operating on our behalf to make partnerships, do deals and engage with wholesalers in our target markets can get better value for the taxpayers' dollar and get more people to the City of Perth and the rest of the state.

Another thing we need to do to assist the city and the entire state is get the message out that we are no longer the boomtown that is expensive and difficult to visit. I went to the Australian Tourism Exchange in Sydney earlier this

year, which is a big event at which all the states are represented and wholesalers from around the world attend, and I can guarantee members that the perception is still out there. We have a legacy perception that Perth and Western Australia are expensive and people cannot get a hotel room. We know that that is far from the truth now. We have a magnificent array of really high quality hotels that are long established and have been upgraded. New ones coming on to the market are also of the highest quality. Unfortunately for the hoteliers, but it is the truth, there is a downward pressure on prices because of the extensive supply we are encountering now. We need to get that message out there. We need to say that WA is no longer an expensive and difficult place to come to. It is a quality and affordable place for people to visit. There are plenty of offerings and now is the time to visit Western Australia and the City of Perth. If people on the east coast have not been here, we encourage them to come here. We are going to open an office on the east coast and re-establish a presence for that purpose and to convey the message to people that this is the time to come here. We will be exploiting the opportunity with the new Qantas flight to London to market a stopover in Perth as part of the deal. We do not want to be paying for advertising to fly to London; we will be advertising a stopover in Perth and Western Australia so that our businesses benefit. I can guarantee members that the state government is absolutely committed to addressing the stress that our hoteliers and small businesses are suffering, particularly in the city. We know that they are doing it tough.

This is not a state government matter, but I agree with the member for Perth that silly little things such as putting impediments and hurdles in front of small businesses or larger businesses that want to activate the front of their businesses is just silly; it is ridiculous. The City of Perth should be focused on this too. Everyone in the state needs to be addressing this challenge. We need to get more people here and make ourselves more attractive. I look forward to the member for Perth's Perth city summit, which he has proposed for later in August. I will be there and so will people from Tourism WA and small business. We will do whatever we can to assist with the challenge of helping small and larger businesses in the member for Perth's electorate, because the entire state will benefit from that.

## SUPPLY BILL 2017

### *Second Reading*

Resumed from 14 June.

**MS C.M. ROWE (Belmont)** [9.54 am]: I rise today to make a contribution to the debate on the Supply Bill 2017 and to make some additional remarks, to conclude my comments yesterday, about how some of our Labor government announcements will benefit people in my electorate of Belmont. I spoke yesterday about some of our great announcements during the election that are now being rolled out, including in relation to jobs and particularly around funding to education in my electorate. A total of \$7.48 million is going into local state schools. Every single state primary school in my electorate will receive funds, and \$7 million will go to building a state-of-the-art performing arts centre at Belmont City College, our only state high school in the electorate. I am really proud of Labor's investment in our local schools. It is really important.

I will make some brief remarks about the very important local jobs and local projects funding. It is not only providing local jobs, but also making important investments in my community, in particular in assisting our sporting clubs and community groups. It is really important that this supports the pillars of our communities, in particular sporting clubs and community groups, which are largely run by volunteers. I think it is really important to acknowledge that, because they do work very hard to keep these groups going. They really are the heart and soul of all communities.

I will note some of those commitments that we are making to groups across the electorate of Belmont. An amount of \$80 000 is going to the Belmont Bombers to provide additional lighting where they train at Forster Park in Cloverdale. This is something that the club is extremely excited about, particularly its president, Mike Brotherton, as it will mean that the club has a greater capacity to train in well-lit facilities. An amount of \$35 000 will go to the Belmont Cricket Club for extra lighting, new astroturf, cricket mitts and new scoreboards and extra storage facilities at Peet Park. An amount of \$31 000 will go to the Belmont Park Tennis Club. That is for resurfacing two of its hard courts and upgrading the men's toilets. There will be \$100 000 to upgrade the Hazelmere community hall. It is very run down and in dire need of an upgrade. That will be a great facility that can be enjoyed by the whole community. An amount of \$150 000 will be used to upgrade the South Guildford footbridge, which links South Guildford to Guildford. At the moment, it floods in winter so it is absolutely inaccessible during winter months. This upgrade will mean that it is fully accessible all year round, which is welcomed by many of the locals at South Guildford.

An amount of \$10 000 will go to Belmont Community Gardens to allow it to upgrade and continue to build its garden beds. This great organisation is run by volunteers and brings the community together in open space in our area in Rivervale. An amount of \$20 000 will go to the Belmont Men's Shed. That funding commitment will mean that it has sufficient equipment required so that everyone can participate in the activities down there at the Men's Shed. We are giving \$50 000 to a facility to build a barbecue at Selby Park in Redcliffe. I think that will activate that park and it will be a great space for families to come and enjoy those facilities. An amount of

\$50 000 will be given to Belmont Sports and Recreation Centre to provide additional closed-circuit television cameras and a temporary overhead power supply. The Belmont Junior Soccer Club will receive \$10 000 for fencing to protect their junior players. They play on one of our major roads on Wright Street at Miles Park. The club is looking forward to having that so that it can provide additional protection for its young players. Belmont Soccer Club will receive \$30 000 to provide additional storage facilities at Gerry Archer Reserve in Belmont.

In conclusion, I thank and acknowledge these great funding announcements by the Labor government. I know that they will be much appreciated by our local communities and will go a long way in stimulating jobs and providing that vital funding for not only our schools, but also our community groups and sporting clubs.

**MR V.A. CATANIA (North West Central) [9.58 am]:** I rise to speak about the Supply Bill 2017 and the effect that it will have on my electorate. I have read the debate in Parliament over the course of the week about projects in members' electorates and I would like to speak about a few projects in my electorate. It has been an absolutely privileged time to right the wrongs of the past in delivering to the North West Central electorate. Royalties for regions has provided an opportunity to right the wrongs of the past 40 to 50 years and deliver to communities from Yalgoo all the way to Onslow, across to Tom Price, Paraburdoo, Wiluna and Sandstone, and now the seat goes all the way out to the Ngaanyatjarra Lands. I refer to projects that have been delivered, such as the installation of regional telecommunication towers along our highways, especially North West Coastal Highway, so that towns that have never had mobile phone reception, such as Yalgoo, now have that convenience.

Gascoyne Junction was devastated by floods in 2010–11, but we were able to rebuild the town because of royalties for regions. At the time, there was a lot of talk within government about whether the town should even exist, but the people of the town and the council got together and put forward what we needed to do, and royalties for regions delivered that. It delivered the amenities and rebuilt the public infrastructure that was needed. Anyone travelling through the Gascoyne should go and have a look at what has been done at Gascoyne Junction, because that is what royalties for regions is really about. It is a very small town, but very pivotal for tourism in the region. It has a linkage to Mount Augustus, and anyone who has been to Mount Augustus will know its beauty and tourist potential. There is a great potential to grow tourism in the region, and Mount Augustus is such an icon. If we talk about big rocks, it is the biggest rock in Australia. Everyone thinks that Uluru is the biggest rock, but in fact the biggest rock is Mount Augustus, in the Gascoyne in my electorate. We are trying to unlock that potential—it is a bit of a trek, but it is well worth making—by rebuilding Gascoyne Junction. Just before Christmas we opened a new bridge. The Gascoyne River runs through the town, and when there is a small flow, it cuts off the town and the ability for tourists to get to Mount Augustus. Royalties for regions paid for a bridge worth just under \$10 million. This is something that has been talked about for 40 or 50 years. The river cut the town off, and made it difficult to get supplies to some places, and that had a detrimental effect on tourism numbers.

Towns like Yalgoo have enjoyed massive benefits from royalties for regions. It has a very small population as well, but it is pivotal, travelling from Geraldton into the midwest. Its tourist potential has been developed through the shire redoing the caravan park, having a rage cage to give the kids something to do, building a new nursing post and rebuilding the St John Ambulance station. Emergency services are vital along that stretch of highway, and they need the tools to look after people who are travelling, not just locals but also tourists venturing into the midwest. Right throughout the communities of Mt Magnet, Cue and Meekatharra we can see how royalties for regions has had an impact. Tom Price, Shark Bay and Paraburdoo have also benefited. One of the biggest issues before 2008 was the number of people brought to the Pilbara by the mining boom. One could question that now, with all the people who seem to have been recently added to the electoral roll in the Pilbara, but that is a matter for another day. One of the big issues was day care facilities and sporting facilities, and we managed to provide those for places like Tom Price and Paraburdoo. Shortly construction will commence on a community hub in Paraburdoo. As people will be aware, it gets quite hot in the Pilbara, and Paraburdoo did not have an appropriate sporting complex to cater for football clubs, which are now accommodated in sea containers. When it is not possible to do anything out of doors during the day, this new community hub will provide for the needs of the town, including providing day care for people with young children. The school will have an undercover basketball court and other amenities, which will attract the attention of companies like Rio Tinto, which has contributed to the Paraburdoo community hub along with royalties for regions.

Some of the other projects highlighted in the media have included petunias down main streets. I am gobsmacked, because the Minister for Regional Development, Hon Alannah MacTiernan, was the Minister for Planning and Infrastructure at the time Forrest Highway was developed. If we are talking about petunias down main streets, members may recall some silver cylinders halfway down Forrest Highway.

**Mr D.A. Templeman:** Ice-cream cones!

**Mr V.A. CATANIA:** Yes, ice-cream cones down the highway! It is okay for Perth to have ice-cream cones down a highway, but it is not okay for places like Exmouth to have a world-class facility called the Ningaloo Centre. Only a couple of weeks ago the new Minister for Environment announced that the international whale shark convention would be held in Exmouth in 2019, because of the Ningaloo Centre. The Ningaloo Centre

has been highlighted in this review—I call it a witch-hunt—by the government, trying to find the petunias in regional Western Australia. The Ningaloo Centre is a big petunia. It is a \$32 million facility, of which \$20 million was contributed by royalties for regions and \$7 million by the federal government. Lotterywest and the local government also contributed money. It has been subject to investigation by the Corruption and Crime Commission. The centre is broken up into different parts, and the issue with the centre has been with the aquarium. The Minister for Regional Development, Hon Alannah MacTiernan, has stated in the other place that it is an empty fish tank. That empty fish tank that she labels a petunia is not actually funded by royalties for regions; it is funded by the local government. Having toured the facility, I can say that it will be an amazing asset that will bring in a lot of people. In Exmouth, it is not always a perfect day. People cannot always go out to Ningaloo Reef, or go fishing, and sometimes there is a lack of things to do during the day, especially if the weather is not right. The centre will provide the opportunity for tourists to have a look at the history of Exmouth, and provide opportunities for tourism businesses to grow. Facilities for research are also included.

Members may not know how it all started. The Ningaloo Centre actually started under a Labor government. It had been talked about for nearly 20 years, and now we are able to deliver it, because of royalties for regions. This project was embarked on because of all the money being spent on the east coast on research on the coral reef systems. There are six of these facilities on the east coast. For a couple of weeks a year they would send over a ship to do some research in Exmouth, along the Ningaloo Reef. We were missing out on the ability to get all these research funds, to do this research. How do we attract and retain kids in regional Western Australia? We can attract and retain kids in Exmouth by making sure that they can have a career progression in looking after the reef through social sciences and so forth. That was the intention but, unfortunately, it has been a bit muddled in recent times with the change of government. TAFE had agreed to go into the facility so that we could have that linkage from the school and so that there could be good research and development facilities from having the universities involved. Suddenly, it has been changed and TAFE does not want to go into it, apparently, and now the shire, through the commissioner of the day, is moving the shire offices into that fantastic building.

I say that the intent has been broken. It was not meant to be a shire office; it was meant to be a facility for research and development and for tourism, and to have that connection between locals and tourists to grow the tourism industry, grow research and develop Exmouth. I think the intent for that facility has been somewhat lost. It is disappointing that the government of the day, which is a Labor government, has not sought to protect the intent of the facility, which, mind you, was started under a Labor government in the early 2000s.

**Dr A.D. Buti:** When you were a member of that great party!

**Mr V.A. CATANIA:** When I was a member I actually pushed for it. I think Hon Jon Ford was the minister at the time and there was never any money; hence, why it has been a great privilege and honour to represent the National Party to be able to deliver the project with \$20 million of royalties for regions to make it happen.

**Ms S.E. Winton:** It sent it broke.

**Mr V.A. CATANIA:** I hear the comment that it sent it broke—I do not even know what electorate the member represents.

A member: Wanneroo.

**Mr V.A. CATANIA:** I urge the member for Wanneroo to go up and have a look, because it is not sending it broke. I imagine that there are facilities in Wanneroo that cost the shire quite a bit and that it is never able to make up for that gap. How many shires use ratepayers' money to prop up swimming pools for example?

**Ms J. Farrer:** There is none in Cue.

**Mr V.A. CATANIA:** Cue does not actually want a swimming pool; it wants a water park because they cannot afford to run a swimming pool. However, that is a quite different matter, as the member for Kimberley should understand. She should support what I am saying because that is not what is set out if a shire cannot afford to have a swimming pool. The swimming pool in Exmouth costs the council about \$300 000 or \$400 000 a year to maintain. That is a loss. Should we get rid of the swimming pool in Exmouth? Is that what the member for Wanneroo is saying? We have to accept that every local government right across Western Australia is there to provide amenities for their ratepayers, and sometimes those things incur a loss, but should that stop them from providing amenities that ratepayers need, to service the community, to support ratepayers and to grow tourism? They are very good questions that the member for Wanneroo and other members should consider, especially if they think that building a facility in rural WA should always have to stack up financially. That is absolutely not the case. If that were the case, we would not have one hospital, any amenities such as swimming pools, or schools in regional WA, because it does not stack up. That is the whole point. We have to provide services for people who live in regional WA.

Look at what Exmouth produces in the oil and gas industry and the benefits that flow in jobs and royalties—although that is probably debatable sometimes when companies do not pay their tax—and the services towns such as Exmouth, cities like Karratha, Port Hedland, Tom Price and Paraburdoo have. The wealth those towns

generate for Western Australia and Australia underpins the whole economy and we should be able to provide services that the people expect and deserve—basic services such as swimming pools, Ningaloo centres, state-of-the-art hospitals in Karratha, the Tom Price pavilion, new childcare facilities in Paraburdoo and the Paraburdoo community hub. I think that people who live in those towns that create the wealth deserve to have those facilities, and they do not always stack up.

I go back to the witch-hunt that is occurring. I could probably write the report now—“Waste of money”—and look at the population; it does not work. Although the Ningaloo Centre has not officially opened, there is no time to prove to people that the Ningaloo Centre is going to be a massive drawcard, other than the Minister for Environment releasing the fact that an international whale shark festival is occurring in Exmouth in 2019 courtesy of the Ningaloo Centre.

[Member’s time extended.]

**Mr V.A. CATANIA:** When the Minister for Regional Development talks about petunias and says that the Ningaloo Centre is a petunia, I say to her that I bet she will be there when we open the Ningaloo Centre in September. She will be cutting that ribbon, with the shire clerk, taking credit for a wonderful facility which this government is now criticising.

**Mr K. Michel** interjected.

**Mr V.A. CATANIA:** I caution the member for Pilbara to be careful what he says because he is going to find it very hard over the next four years.

When we look at what has been planned, it will take a while, because there has been huge neglect. To build a hospital it takes three to four years to lead up to actually laying a brick because a whole heap of design and community consultation needs to occur. We put, I think, over \$150 million into the North West Health Initiative, much like the Southern Inland Health Initiative that transformed health in regional WA.

I would like to see where the Tom Price Hospital and the Paraburdoo nursing post are and whether the government is going to continue to deliver new health services in regional WA. We are seeing that happening in Karratha, Exmouth and Carnarvon. Approved and ready to be funded is the Mt Magnet nursing post, worth over \$5 million. I want to see that occur through the Mid West Development Commission. I want to see where the first stage of the Meekatharra Hospital is, worth \$10 million. That is absolutely needed. It is one of the last hospitals in regional WA that needs to be rebuilt for the people living in Meekatharra, Mt Magnet, Cue and the whole Murchison area. My question is: given the fact that royalties for regions has been labelled a petunia by the Labor government, are hospitals a petunia in regional WA? If we were to use the same criteria that the government is using for the Ningaloo Centre and other projects around regional WA that have been funded by royalties for regions, the government could say that Tom Price and Meekatharra Hospitals and Paraburdoo and Mt Magnet nursing posts are all petunias.

**Dr A.D. Buti:** How do you work that logic?

**Mr V.A. CATANIA:** I say that because if the government is saying that the Ningaloo Centre does not stack up because it does not have the population or that the business case is not up to scratch, then it would not fund anything else.

**Dr A.D. Buti:** No; back it up.

**Mr V.A. CATANIA:** Hang on a second. It will be interesting to see the business cases when it comes to the so-called royalties for regions projects that this government is going to deliver in the state budget come September. I would like to see those business cases.

The other matter that I am sure we will pursue will be in response to Mark McGowan’s media statement on Thursday, 8 May 2014, “Horror budget confirms Royalties for Regions is dead”. I look forward to using that same headline come September. I would like to know whether the Labor government is going to keep to that legislation; that is, that 25 per cent of royalties in this state go to regional WA through royalties for regions. It will be interesting to see whether the government keeps that legislation, or whether it changes the legislation to water down royalties for regions—not just by changing the colours of the logo or even the name—and reflects on its delivery of the absolutely necessary terrific program called royalties for regions that has been delivered over the last eight years by the National Party in the Liberal–National government. Is the government going to change it? If one per cent of that 25 per cent is changed, the government will need to bring in legislation and change the royalties for regions program to reflect what it is doing. Whether it is changed by one, two or three per cent, the government will need to do that. It needs to be honest with the people of regional Western Australia that it will change the legislation. The government will need to introduce that legislation into Parliament as soon as possible so that it can show how important regional development is. That legislation needs to reflect the government’s intent over the next four years.

Members opposite are on notice. Regional WA has them on notice. It is disheartening that projects are in limbo. There are a lot of aged-care projects across regional WA. The member for Bunbury should know how important these projects are. I have an aged-care project that has been funded by royalties for regions, but I do not know whether that project will be completed. The Minister for Education and Training and the Premier still have not really committed to the next stage of the Carnarvon Community College. It was fully funded by royalties for regions. That is not perfect, because I do not think that royalties for regions should fund everything that the Department of Education puts forward. An important part of the social fabric of a community is a good education system. I am pretty sure that the member for Mandurah has looked at Carnarvon over time. It is disgraceful where the Carnarvon high school sits at the moment. The school is being relocated onto one campus. It has been operating over three campuses. By the time it is finished, it will have taken 10 years. It is absolutely disappointing and disgusting that it will have taken 10 years by the time that school is redeveloped and rebuilt—if the funding is there come September. That is unacceptable.

There are some important things that we need to keep. Aged care in Carnarvon should be funded by the federal government. Royalties for regions has come in with \$15 million and filled that gap for people who in their later years of life want to stay in their town and see out their days. I hope that this government maintains that \$15 million.

Several members interjected.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Members!

**Mr V.A. CATANIA:** When I start hearing interjections, I go back to some of the conversations that I had when I was on the Labor side of the fence. Flood mitigation in Carnarvon has been done now—\$60 million.

**Mr D.A. Templeman** interjected.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr T.J. Healy):** Member, I ask you to please talk through the Chair. The member can be heard in silence. He does have the call.

**Mr V.A. CATANIA:** Flood mitigation was put to the then Minister for Water Resources, Hon John Kobelke, but he said that there was no money. Lo and behold, in 2010–11 there was a massive flood that wiped out plantations—the food that we eat. They are still recovering. This is probably the first year since the floods that the plantations have been able to fully recover. Knowing that they are now protected by the flood mitigation work provides peace of mind. It could be delivered only by royalties for regions. It was a massive project that looked after not only the people of the Gascoyne, but also the food that people eat, as a lot of the produce finds its way into the Perth market.

Wonderful things have been done in the north west, but there is a lot more to do. I started by saying that there had been 40 years of neglect, not just by the previous Labor government, but also by Liberal–National governments. All governments before 2008 neglected the Gascoyne, midwest and Pilbara towns. I can say that we were able to deliver a lot of the infrastructure projects talked about over those 40 years, but there is a lot more to do. I hope that this government not only continues with some of the projects that I have highlighted today, but also builds on those projects. It is great that the Karratha–Tom Price road has been talked about. I call her the minister for ice-cream cones now, but I am sure that she would ask why the Karratha–Tom Price road was not sealed during our time. It was because we were building hospitals, schools and all the facilities that we needed to attract and retain people in the towns. That road should be built with contributions from the resource sector and federal, state and local governments. It is a major piece of infrastructure that needs a buy-in from everyone. We needed to do all the other projects that had been talked about for so long to attract and retain people.

One of the biggest hurdles for tourism and attracting and retaining people is airline services. There is a need for the regulation of airline services in Western Australia. I think the former Minister for Planning and Infrastructure, Hon Alannah MacTiernan, was on the right track in her time in the Labor government. My view is that airline companies cannot be allowed to cherry-pick what they see as profitable routes. People can pay up to \$2 100 for a return flight to places like Paraburdoo. That is absolutely out of the reach of anyone who wants their family to come up and visit during Christmas or who wants to see their family in Perth.

A member: It's cheaper to go to Bali.

**Mr V.A. CATANIA:** That is right; it is cheaper to go to Bali. That is the problem. If we cannot fix our transport linkages and make it affordable, tourism cannot grow. The former Minister for Planning and Infrastructure, Alannah MacTiernan, was right; we need a regulated network that treats Esperance, Albany, Geraldton, Kalbarri, Monkey Mia and Exmouth as one destination. I would like that to happen right across regional WA. Regional WA should be treated as one destination and given a regulated monopoly. In that way, government can set the price, where the airline companies can fly to and how often to ensure that regional WA gets to grow tourism and can attract and retain workers. I do not have much time to go into detail on that, but I will be pursuing it with the new Minister for Tourism, who has shown some good signs of tackling this issue. We need to look hard at how we can fix the transport issues in regional WA so that we can stop people going to Bali or other overseas destinations. We have a fantastic state and all we need to do is make it affordable for people to get to these towns.

**MR J.E. McGRATH (South Perth)** [10.28 am]: I was not going to speak on the Supply Bill, but after listening to the member for North West Central, I have to set the record straight on a few things. I know that country people have been bleating for many years that no money is being spent in country towns, but I want to mention something that is happening in my electorate of South Perth. Everyone thinks that South Perth is a high socioeconomic area where everyone drives Mercedes Benzes and they drive past the member for Mandurah's electorate and toot their horn. The truth of the matter is that there is a school in my electorate, Como Secondary College, that has been waiting for 20 years to have some action taken with either a complete rebuild or a new school. **Ms S. Winton** interjected.

**Mr J.E. McGRATH:** No, back in the 1990s, my predecessor the former member for South Perth, Hon Phillip Pental, began asking for better facilities at Como Secondary College. It is a school of excellence, and it is linked to Curtin University in mathematics and science. It has a special curriculum for gifted and talented young sporting people. Most of its students are from lower socioeconomic families, families with single parents and there are a lot of Indigenous kids. Como Secondary College has been punching above its weight for a long time. The former member for South Perth and I have been crying out like voices in the wilderness to get a government, either a Liberal–National or a Labor government—a government of any persuasion!—to do something about this school. For instance, soon after I was first elected, I heard complaints that kids were sitting in a classroom during a storm and water was leaking into the classroom. The teachers had to use buckets. This is modern-day education.

**Mrs R.M.J. Clarke** interjected.

**Mr J.E. McGRATH:** I know; the member for Murray–Wellington can get up and talk about her electorate too, but I am talking about my electorate because they are the people I represent. Como Secondary College was built in 1969. A lot of high schools were built then because the baby boomer generation was coming through and student numbers were getting out of control. The government of the day had to build a lot of schools. They were not built as well as the old schools that were built between the 1920s and 1940s that were much bigger, stronger, longer-lasting buildings. To meet the need, the government of the day put up these schools, and Como Secondary College was one. There is a gym with a basketball court and everything but the kids have to walk about 200 metres to have a shower if they want to get changed. I cannot believe that we allow these things to happen.

**Dr A.D. Buti:** There's a specialised hockey centre too.

**Mr J.E. McGRATH:** There is a specialised hockey school and golf program. When we went to the last election, we came up with a plan to spend \$20 million but we lost the election so that is history. However, I am even critical of the Liberal government because I think we were too late. We left it to announce these things going into an election. Why did we not listen to one of our members? Phil Pental was an Independent, but he was an Independent Liberal. Why did we not listen to him when he had a genuine complaint about the education of our kids? Como Secondary College produces some outstanding students. It gets some great results and punches above its weight. I think resealing the roof is all that has been done for the school in recent years. A new roof was put on it so at least the kids can say, "At least we don't have to take an umbrella into the classroom." I cannot believe it. I can understand the frustration of members in country areas with smaller populations. They are always battling to get things done, but this school is only a few kilometres from the CBD. If we are talking about building schools in the CBD, why do we not get some kids to go over to Como Secondary College?

There was a plan to make Como Secondary College a K–12 school and Curtin Primary School was going to be shut down. It is a small primary school, which used to be called Koonawarra Primary School. A lot of kids from Karawara go to Curtin Primary School. It is a good little school, but it is struggling for numbers. It was planned to shut down the school and move it over to Como Secondary College, and Como Secondary College was to be turned into a K–12 school. What a great idea! Do members know what happened? Nothing. I hear people banging on about things in their electorates and I understand we all represent our electorates but I want to set the record straight on this opinion that South Perth does not need anything. Members think people in South Perth are all wealthy, they do not need anything, no money needs to be spent in South Perth and that we do not need to worry about South Perth. I do not know whether the Minister for Education and Training has ever been to Como Secondary College but I will ask her to come and have a look. Two former education ministers came out to see the college and the work it is doing out there, but nothing has happened. This is from both sides of the chamber; it is not one party. The school has been ignored by whoever is in government and I think it is a disgrace. I think we need some sort of a plan. Both parties, in their times in government, have built a lot of new schools because our city and our population has grown and when urban sprawl happens, we have to put in new schools. That is great and both parties in government have done that. However, we have neglected to look after these ageing schools like the school I went to, John Curtin College of the Arts, and Kalamunda Senior High School. These old schools would be all around the place. They need to be modernised because there were built for a generation in the 1950s and 60s but they are not suitable for the requirements of our modern-day kids.

**Mr M. Hughes:** Kalamunda was ignored because it was a safe Liberal seat. It did nothing in government.

**Mr J.E. McGRATH:** That is Kalamunda; I do not know Kalamunda. I do not want to politicise this. I am saying that I do not care who is in government. I raise this issue in my party room.

For 12 years, I have fought for an on-ramp to the freeway at Manning Road. The member for Nedlands was a transport minister. A conga line of ministers came out and looked at it. The Labor Party did not want to do it; it was only forced on it now by the federal government. The federal government wanted to win the seat of Swan, so it asked: what is an important infrastructure project? Manning Road was a no-brainer. I have been saying for 12 years that it is a no-brainer, but did anyone listen? No. During the election campaign, the former Minister for Transport came out and announced that we would build the on-ramp Manning Road. Unfortunately, we did not win the election. Building a Manning Road on-ramp was not a Labor election commitment but now —

**Dr A.D. Buti:** We're doing it!

**Mr J.E. McGRATH:** The government is doing it and I am very happy!

Several members interjected.

**Mr J.E. McGRATH:** The Labor Party is doing it because when the Labor government went to the federal government and said, "We want to move some of the funding for Roe 8 and we want to do Metronet"—I think that is fine—The federal government said, "Hang on a minute; these are the projects we are going to fund." Somehow, Manning Road was put on that list of projects because the Feds wanted to win the seat of Swan. It is an outcome I am happy about. I will be there when the Minister for Transport comes down—I will show her where Manning Road is—to open the new on-ramp. It will be a great result for me. I hope it is done in this term of government.

I heard what the member for North West Central said about Carnarvon. I have been there quite regularly. There is need for that school to be upgraded but he is not alone. We all have needs and projects that we are trying to get up. I once read about a federal member of Parliament who fought for something for 20 years. He might have died on the job before it happened! It took him 20 years to get a project done. As a word of warning for new members, the process can be very slow at times.

Thank you for the opportunity, Mr Acting Speaker (Mr T.J. Healy). I like the way you control the chamber. You have a demeanour about you that everyone respects and I think you will go a long way. Thank you very much.

**MR R.S. LOVE (Moore)** [10.39 am]: I would like to make a very brief contribution to the discussion on the Supply Bill 2017. I understand it will allow for the continuation of government while the current government goes through the machinations of working out where it wants to spend money to pay for its election promises. Part of that continuation is the royalties for regions program. As we heard from the member for North West Central, royalties for regions is a very important part of the scene in regional Western Australia.

As we know, that program is set at 25 per cent of the mining royalties to the state. That level is mandated by the act of Parliament that brought in the royalties for regions scheme in the 2008–2013 era of government. I am a bit bewildered because I hear from people throughout regional Western Australia that the current Minister for Regional Development and her parliamentary secretary have been visiting the regions and talking to local governments, people who have been in receipt of grants, development commissions et cetera, and have indicated that the government is looking for savings from the royalties for regions program. During the election campaign that led up to this latest change of government, the Labor Party made frequent reference to how royalties for regions was mandated and was not under threat. Therefore, I cannot understand how the government could be looking to make savings from the royalties for regions program. The only way the government could make savings from royalties for regions would be if it decided to spend money from royalties for regions on programs that would otherwise be funded from consolidated revenue. Given that is not the spirit of the royalties for regions program, and given that the Labor government has committed to maintaining royalties for regions, I am at a complete loss to understand what that process of looking for savings is all about. If we take at face value what the minister has said, perhaps the government intends to redirect some of the funding from that program to projects that have not yet been announced by the government. However, the royalties for regions scheme cannot be used to make savings to the budget.

I also take umbrage at the description of the royalties for regions program up until now as being in the "petunia phase". The other week I was in Watheroo at the Keamy family's property for the dedication of the final of the three Doppler radar towers that were approved to be built at the time my colleague Hon Terry Redman, who has just entered the chamber, was Minister for Regional Development. That was a \$23 million program to pay for not only the building of those radar towers but also the running costs for many years to come. Doppler radar fills a big hole that has existed in the traditional radar information that has been available to not just farmers in Western Australia but anyone who is interested in the weather. For example, Doppler radar provides vital information when there is a bushfire and people need to know exactly what the wind is doing and when the wind will change. Therefore, I find it offensive that the minister would describe royalties for regions, which has funded the Doppler radar program, as being in the petunia phase. The Doppler program marries with another program that has been implemented to put over 100 weather stations into country

Western Australia. Those weather stations, together with Doppler radar, provide the sort of ground-truthing that is necessary if we want to introduce a multi-peril crop insurance program that is based on weather events rather than financial events. That opens up the opportunity for farmers to protect themselves in the future against adverse weather conditions and the vagaries of climate change.

I want to take a moment to update the house on the situation in my area of the Agricultural Region, the northern agricultural region, which stretches from the outskirts of Perth to the Murchison River. I drove through that area in the middle of June, and it was distressing to see that most of the ground is still bare and there is very little germination in any of the cropping areas. I have grave concerns for many of the farmers who live in the northern part of my electorate, given the dry start to the cropping season, because by about August, the temperature and the conditions are often very harsh, so cropping needs to begin early.

One of the great ways in which farmers have been trying to improve their productivity and reduce the risks in the farming game is by forming groups for the purpose of joint research. They often use their own land as a place to stage that research and are able to apply that information quickly and directly to improve farming operations on not only their own properties but also other properties. As a Nationals member, I am very pleased that the former Minister for Regional Development approved a significant amount of funding—\$17 million—to grower groups to enable them to partner with others to further research into areas of interest for not only grain growers but also growers who are interested in livestock, the production of wine, and a range of farming activities. That funding has proved very popular and those grower groups have had a tremendous influence in their area. I am proud that in my electorate, grower groups such as the Mingenew–Irwin Group, the Liebe Group, the West Midlands Group and the Moora–Miling Pasture Improvement Group are doing a tremendous amount of work and are contributing to not only their own area but also agriculture generally throughout the state. That program, which enables grower groups to improve productivity in their industry, has been very successful and is very important.

As I have mentioned, at the event at Watheroo for the dedication of the Doppler tower, Hon Alannah MacTiernan, the Minister for Agriculture and Food; Regional Development, indicated that in her view, short-term funding for grower groups is not a good use of government funding and she would rather put that money directly into the Department of Agriculture and Food as was done in the 1950s and 1960s. The minister is trying to turn back the clock to the old days. However, unfortunately, time has moved on and we have moved away from that, because that is what the industry has told us that it wants. It will not be easy to turn back the clock in the way that the minister is envisaging. The Department of Agriculture and Food no longer has the personnel in the form of younger scientists et cetera who can be called upon to do that type of work. They have moved into the private sector, into grower groups, and into other ways of providing for the industry. To try to turn back the clock now will be a waste of the resource and will not lead to a good outcome. I agree that the Department of Agriculture and Food needs to be well funded. It has important tasks to do. However, that is not the only way of delivering research. We know from experience that enabling grower groups to take responsibility for research, and identify the topics they want to address and the methods they want to use to address those topics, is the best way to ensure that research is properly guided into the future.

I found it rather strange to listen to what the minister said in Watheroo. I was talking to a representative of the Moora–Miling Pasture Improvement Group and members of the Liebe Group when the minister said that. They were shocked and somewhat dismayed. I hope the minister listens to industry and to the people on the ground. I also hope that she does not go through with this plan not to fund the grower groups into the future, which is what I understood her to say.

Another area of royalties for regions investment that has been tremendously important has been the commitment to aged care throughout regional Western Australia. I hear that the minister is looking for savings from the program and is holding back on committing to some important announcements that were made by the previous government. Those commitments were approved by the minister and the cabinet of the day. The government says that those commitments are unfunded, yet the money has been put aside in the program. I know this from my previous roles in regional development. The money has been put aside in the royalties for regions program to actually pay for that. As I said earlier, the money is mandated under statute to flow into the royalties for regions program. I cannot see how a claim could be made that these are unfunded commitments. They are not unfunded commitments; they are fully funded under the royalties for regions program. This is very distressing not only to me, but also to the communities involved—small communities in my electorate such as Yerecoin, Calingiri and Dalwallinu, and even some of the larger ones such as Toodyay and Moora. People have worked very hard to gain funding. They have invested an enormous amount of community time into making applications. Tremendous projects have been put forward for funding to provide independent living units within their community only to be left in limbo now while we wait for the new government to decide whether it will go through with these programs. I would have thought, under any sort of fair reading of the Westminster system of government, that cabinet makes a decision, that decision is announced, the funding is available and the incoming government carries on with that funding. I do not really understand what the government is trying to achieve, but I know that it is causing a great deal of upset to people in my electorate. There are some very disappointed and concerned people. These are very much needed programs.

I note an announcement was made today about the Southern Inland Health Initiative. I have previously said in Parliament that that is a very important royalties for regions program. It has also come to a point at which there needs to be a funding commitment to continue that program beyond 30 June. I acknowledge the Minister for Health. He is not in the chamber now, but were he here, I would gladly acknowledge my thanks that he has at least committed to continue stream 1—the very important incentive program for medical practitioners in regional Western Australia. That program would have faced the cliff face in a few weeks, and now at least there is some certainty in that program. I thank the government for that announcement.

I point out that many other streams of the Southern Inland Health Initiative are yet to receive funding commitments from the current government, one of those being the telehealth program. Telehealth in Western Australia not only increases the level of service available to country people, but also saves money for the government because it is a far more efficient way to deliver specialist emergency help into regional areas than actual specialists practising in each small community. A cardiologist cannot practise in communities of 500 people, but through the telehealth system, not only can people access a cardiologist when somebody enters a small nursing post or a small hospital, but also life-saving drugs and procedures can be administered. They have been demonstrated to be lifesaving. Without those drugs and without access to a cardiologist to approve and direct their use, some people who are with us today would not be with us today. It is tremendously important. I hope the government will commit to funding the telehealth program into the future as well, as it has very recently with the stream 1 GP incentives.

Another program in my electorate that I think is tremendously important is the Turquoise Coast Health Initiative. That program provides services into the peri-urban areas of my electorate—the areas that bound the metropolitan area and the coastal strip up as far as Dongara. There has been a dearth of services there for many years. There is very little health infrastructure and services. The population in the Shire of Chittering is growing at one of the fastest rates of any non-metropolitan area of the state—at about six per cent a year. No services are being provided to people in that area. I have highlighted before the situation for people in these districts. The Turquoise Coast Health Initiative requires that \$22.46 million in royalties for regions funding. That funding was approved by the former government. Again, it is a program that is mandated under statute, so the money is available. It will flow into the government's coffers to provide for it. I hope the government will consider that into the future.

[Member's time extended.]

**Mr R.S. LOVE:** The Supply Bill will of course enable the continuation of other programs. I have a particular concern about road safety in my electorate. Over a number of years the dangers of some of the roads in my electorate have been demonstrated. I recently highlighted the situation on Indian Ocean Drive. Indian Ocean Drive is much busier now than it used to be due to the completion of the road, in 2010, from Lancelin to Cervantes, which has linked that road from Wanneroo to Brand Highway, about 30 kilometres south of Dongara.

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

**Mr R.S. LOVE:** I do not know what the minister said, but I am sure it was humorous!

In addressing the government on this matter, I point out that the previous Labor government, going back to the Carpenter government era, put money into completing that section of Indian Ocean Drive. It is largely its responsibility now to fix the southern end because of the tremendous amount of growth that has led to traffic numbers. We need this government's commitment into the future to improve the southern section of Indian Ocean Drive. The traffic numbers mean that it is now much more dangerous than it used to be.

**Mr D.A. Templeman:** What are the numbers now?

**Mr R.S. LOVE:** I am not able to tell the minister those numbers off the top of my head. If he likes, I will certainly send them to him.

**Mr D.A. Templeman:** Take it as a supplementary question!

**Mr R.S. LOVE:** I will get my staff to research it for the minister!

**Mr D.A. Templeman:** Get your people to talk to my people and we will find the answers!

**Mr R.S. LOVE:** I can tell the minister, though, that the very week that Indian Ocean Drive opened, I was a school bus driver in the Badgingarra area and spent a fair bit of time on Brand Highway. It was as though Brand Highway had completely shut down—there was no traffic. Over the first few weeks everybody drove up and down Indian Ocean Drive. I have noticed that traffic has steadily come back to Brand Highway. I am told that that is because people feel unsafe on Indian Ocean Drive. Drivers also feel that they will be held up because of a lack of passing opportunities et cetera. Even though the distance is shorter, I am told the time is longer for trips from Dongara and Geraldton, for instance, down to Perth. For a person living in Jurien Bay it is a different matter, because the distance is far shorter down Indian Ocean Drive than to drive all the way to Brand Highway.

Another road that I will take time to highlight is Toodyay Road. The wheatbelt section of Toodyay Road is a very dangerous stretch of road. Work has been done to improve that road. When I say that work has been done,

environmental clearances have been obtained. Land has also been purchased to enable road widening. That work was done in the recent past. I thank the former Minister for Road Safety for her support. I look forward to continued support from the current government and the current minister to develop a safer Toodyay Road.

To close the discussion, I would very briefly like to touch on tourism. Tourism is a job creator, and I am glad to see the Minister for Tourism in the house. It is a very important industry, especially in my electorate, which has a great deal of potential for the development of tourist products. My electorate has icons such as Kalbarri National Park, the Pinnacles and Nambung National Park. There are opportunities in scenic towns such as Dongara, Jurien Bay, Cervantes, Lancelin and Ledge Point and also, not to neglect the growing popularity of the eastern areas of the electorate, in the wheatbelt and midwest grain-growing areas. A lot of people come out in the wildflower season, especially caravanners, to places such as Mullewa, where they can see the unique wreath flowers around Mullewa, Pintharuka and Morawa. Some royalties for regions programs have helped improve awareness of those areas. Wildflower drive trails have been developed throughout the midwest on what we call the Midlands Road, the old road to Geraldton before the opening of the Brand Highway, as well as the Mullewa–Wubin Road. They are very, very popular and it will be of great benefit to the state of Western Australia if expenditures are made to enable more tourism visitation, to make people aware of the opportunities that exist in the area and to improve their experience when they visit. The “Parks for People: Caravan and Camping” program has been very important in doing that. We have seen some improvements in the Coalseam Conservation Park area just outside Mingenew. It is a very scenic area; it is a spectacular area. If anybody wants to spend a few hours driving around the electorate, I suggest the town of Mingenew as a great destination and then head up the road towards Mullewa.

**Mr D.A. Templeman:** I had an interesting picnic there many years ago.

**Mr R.S. LOVE:** A picnic at hanging rock, yes.

**Mr D.A. Templeman:** When I was teaching in Three Springs.

**Mr R.S. LOVE:** Yes, the member for Mandurah had a lovely picnic there.

**Mr D.A. Templeman:** No, I had a very interesting picnic. I could tell you an interesting story but I might be expelled from the house if I went into detail!

**Mr R.S. LOVE:** It is perhaps a story for the bar afterwards!

I want to touch again very quickly on the situation in Kalbarri National Park—another parks for people program investment site. A major development is underway there with a skywalk and the sealing of roads in and out of the park. The minister will be well aware of that and the potential of that. We hope that will be concluded fairly soon, although I understand the actual skywalk has not yet gotten underway, but it will be good to get that done. I am very concerned, though, about the situation for some of the small businesses in Kalbarri that have been left in a precarious position after being underpaid for some services. It is not just in Kalbarri; other contractors based elsewhere have been involved in that program. They were not being paid, even though they provided a service. The government was paying people above them, but the money was not filtering through.

**Mr P. Papalia:** Have you directed them towards the Small Business Commissioner?

**Mr R.S. LOVE:** Yes. I have directed them through to the Department of Commerce.

**Mr P. Papalia:** And the Small Business Development Corporation as well?

**Mr R.S. LOVE:** I am not sure whether I have directed them to the Small Business Commissioner as such, but we have had advice from the Department of Commerce and through the Minister for Environment in his role as the overseer of the Department of Parks and Wildlife.

**Mr P. Papalia:** I would like to hear it as Minister for Small Business.

**Mr R.S. LOVE:** I would be very glad to get that information to the minister as soon as I can. Those people deserve to be paid for services that they have provided and it would be very sad if this whole exciting opportunity, which has been opened up in Kalbarri, was tinged with people left financially disadvantaged. I hope that something can be done and I will undertake to get that to the minister himself, and through to the Small Business Commissioner as well. All in all, in my electorate at least, a number of programs are waiting on government decisions to see which way they will fall.

To go back to royalties for regions and to reiterate: I do not really see where these so-called savings can be made in royalties for regions, if the government commits to the spirit of royalties for regions and puts in the 25 per cent of mining royalties and spends it in innovative, new ways to stimulate growth and provide a better life for the people in regional Western Australia.

**MR B. URBAN (Darling Range)** [11.05 am]: I rise to speak on the Supply Bill 2017. First of all, I want to acknowledge the former Liberal–National government for my rise into this chamber. If it was not for the last 12 and a half years of promising lots of things and delivering nothing for the seat of Darling Range, I would not be here today.

**Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup:** So, not your own effort? It must have been us!

**Mr B. URBAN:** The effort was absolutely outstanding from the member for Dawesville's side!

First of all, I want to acknowledge Tony Simpson, who was a very good member and a popular member around the Darling Range area. He offered quite a lot. I listened to the member for South Perth earlier today. He seemed to have been forgotten by the government for the last eight and a half years. It was not just his electorate that was forgotten about. Kalamunda was also forgotten about, as was Darling Range. I will not say it was easy because it was hard work. I wore out a couple of pairs of shoes walking around knocking on doors, and I was suntanned! Yes, I slip, slop, slapped, before the member for Dawesville raises that! I had my long-sleeved blue shirt on. The former government forgot about the people of Darling Range.

It is on record that I was a councillor at the Shire of Serpentine–Jarrahdale. I understand that Serpentine–Jarrahdale is growing at the rate of 6.8 per cent. It is probably one of the biggest growth areas in all of Australia, not just Western Australia or the regions. It probably has the biggest growth anywhere in Australia and its needs are great. Housing affordability is really, really cheap; land is cheap and houses are down. But there are no facilities there. As a councillor, I shouted that Darling Range, or Serpentine–Jarrahdale, had affordable housing but not affordable living. We have just managed to get Coles in there. I encourage the member for Dawesville to acknowledge Darling Range in the Peel region, because his member is down there—apart from the minister on the far side, he knows where Darling Range is. He is always over there; he speaks to me.

**Mr D.A. Templeman:** I had a few interesting picnics there too.

**Mr B. URBAN:** I am sure the minister had a few lovely picnics there. I hope he had picnics in Jarrahdale too. It is a beautiful location.

**Mr D.A. Templeman:** Yes, there is a very nice trails area there.

**Mr B. URBAN:** There is. I happen to be a trails guide there. If anybody wants to come and join me this Sunday, please feel free to go to the Old Post Office Museum in Jarrahdale at 8.30 am. I will be a trail guide, as I am every other weekend. Please come and join me and we will take people through the wonderful trails of Jarrahdale. Thank you, minister.

**Mr D.A. Templeman:** I hope you have a GPS tracking device on you just in case. I don't want you to get lost!

**Mr B. URBAN:** Just in case!

I also want to thank a couple of ex-ministers. I see the member for Nedlands, who was the Minister for Planning at the time. He actually came to Darling Range and into the Serpentine–Jarrahdale area, so he knew where it was. He is not here, but the member for Bateman came down once, whilst I was a councillor there. He promised to deliver a world of things. I do not know what the things were. He would say, "Oh yes, \$60 000; \$60 million for that. Yes, we can sort that out." It never materialised, but at least he knew where we were.

I know that the former Minister for Police came down to the Mundijong Police Station, which was greatly accepted and received.

**Mrs L.M. Harvey:** It was a fantastic achievement.

**Mr B. URBAN:** It was an absolutely outstanding achievement, member. I want to put on record too that the former Mundijong Police Station was condemned, through Dave Lampard and me, in company with the Western Australian Police Union. As a councillor, I found the location for the police station and it was with the assistance of the former Minister for Police that we got the police station built, so I thank the member on behalf of the people of Darling Range. It was a much-needed station.

**Mrs L.M. Harvey:** We were very proud of that.

**Mr B. URBAN:** We were very proud. However, with the growth in the number of police officers there, they will really struggle in that central kitchen area that is not big enough for eight police officers.

**Mrs L.M. Harvey:** It was a struggle when there was no commitment from your government for growth in the number of police numbers.

**Mr B. URBAN:** It was the member's government because it was in government at the time.

**Mrs L.M. Harvey:** No. We made a commitment to increase the number with the police commissioner.

**Mr B. URBAN:** We have. Anyway, I am not going to go there. I thank the member anyway.

**Mr P. Papalia:** We both made the same commitment.

**Mr B. URBAN:** Yes, exactly the same.

I want to talk about the money for the public sector. I went from the police into the youth justice world and I saw the amount of money that was lost or frozen. We were unable to renew contracts and that caused front-end staff to really struggle—the staff who talk to young offenders in the community and try to get them into education, to

stop them reoffending and to rehabilitate and reintegrate them back into the community. Those staff were lost. Youth justice officers were working at maximum capacity and kids were literally dropping through the net because of the Liberal–National government’s freeze on funding.

I also want to talk about the child protection and family services in the Peel region. The member for that area is in the chamber and he will attest to this. Due to the freeze on funding and the chopping of the service, much-needed family support units were being closed down. The government agency was suffering, which meant that the people in Dawesville, member for Dawesville, could not use that service. The people in Peel, Pinjarra and Murray–Wellington could not use that service that came out of Mandurah because those services were closed down and the staff were pushed back. It is a shame.

I am glad that the Premier is here. I would like to thank the Premier. It frightens me every time he comes into this chamber for two reasons. He spent just as much time in Darling Range as I did, and at one stage I thought he was trying to be the candidate for Darling Range. I want to thank him and say first that he is an outstanding member for Rockingham, and an outstanding “member for Darling Range”. He came out to Darling Range, as many other ministers from our side did. We walked the streets and talked to people and we understood what they wanted. They wanted to extend the train line from Armadale to Byford. All right; it took a little conversation with the Premier who then said, “This we can do.” I want to thank him for that. The time frame for the line is 2023. I accept that and the people of Darling Range accept that. It is a much-needed facility and a much-needed transport link that people from Byford in particular will use to travel out of the area. Again, we have affordable housing in Darling Range but not affordable living. We do not really have a bus service around the area. Single mums who do not have a car have no other means of travelling out of the area. Kids who want to catch up with their mates on the weekend cannot get out of the area. They have to rely on their parents with cars. This is a much-needed service. We would like to get it earlier but I understand the thoughts behind that time frame.

The member for Armadale and I have been fighting very heavily over the link at Denny Avenue, which is in another part of Darling Range that covers 1 960 square kilometres—the biggest metropolitan electoral seat. We have been fighting for the Denny Avenue link because all the kids from Clifton Hills and Roleystone come down onto Albany Highway at that bottleneck at Denny Avenue. I am glad to see that the Minister for Transport; Planning has looked at it and realised it is a mess. It is going to be sorted out, so I thank her.

I will go to another topic close to my heart. Three years ago, the Premier saw a need to transfer land for a regional sports facility in Mundijong, and he was at that launch. The plan is that 50 000 people will live in Mundijong, and 50 000 people will live in Byford. In the region of 100 000 people will live between the two towns, but there is nowhere for these sports groups to expand—nowhere at all! I have been in a group for about eight years now and we have been looking at trying to put in a regional sports facility to get all these sports groups into the one area so that they can develop their clubs together and not be ad hoc all over the place. We identified a bit of land on Keirnan Street in Mundijong, right in the centre of the Serpentine–Jarrahdale area. This land is in the hands of the Mental Health Commission. I am hoping that it can be a quick acquisition and that the title can be transferred from the Mental Health Commission to the local shire so that it can then move on from the feasibility studies and business plans, which it does have, to developing a regional sports facility. This facility will take in sports such as netball—I will go into these in more detail a bit later—and cricket. It could involve two sports close to my heart, the first of which is soccer. I am a member of the great Armadale Soccer Club, and I will talk about that in a minute. I still play masters soccer. I am not as fast as I used to be but I still play. The other sport is martial arts, member for Dawesville. A recreational sports facility area is set aside so that we can cater for that sport in particular. It could have a cage in the middle and we could run some mixed martial arts fighting events. Lots of people will be there because lots of people enjoy this sport.

**Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup:** I should come on over.

**Mr B. URBAN:** The member should come on over and we could do a bit of a newaza together. I am sure that we will quite happily —

**Mr A. Krsticevic:** I will visit you both in hospital!

**Mr B. URBAN:** I would encourage the member for Carine to join us too and he might learn a bit about some arm locks. I thought that these backbenchers were just going to take it, but, with all these interjections, I am telling them now that I can give a good bit and I am quite happy to take it back.

**Mr P.A. Katsambanis:** You can do it in the octagon now.

**Mr B. URBAN:** My sport has dreamt for so long of the octagon being here in Western Australia

**Mr A. Krsticevic:** You are in the wrong profession.

**Mr B. URBAN:** I am in the right profession because we need people to stand up in this place for all society and all people. I am a proud second dan judo and first dan Shotokan. I absolutely love putting the mixed martial arts gloves on—I cannot say Ultimate Fighting Championship in here, but I am going to say it anyway—and getting

in that octagon and having some absolute fun; that is what I call it. It is fun and it is absolute discipline. It is not just a street brawl in there. I am digressing but I want to add to this. This is not just brawling. It is constructed martial arts between two people who agree to have a fair fight, and there is discipline and courtesy in it and the winner takes all—not literally.

**Mr P.A. Katsambanis:** If the member wants to digress to his other sport and his Newcastle United attire —

**Mr B. URBAN:** I have my Newcastle United Football Club tie on today and we have been promoted to the Premier League.

**Mr A. Krsticevic:** They are magpies so they are okay.

**Mr B. URBAN:** I want to talk about T-ball in Byford, which is going to receive some money from our better communities fund. The T-ball club in Byford has been going for a number of years. It was called the North Murray Diamonds. It died a few years ago and it was resurrected by Ramone Glasgow. It has huge participation. It needs a lot of money for extra bats. Its bats are 19 years old. I think it got them from the Pinjarra club. This money will be used to help Ramone Glasgow buy new equipment for the T-ball club.

Mundijong Serpentine Little Athletics is part of the Peel region. It is run out of Baldivis but when the kids train down at Serpentine Primary School, they do not have new mats to use. The mats have been re-covered and the foam inside is deteriorating. The club does not have its own javelins because they are borrowed from the school, and it does not have its own discuses. This money will be greatly appreciated by the club to let the kids train on new equipment for once and not just go to Baldivis to use new equipment. “Oh, what is this?” “Oh, that’s a javelin.” “Ours is different from that.” “Yes, because yours is 33 years old.” They are totally different. Centrals Football Club and the SJ Blues Cricket Club share clubrooms. They want a better facility with new fridges throughout because they are using second-hand and donated refrigeration systems in their kitchen.

Coming from youth justice, one of the things I am really keen on is youth issues and getting youth engaged. I will talk about the Serpentine–Jarrahdale Youth Activity Group in a moment, but we have committed \$200 000 to expand the Byford youth zone. That is much needed at Briggs Park in the Byford area, which has a little section for the YMCA. We need to build on that because it is turning away kids because it has only one room. I think it is shameful that kids who need help and need a counselling service do not have space or the facility for that.

I refer to Roleystone Theatre. I am going to go out of Byford and head up the hill. The member for Carine does not know where “up the hill” is.

**Mr A. Krsticevic:** Of course I do!

**Mr B. URBAN:** Because he sees it from Carine.

**Mr A. Krsticevic:** I have been up the hill many times.

**Mr B. URBAN:** And back again I hope! Roleystone has many, many good community groups. It has Roleystone Theatre. I want to say thank you to the Leader of the House. He is a great theatre man.

**Mr D.A. Templeman:** Theatre man—is that me?

**Mr A. Krsticevic:** I thought he was talking to me.

**Mr B. URBAN:** I know the member for Carine likes theatricals, but theatre? No. We are going to give Roleystone Theatre money for much-needed sound equipment and lights.

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

**Mr B. URBAN:** Roleystone Theatre.

**Mr D.A. Templeman:** I have not trod the boards there. However, I am sure I will be invited at some stage.

**Mr B. URBAN:** They have just done a great show—*Oklahoma!* Paul Presbury, who was a police officer in Armadale many years ago, is still treading the boards. He is a retired policeman and the grandfather of the theatre. We are going to assist the theatre with some new up-to-date sound and light systems.

**Mr D.A. Templeman:** You would make a good Watson. I can just see you as Watson.

**Mr B. URBAN:** “It’s elementary, my dear.”

**Mr D.A. Templeman:** There you go. You’ve got the gig.

[Member’s time extended.]

**Mr D.T. Redman:** Was that an extension to allow the interjection?

**Mr B. URBAN:** Absolutely. The Roleystone Gymnastics Club is a great facility. There are 250 kids at this club that runs out of Karragullen, even though it is called Roleystone. The club wants some extra tumble mats. The thing that excites me about this club is not only that there are 250 kids—boys and girls—all having fun, but it has a section that caters for kids with autism. It has trained gymnasts or instructors, whatever you want to call them, who help these kids do gymnastics. That is a great facility and community resource. It is much needed by

not only kids in Roleystone–Karragullen; kids also come down from Harrisdale and Piara Waters because there is an instructor there who understands the disability that these kids have. We have offered \$16 400 to this club for extra tumble mats and to make this a better place. I am really looking forward to the end-of-year exhibition in December, which I attended last year as the candidate. It was great to see all these kids enjoying themes and putting on a great production.

I am going to talk about men's sheds in general. There is the Serpentine Jarrahdale Men's Shed at Mundijong, the Roleystone Men's Shed, the Mundaring Men's Shed, the Forrestdale Men's Shed and the Serpentine Jarrahdale Youth Activity Group, which is a men's shed for young kids. All these groups in our area have a great membership base and meet a pivotal need for our communities. It is not only seniors and men who attend men's sheds. They are community sheds and they are much needed to assist people, including people with strokes like Brian Phillips. He is a steam wood bender who worked on the *Endeavour*. After he had his stroke, he could not do anything so we took him to the Forrestdale Men's Shed and he is now getting movement back in his hands and his face and he is part of where he once was. They are great organisations that will benefit from this.

I refer to the wonderful Armadale Soccer Club. I am sorry that the member for Armadale is not here. He had a meeting. The soccer club will benefit from this funding. I have been a member of Armadale Soccer Club for 15 years. It has always wanted that lean-to off the front so that it can put a stand in there to adhere to the conditions of the National Premier Leagues Western Australia in which it competes, and it has never been able to do that. We are committing to developing the grounds so that it can compete at that level and not be pulled back down to the leagues beneath because it does not have an adequate stadium.

I want to say thank you to WA Labor. I would like to say thank you for lots of things that WA Labor has given to Darling Range and is contributing to Darling Range because for many years—I mean many years—Darling Range has been forgotten. To Premier Mark McGowan, I want to say thank you yet again. Mark McGowan has not forgotten Darling Range. He will never forget Darling Range and I know that he will not forget WA people; he always puts them first, so thank you.

**MS S.E. WINTON (Wanneroo)** [11.27 am]: I would also like to speak on the Supply Bill 2017. I thank the member for Darling Range for giving us the opportunity to hear about some of the major issues and concerns that are confronting his electorate. I take the opportunity here to do similarly with regard to the state seat of Wanneroo. I could talk about many things, but I thought I would focus on three areas in particular that have taken my attention as a local advocate, local resident and long-time community volunteer in Wanneroo. Those three areas are education, the environment and sport.

As a teacher for 27 years, I am really delighted to be representing local schools in my area. I am thrilled that in the short time that I have been in this place, I have already hosted students from schools in Pearsall, Carramar and Tapping on excursions to this place. Certainly, they are the future leaders of our great state. Given that it is mandated in our curriculum that civics and citizenship be covered in schools, I am thrilled that my local schools have a strong emphasis in that regard, and I look forward to continuing to work with them.

I want to focus today on Wanneroo Secondary College. It is the only public secondary school in my electorate, so it is an important school for our community. It is also important to me because not only am I the local member representing that school in this place, but also I attended that school. The school opened in 1977, under the leadership of the late Glyn Watkins, who was an extraordinary leader and well ahead of his time. It was a showcase, flagged school in its day, and I had the privilege of being part of the second cohort to go through the school in 1978. I have really fond memories of my time at that school, and it was innovative back in those days. Having been a teacher for 27 years, as I reflect on the practices that were in place at that school in those days, I am further impressed with what was taking place in the late 70s and early 80s. There were things like having zones of 90 minutes, rather than having six periods a day, so we would have three zones a day; and the teacher advisory group pastoral care system. The houses were named after places in Wanneroo, so they included Wanneroo, Ariti and so on. I was in the house of Rogers, and it is not lost on me that the colour for that faction was red. There must be something about red, because even in primary school at Yanchep I was in the red faction. Perhaps I will be wearing this red jacket for a long time to come.

I was a proud student councillor for the five years I attended Wanneroo Secondary College, and I was the president of that student council, so I am really excited about the opportunities I will get to work as both a former teacher and a local member to support that school in its civics and citizenship program. The school is currently under the leadership of Pauline White, who is an amazing educator, and the school is very lucky to have her. It runs a number of specialist programs, including performing arts, instrumental music and Australian Rules football. It has not been lost on me, in the time since I was preselected and have had the opportunity to revisit that school, that it is definitely showing its age. Having been built in the 1970s, it is desperately in need of upgrade, and I am delighted that we will see that happen under this McGowan government. We have made a local commitment to build a brand-new gymnasium for \$4 million, and a \$1 million upgrade of the existing performing arts facilities, which will allow the school, its staff, parents and students to fully meet their aspirations. I am very excited about being able to deliver that in the next few years.

The second aspect I want to speak about today is a commitment we made during the campaign to the Wanneroo District Netball Association. Old members—no disrespect intended—would probably remember that the member for Girrawheen brought a grievance into the last Parliament on that subject, and it was an important grievance. It highlighted the neglect of that important facility in our northern corridor. The Wanneroo District Netball Association has over 5 000 players every weekend—mostly girls, obviously. I found it quite amazing that only about half a dozen toilets are provided for the thousands of girls playing sport. I found it amazing also because, back in my days at Wanneroo Secondary College, I played netball there too, and I have old photographs of me playing there, with the facilities in the background, and nothing has changed, even though we are now in 2017. It is quite extraordinary. I am delighted to have been working with the member for Girrawheen, and we have made a commitment to the netball association that we will deliver much-needed upgrades to that facility.

Those members who do not understand the importance of this should look at it from the perspective of a mum or dad watching their daughter play netball on a weekend. Imagine turning up, along with thousands of other players, and parking is an issue. They arrive maybe five minutes before the netball game is due to start, and then the 10-year-old daughter says, “I need to go to the toilet first, mum.” And then she sees the queue for the toilets. It is inconceivable in this day and age that we have that kind of set-up for a major sport for girls, and one of the biggest netball associations in the state, servicing the northern suburbs. I also acknowledge the work of the committee and the board of the Wanneroo District Netball Association particularly under the stewardship of the president, Judy McInerney, and the director of facilities, Malcolm Wright. I thank them for the opportunity to get to know their organisation better and to better understand the needs of that facility. I am looking forward, as the member for Wanneroo, to being able to support them in the future.

I am not sure whether members are aware, but a couple of weeks ago, over the long weekend, the Smarter than Smoking association weekend took place. This is an occasion on which thousands of girls and women from across the state get together to play netball. The Wanneroo District Netball Association was represented in that carnival, which went over the three days of the long weekend. To show the size, scale and significance of the Wanneroo District Netball Association, it fielded 16 teams in that competition. I think it was one of the biggest associations represented over the weekend, and I am sure that members—and the member for Bicton, who I know loves her netball—would be delighted to know that, of those 16 teams from the Wanneroo District Netball Association, nine made it to the finals, and achieved four victories in the grand finals. It would be nice to know how some of the other districts in the southern suburbs went. I am not suggesting that I am going to start a healthy netball competition between the northern and southern suburbs, but I am happy to oblige. We have made a commitment to provide \$500 000 towards the upgrade of the toilet facilities and change rooms, and I will be happy to report to this house on the progress that we make in that regard.

I have talked about a specific area in education, and I have spoken of the specific area of sport, which I am passionate about, not as a netball mum, but as a volunteer for the sporting communities in my electorate. The third area I want to touch on is the environment, to which I have always had strong ties in my local area. In particular, I want to take this opportunity to chat for a couple of minutes about Lake Nowergup. Many members in this house might ask, “Lake Nowergup—where is it?” I have to confess that, even though I have lived in Yanchee since the 1970s, and travelled along Wanneroo Road thousands of times in my life, going to school, or working or shopping, it was not until about 12 years ago that I actually discovered the lake, because nobody actually knows it exists. When driving along Wanneroo Road, Lake Nowergup cannot be seen physically. It lies about 10 kilometres north of Joondalup and is significant. It is the deepest permanent lake in the metropolitan area, yet hardly anyone knows about it. I find that quite extraordinary.

The reason I got to know about it a little more over the last eight years is that as part of a community campaign we were alerted that a mine was going to be put right next door to it. I could happily talk for hours about the community campaign to make sure that that did not occur, but I raise this matter now because I am delighted to advise that during the campaign and that journey we were able to get a commitment from this government to try to rectify the fact that nobody knows that Lake Nowergup exists. The tragedy about things to do with the environment, unfortunately, is that when we do not know when something exists, we do not know when it is at risk. It is really important that we build up the public profile of Lake Nowergup so that people can not only treasure it but also enjoy it.

It is extraordinary sometimes to see developments in residential areas that tend to follow a cereal packet recipe in the sense that a symbolic park is included or an artificial lake is included because everybody likes water nearby where they live. These wonderful artificial things are built and afterwards local governments have to pay to maintain them, yet Lake Nowergup is less than a 10-minute walk from Alkimos and the whole urban sprawl development is happening in the north. Many local residents know that Lake Nowergup has the potential to become a regional open space for people to enjoy, but, of course, people need access to it. As part of commitments we made during the campaign, we have committed \$100 000 to make sure that we can improve signage and parking near Lake Nowergup so that people will not just drive past but park their cars and perhaps go for a walk around the place. With growing awareness of this beautiful, well-hidden jewel in the north, I am hoping in the long term that more people will share the vision of what locals know—that this is an absolutely beautiful, fantastic asset for the northern suburbs that people can enjoy for recreation.

In that regard, we tend to be a little adversarial in this place. I want to publicly put on the record a couple of things about the community's eight-year journey to protect Lake Nowergup from mining. We made countless deputations to the local council and countless petitions to the Legislative Assembly and Legislative Council in Parliament. We had every minister and opposition member visit over years and years and years. Finally, after 1 437 days, we managed to actually protect it. I have to acknowledge the former Minister for Environment, Hon Albert Jacob, who finally assisted in that regard. A clearing permit had not been granted to the company involved, and it appealed that process. It was up to the former environment minister to dismiss the appeal, and he did so. For that, the local community thanked him, and I want to acknowledge that on that particular matter he made the right call. I am sure I will have many more opportunities in this place when I will be able to explain why the former environment minister has not done such a good job—I am sure the member for Bicton will help me out in that regard—but I want to place on record that for us locally in that instance, he finally came to the party after 1 437 days and dismissed that appeal.

[Member's time extended.]

**Ms S.E. WINTON:** Finally, I want to talk a bit about congestion in the northern suburbs. Mr Acting Speaker, you may have noticed yesterday the front-page headline in *The West Australian* about congestion, particularly in the northern suburbs, and the amount of time that we all spend in our cars. It is a health issue, a family issue and a productivity issue. Since having been elected to this place, I am also experiencing it firsthand, and, quite frankly, it can sometimes take me up to an hour and a half, if I am unlucky, to travel from where I live in Nowergup to this chamber. I well understand the circumstances that face the lady in Alkimos mentioned in the newspaper yesterday who I think spends some 600 hours a year in a car.

The Labor Party and this government did not learn about this matter just yesterday. During the entire election campaign, particularly in the northern suburbs, one of the key issues we heard time and again was congestion, and the fact that not enough was being done about it. I have no doubt in my mind—the results and swings we obtained in the northern suburbs in the election show this—that what was to be done about congestion was a key issue for people. Imagine, then, my delight and the equal delight of my fellow northern suburbs members, when the pre-election commitment was made for the Mark McGowan government to divert funding from Perth Freight Link to the northern suburbs. I remember that the federal finance minister said on 12 March that the funds could not be redirected. On the ABC on 20 March, the Prime Minister himself, who may or may not come to visit us some time soon, said it would be absurd to reallocate the funds. I am very delighted that our Premier, Mark McGowan, and our Minister for Transport, Rita Saffioti, have been able to achieve what seemed impossible or absurd—to get that money and redirect it into much-needed congestion-busting projects in the northern suburbs.

I would like to take the opportunity to highlight three of those very quickly. One, of course, is the dualling of Wanneroo Road between Flynn Road and Joondalup Drive. That will now progress. I am really delighted we have a commitment for that to be done. It is a \$30 million commitment to dual that very important and deadly piece of road. The second congestion-busting project that is now fully funded and will proceed within this term of government is the two overpasses at Ocean Reef Road and Joondalup Drive. The Ocean Reef Road overpass will cost some \$45 million, and I am delighted that that money is coming into the northern suburbs to not only fix the congestion, but also provide much-needed investment in local jobs.

The second overpass that I want to finish with is the one that will be built on Joondalup Drive. There was a lot of talk during the campaign, and there has been since we announced it, about whether there is a need to progress with the Joondalup Drive overpass. I want to explain to members that this overpass is absolutely needed. There are those, including my predecessor, Paul Miles, who say that we do not need it because once the freeway goes through, it will be null and void and all the congestion will be taken off the roads. It kind of explains why he is no longer the member for Wanneroo, because such statements do not recognise that the bulk of the congestion is in the east–west traffic flow. It is the people who live in Banksia Grove, Carramar and Tapping who want to travel from east to west. The suggestion by the former member that they will travel north to get to the freeway entry point and then head south is quite bizarre to me and does not make sense.

I also want to explain to people that the overpass of itself will not be the solution to congestion, and we acknowledge that. As part of our platform, we have committed to form a reference group that will ensure that the overpass is designed and built in conjunction with hotspots on Cheriton Drive and also at the roundabout at Burns Beach Road and Joondalup Drive, because we need to fix the whole east–west corridor in one go. I commit to making sure that we do that in a constructive, holistic way.

I have noticed more recently that the former member and also the predecessor in the federal seat of Cowan have suggested that we do not need the Joondalup Drive overpass and that it is a waste of money. I would like to place on the record a joint media release by Luke Simpkins and Paul Miles on 15 March 2016, which states —

Both MP's are pushing for key infrastructure projects to get the green light, such as a flyover for Wanneroo Road, crossing Ocean Reef Road, ... and an underpass for the Joondalup Drive/Wanneroo Road intersection.

I am not quite sure what happened in the northern suburbs under the Liberal government, because while those members were in government, there were banging on that the overpass was needed but they could not quite deliver it and could not quite get a commitment from their government to build it. They realised that they failed because they got turfed out and now that they are commentators on the sideline with, I hear, aspirations to get into local government, they are saying that the Joondalup Drive overpass is not needed. They are a little confused, because when they were in government, they wanted to achieve it but did not quite get there with their federal counterparts. We have, and I am really pleased about that. I congratulate again the Premier and the Minister for Transport for looking out for the northern suburbs. It is fantastic.

Finally, I want to quickly touch on an issue that was also important to the northern suburbs prior to the election. I acknowledge that a couple of petitions have been lodged with the Legislative Assembly on this matter. It relates to the horse beach that was closed by the City of Joondalup. I am really delighted that these people have sought recourse from this government and I very much look forward to the parliamentary process of this fortieth Parliament that allows us the opportunity to revisit that position, given that those people have petitioned us. I look forward to debating that at some point in the future. For those members who do not know, there are not many horse beaches around and the one in the City of Joondalup was a very important horse beach to the equine family in the northern suburbs and from as far afield as Swan Hills. We must retain in the northern suburbs an area for people with horses to exercise their animals. We are not absolutely sure why the City of Joondalup closed that beach, but I look forward to investigating why that occurred and what this government feels about that.

MR D.T. PUNCH (Bunbury) [11.25 am]: I speak to the second reading of the Supply Bill 2017 and, in doing so, I am proud to be one of seven regional representatives on this side of the house and part of a team that has the largest representation of people in regional WA and part of a team that regional WA has placed its trust in, with part of those 35 years of history working in regional WA. I speak to this bill because of the importance of providing continuity of government operations whilst the 2017–18 budget and appropriations are prepared and the importance of providing certainty and continuity of services to regional communities. The member for North West Central in his earlier commentary spoke about the impact of royalties for regions on the regions. Although I was going to speak about some of the issues affecting my electorate, I feel a pressing need to make some comment, because we have a financial legacy left by the previous Liberal–National government—a Liberal–National alliance government. What does that mean in practice? It means two teams, two party rooms and two treasuries—the state Treasury and the National Party room treasury. The state Treasury was managed by the state budget under the direction of the current Leader of the Opposition, and the National Party managed the alternative treasury through royalties for regions of \$1 billion a year. The problem was that the Liberal government kept spending as though royalties for regions did not exist, so two parties, operating as two independent teams in some form of alliance, were spending without regard to each other, with the Nationals particularly having complete disregard for the overall financial future of the whole of WA. That is why we are sitting here today debating the Supply Bill, because we have to review and look at what the next budget and the forward appropriations will be as we unpick that mess. There were two teams, with two sets of objectives, no common strategy and no collective interest or regard for Western Australia as whole, and that is why we are here today.

In looking at how royalties for regions was spent, we can see that the stewardship of the National Party is quite interesting. No wonder the member for North West Central was so happy with the work in his area, as \$34 584 per person was spent in that electorate. In the electorate of the member for Mandurah—I think the member for Dawesville also might come into this—\$1 153 per person was spent, and in the south west, \$3 028 per person was spent. What an unfair distribution across the whole of regional WA. Where are the future interests of regional WA?

We have made a commitment to the future of royalties for regions. We will focus on regional job creation, regional infrastructure, sustainable regional services into the future and regional safety. The previous Leader of the National Party thought that that was a recipe for putting a raid on royalties for regions and simply moving to a situation of cost substitution. In March 2017, he said that we would be raiding the royalties for regions budget and replacing it with normal government expenditure on things like roads. I had a quick look at some of the projects that are funded by royalties for regions, and what did I find? They include Marble Bar Road upgrades, the Margaret River perimeter road and upgrades to South Coast Highway and Pile Road. There is no doubt they are all good projects, but why criticise our proposals for improving road safety in regional Western Australia and say we are raiding royalties for regions funding and substituting normal government expenditure on roads when the National Party was spending on roads? In 2016–17, around \$70 million was allocated to Main Roads Western Australia for roads projects. I have no doubt they were all good projects, but do not criticise this side of the house if we look at regional road safety. I read the Western Australian Regional Development Trust's report. The body was set up to safeguard royalties for regions and ensure that funding is spent in accordance with the legislation. In advice to the minister in its 2012–13 annual report, it comments on the risk of substituting normal government expenditure for royalties for regions funds. In particular, it refers to moving the funding for the Department of Regional Development, nine development commissions, the regional development trust and the regional council across to royalties for regions funding. That is cost shifting. It might have been done for a very

good reason. The explanation at the time was recognition of the growing pressures on consolidated revenue and growing debt, but it is cost shifting and, as such, it needs to be transparent. Nine development commissions, a whole department, a trust and a council were all living off royalties for regions. The National Party criticises this government although it has clearly engaged in the business of cost substitution for quite some time.

I come to WA Labor's "Plan for Bunbury". The difference between our side of the chamber and the other side is that we base our decisions on strategy. The "Plan for Bunbury" is a strategy for building prosperity in the electorate. I am very proud of this plan and the people of Bunbury were clearly very impressed with it because they voted for me overwhelmingly. The first part of our plan is an emphasis on local content and purchasing. I am very pleased that the previous government supported stage 1 and 2 of the Bunbury waterfront project. It is a longstanding Labor Party project from the 1980s under the Bunbury 2000 agenda. I was very pleased it was supported. I am even more pleased that, following the implementation of our policies around encouraging local suppliers, more than 75 local contractors and suppliers from Bunbury and the south west attended a briefing session on the redevelopment of the Bunbury Dolphin Discovery Centre, which is a major tourist attraction. For the first time, they had a line of sight for how to access contracts flowing from government into the local community and that is our strategy for Bunbury. Our strategy is to work in ways that bring new money into the electorate and into the city and keep it circulating there for as long as possible to build support for our smaller businesses, medium enterprises and local jobs. The Bunbury waterfront project is a great project and I was very pleased that very quickly after coming to government, the Minister for Regional Development; Agriculture and Food came to Bunbury and confirmed the government's commitment to stage 3 of the project. That generated enormous excitement in Bunbury because people can see that the whole project now has certainty. It has certainty for jobs in continuing construction and in the economic stimulus that the project will bring to Bunbury.

In our Bunbury plan, we refer to the Bunbury port. Bunbury port has been a fantastic asset. It is part of Bunbury's economic history. It has grown to provide for over 15 million tonnes of local export and import in the current financial year, which is an extremely good example. Some of the land surrounding Bunbury port has the largest potential opportunity for growing the port's use than I think any other port. It is a marvellous asset. Our "Plan for Bunbury" incorporates the Bunbury port into the state's strategic freight task. It looks at freeing up the port to pursue broader opportunities in the state's interest and in the interests of local jobs. That is great news for us.

Our strategy also embraces small business and we will work with the Chamber of Commerce and Industry in Bunbury to support local businesses in the CBD to create more of a sense of destination and attract visitors to the CBD to shop. That has been sadly lacking for people who have recently walked down the streets of the CBD. It has injected new enthusiasm into small retailers in the CBD and we will support that with a commitment to new signage towards the CBD. We will also create new opportunities for people who come to Bunbury to know where the CBD is and where they can find really interesting and innovative shops.

We also looked at the Bunbury community's needs as a growing city. Bunbury Hospital at South West Health Campus has faced pressures of enormous growth. I am really pleased that we have given a commitment to grow the number of beds in the hospital to 200. This will enable patients to remain in the hospital and not have to be transferred as frequently to other outlying hospitals for want of a bed. It will enable Bunbury hospital to meet the growing needs of a city that is increasingly playing an important role for our state.

We have also examined and committed to a strategy to deal with meth. In the lead-up to the election, members on the other side looked at simply the issue of enforcement of penalties for dealing meth. We came out with a comprehensive strategy that looks at the supply and usage sides of meth. It gives positive options for users to deal with addiction and educates people about the risks of addiction as well as dealing with the issue of supply. I am very pleased with the recent news that seems to take the focus off Bunbury as the meth capital. It was never a deserved reputation. It was a city that was dealing with a major problem. I want to acknowledge the work of people like Julie Kent and Lina Pugh through Doors Wide Open. They have done so much to bring focus to the needs of addicts and their families for positive treatment options. I am very pleased with that.

Sport is another area that we have examined as part of our "Plan for Bunbury". We know that sport plays an absolutely critical role in every electorate to engage people, support volunteerism, build teamwork and build leadership. It makes such a positive contribution to our communities. Our "Plan for Bunbury" clearly indicates detailed support for the Hay Park sporting facilities. We committed to working with the City of Bunbury to improve those facilities over the next four years and make sure that they are fit for purpose as far as possible. I went into changing rooms that had water running through gaps in the ceiling and where people could touch water pipes and get electric shocks from them for want of electrical servicing. The City of Bunbury is starting to address those issues but they highlight a major lack of investment in some core sporting infrastructure and we will address that.

Many members on this side spoke about the value of the local jobs, local projects initiative for our electorates. I am very pleased with the commitments that we have made for our areas, including improving sea safety. Bunbury is surrounded by water on three sides and we will make commitments to improve radio servicing from the Bunbury and Districts Power Boat Club. We have committed to supporting the Bunbury Sea Rescue Group

with additional navigation and radio equipment. We will continue to work with those groups to ensure that, as far as possible, the coastal areas around Bunbury have adequate radio servicing and coverage.

We will also be supporting the Ice Breakers program. That is a marvellous development. It is funded through the police and community youth centre, and it will be providing an outreach service into Carey Park that will engage directly with at-risk youth and encourage and involve them in thinking about the risks of addiction and addictive behaviours.

While I am speaking about Carey Park, I would like to acknowledge the work of Karen Turner, who has worked with me and the City of Bunbury to look at improvements in an area that has long been neglected. Through our local jobs, local projects program, we will be committing funding to support the improvement of Kelly Park as an area in which families and children can recreate. Forrest Park, which is another major sporting facility in my electorate, has suffered from long years of neglect. We will be supporting Forrest Park to undertake important plumbing and electrical work to bring the clubrooms up to standard.

Bunbury Bowling and Social Club is an enormous asset for older people in Bunbury in particular, but it also has a growing membership base from younger people. Bunbury bowling club has long wanted to provide more shaded areas, and also access for people with different abilities, including wheelchair access onto the bowling green. We will be supporting that club through local jobs, local projects. That is a terrific outcome.

Leschenault Community Nursery will be another beneficiary of the local jobs, local projects program. That organisation has been doing fantastic work in propagating native species and on civic rehabilitation projects throughout the south west. More importantly, it comprises groups of volunteers from all walks of life—people who need to work for the dole, people who have different abilities and want to volunteer, and people who need support. Leschenault Community Nursery not only helps ensure that we have continued access to good quality propagated species, but also provides a venue for people in need.

These projects are designed to bring new life into the City of Bunbury and take the city forward on a trajectory that was started by Bunbury 2000. However, we will be doing that on the back of a budget that will be for the whole of Western Australia, will incorporate royalties for regions, will spend money wisely, and will look to the future. That budget will be built by one team, with one vision—a McGowan Labor government—not two teams with two party rooms operating two distinctly different budgets. Thank you.

**MRS R.M.J. CLARKE (Murray–Wellington)** [12.12 pm]: I stand here today to speak on the Supply Bill 2017, and also as a representative of the strong south west contingent of Western Australia Labor. I am very proud to say that people said I would not get here, but I am here—and now that I am here, I am planning to stay!

Members: Hear, hear!

**Mrs R.M.J. CLARKE:** One of the things that I have found in my first few months as the member for Murray–Wellington is the feeling of neglect, of not being heard and of being ignored that has been experienced by many of my constituents. Many people have come into our office or contacted our service and have said that nothing has been done in the electorate in the past eight and a half years. It has been sad to see the number of people who want to speak to someone or have someone listen to them.

In my region, we have a wonderful community of volunteers. As a regional area, we rely on our volunteers. I have recently been to two volunteer award ceremonies in my electorate, and I would like to acknowledge some of the winners of those awards.

Last Friday night, I was privileged to go to the annual volunteer awards ceremony at the Shire of Harvey. The evening had just started, and I was sitting at the table, and a lovely lady and her husband came up to the table, and she said to me, “I think there’s been a mistake; I don’t think we should be sitting at this table with an MLA and the shire president”. I said, “Well, your name is here; please take a seat”. As the night went on, we got to chat, and I noticed that her husband was wearing a beautiful swan lapel pin. I asked him what the lapel pin was for, and he said that is the pin that he received in 2014 for 50 years of continuous volunteering service. I sat there for minute in awe, and I thought he has been volunteering for as long as I have been alive! It was wonderful to have that conversation with this gentleman. As the night went on, this gentleman, Mr Bill Scott, was given the meritorious award for outstanding volunteer service. For the past 14 years, Mr Scott, who along with his wife resides in Australind, has dedicated himself to the Society of Saint Vincent de Paul, which provides clothing, food and emergency shelter for people in need. Mr Scott and his wife collect clothing and furniture, and every weekend they hold a garage sale at their house, and they use the money raised from those garage sales to buy food vouchers that they give to needy families. This couple was very humble about sitting at a table with a member of the Legislative Assembly and the shire president. They did not think they were worthy to be sitting at that table. I am sorry, but I did not feel that I was worthy to be sitting at that table with them, because what they have done in the last 53 or 54 years is absolutely outstanding. I acknowledge Mr and Mrs Bill Scott of Australind on their many years of service.

Members: Hear, hear!

**Mrs R.M.J. CLARKE:** A few weeks ago, I went to the Shire of Murray's volunteer awards ceremony. There were some outstanding nominees and winners at that ceremony, and I want to acknowledge a couple of those. The first is Robert "Bluey" Wilson. One thing that happens in the regions is that everyone has a nickname. Robert "Bluey" Wilson has completed 35 years of volunteer service for the Bunbury Volunteer Fire and Rescue Service and the Bunbury Bush Fire Brigade in the Shire of Murray. He does this tirelessly. He does not ask for anything back. He is affectionately known in the region as Bluey; to the point that I had to think about what his first name is, because I know him only as Bluey. Bluey has contributed greatly to keeping the community safe from the threat of fires. He makes tough decisions under pressure and helps make the Murray community safe. His 35 years of voluntary contribution to the Shire of Murray is significant and worthy of recognition.

The winner of the award for sport and recreation volunteer of the year was another gentleman with a nickname—David Jones, affectionately known as Dingo. He has been involved with the Pinjarra Football Club for over 10 years. He has volunteered in a number of roles and now holds the role of team manager for all three football grades. He has made a fantastic effort, and, again, not many people know him by his first name—he is known as Dingo.

The most outstanding person on the night was Dylan Whale. I felt humbled to stand next to Dylan. Dylan has volunteered at the Pinjarra and Christmas festivals for over three years. That may not sound like a long time. However, this boy is only 12 years old. This is a significant achievement for someone so young. Dylan has also participated in the Shire of Murray Relay for Life team and has completed many hours of walking and assisting to raise valuable funds for cancer research. His commitment to the community and the Shire of Murray should be commended, and it was deservedly recognised at these awards. He is only 12 years old. Imagine what his future will be. He will be another Bill Scott. I can see that. His future will be fantastic.

I would also like to recognise the work that a group of grassroots members from the Australian Manufacturing Workers' Union are currently doing in Canberra. This is a national group, with grassroots members from the manufacturing industries who provide representation from each state. About 12 years ago, they formed the National Skills Training Committee, under the leadership of Doug Cameron. I am very proud to say that my husband has been the chairman of that committee for the past 10 years. The group goes to Sydney and Melbourne about four times a year to meet and talk about skills and apprenticeship, and about how to keep TAFE active and in capable hands.

This week the committee has been to Canberra to lobby with all Labor and Liberal federal counterparts to ensure that apprenticeships and TAFE are looked after and that jobs and skills are first and foremost in parliamentary minds. I am very proud to say that it is doing a fantastic job. With all the union bashing that went on yesterday, the union does do great things for our workers and our community.

I need to acknowledge a couple of other people. On the Western Australia Day long weekend I had the privilege of having the Premier attend a couple of events with me. One of them was the opening of the Forest Heritage Centre's emu walk. If any members have been down to the Fremantle Markets, they would have seen a stall belonging to Wendy Binks, a renowned Western Australian artist, that sells her stunned emu designs—they are fantastic. She has created this wonderful emu walk at Dwellingup. The walk starts at the Blue Wren Cafe and goes for about 1.2 kilometres to the Forest Heritage Centre. Along the way Wendy has created these magnificent stunned emu designs, each one unique in its style. Premier McGowan and his family joined over 300 of us—the entire town plus outside people turned up on the day—to walk the streets of Dwellingup to the Forest Heritage Centre. It was such a beautiful morning. I thank Premier McGowan for spending that time with me. The chair of the Forest Heritage Centre, Sue Fyfe, and its manager, Shani Holster, were absolutely thrilled and overwhelmed by the fact that their event was attended by not only their local member, but also the Premier of this state who opened this fantastic walk. They admitted to me afterwards they were expecting about 50 to 80 people, but when word got out that the Premier was turning up, over 300 people showed up in the town of Dwellingup. It was absolutely remarkable and they were overwhelmed by the amount of support shown on the day. After the Dwellingup walk we had a brisk drive down the hill to the Pinjarra Festival, where Premier McGowan again joined me for a few hours and had the privilege of opening the festival. The chief executive officer of the Shire of Murray, Dean Unsworth, and its president, Maree Reid, were absolutely overwhelmed and enjoyed the fact that the Premier took time out of his long weekend to bring his lovely family down to Pinjarra to experience the wonderful Pinjarra Festival. The Premier admitted that he had been there over the past four years as a participant to just walk around, but they were absolutely thrilled to have him open the festival this year. Again, the people of Pinjarra and the shire were appreciative that the Premier attended that event. The feedback from my constituents on my Facebook feed has been overwhelming. It is really nice to see that the Premier is a down-to-earth, approachable Premier who people see as an everyday good bloke.

*Point of Order*

**Mr R.S. LOVE:** I understand that this is about the Supply Bill 2017 but I do not see any relevance at all in this speech. I know that members can talk about a wide range of activities, but surely they have to talk a little bit about the finances of the state.

**Mr B.S. Wyatt:** It is a general debate.

**Mr R.S. LOVE:** It is a very general debate.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** No, there is no point of order. Could you please continue, madam.

*Debate Resumed*

**Mrs R.M.J. CLARKE:** Thank you. I am sorry I am upsetting the member.

In saying that, we have a couple of other fellows who are doing some wonderful work around volunteering and the Indigenous community throughout my region. Terry “Koodah” Cornwall and Mark Anderson from the Foundation for Indigenous Sustainable Health have worked in the community sector for the past 35 years. They have committed to working in partnership with Aboriginal people to redress the balance in health, education, employment, justice and life opportunities, and to enable Aboriginal people to be healing and leading contributors to the whole community in connecting people to caring for each other and caring for their country. I would like to acknowledge the work that they are doing.

Along the lines of local jobs and projects, I would like to acknowledge a few that we have committed to and will be rolling out in the coming weeks. There is a desperate need for a skate park in the Australind region as there is very little for youth to do down there. The government is committing \$100 000 to help build an Australind skate park. The Brunswick River cottage stage 2 development is in desperate need of funds and its staff were thrilled when we committed to giving them another \$100 000 towards stage 2 and the completion of the Brunswick River cottage. The government has committed \$200 000 towards the Dwellingup town square redevelopment including the adjacent green precinct of the Hotham Valley Tourist Railway. This town is in desperate need of beautification and this money will help bring that town to life. We have also looked at the extension of the Shire of Harvey’s library. It was quite funny because one of the ladies who works at the library as a volunteer was also a volunteer on my campaign. We made an announcement to commit \$100 000 to the Harvey library, and on the Monday after my election win she emailed me asking me when do they get their money—she was so excited that Labor took the seat of Murray–Wellington.

Another commitment of \$50 000 has been made to the Lake Clifton fire shed, the hardstand and roadworks, and also some work around the historic Lake Clifton lime kiln park. We have also committed \$50 000 towards putting in some outdoor lighting at the Leschenault Leisure Centre. The Pinjarra town centre is also in need of some beautification and a bit of development, so we have pledged \$100 000 to the Shire of Murray for that project. When we went to Ravenswood we had a street meet. Nearby was this old playground that the kids would not play on while the parents were talking to me. The parents told me that the kids do not like playing on it. After negotiation with the Ravenswood community group and the Shire of Murray, we were able to give them \$50 000 for a new nature play centre in that locality. We are also going to put \$100 000 towards the Ridley Place redevelopment in Australind. Our very special project in Waroona is its men’s shed, which is in desperate need of an upgrade. We will be contributing \$100 000 to that project. Last but not least is the small community of Preston Beach—I absolutely adore the region—and its little hall. When I say little, it is tiny. That community has been doing so much fundraising. The shire is putting some money towards the hall and the community got a little bit of royalties for regions money, but it was just a little bit short to finish off the community hall. All the community needed was \$50 000 and I was happy to oblige and give it that money.

I would just like to say that there are huge opportunities in our region for industrial expansion. Two major industrial parks in the region will create thousands of jobs if the right industries are developed and the community gets behind them—the Nambeelup and the Kemerton Industrial Parks. One is at the northern end of my electorate and the other is at the southern end. We cannot continue to rely upon the industries that we currently have in our regions because they are the major employers for our region and, at some point, if they decide not to continue, it will affect us greatly. We need to expand, to look outside the box and to develop these two huge industrial parks. WA Labor is committed to looking at and helping to develop these two industrial parks. This will also contribute to the electorates of the members for Bunbury and Collie–Preston. I feel that the electorate of Murray–Wellington is now the final piece of the puzzle for the south west because it connects so many electorates. If these two industrial parks get up and running, it will affect many electorates. I remember talking to people at the Peel Development Commission, who said that, as part of its long-term plan over 20 years, they expect at least 30 000 jobs to be created in that Nambeelup region alone. That will create huge opportunities for people in the region of Murray–Wellington. I would like to say to members today that we might be regional but we will not sit back and be quiet about it. We are going to speak up and ask to be supported.

Talking about schools, it was very sad to sit in this place and hear that schools are getting wonderful gymnasiums and performing arts centres. Meanwhile, my poor Pinjarra Senior High School, which has approximately 800 students, has for 20 years to this day been fighting for an undercover area under which its students can eat. There is nowhere to conduct an assembly. The school has to hire the Murray Leisure Centre from the shire and teachers and students have to walk across a main road, carrying their own chairs, to have an assembly. In wet weather, it just does not happen. In hot weather, it is terrible to have to walk that distance.

I heard that students at Como Secondary College had to walk 200 metres to get changed. The students at Pinjarra Senior High School have to walk a lot further just to go to an undercover area for an assembly. At the moment, I am in talks with the Minister for Education and Training about this issue. It may not happen this term, but going forward we are looking at a plan for that school. With the development occurring in the region, that school will have 1 100 students in about two to three years. We really need to be looking at these regional schools. These areas are now being developed and more people are coming into them. The farming lands are getting smaller and more housing developments are occurring in these regions. We need to cater for the expansions in our schools, hospitals and community services.

**MR S.J. PRICE (Forrestfield)** [12.31 pm]: I rise to contribute to the debate on the Supply Bill 2017. I acknowledge the announcements from the Minister for Planning this morning on aged-care development within the Shire of Kalamunda. It is certainly well overdue and very much appreciated. On World Elder Abuse Awareness Day, it is certainly very pertinent.

One of the things I was told when I first came into this house was to learn parliamentary procedure. Over the last couple of days we have been very fortunate to receive a very good lesson on what the Supply Bill means. Courtesy of the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Carine, we had quite a lengthy debate about what this bill actually is. It was quite surprising that we had to take so long to explain to them what we are debating here and why, because the material that is provided with the bill explains all that. I will start with the second reading speech. Part way into it, it states —

... the intent of supply is to give authority for expenditure from the commencement of a new financial year pending the passage of the consolidated account appropriation bills.

That is pretty self-explanatory. Further down the page, it states —

To support the late timing of the budget, the Supply Bill 2017 provides for interim appropriations out of the consolidated account to fund the core activities of government agencies until the passage of the annual appropriation bills.

That, too, seems to be quite self-explanatory. The section of the explanatory memorandum, which explains clause 4 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. 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*.

As the Minister for Mines and Petroleum said, it does not approve any expenditure. The bill approves a supply of money that is being sought under the previous bill that we debated—the Loan Bill 2017. I thought that was very interesting and I thank the members on the other side for seeking so much clarification on that. It is a shame that it took eight and a half years for that to become evident, but I suppose when we look at some of the activities of the previous government, it may explain a bit.

The people of Forrestfield were very excited about the recent funding announcements for commitments we made during the election campaign, in particular, two major infrastructure commitments to fund road intersections. One of them might not seem that important to everyone, unless they are impacted by that particular intersection. That is the intersection of Hale Road and Woolworths Drive in Forrestfield. This is just a small intersection that gives access to and from the shopping centre in Forrestfield, but it is an absolute nightmare. This intersection has been discussed, and promises and commitments were made by former governments over the past eight years, saying that they would fix it. Even as late as last year, during the federal election, the member for Hasluck committed \$650 000 to fix this intersection. As with previous commitments to fix this intersection, when we look into the federal budget, what do we find? We find absolutely nothing. There is no money in the budget whatsoever to fix it. It was another hollow commitment from the federal Liberal government. Not only that but the state member at the time committed to match the funding. When we look for that in the budget, once again, there was no funding from the state Liberal government. For the Labor government to say that it has been able to repurpose some of the money from Roe 8 and seek additional funding from the federal government to fix that intersection is a welcome achievement for the people of Forrestfield. The fact sheet from Main Roads states —

- The intersection of Hale Road and Woolworths Drive becomes heavily congestion during shopping hours, particularly at weekends.
- Vehicles turning right into the shopping centre are required to cross oncoming traffic as no signals or roundabout are in place at this location. This creates a safety risk and adds to congestion on Hale Road.

The amount of \$900 000 has been committed to fix that intersection. There are probably two main ways we can fix that intersection. We can insert a set of traffic lights to control the flow of traffic in and out of the shopping centre or we can put in a roundabout. The first problem we would encounter by installing a set of traffic lights is that apparently Main Roads has a bit of an issue with traffic lights being close together. If it were implemented, there would be about 186 metres between that new set of traffic lights and the traffic lights at Strelitzia Avenue and Hale Road. Main Roads indicated that having two sets of traffic lights 186 metres apart on a main road is a bit too close. That might rule that out. The alternative is to put in a roundabout. That would be great, except some major power infrastructure is running very close to that intersection, and unfortunately there are no road easements. We do not have a great deal of room to construct a roundabout at that intersection. The third alternative is to possibly switch the lights and the roundabout by installing a set of lights at Woolworths Drive, taking out the set of lights at Strelitzia Avenue and building a roundabout there, because there is a little more room on the roadside. The problem with doing that is that we would go from fixing one intersection to fixing two intersections, and the cost becomes a lot more than necessary. The McGowan Labor government's commitment of \$900 000 to fix that intersection is certainly well received by local constituents.

The other major infrastructure commitment we made was to build a grade separation at Kalamunda Road and Roe Highway. Once again, unless people are impacted by this particular intersection, they will not fully appreciate its significance. After the conclusion of the fabulous Gateway WA project, which realigned the roads and put in some beautiful infrastructure around Perth Airport, some additional problems were created. We dealt with a lot of the congestion and traffic flow issues in the vicinity of the airport, but we pushed them out. Two bridges should have been built as part of that project and they never were. One of them is the Roe Highway and Kalamunda Road interchange. This is an \$86 million commitment, which is a significant amount of money. It reflects the size of the intersection that will need to be constructed. Roe Highway is one of the major transport routes in and around this great city of ours. The intersection of Roe Highway and Kalamunda Road is the last remaining signalised intersection on Roe Highway. That project will remove the congestion, which has a significant impact on the productivity and efficiency of the transport companies that use that road. This is also quite a dangerous intersection and, unfortunately, there have been a significant number of accidents there. Even worse, in the past couple of years a young child was killed at that intersection. The commitment of \$86 million to fix that is certainly, once again, well appreciated. I know that the member for Kalamunda is quite happy about it and a number of residents of Kalamunda also are extremely happy that that is going to be done. That is another great outcome for the electorates of Kalamunda and Forrestfield, and it is appreciated. Not only that; these two projects will create about 700 jobs between them while they are ongoing, which is a significant part of why those two commitments are extremely important.

I touch on the fabulous support I had from the volunteers and all the party members in general and also the branch members in Forrestfield during the election campaign. It would be remiss of me not to say what a great campaign the Australian Services Union and the Electrical Trades Union WA ran to save Western Power from privatisation. During that campaign they held a town hall meeting at High Wycombe. In the vicinity of 100 residents turned up to that meeting. The unions put forward a good case about why we need to maintain Western Power. I suppose I digress slightly because that leads a bit into the debate we had yesterday on the private members' business matter that was raised. One of those points was about the expenditure of union money on the Labor Party campaign. The point I never got to make, which I think is very important, is that the campaign that the ETU and the ASU ran was not to support Labor; that campaign was run to support Western Power. That campaign was run against the sitting government at the time. It was against the Liberal Party. The Liberal Party came out and said it was going to sell off 49 per cent of Western Power. That was going to equate to the loss of a significant number of jobs and that was going to have a significant impact on those particular unions. The unions' response was to get rid of the government to save Western Power. It was not to get the Labor Party in; it was to run a campaign against the government at the time. In addition, all the funds expended on that campaign by those unions had to be authorised by their branch and executive committees, and they were. As members well know, there have been quite a number of investigations, the most recent of which was the Trade Union Royal Commission. The management of union finances is front and centre of every union in this state and in this country and they have procedures in place and reporting requirements under the amendment to the Fair Work (Registered Organisations) Act that they have to abide by legally.

All that expenditure was authorised. If opposition members were wondering about that—they were, quite clearly, from the matters raised in the debate on the motion yesterday—the campaign was not for the Labor Party; it was against the Liberal Party. It was a very successful one, I must add. It certainly helped us pick up some seats that were going to be challenging for us. I am not saying that we were not going to get there anyway, but it certainly contributed to picking up some of those additional seats. On that issue, I would like to say that it has been a very enjoyable week and I have certainly enjoyed learning about parliamentary procedure. Thank you.

**MRS J.M.C. STOJKOVSKI (Kingsley)** [12.44 pm]: I rise today to give my contribution to the second reading debate on the Supply Bill 2017. Like many of my fellow colleagues in this place, I have been meeting with the schools in my electorate in the first few months since being elected and overwhelmingly they feel that they were neglected by the previous government over the last eight years. All three of my secondary schools—

Warwick Senior High School, Greenwood College and Woodvale Secondary College—were built prior to 1985. All my primary schools, except for Greenwood Primary School, were built in 1990 or earlier. Yet as these school buildings began to age and technology began to evolve, these schools were neglected, forgotten and not upgraded, while schools in very close neighbouring electorates, some represented by members opposite, received significant investment. Take from that what you will. Only when the former government realised that the former member for Kingsley may not hold her seat at the election did it start making promises to pump money back into these schools in an attempt to buy votes in the electorate of Kingsley.

This money was to be given to the schools from the profits of the ill-conceived plan to sell the state-owned Western Power asset, but the people of Kingsley saw through this as too little, too late. They would not be fooled by the former government's attempts to rob Peter to pay Paul. I would love to promise these schools that we will be able to invest in the upgrades they require. However, from conversations with my schools, they know and acknowledge that we have to clean up the mess left to the McGowan government and that the finances are just not there to provide them with these upgrades. We do not have the money because we are cleaning up the former government's mismanagement of the state's finances. However, they are excited about the Labor government's focus on schools. They feel that the McGowan government is in touch with the issues that are important to schools and students. As a mum of a school-age child, I understand that we need to prepare our children for jobs that have not been invented yet and that the science, technology, engineering and mathematics disciplines taught in these schools will be the drivers of those new jobs. The Labor government's focus on science and coding in primary schools is to be commended. That is the type of real, in-touch policy that we require from an innovative government. It is required to move our state forward into an exciting future and to ensure that we diversify and futureproof our economy to ensure that our children are equipped with the skills that will best serve them for their future and ours.

I am pleased that the Minister for Education has accepted my invitation to visit a number of schools in the electorate of Kingsley in September to see firsthand the good work, engaging programs and dedicated staff and students whom I am fortunate enough to represent in this place. On the topic of future jobs, I am relieved that this government will be implementing a local content for local jobs policy, because this will deliver jobs to the people of Kingsley. This is not just a pie-in-the-sky policy that Labor announced before the election. We will be delivering on this promise to the Western Australian people and creating real jobs. I am very excited that young people in Kingsley, and indeed across the state, will have the opportunity to train at WA's first Metronet trade training centre to be located in the very close electorate and suburb of Joondalup, which will train young Western Australians with the skills to build and operate our new public transport network. This move will ensure that the much-needed Metronet will be not only delivered in a timely manner to the people of Western Australia, but also built from high-quality local components made by locals.

I will read from an article in today's newspaper that goes to show that Labor's policies around job creation have increased the confidence in the Western Australian labour market. It states —

Western Australia has recorded a positive result in its unemployment numbers, recording the biggest uptake in new jobs around the country in May alongside South Australia.

Western Australia's unemployment dropped to 5.5 per cent, down from 5.9 per cent in April.

I think this is a fantastic achievement and a ringing endorsement of the McGowan Labor government's commitment to creating local jobs in Western Australia.

**MR D.A. TEMPLEMAN (Mandurah — Leader of the House)** [12.49 pm]: I will make a contribution to the debate on the Supply Bill 2017, for about 30 seconds. I congratulate particularly the members from this side for their contributions to the debate. I think more members from this side than from the opposition have made a contribution to the debate, which is a very interesting point to note. I congratulate government members for raising issues of concern, given that the Supply Bill allows a general debate. I am very interested that opposition members did not take up the opportunity to speak, when there is a general debate, because it is an opportunity to raise matters of concern to their electorates. However, that is their choice. We look forward obviously to the Treasurer making a contribution.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member, I am dismayed to have to interrupt this enlightening presentation for further business.

Debate interrupted, pursuant to standing orders.

[Continued on page 1048.]

#### **DENMARK SURF LIFE SAVING CLUB — AWARD WINNERS**

*Statement by Member for Warren–Blackwood*

**MR D.T. REDMAN (Warren–Blackwood)** [12.50 pm]: The Denmark Surf Life Saving Club would have to be one of the best, if not the best, surf club in regional western Australia. It has a strong volunteer base, with a membership in excess of 220. It is not uncommon to see 80 kids participating in Sunday morning club events on the beautiful Ocean Beach. There is a strong commitment to not only immediate club activities, but also

preparing young Western Australians to be contributors to the broader community. With past surf club members spreading as far as Beagle Bay and Kununurra in the Kimberley and Esperance in the south east of our great state, the investment the club is making in its kids pays off for all of us. Saturday, 20 May was the Denmark Surf Life Saving Club annual dinner, which included an award presentation. I would like to acknowledge the following award winners, and in doing so acknowledge the wonderful contribution the club makes to not only the Denmark community, but also our greater state: the award for the under-14 club achiever went to Chyan Berliner; the young achiever award went to Phoebe Kelsbie; the young lifesaver of the year award went to Luke Friar; the senior lifesaver of the year award went to Tim Sinclair; the club person of the year award was won by Mark Williamson; the president's award was made to Jo Sinclair; the Surf Life Saving WA youth club achiever award went to Laura McEwan; the SLSWA junior club achiever award went to Olivia McEwan; the two-kilometre beach run award went to Anthony McEwan; the Matt Pearse run-swim-run was won by Anthony McEwan; the Bill Greenwood ironman award went to Charlie Thornton; in a sister-brother affair, the DiamondLady ironwoman award went to Phoebe Thornton; the Dean Morrison one-kilometre handicap went to Andrew Milne; and the male club championship went to Sam Williams.

#### **FATHER ALBERT SAMINEDI — ORDINATION ANNIVERSARY**

*Statement by Member for Girrawheen*

**MS M.M. QUIRK (Girrawheen)** [12.52 pm]: Last month I attended events to mark the twenty-fifth anniversary of the ordination of Father Albert Saminedi, or Father Sam, as he is better known. Father Sam has been the parish priest at Our Lady of Mercy in Girrawheen for the past seven years. It is a testament to the high esteem in which Father Sam is held that there was standing room only at mass and the later dinner dance at Herb Graham Recreation Centre was also extremely well attended. The mass was concelebrated with a number of Father Sam's colleagues and the homily was given by the lively Father Bona from Ellenbrook. The South Sudanese choir and Mercy College students' performances made the mass even more memorable. Visitors came from far and wide, including Father Sam's brother, Father Julian, from Germany, his sister Fatima, from Sydney, and nieces from Norway.

A Salesian born in Chennai, Father Sam's vocation led to work in India and then in Africa for 21 years, in Tanzania, Kenya, Egypt and the diocese of Wau, South Sudan, where he was the development coordinator for health and education for 11 years. From that work in South Sudan, Father Sam has a great affection for its people and he continues that contact with his South Sudanese and African friends in his role as migrant chaplain to Africans at St Josephine Bakhita in Westminster. Father Sam's lifelong commitment to education continues with his pastoral duties at Our Lady of Mercy Primary School and Mercy College. He has made a great impact on the Girrawheen community. He has touched many lives. I thank Father Sam for his tireless endeavours always undertaken with his characteristic good humour, kindness and humility.

#### **JOHN "JJ" MILLER — AUSTRALIAN RACING HALL OF FAME**

*Statement by Member for South Perth*

**MR J.E. McGRATH (South Perth)** [12.53 pm]: I rise to recognise the elevation of champion jockey John Miller into the Australian Racing Hall of Fame. JJ, as he is commonly known, rode hundreds of winners in Australia, Ireland, Mauritius and Singapore. In the 1966–67 season, he wrote his name into the history books by winning the Caulfield, Melbourne and Sydney Cups on the great champion Galilee. In the same year, he rode another champion, Tobin Bronze, to win the Doncaster Handicap and All-aged Stakes. At home he won every big race on the calendar, including six Australian Derbies at Ascot. JJ was a champion among champions. I also recognise the induction of Western Australia's Lee Steere family into the Australian Racing Hall of Fame for its contribution to racing. Over more than a century, the Lee Steere family established a dynasty that provided leadership for the industry through three chairs of the Western Australian Turf Club. The family bred and owned some of the best horses to race both here and in the eastern states, including the weight-for-age champion Eurythmic, winner of a Caulfield Cup, Sydney Cup and a string of weight-for-age races. In my office hangs a black and white photo of Maple, owned by Sir Ernest Lee Steere, winning the Caulfield Cup in 1928.

#### **BLETCHLEY PARK PRIMARY SCHOOL P&C HUNTINGDALE PRIMARY SCHOOL P&C SOUTHERN RIVER COLLEGE P&C**

*Statement by Member for Southern River*

**MR T.J. HEALY (Southern River)** [12.55 pm]: I am lucky to have some amazing parent committees in schools in my electorate and I am humbled to mention the individuals who are the daily heroes in my community. I wish to inform members that these individuals ensure that students and families in Southern River have great schools and incredible education communities.

At Bletchley Park Primary School parents and citizens association, I mention president Renae Ritchie, Vanessa Magee, Paula Kontor, Jacqui Watts, Robyn Menzies-Moore, Sonia Wright, Kylie McKivett, Vanessa Gordon, Kylie Newton, Sarah Yoo, Kerry Heliam, Sen Ooi, Joanne Ivey, Vicky Warwick, Darren Warwick, Narelle Marinescu, Theresa Kennedy, Vanessa Woodington and Nahin Ahmed.

At Huntingdale Primary School P&C, I mention president Mike Goode, Sharon Taylor, Jamie Powers, Louise Thomas, Nicole Smith, Natasha Bakranich, Graham Johnson, Lisa Hornblow, Kasey Hewitt, Samantha Quaynor, Kellie Innes, Juanita Denholm, Amy Watkins, Steve and Barbara Cox, Suzanne Roth, Simon Adams, Rebecca Tennant, Larissa Koch, Wanda Coops, Serena Williamson, Jo Hawksley, Jennifer Keys, Glen Bakranich, Lea Menzies and Kaylene Matthew.

At Southern River College P&C, I mention Karen Adams, Di Kowalski, Jen Clune, Sam Dundeger, Nina Adiya, Paula Duffin, Ian Lau, Tess Lau, Kristie Champion and Jenny Lenane.

These people are some incredible community champions. I thank them for their service and I am humbled to be their representative in this Parliament.

### **BUSSELTON DUNSBOROUGH VOLUNTEER OF THE YEAR AWARDS**

*Statement by Member for Vasse*

**MS L. METTAM (Vasse)** [12.55 pm]: The Busselton Dunsborough Volunteer Centre and the City of Busselton recently held the second annual Busselton Dunsborough Volunteer of the Year Awards on Monday, 8 May 2017, which I attended and was delighted to sponsor. Coinciding with National Volunteer Week, which ran this year from 8 to 14 May, and which is an annual celebration to acknowledge the generous contribution of our nation's volunteers, this event was a perfect opportunity to say thank you to the many wonderful volunteers in my electorate of Vasse, to recognise their selfless contribution and to highlight and promote volunteerism in our area. I would like to congratulate Helen Rabjones, Margaret Tickle, Connor Oliver, Doreen Bailie and Des Austin who received awards for their dedicated voluntary service across a range of areas in our community. Connor Oliver was the winner of the Apex youth award, awarded to youth under the age of 25, for his strong commitment to Busselton Surf Life Saving Club. Margaret Tickle was the winner of the 2017 Senior Volunteer of the Year award, Helen Rabjones was the winner of the Open Volunteer of the Year award and Doreen Bailie was the winner of the Rotary tourism and events category. Des Austin received a special "highly commended" certificate.

Volunteering is an integral part of our community, playing a vital role in fighting fires, protecting our beaches, and promoting events.

### **EAST WANNEROO PRIMARY SCHOOL**

*Statement by Member for Wanneroo*

**MS S.E. WINTON (Wanneroo)** [12.57 pm]: I rise to share with the house the WA Day celebrations at East Wanneroo Primary School. Last week East Wanneroo Primary School learnt about our state's history and celebrated WA Day with its Pioneer Week. Last Friday, I had the pleasure of attending the school's annual celebratory picnic with parents and friends of the school. The turnout by parents, grandparents and caregivers was outstanding. I congratulate the school on this fantastic initiative, which I understand is a whole-of-school effort. However, I would like to also acknowledge the work of principal, Bill Dawson, and the hard work of the school's parents and citizens association, led by Lisa McMinigal and Belinda Davies.

East Wanneroo Primary School is also doing some innovative work in the classroom and is lucky to have such creative and enthusiastic teachers. The school has come a long way since opening in 1975, with a structured coding program being implemented from preprimary through to grade 6. The school also communicates extensively online with parents through a software program that keeps parents informed of their child's individual and collective learning in real time. It is fantastic to see this local Wanneroo school structuring itself to effectively prepare our children for the jobs of the future. It is also exciting to hear about the school's strong focus on civics and citizenship. I am very much looking forward to visiting Ms Duffy's classroom to work with the year 6 students next week.

East Wanneroo Primary School has a strong student leadership program and I am thrilled that the school has such a strong emphasis on preparing students to become active members of their communities. As a teacher with 27 years' experience, I know a good school when I see one. East Wanneroo's parents, students and staff have built a school of choice for the many families in my electorate.

*Sitting suspended from 1.00 to 2.17 pm*

### **QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE**

#### **GST DISTRIBUTION**

#### **142. Dr M.D. NAHAN to the Premier:**

I refer to the Premier's political grandstanding on GST today. What deal has the Premier struck with Bill Shorten for getting a better share of GST for the people of Western Australia?

**Mr M. McGOWAN replied:**

I thank the Leader of the Opposition for the question. I want to let him understand something, which I suppose he is starting to slowly realise presently, which is that the opposition does not set policy. It might not have occurred to the former Treasurer, but he is in opposition and when he is in opposition, he does not set the policies of the government. The government sets the policies of the government.

I went to Tasmania last week and met with the Prime Minister. I expressed our views on the goods and services tax. The return from the goods and services tax is not what was expected. It is not as high as was predicted in the last few budgets and it is not as high as was predicted in the *Pre-election Financial Projections Statement*. The Prime Minister indicated a couple of years ago, or perhaps last year, that the expectation was it would get to 75 cents in the dollar in 2019–20 and that is clearly no longer going to happen. He indicated that would be when a floor was put in place. My view is that a floor should be put in place currently and as our share of GST goes up, each and every year a new floor should be set, below which no state can go. I put those arguments to the Premiers and the Prime Minister in Tasmania.

I also put the argument that a certain percentage of mining revenue—25 per cent—should be excluded from the GST distribution as happens in Canberra. I think the Prime Minister understands the issue but, so far, he has not acted, except for the Productivity Commission inquiry. The Productivity Commission inquiry will come down in January or February next year.

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

**Mr M. McGOWAN:** My very strong advice to all federal members of Parliament is that this is a big issue in Western Australia and whoever is in government nationally is going to be held to account for the woeful position that the commonwealth government is putting Western Australia in.

## GST DISTRIBUTION

**143. Dr M.D. NAHAN to the Premier:**

I have a supplementary question. In opposition, the Premier got an agreement from Mr Shorten on Metronet —  
Several members interjected.

**The SPEAKER:** Leader of the Opposition, members, I will decide whether it is a proper question, not this side of the house.

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** In opposition, the Premier got a commitment from Bill Shorten on funding for Metronet. Why can he not do the same thing to him on GST?

**Mr M. McGOWAN replied:**

The truth of the matter is, as I said —

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

**The SPEAKER:** Leader of the Opposition, you have asked a question; let him answer it!

**Mr M. McGOWAN:** The opposition in this state is in a very, very sad state. It is in a very sad state.

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

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

**Mr M. McGOWAN:** You are seriously in a bad way in Western Australia, and I think everyone knows it.

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

**Mr M. McGOWAN:** I said in my answer to the question before, whoever is in power nationally will be held to account. That is the truth because whoever is in power nationally will be held to account. Whoever the government is nationally will have to account to the people of Western Australia.

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

**The SPEAKER:** Leader of the Opposition, I call you to order for the first time. I thought an intelligent man like you would have worked it out now.

**Mr C.J. TALLENTIRE:** Mr Speaker!

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Thornlie.

**Dr M.D. Nahan:** I call for a ruling, Mr Speaker.

**The SPEAKER:** Yes, members have to call out. The member for Bateman only stood up and did not say anything. Member for Thornlie.

## WAGES POLICY

**144. Mr C.J. TALLENTIRE to the Treasurer:**

I refer to this government's new wages policy that will save the state \$500 million—a policy that the opposition now overwhelmingly supports. Could these savings have happened earlier; and, if so, what stopped them from being achieved?

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

That is a great question, member for Thornlie. I was surprised when I heard the Leader of the Opposition warmly embrace the policy of the government that we have unfortunately had to go through to find further savings to a very strained budget. I was surprised when it was announced, so I went back and had a look through the Leader of the Opposition's Twitter account that is usefully promoted on my Twitter handle on a regular basis. It states —

Today the McGowan government announced its plan for wage freezes for frontline services. A pay cut in real terms. #police #nurses #teachers

And the accompanying picture has three red crosses.

I was very surprised, although pleased, when just yesterday and the day before the Leader of the Opposition said —

I did not complain about ... Labor's wages policy.

Again, as it is being promoted on my Twitter time line, apparently not a complaint —

I actually think it is excellent ... The fact that this government got away with it makes me jealous as hell. I tried the same thing. I actually tried to go further at one time with a wage freeze altogether.

That is obviously different from a pay cut in real terms and three red crosses! But then the Leader of the Opposition went on to make this point —

... I was pushing for something like the present government has done. I thought about a freeze altogether for a long time ... 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, ...

The question then is: what happened when the Leader of the Opposition brought it to his colleagues? Did the member for Churchlands knock it off? Did the member for Bateman knock it off? Did the member for Scarborough knock it off? Did Banquo's ghost up the back there from Cottesloe knock it off? Who knocked it off, Leader of the Opposition? When it came to it, when the Leader of the Opposition took it to his colleagues —

**Dr M.D. Nahan:** Where are your union mates?

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

**Mr B.S. WYATT:** I will take that interjection, Mr Speaker: "Where are your union mates?" As far as I understand it, the Leader of the Opposition brought it to his colleagues, but because of our union mates, he could not do anything else. I am just trying to understand. The Leader of the Opposition must have been captured by the unions when he was the Treasurer! Not willing to implement a policy around saving, he was captured by the unions. I thought we had three hours yesterday in which we were reprimanded for such audacity, yet here we have a policy that makes the former Treasurer as jealous as hell, but he brought it to his colleagues, and all of them sitting around him now decided that it was not going to happen. Whether it was all of them or whether it was Banquo's ghost, one or the other —

Several members interjected.

**The SPEAKER:** Members, no. I will get the cameraman back if we keep this up!

**Mr B.S. WYATT:** At some point along the way, of course, a government had to be elected that took these things around the finances seriously. We take it seriously.

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

**Mr B.S. WYATT:** Again, my identity crisis about whether I am captured or not is coming through. Unfortunately, these decisions need to be made and we will continue to make them.

## UTILITY PRICE INCREASES

**145. Mr D.C. NALDER to the Treasurer:**

Before I ask my question, on behalf of the members for Dawesville and Mandurah, I recognise the staff and students from Mandurah Catholic College in the public gallery.

Can the Treasurer advise the house what electricity and other utility price increases will take effect in just over two weeks' time so that local governments, businesses and households can prepare their budgets for the upcoming financial year?

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

I will be telling members all very, very shortly. We have made those decisions and, as they know, we need to have them gazetted.

**Mr D.T. Redman:** Leak it!

**Mr B.S. WYATT:** Leak it, leak it! This is a new, professional government now, Deputy Leader of the National Party. We do not do those sorts of things that you guys used to do! I am enjoying the fact that I get to say to the member for Bateman what the bloke sitting next to him and a few other former Treasurers got to say to me: very shortly it will be announced; and, when it is announced, the member will find out.

## UTILITY PRICE INCREASES

**146. Mr D.C. NALDER to the Treasurer:**

I have a supplementary question. Given that the community needs to budget and we are only two weeks away from the beginning of the next financial year, is it not fair that the Treasurer needs to come out with that information posthaste, or is he simply waiting until Parliament rises to avoid scrutiny?

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

No; I can assure the member that the last day of Parliament before the winter recess is 29 June and that the decisions need to be gazetted before 29 June, so here is a little hint: it will be announced before Parliament rises.

## PERTH STADIUM — FEDERAL FUNDING

**147. Ms C.M. ROWE to the Premier:**

I refer to the Premier's letter to the Prime Minister requesting federal government funding for the new Perth Stadium that was sent more than a month ago. Has the Premier heard back and what has been the response?

**Mr M. McGOWAN replied:**

I thank the member for Belmont. It is true that on 11 May this year I wrote to the Prime Minister, Mr Turnbull, requesting a contribution from the commonwealth towards the new Perth Stadium. I am still awaiting an outcome in respect of that correspondence and I would certainly like to see the commonwealth provide a commitment to Western Australia's stadium. I am of course aware of other comments on this issue. Last week, whilst I was in Tasmania, Christian Porter, member for Pearce, came out and said that the GST distribution was a matter for all the states, not the commonwealth government, which of course was inaccurate. I also note that whilst I was in Tasmania fighting for a better deal for Western Australia, Mr Porter said this in relation to the stadium: "The commonwealth government generally doesn't fund stadiums."

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

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

**Mr M. McGOWAN:** Mr Porter said that: "The commonwealth government generally doesn't fund stadiums." I had that researched, because we would think that, as a federal minister, he would be accurate, but it turns out that the commonwealth government handed over \$100 million to Townsville, \$90 million to the Melbourne Cricket Ground, \$35 million to the Sydney Cricket Ground, \$55 million to Adelaide Oval, \$24 million to Geelong and \$15 million to Bellerive Oval in Tasmania. Yet what we find from Mr Porter is no commitment to Western Australia for our stadium. Obviously, there was a major oversight by the former state government in not approaching the commonwealth government for assistance. I am now calling on Mr Turnbull to overrule Mr Porter and act in Western Australia's interests. Mr Porter is clearly not prepared to stand up for his state. He is not prepared to stand up for us on the GST and he is not prepared to stand up for us on the new Perth Stadium. I would ask Mr Turnbull to act —

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

**The SPEAKER:** Leader of the Opposition, I call you to order for the second and third time. The third time is because I was on my feet and you just kept going.

**Mr M. McGOWAN:** I now have a relationship with Mr Turnbull—I suspect it is somewhat better than the Leader of the Opposition's relationship with Mr Turnbull in light of the sorts of things he has said about him—and I would ask Mr Turnbull to overrule Mr Porter and ensure that Western Australia gets at least as good a treatment as New South Wales, Queensland, Victoria, South Australia and Tasmania. We deserve a substantial contribution to this stadium in exactly the same way as every other state in the commonwealth has.

## RESOURCES SECTOR — SPECIAL LEASE RENTAL FEE

**148. Ms M.J. DAVIES to the Treasurer:**

Yesterday in the other place the Treasurer refused to provide the details of the financial benefit of a cash out of the special lease rental because it would impact on the state's bargaining position. Which bargaining position is the Treasurer protecting, given that BHP and Rio Tinto have made it clear that they do not want to proceed with the cash out?

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

I am getting arthritis, Mr Speaker! Repetitive strain syndrome I think it is called, amongst other things.

I did answer that question, and that is one of the reasons. Of course, some of the other reasons that I gave in not being able to answer the question were that it depends on the range of assumptions applied to the value of the cash out. The net present value of that money is disputed, as the Leader of the Opposition knows from when he had those conversations late last year.

**Mr D.T. Redman:** Give us an idea of the range.

**Mr B.S. WYATT:** Well —

**Ms M.J. Davies:** Are you bargaining or not?

**Mr B.S. WYATT:** Mr Speaker, if I can go a bit wider and further off for a second.

**Ms M.J. Davies:** The Premier says no; the Treasurer says yes. Got a bargaining position?

**Mr B.S. WYATT:** One of the things I am having to deal with from the previous government is the atrocious bargaining position it got itself into in getting football to Perth Stadium. Because it built the stadium and then thought, “Let’s go and find content”, we now have to deal with that content to get them to the stadium. I am not —

**Ms M.J. Davies:** Are you having fun dealing with the AFL?

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

**Mr B.S. WYATT:** I am not now going to put the state in a similar position of weakening bargaining positions.

**Ms M.J. Davies:** So you are bargaining? You are bargaining?

**Mr B.S. WYATT:** I have made it clear that I am keen —

**The SPEAKER:** Leader of the National Party, I call you to order for the second time. I do not know how many times I have to tell you that you ask the question and you do not give the answer.

**Mr B.S. WYATT:** I have made it clear that it will be pursued if it can be, but I am not going to put out there the terms and conditions of the state before a negotiation is even taking place. To do that would be to expose the taxpayer to a weaker bargaining position.

#### RESOURCES SECTOR — SPECIAL LEASE RENTAL FEE

**149. Ms M.J. DAVIES to the Treasurer:**

I have a supplementary question. On Tuesday the Premier said, “If one party does not agree, it is clearly not going to happen”; on Tuesday the Treasurer said, “If it’s on the plate and the miners want to, so be it”. When was the last time any company volunteered to pay more rent? Who is the running this state—the government or the miners?

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

I just quickly remind all members in this place, because some have clearly forgotten, and all the people of Western Australia, that for the last eight and a half years the Liberal–National government ran this state. Actually, sorry: of the last eight years and nine months —

**Ms M.J. Davies:** No; you’re in government!

**Mr B.S. WYATT:** — for eight years and six months the former government ran the state.

**Ms M.J. Davies:** So until the miners come to you, that’s it; it’s off the table.

**Mr B.S. WYATT:** It is interesting that at no point did the former government seek to apply this to Rio Tinto and BHP—at no point!

**Ms M.J. Davies:** Patted you on the head, shuffled it off! Patted you on the head and said, “Go away”!

**Mr B.S. WYATT:** The only time it became apparent was when—are you ready for it? —

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

**Ms R. Saffioti:** You did nothing! Nothing! Useless sports minister.

**Mr B.S. WYATT:** The only time it became apparent—I think I am still going!

#### *Point of Order*

**Mr S.K. L’ESTRANGE:** Mr Speaker, while you were on your feet, the Minister for Planning; Transport was shouting across the chamber.

Several members interjected.

**The SPEAKER:** Members, I did not hear it, but if you did, I want you to apologise. I did not hear it; I was calling the Leader of the National Party to order. So, it is not a point of order because I did not hear it said. Who was next? Treasurer.

*Questions without Notice Resumed*

**Mr B.S. WYATT:** Can I finish? I anxiously rise to ask whether I can finish my answer.

The only time it became an issue was when Brendon Grylls used it to knock off the former Leader of the National Party. He used it to wield the sword against the former Leader of the National Party! Why did he do that? He did it because for the first time in eight and a half years, the Liberals were starting to put a little bit of pressure on the National Party and how it was spending huge amounts of money. That is the only time in eight and a half years it was ever mentioned. In the eight and half years when the National Party ran the show, its members all sat along this side of the chamber. We will not be pursuing this on a unilateral basis because we do not believe in tearing up contracts.

ORGANISED CRIME

**150. Mr M.J. FOLKARD to the Attorney General:**

Will the previous Liberal–National government’s soft approach on the Mr Bigs of organised crime continue under this government; and, if not, what approach will our government take?

**Mr J.R. QUIGLEY replied:**

I thank the member for Burns Beach for his question.

The previous Assistant Commissioner for Specialist Crime, Mr Nick Anticich, gave evidence before the parliamentary committee, saying that the soft underbelly of organised crime was their unexplained wealth. In 2008, Gail Archer—now Mrs Justice Archer—made a recommendation to this Parliament that the Corruption and Crime Commission be given powers to take unexplained wealth applications to the Supreme Court to seize it. In 2012, in the first term of the Barnett government, nothing happened in that regard; they were not taken up. Then, in 2012, the twenty-eighth report of the Joint Standing Committee on the Corruption and Crime Commission, titled “Proceeds of crime and unexplained wealth: A role for the Corruption and Crime Commission?”, recommended that the CCC be given these powers; indeed, on 21 June 2012, the then Premier said that amendments to the Criminal Property Confiscation Act would mean that the CCC would be able to apply to the court for unexplained wealth declarations. Nothing happened at all in the subsequent five years.

I was sworn in as Attorney General on 17 March. On 6 April 2017, I took to cabinet a recommendation that we proceed with giving the CCC these powers. On 12 May 2017, a parliamentary counsel was allocated the task of drafting that legislation. This will happen, and, as I said, the front doors of the CCC will become like the gates of hell.

But not only did the Barnett government do nothing; I hear that the member for Dawesville learned his craft of doing nothing in the former Premier’s office. Since we announced this bill, the member for Dawesville has done everything he can to frustrate the CCC and the Director of Public Prosecutions in their task of pursuing the Mr Bigs. Might I just inform the house that on 20 June he sent a question on notice requiring the CCC, amongst other things, to count how many pens and pencils it has, and to provide a breakdown of the type of expenditure, the type of pencil and the type of pens!

Several members interjected.

**Mr J.R. QUIGLEY:** For the DPP to take prosecutors —

Several members interjected.

**The SPEAKER:** Members!

**Mr J.R. QUIGLEY:** He wants the DPP to take prosecutors off the very important task of prosecuting the Claremont serial killer and prosecuting methamphetamine dealers to say how many pens and pencils she has in her office, and how many pens and pencils by name and type does each prosecutor have. He wants these prosecutors to come off pursuing organised crime to play tiddlywinks! He is the opposition spokesperson for tiddlywinks! It is a disgrace. I have spoken to the DPP. It is stressing their office to have to go around counting, for the member for Dawesville, how many paperclips they have. I am inviting him to put on a pair of long pants and come across and see me after question time, and to relieve the DPP and the CCC of this onerous task as the opposition tries to bring the fight against organised crime to its knees by these pathetic questions!.

CITY BEACH SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL SITE — DEVELOPMENT

**151. Mr S.K. L’ESTRANGE to the Premier:**

Is the Premier’s government planning to sell the City Beach Senior High School site for housing or private sector development?

**Mr M. McGOWAN replied:**

No decisions have been made about the City Beach high school site. I note that the majority of buildings there have been unoccupied now for perhaps 12 or 15 years. I also note that, as I recall, the International School of Western Australia is operating out of the City Beach high school site. I also note that, as part of the arrangements that have been put in place for a new inner-city school, that will be resolved, and the international school will be moving elsewhere. But no decisions have been made in relation to this.

## CITY BEACH SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL SITE — DEVELOPMENT

**152. Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE to the Premier:**

I have a supplementary question. Given the projected population increases over the next 15 or so years, will the Premier keep the 10-hectare City Beach high school site reserved for future education purposes?

**Mr M. McGOWAN replied:**

As I said, no decisions have been made. We will act in the public interest. I note that under a former Liberal government that Swanbourne senior high school, Hollywood senior high school, City Beach, Scarborough senior high school and the —

Several members interjected.

**Mr M. McGOWAN:** There they go again.

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

**Mr M. McGOWAN:** There she goes, firing off. The decision to close Scarborough senior high school was made by a Liberal government.

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

**The SPEAKER:** Deputy Leader of the Opposition, act like one; thank you. I call you to order.

**Mr M. McGOWAN:** A very good point. She is very passionate about this place; so passionate that she does not ask any questions, Mr Speaker!

Those decisions were made in the 1990s and they were bad decisions, and there are now consequences. A new school was built—the member is right—Shenton College, but three or four were closed. Now we have had to resolve this issue with the announcement we made on Tuesday. We made the correct decision for the people of the inner city where the population growth is. We will make a decision on City Beach in due course.

## NAVAL SHIPBUILDING PLAN

**153. Mrs R.M.J. CLARKE to the Minister for Defence Issues:**

I refer to yet another advertisement in today's *The West Australian* by Western Australia's federal Liberals who no longer claim the state is getting 50 per cent of work from the "Naval Shipbuilding Plan", but now claim that they are securing jobs. Can the minister clarify which state the WA federal Liberals are actually securing jobs for?

**Mr P. PAPALIA replied:**

I thank the member and welcome her to this place; it is my first opportunity to do that formally. It is wonderful to see her here. Today we saw the third edition of the forlorn attempts by the federal Western Australian Liberal Party, in fact the entire Western Australian Liberal Party, to convince Western Australian voters that somehow they are getting a good deal with the Turnbull government's shipbuilding plan. It is undeniable that \$86 billion of \$89 billion is going to South Australia with the ship and submarine build, and, as a consequence, Western Australians will not be convinced that they are getting a good deal. Recently I went to Canberra and met with my good friend Christopher Pyne. He is a good guy. He was interesting, and a very cheerful and entertaining bloke and worth listening to. Although we had a fruitful discussion, he did not agree with me about the location of ship builds. When I met with him, we also met with the chair of the federal government's Naval Shipbuilding Taskforce, a gentleman called Marc Ablong. One would imagine that he would have knowledge of where the ships and submarines are going to be built and how much work is going to each of the states. In our discussions he had to concede that of the \$89.5 billion allocated to ship and submarine construction, \$86 billion was going to South Australia. He had to concede that the Turnbull government's "Naval Shipbuilding Plan" states that 5 200 shipbuilding jobs will be created in South Australia by 2022, but on the same subject, in respect of Western Australia, it also states —

... there is unlikely to be a requirement for a rapid increase in employment over a short period of time.

It is found on page 67, should any of the Western Australian Liberals choose to look it up. It is clear—the Western Australian public has got the message: we are duded on the GST. There is no appetite by the Turnbull government to address that problem. There is also a complete rip-off when it comes to the distribution of

infrastructure money. Even the \$2.3 billion deal that the Minister for Transport was able to get across the line nowhere near evens the ledger there. I hope that she keeps trying to extract some more, but right now Western Australians know that they are duded. It is undeniable that Western Australia is being completely duded when it comes to a share of the shipbuilding funding from the federal government. The only thing that will change people's minds is a change by the Turnbull government. I am very interested to see when the opposition will join us in demanding a better share for Western Australia.

SHIRE OF EXMOUTH — COUNCILLORS

**154. Mr V.A. CATANIA to the Minister for Local Government:**

I refer to the minister's meeting with councillors from the Shire of Exmouth earlier this month, which resulted in the resignation of five shire councillors. Which councillors did the minister meet with and did he discuss a Department of Local Government and Communities investigation into the Shire of Exmouth?

**Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN replied:**

I thank the member for North West Central for his question.

The member is aware that I went to the Shire of Exmouth in late May after a very damning Corruption and Crime Commission report had been released by the Corruption and Crime Commissioner, which unfortunately included some serious findings against some salaried officers at that council at Exmouth. To quote the commissioner, he also found "stunning indifference"—they are his words—with regard to the council's oversight of operations in Exmouth. They were serious allegations—not "allegations", serious findings by the commissioner. The member would be aware also that the council had up until this time been suspended—an action taken by the previous Minister for Local Government, Paul Miles. The member would also be aware that there was a resignation earlier this year by one of the six councillors. My meeting in late May was with the then five remaining suspended councillors with the Shire of Exmouth. The meeting was very robust. In fact, the first comment given to me by at least two of the councillors I met with was, "Thank you for coming. You're the first one to come up and actually talk to us about the situation." I can even say that one of those was Councillor Hood. I said to them, "Look, I am not sugar-coating this issue at all. This is a serious matter that has been found with regard to the CCC outcome." It was my view that I could not ignore the comments in the report by the CCC commissioner with regard to the oversight by the elected members themselves. I could not ignore that. I explained to them very clearly that one of the options I was pursuing was an inquiry panel, which of course would look at the operations of elected members themselves. I also said to them it was important that they consider that for the benefit of their community. Exmouth has been through a lot. These matters are very difficult for local communities. Their local council is under investigation—in this case suspended—and this is very difficult. The last thing a community needs is adverse media about its town. That is something I found when I talked to a number of people during my visit to Exmouth. I said to the councillors, "You might like to consider your position and maybe it's an opportune time to ensure that the people of Exmouth have a fresh-slate opportunity to determine whom they would like to represent them in October." That is what I put to them and, to their credit, as I highlighted in my ministerial statement this morning, they have put the interests of their community first. I applaud them for that. That means that in October this year, all six seats will be vacated and will be able to be contested by whoever puts themselves forward. I admire that action. I urge the people of Exmouth to take an active interest in their local government.

WESTERN AUSTRALIAN INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS COMMISSION DETERMINATION —  
MINIMUM WAGE INCREASE

**155. Mrs J.M.C. STOJKOVSKI to the Minister for Commerce and Industrial Relations:**

I refer to the Western Australian Industrial Relations Commission decision to give our lowest paid workers an extra \$16 a week. How does this determination help low-paid workers, or is the opposition correct when it says that an increase of just one per cent would be enough to help those workers cover their bills?

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

I think this is an excellent question, and I thank the member for Kingsley for the question.

**Mr S.K. L'Estrange:** You wrote it!

**Mr W.J. JOHNSTON:** I did not write it.

The member for Kingsley is one of our giant slayers, having defeated a minister to get into this chamber. And, of course, she is a working mother who knows what it is like to struggle, which is something that the opposition does not seem to understand.

The McGowan Labor government welcomes the WA Industrial Relations Commission state minimum wages decision. We believe that it is a fair and balanced decision, and it rewards low-paid workers for the efforts that they make in their life each day.

**Mr A. Krsticevic** interjected.

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Carine, I call you to order for the first time.

**Mr W.J. JOHNSTON:** I remind the house that low-paid workers spend all their money. When the minimum wage increases, the economy benefits. As all the research shows, including from the Chicago School, a regular and modest increase in minimum wages has an overall benefit on the community. It is particularly important, and if members read the reasoning of the commissioners, they make it clear that one of the reasons they made this decision to provide a \$16 a week increase was the net benefit to the economy that it will have. Sometimes, including yesterday, there are allegations of class warfare in this chamber. We have seen that class warfare from the member for Hillarys, who does not want to give hardworking low-income earners a wage rise. He says that one per cent is all they should be given.

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

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Hillarys!

**Mr W.J. JOHNSTON:** Is it not interesting that the member for Hillarys complains about the state government's wages policy in which it gives \$1 000 as a capped increase.

**Mr A. Krsticevic** interjected.

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Carine, second time!

**Mr W.J. JOHNSTON:** But then he complains about just \$16 a week for the lowest paid workers. There is a class war going on in Australia; it is the Liberal Party's hatred for working people—people who rely on the award system and minimum wages. The opposition does not get it, and its members do not like it. They will always continue to oppose it. Let me make it clear that we are very happy to see regular increases in the minimum wage, because, as the research shows, and if members read the commission's decision, the commissioners make this point themselves, regular increases in minimum wages is a net benefit to the economy and will assist small businesses because it ensures that there are customers with money to spend in small businesses.

#### SUBURBAN GROWTH

**156. Mrs L.M. HARVEY to the Premier:**

According to Western Australian Planning Commission data, the fastest —

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

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** Are you the Premier? He is the Premier; is he not?

Several members interjected.

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** According to WA Planning Commission data —

Several members interjected.

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

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** According to WA Planning Commission data, the fastest growing suburb for 10 to 19-year-olds from 2016 to 2026 is Scarborough, at 132 per cent, while Doubleview–Innaloo is 92 per cent. Does the Premier consider these inner-city suburbs or will he admit that the data he has been using does not match his rhetoric?

**Mr M. McGOWAN replied:**

I thank the member for Scarborough for the question. It begs the question: why did the Liberal Party close down Scarborough Senior High School?

**Mrs L.M. Harvey:** We didn't sell the site!

**Mr M. McGOWAN:** I remember the closure of Scarborough Senior High School and of Belmont. There was a high school in Belmont and I think there might have been one in Thornlie, or out there; then they closed a bunch in Nedlands and Cottesloe. It begs the question: What has the Liberal Party got against the western suburbs? What has it got against the western suburbs when it is going to close the high schools there? It is only Labor that will provide a new high school in the member for Nedlands' electorate. It is Labor that will provide a new high school in the member for Nedlands' electorate. We will ensure that those people in the western suburbs have the best of education. Incidentally, whilst that is occurring, the people of Perth and Mt Lawley will also have access to a wonderful new high school. What is clear to me from the question from the member for Scarborough is that she does not want the people of Mt Lawley or Perth to have access to a new state-of-the-art high school right in the heart of where people are living. We will make sure that that is communicated to the people of Perth and Mt Lawley.

## SUBURBAN GROWTH

**157. Mrs L.M. HARVEY to the Premier:**

I have a supplementary question. When will the Premier accept that the rhetoric he is using to support his thought bubbles is at odds with the Department of Education's advice that the City Beach high school site is the best site for the growth in the number of 10 to 19-year-olds in the western suburbs?

Several members interjected.

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

**Mr M. McGOWAN replied:**

When we made the announcement on Tuesday, we outlined to the people of Western Australia the growth patterns in various areas. I will repeat them to members.

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

**Mr M. McGOWAN:** The member has difficulty listening.

Several members interjected.

**The SPEAKER:** Members, do not talk across the chamber, please.

**Mr M. McGOWAN:** The member for Scarborough was deputy Liberal leader—Deputy Premier all that time, now declining to become the opposition leader. I think that says a lot about the member for Scarborough. She was not prepared to take on the role of the opposition leader! I know a little bit about being the opposition leader; it is actually not easy. To a degree, I admire the member for Riverton and the fact that he was prepared to take on the role that the member for Scarborough was not.

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

**The SPEAKER:** Deputy Leader of the Opposition, I call you to order for the second time.

**Mr M. McGOWAN:** I did outline to the house—or perhaps not to the house—that, from memory, between 2016 and 2026, the population of City Beach is predicted to decline by 0.97 per cent. As members will know, City Beach is an area that has large blocks and expensive houses and, therefore, almost by definition, not large numbers of high school students. The more affordable the land and the more dense the development, we will find larger numbers of students, because families who have school-age kids often have not accumulated the wealth to afford a house in an area like City Beach. That is demographic reality. A location in Subiaco, in the heart of the member for Nedlands' electorate, is the right decision for students of the inner city.

**The SPEAKER:** That is the end of question time.

**JOINT STANDING COMMITTEE ON DELEGATED LEGISLATION***Council's Message*

Message from the Council received and read notifying that it had agreed to the amendment made by the Assembly, and that the following members have been appointed as members to the Joint Standing Committee on Delegated Legislation: Hon Robin Chapple, Hon Martin Pritchard, Hon Kyle McGinn and Hon Charles Smith.

**SUPPLY BILL 2017***Second Reading*

Resumed from an earlier stage of the sitting.

**MR B.S. WYATT (Victoria Park — Treasurer)** [3.00 pm] — in reply: I thank members for what has been a long but interesting debate on the Supply Bill 2017. Many issues have been raised, being a general debate—that is the nature of supply bills—and I have enjoyed listening to members talking about their electorates, and in many cases what brought them to this place. I wanted to go over a range of things in some detail, some of which I had the opportunity to go through during debate on the amendment moved by the opposition on Tuesday in its attempt to amend the Supply Bill to ensure that a range of spending measures would be agreed to before the bill could proceed to the third reading. Of course, in the end, that amendment was not passed, but I again make the point that this is a supply bill and, like the Loan Bill 2017 before it, it does not seek to appropriate money; it will simply see us through, as I pointed out in my second reading speech. I would like to again quote myself from my second reading speech, because this was perhaps the main issue that was raised in respect of the Supply Bill. I accept that supply bills are unusual; they come about only with a delayed budget, which generally occur after elections. I said —

Although the Financial Management Act 2006 provides two months' automatic supply if the appropriation bills are not passed before the end of the financial year, it is anticipated that the 2017–18 budget will not complete its passage through Parliament until November 2017.

After the 7 September budget, of course. I continued —

As such, a standalone Supply Bill authorising supply for this period is required.

The point is that although the Financial Management Act effectively gives us an automatic two months' supply, we will need supply to get us through to the passage of the budget around November. That is the point of the Supply Bill. There is nothing particularly unusual or controversial about it. It is a mechanism that has been used many, many times over the years mainly, as I said, when there has been a delay in the budget after an election.

I thank members for their contributions; I think it has been useful. Most of the specific issues that were raised were dealt with during extensive debate on the amendment moved by the opposition on Tuesday. I otherwise thank members for their input and their cooperation.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

Leave granted to proceed forthwith to third reading.

### *Third Reading*

**MR B.S. WYATT (Victoria Park — Treasurer)** [3.03 pm]: I move —

That the bill be now read a third time.

**MR D.C. NALDER (Bateman)** [3.03 pm]: I rise to wrap-up debate on the Supply Bill. Although the opposition was always cognisant of the need for the Supply Bill to go through so that the government could continue to function, and we were never going to stop it, I believe it was prudent for us to ensure that we pointed out a few things that are occurring with the government's rhetoric and some of our concerns about the actions that are being undertaken.

The first point I would like to make is to set the record straight on some of the comments I made, with particular reference to what the Treasurer said yesterday during question time about comments I made with regard to the GST and iron ore royalties. When I referred to iron ore royalty income—I am reading straight from the *Quarterly Financial Results Report 2016–17*—I was commenting on our financials relative to the corresponding period 12 months earlier; I referred to the nine months to March 2016, and I was comparing that period with the nine months to March 2017, and our royalty income is up 31 per cent. The Treasurer rightly pointed out that in the last three months we have seen royalty income drop down to \$55 million, but if we consider the points I made, that \$55 million is still higher than the average royalty income for the nine months of the corresponding period in the previous year. I am saying that when we look at royalty income and GST, we are not seeing a more dire financial position than the previous government faced over the previous two years. We saw the bottom fall out of the iron ore price when it moved from a \$180 high down towards \$40, and then back up towards \$90. In the last couple of months we have seen it retreating again.

My point is this: when we were in government and we saw the bottom fall out of the iron ore price, the then opposition pointed out to us that that was just the volatility of the market and that we had to deal with it. The point I make to the new government is that these are volatile markets. If the Labor Party went to the 2017 election with \$5 billion in commitments on the basis that we were going to have stable commodity prices, it made a fundamental mistake in managing the finances. The government cannot turn around and point to the former government and say, "The books are a lot worse because of the former government; the books are a lot worse than we thought, and we're therefore going to have to increase taxes", when, as I am pointing out, a couple of the key fundamentals are not any worse than they have been for the last two years.

We heard the Premier again talking about the GST during question time, and I would like to reiterate that I believe the GST system is wrong; it is flawed. The government has no problem with that and it is not in dispute. What is in dispute is that the impacts of the GST are making our financial position worse. Over the previous two years, we had a GST allocation of 30c in the dollar, and it is now 34c in the dollar. Yes, the forward projections said that it would be 38c, but the Commonwealth Grants Commission decided to reduce that to 34c. Again, I think that is wrong, but the commonwealth government topped it back up to 38c, as it did when we received 30c in the dollar. For three years in a row we have had identical GST allocations of 38c. The government is out there talking about the dire financial circumstances, but if we are looking at iron ore royalties, we are looking at a very short window of time. There is volatility in the price and we do not make long-term projections or long-term capital commitments on the basis of short-term commodity price movements. It is a very dangerous precedent to set.

That is what I am concerned about. I am concerned about this government not understanding some of the basic inputs to the financial models and therefore potentially leaving itself exposed to future commodity price hikes or changes in other financial metrics that it will have to manage.

In talking about this bill I reiterate that the *Quarterly Financial Results Report* that has come out clearly points out that iron ore volumes and iron ore prices have gone up. The exchange rate has worked against us, but in

essence there has been \$928 million in additional revenue than in the corresponding nine-month period to 2016. In the last three months we have seen iron ore prices fall. The nine-month average to the end of March was \$70.90. Yes, we do know that iron ore is down to \$53 at the moment, but for the nine months to the end of March 2016 the average price for iron ore was \$49.40, so it is still above the nine-month average for the previous corresponding period. That is what I wanted to point out to the Treasurer. He talks about a worsening financial position, but he is talking about it over such a short period of time. It is a better financial position than the previous government found itself in because of the volatility of the market. Labor still went to the election and committed \$5 billion. We tried to point out to Labor during the election that it could not afford it, and particularly not if, at the same time, it was telling people that it was not going to introduce new taxes or increase taxes. We tried to point that out over and over again. We will continue to remind people that these are the commitments that Labor made, and we expect it to honour those commitments. We are in some ways reluctantly supporting this bill. We know that we have to support the Supply Bill for the government to continue to operate, but we are concerned with the approach it is taking and the shocks that will be coming for the broader community based on the signals that have been sent on increased taxes.

We have talked about increased power prices and I will just touch on this point for a bit. Part of the rhetoric from the government is that it is substantiating a potential seven per cent increase in power prices on the basis that it was in the forward estimates. The government's rhetoric is that it is justifying a potential seven per cent increase because it was in the forward estimates. What I would like to point out is that seven per cent has been in the forward estimates for the last four years, yet the Liberal government, when it came to the budget, did not increase prices in accordance with the forward estimates over the last few years. If the government does lift them and makes the excuse on the basis that it was because of the forward estimates, it will be setting a precedent, because the previous government never followed the forward estimates in setting the budget. The government says that it is the fault of the former government for putting it there, yet Labor has the authority and the autonomy as the government to determine what is appropriate for the state to take forward. I reiterate that based on the commitments the Labor Party made to the community at the election, when the now Premier said that there would be no new taxes and no tax increases full stop, it needs to ensure that it adheres to that. To use the excuse that the former government had it in its forward estimates is simply not appropriate.

I will wrap up my contribution to the third reading debate. I appreciate the input of the opposition. I hope that the government takes on board some valid points and that it realises that it has a responsibility to the people of Western Australia to ensure that they are looked after and to provide everybody with the best possible opportunity for this state to grow and prosper as we move forward.

**DR M.D. NAHAN (Riverton — Leader of the Opposition)** [3.13 pm]: I will make a few comments on the third reading of the Supply Bill 2017. We will support the bill, of course; that is necessary, given the timing of the budget. There is nothing debatable about that. In this process, one of our complaints has been that by the time the budget comes down, we will have had six months of government before we will see an official statement on policy. Labor went to the election with a whole range of commitments. We are sitting here debating various bills without any detail. Indeed, there have not been any studies to support many of the government's statements, so we are kind of in no-man's-land here. It is clear to me that the McGowan government had a plan to get into government, but it had no plan to govern. For six years the Treasurer was in the role of shadow Treasurer. I was Treasurer for three of those years. He made it clear to me that he knew the position of the state's finances. In fact, he wrote an editorial the other day and said, "We knew the difficulties, we knew the pressures, we knew what we were getting into." Indeed, he went into the last election with a commitment that he had a plan. He claimed that he had a sensible, credible financial plan that had been subjected to the most robust and vigorous independent assessment of any opposition ever, and that independent assessment gave them the tick of approval.

*Point of Order*

**Mr M. HUGHES:** Is it appropriate that the Leader of the Opposition addresses Parliament with his back to the Deputy Speaker? I think it is probably not appropriate.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Thank you. It is actually not a point of order, but I will encourage the Leader of the Opposition to address the Chair.

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** I take your advice, Madam Deputy Speaker; I will look at you and speak through you.

*Debate Resumed*

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** Labor had an assessment done. The Treasurer claimed it was a sensible, credible financial management plan that had been subjected to the most robust scrutiny ever. A Labor media release states that WA Labor's financial plan was given a big tick by the experts, that it would return the budget to surplus in 2019–20, that Colin Barnett's debt would be stabilised and reduced over time without privatising Western Power, and that WA Labor's gross capital spend would be \$2.8 billion and that it would raise almost \$3 billion from other sources. Labor said that it would go out and produce a surplus. Labor members knew the state of the finances, they had some independent experts go out and get access to the greatest detail and put it

together and scrutinise it, and they came with this plan that would lead the budget to surplus and stabilise debt and pay it down. They also went on to make statements that there would be no increases in taxes and no new taxes on Western Australians. When asked that question before the Premier made that comment, the Treasurer wisely said that no Labor leader should make that comment because they would not be believed. He was right. Nonetheless, the Premier made that comment repeatedly. He also said in the debate that the reason he would not do that was that he knows that higher taxes kill jobs, and he is a jobs Premier. He then went on and made some other claims that he would keep the wages policy that was in the forward estimates and keep the electricity prices in the forward estimates. He was pretty quiet about electricity. I think he was fairly careful about that. It is seven per cent going forward. He was confident that he could do all that with no new taxes, keeping the forward estimates and spending an extra \$5 billion. That is a huge ask.

Within a month of gaining government, the Premier said that he had talked to Treasury. He said, “Woe is us. The books are worse than we thought they were. They are the worst set of books and it is the worst economy since the Great Depression.” All Labor’s promises and all its commitments, its great fiscal plan and the most sensible, robust fiscal examination ever were thrown out the window in a month! That same month, as the shadow Treasurer indicated, a statement from Treasury came out about how the budget was going for the first nine months of 2016–17, and it said that we were actually ahead of schedule, but whatever Labor could find, it tore it all up. Labor had a plan to get onto the treasury bench, but it was going to make it up afterwards and blame us. That is what the government has been doing. We have heard it over and over again. I put to government members that it was their decision to promise to spend \$5 billion, not ours. It was their position to refuse to have a credible debt management strategy. They had one, but it was thrown out within two days. It was their decision to promise no new taxes or tax increases. That was stupid, given the volatility of our revenue source, but they chose to do that. It was their decision to say that they would stick with the forward estimates on wages and electricity. It was the government’s decision to stick with the wages and electricity forward estimates. We did not force the government down that path. Three months out, it was going to win the election without a doubt. The government was not under pressure to do that, but it did it. Since then the government has said, “Woe is us, the goods and services tax has collapsed.”

**Mr P. Papalia:** Three months out we were going to win, no doubt?

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** Three months out, members opposite were going to win—the polls were obvious. Our GST share is \$200 million plus more than in the 2017–18 budget for this year—\$200 million more than forecast. I might add that I sat in here and listened to the then shadow Treasurer say that GST was not the issue, as quoted in *Hansard*. We do know that Treasury always gets pretty much right what GST revenue will be for each budget year. There has never been a budget shock as a result of the GST each year. “We know what we will get”, the then shadow Treasurer said over and over again, as did the then Deputy Leader of the Opposition and the shadow Minister for Transport. They said that GST was not the cause of the state’s fiscal problems; it was expenditure. Treasury put out a report that shows that for the last three years revenue has declined by an average of 1.2 per cent. It has not been growing; it has been shrinking, but that is beside the point. The Treasurer knew that before the election. He overlooked it and is trying to blame it on us, the GST or anything else, except his own issues. The issue is the Treasurer went to the election with promises he cannot keep on taxes, and on wages perhaps—he could not keep them—and \$5 billion worth of expenditure but no strategy to pay down debt. The former Treasurer rightly reiterated a comment the former Under Treasurer Tim Marney made to both parties in the run-up to the 2013 election when he said, essentially, that iron ore revenue is highly volatile and we should be cautious about promises in the budget going forward. We were not cautious enough, nor was Labor. For Metronet mark 1 the Labor Party offered huge increases in capital. The Labor Party did not win that election; we won so we were responsible. In this election, the Under Treasurer warned all parties that debt was too high and that we needed a strategy to pay down debt. Labor came up with its GST share and iron ore price concoction—a Clayton’s strategy—and it was thrown out within two days. That was the government’s decision. As we said when we debated the Loan Bill, any debt over the \$33 billion we expect to incur by 30 June is this government’s debt; it chose it. The Labor Party wanted to get in government; it won, great. Deficits due to other issues going forward belong to the government because going into the election, members opposite said they would scrutinise. Both the Leader of the Opposition and the Treasurer had six years of apprenticeship. They said they knew what the accounts were. They had the most thorough review by experts and came out with a plan but they are jettisoning it left, right and centre. What is their problem? We will hold them to account for what they promised. That is what we are here for. They committed to a 1.5 per cent wage increase. When we first mooted that, it was below the forecast inflation rate, and there were howls of outrage, particularly from the backbenchers. I do not think the shadow Treasurer complained, but everyone else shouted, “How can you do this; you’re tearing apart the fabric of society.” Then he changed his mind and accepted it. He went to the election telling the public that his party would maintain a wages policy of a 1.5 per cent increase over the next four years, which is built into the budget and members opposite told their union mates: “Don’t worry; we’ll maintain the status quo.” I heard the then Leader of the Opposition get a bit of curry from the unions because he said that Labor would be doing nothing more than what the Liberals would do. Now members opposite have changed that. In question time, the

Treasurer did a little number on me. As he often does, he left out the key issue. I am jealous because he got away with something I would like to have done but if I had done it, there would have been a mass shutdown of the public sector. That is what we were told. There were strikes over the rumour that we were going to freeze wages or reconsider the 1.5 per cent and there were strikes out the front of Parliament House and, of course, many of the Labor members joined the strikers.

A government member: Are you sure about that?

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** Yes; I know so. It surprises me that the unions acquiesced to that but I imagine they will get it back in some other way. I do not know, but all I can say is—I stand by this—that I support the government's \$1 000-a-year wages policy for each of the four years. I wish I could have done it but, then again, I do not have the sway over the union movement, and we were not willing to shut down schools, hospitals, public transport, prisons and everything else—that would have happened.

The shadow Minister for Energy raised a very important issue. We have a policy of deciding electricity prices year by year. The increase has been seven per cent year after year for the last term and over the forward estimates. It is decided each year because the subsidy rate to Synergy is high and, in fact, peaked at over \$500 million. We should not be subsidising electricity except through support payments to people on low incomes or who are fiscally stressed. The Liberal–National government chose to reduce that subsidy by reforming the efficiency of Synergy. We cut its costs substantially and reduced the subsidy from peaking at \$500 million to less than \$300 million this year. We did that for two reasons. It, firstly, enabled us not to increase prices and, secondly, we had a policy of going to full retail contestability by 1 July 2019. We knew that if we went to full retail contestability in 2019 and Synergy was still a high cost, it would be taken to the cleaners by the nimble, competitive private sector operators, and that would cause Synergy's subsidy to rise again, so there is an issue. We cannot just create retail contestability by increasing prices, and I will give an example of this. It is in the paper. This is serious. We go to competition to provide choice. That in itself is good; it also puts downward pressure on prices. The gas market is showing a substantial reduction in prices, according to the paper, in the vicinity of 30 per cent. That is great, but why increase prices by the mooted rate of 15 per cent to get a 30 per cent decrease? Is that not strange? Synergy is a monopoly provider of about 80 per cent, either directly or indirectly, of electricity to the metropolitan area and the south west interconnected system. If reform does not occur, we will not get retail contestability; it will happen around the edges and the nimble Alintas et cetera will cherrypick and Synergy's high-cost energy system will remain. If we go to full retail contestability, it cannot be only on the price side, it must be on the cost side. The government must also look at splitting the dollar. As long as it is a dominant, single monopoly, regulations that Labor put in place and which I am not complaining about, will force Synergy to be regulated as a monopolist. That will slow its ability to compete and cause it to charge less than cost. This is a very serious issue. We cannot use full retail contestability to jack up prices because if we go to full retail contestability, we will be in trouble. If we do not—people are trying to stop the Treasurer from doing that—it will be just a tax. Before the election, the current Minister for Energy was not the shadow Minister for Energy; the member for Cannington was. An energy minister's debate was held, I think, at the Australian Institute of Energy, at which 300 people attended and which focussed on the issue of full retail contestability. The Liberal–National government was committed to it. I went through what needed to be done and what the challenges were. The Labor Party abandoned most of its energy policy during that campaign because it had adopted 50 per cent-plus renewables, and the examples in South Australia showed that that was madness, so, quite rightly, the Premier, the then opposition leader, abandoned it. He said, "Pull the plug, shut up and go away on that." That is fair enough; it would have been a disaster. Do not go to it. But the Labor Party quietly went to the election not supporting full retail contestability. It is fair enough to allow the current minister to go to it, and I will support him to go to full retail contestability, but not just by jacking up prices. Why? First, because a 15 per cent increase is really going to kick the guts out of small business, and again that price relates to quite small businesses; it will kick the guts out of them. Second, the cost side of Synergy has to be focused on and structural reform has to be undertaken. I do not care whether the government sells the thing or not—it should but probably cannot; I understand that—but it has to split it up, otherwise the regulations will force Synergy to act in a non-competitive manner because it will be treated as a monopolist. These are big issues going forward down the track. I am not an expert on union and Labor Party machinations, but it is quite clear to me that the unions that helped the Labor Party greatly on stopping the sale of Western Power for their benefit are also working to stop the undergoing reforms to Synergy and also the need for further reforms, including structural reform. The government has to fight the good fight here, because what is at cost is electricity prices and choice to the community. The government has to make a choice about whom it will govern for—the union movement or the community. Electricity is very, very important, and we will watch how the government goes with that. There is clearly a tussle within the government on this issue. Nonetheless, given that the government has taken on our policy, we will support it.

It has been interesting to listen to the backbenchers in this debate. The government leadership probably provided backbenchers with cheat sheets and said, "We have to pad this issue out because we don't have a very deep legislative agenda right now, so here are some cheat sheets—blame the old government for everything", and they

did that. Again, when I was in government, I listened to the now Treasurer lecture me about my Institute of Public Affairs days, how we did not manage the finances, how we left a debt and deficit, and how he would do better and whatnot. Then he would sit down and the backbenchers would say that we did not spend enough and that we should spend more on education, health, public transport, disabilities, their electorates and everything else under the sun. Indeed, the member for Bateman once added up the cost of all those things, and I think he was there for over a day and a half. The result was over an extra billion dollars in that single year. We have heard the same thing this time. In fact, I heard about Metro Area Express light rail; it must have been in the cheat sheet—“MAX, MAX”, as the member for Cannington likes to bray it. The trouble is that the Labor Party is in government now and where is MAX light rail? Where is it? The Labor Party criticised the previous government and demanded that it be built—an extension from the city of Perth to the area of Morley—but it has chosen not to build it. It has a massive Metronet plan that does not have that facility. This is difficult for most government members, because it is a new experience, but they are in government now and they have to go and talk to the Treasurer.

**Mr J.R. Quigley:** All we hope is that you stay the Leader of the Opposition.

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** I bet the government does. Government members should talk to the Treasurer to give the Corruption and Crime Commission more facilities to count the pins, staples and other things that are exercising their minds. The Labor Party is in government now. It went to the election committing way too much and something has got to give. We already know that electricity prices are going to go up. We already know that debt and deficits are going to go up. We also know that what cannot be savings—they cannot be—are all those \$5 billion promises. Most of them are little, with a slush fund here and a slush fund there at every marginal seat that is now held by Labor. The government will not be able to deliver on all those things. The real issue going forward, and I have said it before, is that the Labor Party went to the election telling the public, and it believed it, that the Liberal government had slashed and burned essential services—education, health, disability services and mental health. Actually, the reality is that we funded those things like no other government ever had. Now the Labor Party is in government and the Treasurer has the treasury bench, and he is going to be responsible for delivering those things to the level that we had. Do you know what? He is not going to be able to do it. He knows it; Treasury would have told him that right away. One major area of expenditure is wages and he is attacking that—right—but there is a whole raft of other areas. The Labor Party went to that election promising, I think, 450 more education assistants. I know it was rhetoric; I heard it all over the place. According to the Labor Party, we slashed and burned and fired a bunch of education assistants, but we actually added 2 000 extra. We have 50 per cent more education assistants than any other state. The Labor government might be able to promise that; I am sure it will deliver that in exchange for the assistance of the school teachers union. That union might not be aligned to the Labor Party, but during the election campaign it sure as hell was. The Labor government is going to have to be responsible for its expenditure going forward. We have four long years here, and the government will be held responsible for going into the last election promising the world but not delivering. If the Treasurer was on this side of politics, he would be better off. When we had the debate on unions, and the unions were patrolling the aisles above us, they were not looking at us; they were keeping the Labor Party in check, not us. They were patrolling up and down, trying to protect their nests, I guess. The Labor government will be responsible for this, and I look forward at budget time and over the next four years to pointing out the mistakes it made during the election campaign.

**MR B.S. WYATT (Victoria Park — Treasurer)** [3.37 pm] — in reply: I thank colleagues for their contributions to this third reading debate on the Supply Bill 2017. It has been an interesting debate. The third reading debate has perhaps been just as interesting as the second reading debate. I want to respond to a couple of points raised by both the shadow Treasurer and the Leader of the Opposition. The books have become worse. That is not something I was wishing for, dreaming of or wanting to happen; that is the reality. The shadow Treasurer is correct that it is a result of revenue writedowns that have been happening for a while, but the vulnerability of the finances is a direct result of the former government. I made the point a lot, not just on this side of the house, but when I was in opposition, that there was a key point in time in the first term of the Barnett government when revenue was surging and GST revenue was still high. I take members back to 2010 and that famous interview done by the former Premier, the member for Cottesloe, in which he made the point that he did not want net debt to rise above \$20 billion—at the time he was Treasurer as well. I have confirmed the numbers many a time and in the revenue that came into the general government sector in the 2009–10 budget and the forward estimates, there was an extra \$6 billion compared with what Mr Barnett thought would come in when he put on that \$20 billion cap. From 2008–09 to 2012–13, the former government had total revenue growing by 32 per cent on the back of state tax growth of about 47 per cent at a time when GST had not yet started to do what it ended up doing because of the lag period in the decline. That is why the first term of the Barnett government had the opportunity to control its spending. The \$20 billion cap could have been met because the revenue that came in was \$6 billion higher than Mr Barnett had expected when he made the commitment in 2010. The shadow Treasurer referred to the quarterly finances for March 2017. He was right; in a comparison of March 2016 on the revenue side, the spend side was the problem when spending outstripped it by some \$1.5 billion in 2016. That is the fundamental point.

One of the common themes from the opposition is probably a theme that I have run myself many a time, just with a different argument. It is the issue around the debt plan. The opposition's argument is that it had a plan to reduce or pay down debt by selling Western Power and we never had a plan. I sense their frustration of the reality of debt being a long-term problem. If we sell Western Power, it will still be a long-term problem. We made that point time and again. Indeed, it was the exact point made by the future member for Cottesloe, Joe Francis. I want to quote Mr Francis who made this point between election day and realising he had been defeated in Jandakot. I quote —

The State Government is no different to a home mortgage, to a home budget. We do exactly the same thing. You borrow money when interest rates are low. You build infrastructure, you can enjoy it now, exactly the same principles as a family home, you can pay it off over time, you get to use it now and you create jobs — and interest rates are at record lows. How obvious is it?

He goes on to make the point that the government should borrow more money to build more capital works. This was always the problem of the former government. All through 2016 on four separate occasions, the Leader of the Opposition made the point that debt was not too high; it was manageable and it was all okay. A former minister, the future member for Cottesloe, made the point that the government should borrow much more because it is like a mortgage and it can be paid off over time. Suddenly, in the teeth of an election campaign, the government changed its rhetoric and said, "We're going to sell Western Power but we're going to spend all the money we get from that and somehow reduce debt." This has always been the fundamental problem.

I note the comments made by the Leader of the Opposition. This was interesting—I wrote it down. The Leader of the Opposition said, "You're going to win the election three months out, no doubt." That does not reflect well on some of the decisions the opposition made, including to expose taxpayers to the most expensive option over Roe 8. That statement reflects the comments made by the president of the Liberal Party, Norman Moore. He said he knew 12 months out yet these decisions were being made by the government, convinced of its own defeat, to expose taxpayers to greater costs. The fact that less than three months out, the government signed up to the National Disability Insurance Scheme and we are still trying to get an understanding of what that means and the financial risk to the state highlights the former government's fiscal negligence and the approach it took to managing the finances.

I want to make a couple of final points about some of the Leader of the Opposition's comments on electricity prices. The point I made around 15 per cent was when the question was asked: what is the difference between where we are now and so-called cost reflectivity? As the Leader of the Opposition pointed out, cost reflectivity has all manner of parts to it, not all being the delivery of energy to people's households. That is the reality with the structure of Synergy bills that people pay. Depending, again, on assumptions, it is about 15 to 17 per cent now. Now, other things are in play that might impact those and one of those things will play out at the federal level regarding the outcomes of the Finkel report and whether a clean energy target should replace the renewable energy target post-2020. Many things are in play that make up the Synergy bill that we all, ultimately, receive. Interestingly, it is not just something the consumer has to do. Synergy and Western Power have to do their bits to ensure that the burden to get to so-called cost reflectivity is achieved. It has been a desire of governments for a long time. I understand there have been four separate dates since the former Labor government disaggregated Western Power.

**Dr M.D. Nahan:** Eric Ripper never committed to full retail contestability. It was a long-term goal.

**Mr B.S. WYATT:** But he committed to introducing competition into the retail market.

**Dr M.D. Nahan:** Yes.

**Mr B.S. WYATT:** That is what he committed to. There have been four separate dates over that time.

**Mr C.J. Barnett:** Competition started in the 1990s.

**Mr B.S. WYATT:** I do not dispute that, but the finish line seems to be very difficult to get to. I acknowledge the points made by the Leader of the Opposition. Interestingly, he now has a different position on splitting Synergy up, wanting to reverse the position taken by the former government of bringing Verve and Synergy back together.

**Dr M.D. Nahan:** The generator and retail were put together. Now the issue is that they can be split up in a different way and there are many different combinations but as long as there is a monopoly provider like that, it will not have effective competition in the market and the people who will struggle are the owners of Synergy.

**Mr B.S. WYATT:** When the Leader of the Opposition announced contestability and competition back in 2015, as the then Minister for Energy, the Leader of the Opposition ruled out splitting Synergy despite the review recommending it do so. I quote —

"The Government, it says, should structurally separate and sell Synergy and introduce full retail competition," he said.

“The Government agrees with the committee that the Government risk is unsustainably high as a consequence if their market competition.

“However, the Government will not split Synergy nor sell Synergy as a business.”

I understand the Leader of the Opposition’s position on that has now changed, and so be it. That is what happens when you move from government to opposition.

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

**Mr B.S. WYATT:** It is a different position than the Leader of the Opposition had when he sat on this side of the chamber. The fundamental point that has been raised, which the shadow Treasurer asked me about in question time today, is: when will a decision be made so we can let local governments and others know? He is quite right. I asked specific questions around how late the decision can be made so it can be implemented for those customers who rely on it and who are outside residential consumers. I am comfortable with the advice I was given on that. The decision will be made and announced well before 29 June, which is the last day of Parliament before the recess. I said that in question time and I emphasise that again.

Again, I thank my colleagues for their contribution on the Supply Bill 2017. It is unusual because supply bills do not come around that often, but, when they do, it is fairly obvious. I think that even the Leader of the Opposition would accept that. It is not something that is particularly tricky. It is simply that an election forces things to be pushed later than they otherwise would. I do not expect another supply bill until probably 2021 after the next election when, no doubt in due course, the government that is elected will make those decisions. I thank all my parliamentary colleagues for their contribution to the debate.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

#### JOINT STANDING COMMITTEE ON THE CORRUPTION AND CRIME COMMISSION

##### *Consideration in Detail — Amendment to Motion*

Resumed from 13 June on the following motion moved by Mr D.A. Templeman (Leader of the House) —

That the member for Girrawheen and the member for Kalamunda be appointed as members of the Joint Standing Committee on the Corruption and Crime Commission and that the Legislative Council be acquainted accordingly.

to which the following amendment was moved by Mr S.K. L’Estrange —

To delete “Kalamunda” and substitute —

South Perth

**Mr S.K. L’ESTRANGE:** I am glad we have brought this motion back to the house relatively quickly for continued debate because it is quite a serious issue for the Parliament of Western Australia to be looking very closely at how a parliamentary committee with oversight of the Corruption and Crime Commission is formed, and its roles and responsibilities. I would like to highlight to people why it is so important that we, as the opposition as defined under the Corruption, Crime and Misconduct Act and the word “bipartisan”—I will read that in a moment—have more than one member on this committee. I will step members through it now, if I can. First of all, I think what happened in the upper house was a mistake. I think the Leader of the Government in the Legislative Council did not nominate a Labor member; instead, she nominated a Greens member. This is nothing against the Greens member of Parliament; this is not about that at all. It is about the functioning of the act.

**Mr D.A. Templeman:** Yes, but that’s not what some of you said about the Greens member in the debate.

**Mr D.C. Nalder:** No, we didn’t.

**Mr S.K. L’ESTRANGE:** No, I never said anything. No, if the Leader of the House checks *Hansard* —

**Mr D.A. Templeman:** I think you will find you did.

**Mr S.K. L’ESTRANGE:** Somebody else might have, but if the Leader of the House checks *Hansard*, I was very clear —

**Mr D.A. Templeman:** I think members of the opposition may in fact have impugned her under standing order 92.

**Mr S.K. L’ESTRANGE:** No, member, I was very clear that the leader of the government in the upper house had her nominee and the Leader of the Opposition in the upper house had his nominee. I think it was a mistake for the leader of the government in the upper house not to nominate a member of the government side—the Labor Party—to that committee in the upper house. I think that was a mistake, and that is why I think we find ourselves here today having to move this amendment. The Labor Party, or government, has decided to try to somehow counterbalance what occurred in the upper house. It is saying no to a Liberal and a Labor member from the

Legislative Assembly, and it is saying that it wants two Labor members from the Legislative Assembly. We are saying that cannot enable the functioning of the actual oversight committee to work. I will tell members why.

Section 216A(3) of the Corruption, Crime and Misconduct Act, under “Standing committee of Houses of Parliament”, reads —

- (a) carry on the functions conferred on the Standing Committee under this Act; and

So it is the functions conferred on that standing committee. One of those functions—a very important and significant function—is detailed in division 1 of part 2, under section 9(3a)(b), which reads that the person to be nominated must be someone —

who, if there is a Standing Committee, has the support of the majority of the Standing Committee and bipartisan support.

This notion of bipartisan support is very significant as it exists in the act. If members go to the definition of “bipartisan support” in section 3 of the act, it reads —

- (a) members of the Standing Committee who are members of the party of which the Premier is a member; and
- (b) of the Standing Committee who are members of the party of which the Leader of the Opposition is a member;

To us it is very clear that part of the functioning of the act is to be able to appoint the commissioner—Section 14(2a) refers to the appointment of acting commissioners. That section again states that bipartisan support is required. The same also applies in other parts of the act that refer to the Parliamentary Inspector of the Corruption and Crime Commission; it also requires bipartisan support. It is very clear that the act cannot function by having only one member of the opposition on the committee.

**Mr D.C. NALDER:** I would like to hear further from the member.

**Mr S.K. L’ESTRANGE:** By having only one member of the opposition on the committee, we are not allowing the act to function because it means the committee cannot be in a bipartisan position to carry out these very important roles that it has to for the actual operations of the Corruption and Crime Commission. This is of serious concern to us, and that is why we have moved this amendment that will enable the member for South Perth to be on this committee. We could then have one Liberal member from the upper house, Hon Jim Chown, and one member from this place, the member for South Perth, as the two opposition representatives on this committee. That would satisfy the definition of “bipartisan”, and therefore enable the act to function as it should. That is just the functioning of the act, which is serious in itself. How will that committee be able to conduct these important tasks if the act states it cannot because the notion of bipartisan support, as defined, cannot be achieved? That in itself is a very serious matter that we are very concerned about.

But taking it a bit further: we could try to get some lawyer, State Counsel or Queen’s Counsel to advise on exactly what the plural “members”, as it appears in the act, means—it reads “members”, so plural; clearly it implies plural—the government could say, “Oh yes, but we can try to get an interpretation from the Interpretation Act to mean that, yes, it’s a plural meaning, but you can interpret that to be singular.” The government could go down that route and try to be tricky and sneaky with these words to try to get around this problem, which, as I said at start, I think was a mistake. I will give the government the benefit of the doubt. I think it made a mistake in the other place. It is trying to work out what to do with this mistake and it has itself wrapped around axles. To put that to one side, if the government tries to get tricky with this definition of clearly “members”, plural, I would suggest that members only need look at convention that has existed since this act was created and since this committee was created, because the convention has been, since that time, that there are two members of government and two members of the opposition as defined in the act. That has been the case from the start. It has never varied from that. It has always been two members of the government and two members of the opposition, as defined in the act.

We find ourselves in a very difficult position now, or the government finds itself in a very difficult position. For us as an opposition, we are very much concerned about how this committee can function. We think the people of Western Australia are owed an explanation of how the government is going to untangle this and get it so that we can have the function under the act occurring as it should and so that we have at least two members of the opposition on this committee. That is what is required, we believe, in the act, and that is what the convention has been since this committee was created in, I think, 2004.

That has been the situation, and that is why, to satisfy our responsibility of ensuring that the act is followed, we are moving this amendment. It has been moved so that we have two members of the opposition on this committee as we should, and as defined in the act. That is what we are doing. I urge all members in this place to make sure that they think about this very seriously, and vote yes—vote with us—on this amendment, to ensure that the member for South Perth is put on this committee so that the functioning from the opposition side, under the act, can occur.

**Mr A. KRSTICEVIC:** The manager of opposition business has done a great job in outlining the case. He mentioned convention in terms of the interpretation of “members”. It is not just convention, but the application of the Interpretation Act 1984. Section 3 reads —

(1) The provisions of this Act apply to every written law, whether the law was enacted, passed, made, or issued before or after the commencement of this Act, unless in relation to a particular written law —

...

(b) in the case of an Act, —

In this case, the Corruption, Crime and Misconduct Act —

the intent and object of the Act or something in the subject or context of the Act is inconsistent with such application; or

Not only does convention back up the opposition’s amendment, but also the Interpretation Act 1984 says that plural–single does not apply in the event that it is referred to in another act where it is specifically indicated.

The other thing is that we have the opportunity for adverse consequences. Remember, this is a committee of the Parliament. Imagine when this committee reports back to this house, we will have only the view of the two Labor members telling us what the committee has decided, and what its view, application and intent was. We will get only their view; we will not get a balanced view in the Legislative Assembly. It will only be the view of Labor members on that committee. That is a real travesty of justice and would not be allowed in any other democratic government in the world. It is an absolute disgrace from that point of view. There are adverse consequences. There is that interpretation. It is a pretty obvious convention and the legislation itself says it needs members from both houses. I think that point has been made and the amendment needs to be supported.

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** This is a really important issue. When we had this debate on the amendment last time, the question I asked was: Why is the government doing this? Why is it mucking about with one of our most delicate standing committees and issues? It is the Joint Standing Committee on the Corruption and Crime Commission that has oversight—*independent oversight* of this Parliament and many other issues around the state. We hear it is going to go into organised crime. It is a very important committee. Similar groups and organisations have played a very important although controversial role in our body politic around Australia. Why is the government mucking with it? Our hypothesis now is that it was an error in the upper house committed by the leader of government business in the upper house. It might not have been—I do not know, but we are giving the government the benefit of the doubt there. As the opposition, we nominated Hon Jim Chown in discussion with the leader of business in the upper house. For some reason, the government nominated a person other than a member of the government. We were surprised at that. Why did it? I do not know why the government did that, but it did. It was the government’s nominee. You are the government; it is your nominee. We had no problem with the person. We were surprised you nominated them.

**Mr D.A. Templeman:** I think that you did. You made some inappropriate comments about Hon Alison Xamon.

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** We did not—just find evidence!

**Mr D.A. Templeman:** She’s upset with you. I can tell you. She’s appalled by your comments about her.

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** I am puzzled by your action. Anyway, you nominated her and we nominated Hon Jim Chown.

*Point of Order*

**Mr S.K. L’ESTRANGE:** There is constant interjection from the Leader of the House. I ask you to enable the speaker, the Leader of the Opposition, to be heard in silence.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms S.E. Winton):** May I say, if you put the discussion through me, it might assist you.

*Debate Resumed*

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** We acted in good faith, consistent with convention and with the interpretation of the act, and consistent with good policy. That is, we nominated a person from the opposition, an opposition defined under the conventions of the Parliament as the Liberal Party. We nominated Hon Jim Chown as our person on that committee. We did this across a range of committees and, with one exception, our nominations were accepted—except this one. We were puzzled why the government did this, but it is the government. I think it did not look at the act. I think it was an error, not perhaps in the appointee. I am not saying anything about their appointee or her qualities—not at all, never did—but I do not think the government put a lot of thought into this because it is a contravention of the intent, if not the detail, of the act.

**Ms A. Sanderson:** No, it is not and it is not in the standing orders either.

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** By our interpretation and that is the advice: the government has to have at least two—make it plural—people on the committee from the government, defined this time as “Labor”, and two from the opposition, defined as “Liberal”, but right now we do not have that. That is a problem of the government’s making. We thought the government would accept our recommendation, as it did with all the other committees, but it chose to deviate on one committee and that is the Corruption and Crime Commission oversight body. Why would the government do that? Why would it do that? We think it was a mess-up. We are giving the government the benefit of the doubt, if there was a mess-up in the upper house. It might not be. I might add that we can look to the history.

Several members interjected.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Member for Mandurah and member for Churchlands! Members, please, not across the chamber.

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** If that is not the explanation, then this will be hard to fix.

*Quorum*

**Ms L. METTAM:** Can I draw your attention to the state of the house.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** I believe there is a quorum present.

*Debate Resumed*

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** What other interpretation is there? Was there an error in the upper house? We were not privy to those conversations, but I can guarantee that the manager of opposition business in the upper house was—not miffed, but puzzled by the decision.

**Mr D.A. Templeman:** You should have voted against it!

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** No; it did not go to a vote.

**Mr D.A. Templeman:** No, because it was supported by your leader.

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** No, it was not. It was a decision by the government to put forward its nominee.

**Mr S.K. L’ESTRANGE:** I would like to hear more from the Leader of the Opposition.

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** What other explanation would there be? I might add, we should look at the history in this state and this Parliament about the importance of the Corruption and Crime Commission. Also this week the Premier thought it was necessary to come out and, verbally at least, warn his ministers to stay away from Brian Burke. That is what he did. As I said earlier, I do not think it was necessary but I can understand why he did it. We have gone through a number of waves of corruption in this state. Back in the 1990s, I was a public servant and I saw political parachutists go into the public sector and politicise it, which led to terrible actions in this state.

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

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** It is not funny! There were parachutists in the public sector. As Treasurer, I had to deal with the Bell Group debt—the Bell Group money. Then, last decade, it happened again. One of the great things about Western Australia—if we look at Transparency International, I think—is that we have a low level of corruption in our body politics. That is what this body is set to oversee and stop. Why would anybody—why would a government with the majority that it has and a track record, let us be honest; I know they do not like it but that is it—want to stack it? Why would it?

**Mr D.A. Templeman:** In what way is it stacked? Do we have a majority? No, we do not.

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** Yes, you do have a majority. If you have two Labor, one Green and one Liberal, you have the majority!

**Mr D.A. Templeman:** The Green is not a member of the Labor Party. Get it through your thick head!

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** Why would you do this? You have the majority. Why would you do this?

Several members interjected.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Members!

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

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Member for Girrawheen, I am on my feet. Members, could we please hear the member in silence.

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** I would like to summarise the problem we have here. From our interpretation, if the government does not accept our amendment, the oversight body will not be able to function. It will not meet the

definition of impartiality in the Corruption, Crime and Misconduct Act 2003. Without that impartiality, it will not be able to function and be bipartisan. It will not be able to do certain things that are essential to the functioning of the Corruption and Crime Commission, such as select the commissioner, the deputy commissioner and others. With that interpretation, what does the government want us to do? Just accept its error? It is basically asking us to accept a recommendation that breaches the act; that is what the government is saying. We cannot do that. The government has the numbers to do it, but it will be on its head. Going back to the purpose of this—it is to select the Corruption and Crime Commissioner and deputy commissioner. The act states that that is the overall primary function of the oversight body. It has to do that with bipartisan support. Bipartisan support is defined as plural from government and opposition. The government's nomination does not achieve that. It is asking us to accept its nomination knowing full well that it will nullify the functioning of the oversight body.

**Mr D.A. Templeman:** We simply don't agree with your interpretation.

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** Read it. Does the government have legal advice otherwise? I am sure that the government could get some legal advice but, as the member for Churchlands indicated, we know what the purpose was because we had a convention on this for a decade.

**Mr W.R. Marmion:** Why break it?

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** Why break it? Now cop it sweet. You made an error. Let us go. We can move on. We suggested a solution last time. We are open to that. We want this to function. We do not want controversy about the oversight of the CCC; it is too important. We want this to function; we want oversight. If it was an error, errors happen—that is what it is. We will look at trying to rectify this. But if the government overrides us, it will be on its head. Our interpretation is that the government is asking us to accept a nomination that will nullify the functioning of the oversight body. It will be on its head if it does not do it.

**Mr D.T. REDMAN:** I want to make a couple of comments from the National Party in support of what the Liberal Party has put up as amendments. I will take a slightly different tack from what has been pushed. Some technical issues have been raised and a very strong argument has been put by the leader of opposition business. The issue of perception of conflict of interest is a significant issue. Former ministers—there are a bunch of former ministers in the house now—and ministers of government declare the interests that they have. The issue of perception of conflict of interest comes to the fore all the time. It is a particularly high bar. We have seen the history. There would not be too many people in this house now who were around when the Carpenter government was in play. I was one of those. I was an opposition backbencher at the time—I sat just up there. I remember being on the Public Accounts Committee with Norm Marlborough; I was on there with him. He was one of the people who got wrapped up in the sort of issues that we probably will not see happen again in this place. I remember the occasion when Julian Grill was brought to the Bar to apologise. Fred Riebeling was in the Chair. It was absolutely unique. Once again, I would be surprised if we saw that happen again. There are some substantial issues. I do not think for a minute that the government today wants to be a part of any of that. It wants to have itself, quite rightly, separated from it. This is an issue that has historically dogged the Labor Party—the perception of its integrity by the people of Western Australia. I would have thought that the Premier would want to distance himself as far as he possibly could from those issues and start the game running with integrity and the perception of integrity—all the things that are important—to get rid of that history and make sure that it is not even going to be something that anyone raises. Yet, we find ourselves with something that appears to be in conflict with that perception. I thought it was the right move.

A question was asked by the member for Dawesville: has the Premier issued any instructions to his ministers or backbenchers about Brian Burke? He has; he has told them not to talk to Brian Burke. He could not say anything else. In my view, that is setting a high bar. It is consistent with the position that the Premier has taken when coming into government. But this issue is not consistent. The very reason that there has been a convention regarding the CCC in place in response to the history that we have seen in this place means that if the government were to follow that convention, it would be keeping itself distant from those issues. The perception of conflict is as big an issue as the actual issue of conflict. The perception of conflict is a substantial issue; it is a high bar. I would have thought that the Premier would have wanted to set that standard right from the outset. We have a situation in which there is an inconsistency about the points that the leader of opposition business has made. There is what the opposition would argue is a dominance of the Labor Party on the CCC committee. In my view, that can only mean one of three things. The first is that the Premier got rolled in caucus. That is one way. Caucus discussed what they were going to do and this is what it rolled out. That is one potential solution. The other solution is that he got rolled by the Attorney General. The Attorney General may have said, "I don't like this. I want to have a position where we've got a bit of charge on this." The third solution is that the Premier genuinely believes that this actually passes the pub test. A third possible issue here is that the Premier genuinely believes that the position the Labor Party has taken on appointment to this committee is that it passes the pub test. It smells, Madam Acting Speaker.

*Point of Order*

**Ms M.M. QUIRK:** I have sat here and listened to this debate—not only this today, but previously—and I have to say I believe that a lot of members of the opposition are falling foul of standing order 92, in relation to imputations of improper motives, personal reflections on members of the Assembly or the Council and they are disorderly. If the opposition wants to infer that there are improper motives, improper conduct or lack of integrity, it needs to move a substantive motion.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms S.E. Winton):** I do not think that that is a point of order. I think that the members of the opposition are speaking in general terms. I will let it continue.

*Debate Resumed*

**Mr D.T. REDMAN:** I think that there are two remaining issues. There is the issue of perception of conflict of interest, which is a high bar and one that I would have thought that the Premier would have wanted to absolutely ensure being covered off on to distance himself from those issues. The other issue is the technical aspects raised by the leader of opposition business in terms of the legal aspects of the fulfilment of the committee and the functions that it is able to carry out.

**Mr C.J. BARNETT:** I agree with what has been said so far in this debate. I want to add a couple of observations and restate what the member for Churchlands said in the previous debate. When the Corruption and Crime Commission was established, the role of the parliamentary oversight committee was clearly important. The intent of legislation—I remind members that it was Labor Party legislation—was that there be bipartisan support on that committee. The mere fact is that the definitional section of the act, as pointed out previously, defines bipartisan support and refers specifically and only to members of a party of which the Premier is a member and a member of the party of which the Leader of the Opposition is a member. This legislation is black and white. It is very clear that the intent is that the membership is to be made up by the government of the day and the opposition of the day as defined; that is clear. That was the intent and it has been the practice of this Parliament ever since this legislation came into place. It has been respected—until now—by successive governments of both persuasions. It is quite sensible: two houses of Parliament, two members from each house on this committee—one Liberal and one Labor, because that is generally the government and the opposition. That is the way that it should be. The Leader of the Opposition is a far more generous person than I am. He has described this as a mistake in the upper house. I do not believe it is a mistake. I believe it was a considered position by the Labor government. Indeed, the fact that so many members opposite are interjecting even in this debate shows that they have some prior knowledge.

**Ms M.M. Quirk:** This is absurd!

**Mr C.J. BARNETT:** The member should tell us: was it a mistake or was it a predetermined policy of the Labor government? Tell us.

**Ms M.M. Quirk:** I'm a mere backbencher. I'm not privy to these matters.

**Mr C.J. BARNETT:** It is a simple question. Was it a mistake? Did one of the government's members in the upper house make a mistake?

**Ms M.M. Quirk:** I don't know. That's the honest answer.

**Mr C.J. BARNETT:** Well, it seems very strange to me that so many government members seem to have opinions about and knowledge of this. That does not smack of a mistake to me.

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

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms S.E. Winton):** Member for Girrawheen, I call you to order. Please let the member for Cottesloe continue.

**Mr C.J. BARNETT:** If the Premier or whoever has made decisions about this has made a mistake, they should stand up and admit it and we will help to correct that mistake. But I do not think it was a mistake. I think the government went in with a strategy, which we are seeing. In the upper house, yes, a Liberal member, Hon Jim Chown, has been nominated. Obviously, that is the opposition nomination and we are happy he has been endorsed. With respect to the other nomination, a Green, it was the Labor Party's choice to forgo its normal position of having a Labor Party member from the upper house on this committee and to give that position to a Green. I think it was a silly thing to do, but Labor did it as a government, and presumably it did that deliberately. That left the scenario, when it got to the lower house, that the only two members on the committee from the Legislative Assembly would be Labor members. As the member for Warren-Blackwood has said, that does smack of a conflict of interest. I agree with what he said. It also happens to be the case that the Attorney General is in this house. There he sits. We now have an Attorney General who himself has been subject to investigation and inquiries by the Corruption and Crime Commission. That is a fact. It is in the records and publications of the CCC.

**Mr D.A. Templeman:** And it's a fact that your nominee has also been of the same circumstance.

**Mr C.J. BARNETT:** I make the point that the member opposite is the Attorney General.

**Mr D.A. Templeman:** It doesn't matter; it's the same circumstance.

**Mr C.J. BARNETT:** It is the Attorney General who has oversight of the CCC as a minister.

**Mr D.A. Templeman** interjected.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Member for Mandurah, please stop interjecting. Let the member for Cottesloe continue.

**Mr C.J. BARNETT:** If the Attorney General is a member of this house, surely the two lower house representatives on the standing committee should not be Labor members. It should be one Labor and one Liberal. Has that got something to do with it? Is the Attorney General actually trying to avoid scrutiny? Is he trying to avoid scrutiny by not having an opposition representative on that joint standing committee from the house in which he is a member? He is the Attorney General, he is a member of cabinet, he has ministerial responsibility for the CCC and he—and I think it is him and solely him—is denying scrutiny. This is the government's first major error in accountability and integrity. I say for the third time in this Parliament: do not forget that the Attorney General has been the subject of CCC inquiries. For that reason alone, one would think that the government would ensure that it does not compromise the oversight committee and indeed the integrity of oversight of the Corruption and Crime Commission. The government will probably have its way today. Government members are all upset and intent about it because they have all been involved in it. History will show.

**Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE:** I would like to hear more from the member for Cottesloe.

**Mr C.J. BARNETT:** I made a speech a couple of weeks ago. The media got all upset and intense about it; a bit too much for my liking. It was a bit touchy, I thought. However, here we are just a couple of weeks later and we have the first tangible sign of Labor compromising on integrity and accountability. This will be a little moment in the story of this government. It is making a serious mistake in the intent of the act that was introduced by a Labor government. It is making a serious mistake in simply overruling and ignoring a convention that has been honoured by successive governments. The Attorney General is making a mistake in his role as Attorney General, and indeed the Premier is making a serious mistake given his responsibility to provide leadership and standards to cabinet.

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** In looking over this issue I went back and had a look at some of the reports of the previous iterations of the Joint Standing Committee on the Corruption and Crime Commission that have been tabled in this place. It is really important that the government articulate why it is choosing to not have two members of the opposition on this committee and why it is using its balance of power in this place to ensure that the representation of the opposition is diminished. Between 2005 and 2008 this committee tabled numerous reports; in fact, 31 reports were tabled. One of those was a report on legislative and procedural matters arising from the parliamentary inspector's investigation and review of the acts and proceedings of the CCC concerning Mr John D'Orazio. The third report of this committee was an inquiry into legislative amendments to the Corruption and Crime Commission Act 2003. This committee makes recommendations to the government about changes to the Corruption and Crime Commission Act, which is a very, very important role. That is the power of this committee. That is why it is important that it has bipartisan representation, meaning representation of the opposition party, which is the Liberal Party. The twenty-first report was a report on the release of records pertaining to the Joint Standing Committee on the Corruption and Crime Commission and its predecessor.

The 2008 to 2013 period is even more interesting. A report was tabled on whether the exceptional powers of the CCC should be revoked, which are the powers to compel witnesses to give evidence. There was a parliamentary inspector's report concerning telecommunication interceptions and legal professional privilege—really important stuff that this committee is required to investigate to inform the Parliament and the people of Western Australia, and to require the government to respond. The eighth report of this committee was headed "Corruption and Crime Commission Report on the Investigation of Alleged Public Sector Misconduct in Relation to the Activities of an Associate to a Judge of the District Court of Western Australia". Why on earth would the government deny the opposition what has traditionally been 50 per cent representation on a committee with an important role such as this? There was also a report by the committee headed "Corruption and Crime Commission's Response to the Select Committee into the Police Raid on *The Sunday Times* Report No 1". Members might remember that police raid. There was a question at the time about whether the government of the day had ordered the police raid on *The Sunday Times* to try to find the source of a leak of something that was embarrassing to the government. The CCC committee, the committee of this Parliament, held an investigation and inquiry into that using all the powers available to those committee members of this place to ensure that they could get to the truth of that matter and to understand whether there had been improper actions on behalf of the government of the day, the police of the day, or whoever else may have been involved in that raid on *The Sunday Times*, the purpose of which was to interrogate the source of a journalist's leak from government, as I understand it. It is up to the government to explain to us and the community why it thinks that the opposition party of government, whose role is to hold the government to account, should be denied representation on this committee.

Looking at the activities of this committee from the last Parliament—2013 to 2017—there was a recent report on the ability of the Corruption and Crime Commission to charge and prosecute. Do we give the Corruption and Crime Commission additional powers to charge and prosecute or do we wind them back? The committee investigated that. It made a recommendation to government.

The Attorney General would have the responsibility of amendments to this very important piece of legislation that holds the public sector and the government to account with respect to corruption and misconduct, and not to mention the police.

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** I would really like to hear some more from the member for Scarborough.

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** In its twenty-eighth report, this parliamentary committee looked at the activities of the Corruption and Crime Commission itself. That report reported on the outcome of allegations of misconduct made against officers of the Corruption and Crime Commission. Why on earth would the government deny the protocol that has applied since the inception of the Joint Standing Committee on the Corruption and Crime Commission of having two members from the opposition of the day and two members from the government of the day? I also thought the twenty-first report of the committee, “Recent amendments to the Corruption and Crime Commission Act 2003: Some implications for Western Australia’s integrity framework”, was really interesting. That is what this committee did: it looked into the implications of amendments to the Corruption and Crime Commission Act for Western Australia’s integrity framework. Nothing is more important to the community of Western Australia than the accountability and the integrity of the government. That is what this committee does, that is what the Corruption and Crime Commission does, and that is why it is so important that the opposition, which is here to hold the government to account, has 50 per cent representation on that committee, as it has done from the get-go—from when it started. That tradition was set by a Labor government. I do not understand the position of the government on this issue. I do not understand why it is being so pigheaded about this. I do not understand why it wants to turn years of the successful operation of this very important parliamentary committee on its head, at a time when it has experienced a massive swing. The government has a massive number of members in this Parliament. It has made history. Why would it wind back the only integrity oversight committee of Parliament, and hold back those members of the opposition who choose to take on that very important role in ensuring that the CCC is carrying out its job to hold the police, the state, the government of the state and the public sector of the state accountable for corruption and misconduct?

I encourage members to go online and have a look at the previous committees that have been formed on the Corruption and Crime Commission, and see the incredible work that they have done. The committee of the previous Parliament was very active indeed. It had an inquiry into the CCC’s interaction with the state’s Integrity Coordinating Group. This is really important stuff. I am not going to say any more. I have said a lot on this already. I concur with everything that members on this side have said about this. The risk of a government watering down the integrity framework and the oversight committee of our integrity watchdog is extreme. Every single taxpayer in Western Australia, every single police officer, every single individual whom those police officers interact with, and every journalist who might find themselves the subject of a potentially improper action of the police, as a result of their activities, should be concerned about this. This goes to the heart of integrity in this state. It was set up for a purpose, which was to ensure that crime, corruption and misconduct could be weeded out. That is why the CCC has the investigative and coercive powers that this Parliament has granted it, and why it was set up with a parliamentary inspector and a parliamentary oversight committee that included two members of the opposition that holds the government to account in the Parliament, and two members of the government of the day. This issue is the most important test for this new government. Will it be arrogant and cocky and use its numbers to water down the integrity framework in this state, or will it run with convention, run with the status quo, and ensure that the Liberal opposition has proper, 50 per cent representation on the most important committee of this Parliament?

**Mr P.A. KATSAMBANIS:** I have listened intently to this debate. As someone who has been on parliamentary committees on and off for over 20 years, I have experienced the work of committees, and I recognise that the best committees operate on a bipartisan basis. Sometimes when they are doing the committee work, it is impossible to tell which party each person belongs to. That is when committees do their best work. To kick off any committee at the start of a new Parliament with a debate about its composition clouds the ability of that committee to work in a bipartisan manner. It clouds the ability of a committee to set forth and do its work in as apolitical a manner as it can, given the circumstances, and the fact that we are political people who are appointed to these committees. This is why I listened to the debate intently. However, when it comes to a committee that is the Joint Standing Committee on the Corruption and Crime Commission, it elevates my concerns to an even more significant level. As the Deputy Leader of the Opposition so eloquently put it, it goes to the heart of the operation of the integrity framework in this state. Of course, I am concerned, and I share the concerns that have been expressed by my colleagues in the opposition and the National Party.

However, I want to shed a slightly different light onto this that could possibly elevate my concerns to an even higher level. Members talk about this committee being an oversight committee, and that is an important part of

its role, and we use that oversight as a bit of a shorthand for the committee, but it is more than an oversight committee. It is actually a committee that has an integral, legislated role under the Corruption, Crime and Misconduct Act 2003 in the appointment of the Corruption and Crime Commissioner, as well as any acting commissioner and the Parliamentary Inspector of the Corruption and Crime Commission. Its role in the appointment of people to those three positions is identical in the legislation for the appointment of each. It requires the person who fills that office to have the support of the majority of the standing committee, and bipartisan support. Interestingly, it does not require unanimity, and I think that is important. It envisages a time when a committee may not necessarily be able to reach a unanimous view, but it also talks about bipartisan support. All of us can have our own definition of bipartisan support, but the primary act—that is important, too, because we are not relying on some other act to interpret this—defines bipartisan support in section 3 as meaning —

(a) members —

I stress the plural —

of the Standing Committee who are members of the party of which the Premier is a member; and

(b) members of the Standing Committee who are members of the party of which the Leader of the Opposition is a member;

It uses the plural in both cases. It could have chosen to use the terms, “at least one member of the party of which the Premier is a member”, and analogously “at least one member of the party of which the Leader of the Opposition is a member”, but it did not. The framers of this legislation, the Parliament that passed this legislation, clearly envisaged that that was not good enough.

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** I would like to hear more from the member for Hillarys.

**Mr P.A. KATSAMBANIS:** They clearly said that we needed more than one member of each of those two parties to agree to form the majority required in the case of the Corruption and Crime Commissioner himself, in section 9(3)(a), and analogous provisions for the acting commissioner or parliamentary inspector. Envisage when there might not be unanimity and there is only a majority, but it requires more than one person from the Premier’s party and more than one person from the Leader of the Opposition’s party to support that appointment so that it can be valid and legal. This is where my concern comes. Appointing a committee made up of the members and their representative parties that the government has brought to this house runs the serious risk that the appointment of a commissioner, any acting commissioner or the parliamentary inspector may be brought into question at the outset—ab initio, as people in the law like to say.

Who would want to bring those appointments into question and perhaps go to court and say that the Corruption and Crime Commission can claim it has all the powers it wants, but it cannot apply them because the commissioner is not validly appointed because the committee that had a role in the appointment of the commissioner was not properly constituted? Who would want to do that? Someone who would want to avoid the commission’s scrutiny or someone who may not want the Corruption and Crime Commission to shine a light on their activity—the very people whom the Corruption and Crime Commission was established to go after in the best interests of all Western Australians. When we move to vote on the motion brought forward by the government and on the amendment, we need to consider whether we as a Parliament are creating a window of opportunity for somebody or some persons who want to avoid scrutiny in the future by bringing into question the very composition of the commission and the position of the commissioner in the first place. That is the real risk this government runs by bringing this motion to the house, which is why the manager of opposition business has, rightly, moved that we partly correct it.

Based on the analysis I put forward today, even if we partly correct it in this house, because of what happened in the other place, that risk would remain because, if the opposition’s motion succeeded, there would not be two government members on the committee either, so there would not be plurality of members of the Premier’s party as envisaged by the Corruption, Crime and Misconduct Act. This is a real mess.

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

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

**Mr P.A. KATSAMBANIS:** Someone on the other side could raise an argument to nuance what I have said or argue against it. We can do that in here and we can all then decide that argument on the numbers. But it is a legal argument that will need to be determined by a court and whether or not someone else’s position is right will not necessarily matter.

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

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Thank you!

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** I would like to hear more from the member for Hillarys.

**Mr P.A. KATSAMBANIS:** Thank you. It will not be my opinion, that of the member for Girrawheen or of the Attorney General if he chooses to offer one in this debate—that is up to him. It will be a court's opinion that will determine in the end whether what we do today or when we come to vote on these motions was valid. However, make no mistake: we are giving that court the opportunity to interpret the legislation in the same way as I have discussed in the house today at the great expense of the protection of the public, at serious risk of allowing someone who wants to avoid proper scrutiny and proper investigation by the commission of so avoiding it by questioning the appointment of a commissioner, acting commissioner or parliamentary inspector. That is an even bigger error for us to make than simply breaking the convention that has been practised for the last seven years by clearly breaching the legislative intent demonstrated at that time in 2003 when this act was brought into force and the body of knowledge or the activities of this Parliament that have gone on since. I do not think we should allow that. I think the government should go away and have another think. I cannot speak for the other members of the opposition but they can have a conversation with us—with me; with the Leader of the Opposition, I am sure; or the leader of government business. Let us work our way through this because the pursuit of corruption should not be hobbled by an innocent mistake or something motivated by any other reason that we do today. It is too important for the reasons everyone else has outlined.

I am not imparting nefarious motives on anyone in this. In fact, I do not think anyone in this place wants the Corruption and Crime Commission to be hobbled in its work and I do not think anyone in this place wants to stop a properly constituted standing committee of this Parliament from properly scrutinising, overseeing or doing all the other things it needs to do under the act to assist the Corruption and Crime Commission's work. We have reached this stage by innocent mistake, by omission or because people did not consider the totality of what they were doing at the time, but we should not let it go any further; we should fix it. We should work towards fixing it rather than perpetuating the mistake because the real risk we run is twofold. It is the risk that all the other members have talked about in not having appropriate oversight. But it is that other risk that someone who wants to avoid the scrutiny of the commission may be able to get away with it simply because an interpretation I put today might be later affirmed in a court of competent jurisdiction. I do not think we should be looking at this on a Liberal versus Labor versus Nationals point of view but on a parliamentary point of view, going away and fixing it.

**Mr W.R. MARMION:** I was not going to speak on this, and I do not want to delay the house too much, but this is something I feel very strongly about. Governance is paramount in how Parliament works. The Joint Standing Committee on the Corruption and Crime Commission is probably the most important committee of this Parliament. What the government is trying to do is wrong. It is simply wrong and members opposite should know that through the arguments that have been put on this side. The government might legally be able to do it. I think we have argued that it cannot, but let us say that the Attorney General thinks that legally the government can. It is then a case of legality versus ethics. I think what the government is doing is unethical. Unfortunately, I had to teach ethics to first-year engineers, and ethics are difficult to define. Ethics depend on where the bar is put. Everyone has a different view on ethics. I think that if the government pushes this through, its bar for ethics is very, very low. In fact, the member for Warren–Blackwood said that the best way to define ethics is to ask whether we would like to see what we are doing on the front page of *The West Australian*. If I was sitting on the government side and listening to the opposition, I would have given in. I would have said that the Corruption and Crime Commission is so important that there cannot be a perception that there is a problem with it. If we want to have two opposition members on the oversight committee, as the act says we can, we should have two members of the opposition. If the government wants to have two of its members on the committee, it can put two government members on it. As the member for Hillarys has said, if there has been a problem in the other house, the government should go back and sort it out. Perhaps this motion should be deferred so that a solution can be reached. I notice that only two ministers are in the house; they have all run away. They have left the Attorney General after telling him to get this motion through with the numbers. It is very disappointing, in a debate on an issue as important as this—the essence of governance in the whole state and a watchdog on corruption—that over there everyone has gone home. I want to put on the record that the member for Nedlands does not support what the government is trying to do.

**Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP:** It gives me great pleasure to rise this afternoon to speak to this motion. I am glad that I have had a bit of a stay since question time after the blistering attack from the Attorney General. I am surprised that I can still stand after that vicious burn he gave me this afternoon. In the process of that, he has signed himself up to another 50 questions over the weekend; I look forward to that!

**Mr J.R. Quigley** interjected.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Member for Butler, I am on my feet. I call you to order.

**Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP:** I will move on quickly to escape the second blistering attack from the Attorney General!

Many members on this side of the house have spoken about the need for bipartisanship on this issue. I think it is pertinent for us to refer to a former chair of the Joint Standing Committee on the Corruption and Crime Commission, the former member for Perth, who in 2005 said that members of the parliamentary committees that

oversee corruption and crime commissions are perhaps more aware than other members of Parliament of the need for bipartisanship.

The motion moved by the government today to put two Labor Party members, one Greens member and one Liberal party member on the committee raises more questions for this house than it answers. Members opposite have said at length that this is not necessarily against the law and that it has simply been convention that has guided them through, and they are happy to break it. But why break convention on this committee in particular? There are 12 other committees that could have been reconstituted in a way that is more desirable for the government of the day, but it chose this committee. I stand with the member for Cottesloe. I think this decision is not a mistake. I think it is the decision of a calculating and cunning government. I think it has deliberately decided in this case to do all it can to reduce the oversight of the CCC because we all know in this place that when the Labor Party is in government, it has form when it comes to the CCC. It has had plenty of incursions of ministers being hauled towards the CCC that I look forward to getting to later on. Many people have asked why this matters. Why does it matter that there is only one Liberal member and there is a Greens member? Again, the Leader of the Opposition made the point that he is not in any way attacking or reflecting poorly on the Greens member that the upper house has nominated. It matters because in this place here, this chamber, when a CCC report is handed down, there will simply be no Liberal member to speak to it. By the move of this government, it is choosing to try to mute us from having any say on any reports that will be delivered. In this chamber of the Attorney General, I would find it very improper, and all should find it improper, that there will be no opposition member who can speak to the reports that are handed down.

This decision is not a mistake. This is a calculated and cunning decision. We know it is because the Labor Party in government has a dark legacy when it comes to the CCC; it has form on this matter. It had Norm Marlborough thrown out or sacked over his connections with Brian Burke; John Bowler was sacked because he leaked a parliamentary report; Tony McRae was sacked as a minister over the financial benefits that he may have gained; and, of course, there is the legacy of the late John D'Orazio. We know of numerous links of the Labor Party with former Premier Brian Burke—a shady figure in Western Australian politics. As the Attorney General inferred today in regard to my young age, Brian Burke was around far before I was even in my primary school shorts, as the Attorney put it, but we all know here that he has a dark legacy with the Labor Party. Indeed, the member for Warren—Blackwood raised the fact that the thirtieth Premier has verbally advised his ministers not to have contact with Brian Burke, but that is distinctly different from the operations of the twenty-seventh Premier, Geoff Gallop. Geoff Gallop issued a directive to his cabinet that was mutually agreed to—a binding directive to his cabinet to have no contact with Brian Burke. In stark contrast, this Premier has decided to verbally advise his ministers. There was a binding directive from Geoff Gallop that was mutually agreed to in cabinet, and in this case verbal advice was given by the Premier of the day. Yet again this motion raises many more questions than it answers. I think it is simply that the Premier of the day wants an insurance policy to ensure that history, in case it repeats itself, does not implicate him further. He does not want to end up with the same mess that former Premier Carpenter had with his ministers.

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** I would really like to hear more from the member for Dawesville.

**Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP:** I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his support.

I think today the Premier is making a cunning and calculated decision, because he wants to ensure that there is an insurance policy. He wants to ensure that there is a structural weakness in the oversight committee of the CCC and that in the event that one of his ministers gets tied up in some sort of shady decision-making and once again the Labor Party ministers are hauled towards the CCC, there is reduced oversight in this chamber with this Attorney General. We know that there is a history here and, moreover, we know that some prospective decisions might have to be made by this government going forward that might perhaps raise the ire of the CCC at some point. We know, for example, that the Labor Party previously stood against some buffer zones in the south metropolitan area, but after receiving fresh donations from a property developer, it changed its decision. It will be interesting to see whether that changes with planning structures coming forward and whether decisions that this government makes going forward might benefit donors such as that. There will be plenty of incursions, I think, as the member for Cottesloe has alluded to, whereby this party in government might find itself going towards the CCC. I think it is important and incumbent upon all members of this place to ensure that they stand on the right side of this argument and that they stand to protect the important democratic institutions that we all hold dear.

I believe that today the Labor Party is seeking to remove the strong independent oversight of this government by preventing a Liberal Party member of this chamber from being a member of the CCC oversight committee. I think this is a dark day for Western Australia's democracy. I stand with the member for Cottesloe in suggesting that this is the beginning of the end of the McGowan government's gold standard of transparency, and all those who vote in favour of this motion today, who vote in favour of what the government has put today are, I believe, complicit in another dark day of our democracy. In all reality, a little bit of Western Australia's democracy will die today if the government's motion is passed.

**Mr A. KRSTICEVIC:** Just going on from the member for Dawesville, I want to say very quickly that I think members need to be very careful here. We are talking about a piece of legislation, the Corruption, Crime and Misconduct Act 2003, that went through this Parliament. We are legislators. We put laws through Parliament and what members are saying today—each and every one of them—is that we do not care what the law states. I guarantee that no members have even read it. Members should bear in mind that they are telling the people of Western Australia that they can ignore the law because they are ignoring the law as well. Members should bear that in mind.

**Mr J.R. QUIGLEY:** To date, there are a lot of misconceptions, not just about the law, but about the operation of the Corruption and Crime Commission. I want to preface my comments this afternoon by addressing a couple of slight slurs directed in my direction. They were that as the Attorney General I have been the subject of investigation by the Corruption and Crime Commission. That is a matter of not only public record but also public notoriety because those investigations were televised live. I have before me the CCC report on one of the investigations. At paragraph 709 of the report, dated 7 October 2008, the Commissioner stated —

Before concluding the Report it is desirable and proper for the Commission to acknowledge and pay tribute to the efforts of those who believed in the innocence of Andrew Mallard and who by their time and efforts secured his freedom and ultimate vindication. Those persons whose efforts were particularly significant were Ms Colleen Egan —

She is my current chief of staff —

... John Quigley MLA, Mr Malcolm McCusker QC, and Clayton Utz solicitors, who all acted without remuneration. Without their respective efforts and expertise, Andrew Mallard would still be in prison, convicted of a wilful murder he did not commit.

There has never been a time when the CCC has made one criticism of my conduct.

**Mr C.J. Barnett:** Did they investigate you?

**Mr J.R. QUIGLEY:** That is a vindication.

There has never been a time when the CCC has made one criticism of my conduct. I recall that the former Premier of Western Australia, who was the minister responsible for the CCC during the previous term of government, was himself the subject of a couple of investigations. One of them was over allegations of corruption in helping his son who was helping a guy called Creasy in a company that had a residence called “The Cliffe” in Peppermint Grove, as I think the address was. The Premier was investigated and no criticism was made. He was not vindicated, but no criticism was made. I recall another time when the former Premier of Western Australia was referred to the CCC by the former member for Fremantle, Ms Adele Carles, over an allegation of corruption over the allocation of resources. On that occasion, no criticism was made of the Premier of Western Australia. Neither of those circumstances would have warranted the Premier stepping aside. No criticism was made against him. He was not commended by the CCC like I was, but no adverse comment was made against him.

Let us go to the next stage, which is my role as the Attorney General. The Corruption, Crime and Misconduct Act comes under the basket of legislation that falls within the portfolio of responsibilities of the Attorney General, me. As to the nominations for this committee, I wish to assure the house, the Parliament and the public of Western Australia that I played no part in the nomination or the advancement of any name to that committee. In fact, prior to today or yesterday, I was unaware of who was being nominated for the committee, apart from the nomination of the member for Girrawheen. As an independent oversight committee, I, as Attorney General, played no hand in its composition or anything. I was aware that Ms Quirk would be nominated as the chair of that committee.

Next, I note the role of the oversight of the committee itself. The committee has an overview function of the CCC and it performs the function as described by the member for Churchlands.

**Mr D.R. MICHAEL:** I would like to hear more from the Attorney General, please.

**Mr J.R. QUIGLEY:** As described by the member for Churchlands, section 9 of the legislation describes participating in the nomination of the person who would be the chair of the CCC. The committee plays no role in the oversight of the conduct of individual members of Parliament. That is the function of the CCC. The committee plays no part in supervising, overseeing or investigating members of this chamber or the other chamber. That is the function of the commission and it is completely independent of this Parliament. I will say more on that in a moment because something happened that led to the newspaper having that big headline, “The untouchables”. They became untouchables by dint of an amendment brought to the CCC’s legislation by the former Premier, which excluded members of this Parliament from investigation. I will come to that in a moment. The committee does not have an oversight function of members of this chamber. For the member for Dawesville, the member for Carine, the member for Churchlands, the member for Scarborough and the member

for Cottesloe in particular to say that the constitution of this committee and the way it was proposed by this Parliament diminishes the oversight of the members of this chamber and the other chamber is a total misbegotten conception. It has nothing to do with our oversight. That is to do with Mr McKechnie, QC, who is the Corruption and Crime Commissioner.

The member for Churchlands was quite right about the legislation itself in saying that section 216A legislates that there will be a joint standing committee made up of two members of each house. It is silent as to the composition of the committee party-wise. It is absolutely silent on the constitution of the committee party-wise. The only concept of bipartisanship comes in the definitions section that states —

*bipartisan support* means the support of —

- (a) members of the Standing Committee who are members of the party of which the Premier is a member;
- (b) members of the Standing Committee who are members of the party of which the Leader of the Opposition is a member.

Why is this relevant? Section 9 of the act, as the member for Churchlands, the member for Cottesloe, the member for Carine and others have pointed out, states that in the appointment process —

- (3a) Except in the case of the first appointment, the Premier is to recommend the appointment of a person —
  - (a) whose name is on a list of 3 persons eligible for appointment that is submitted to the Premier by the nominating committee; and
  - (b) who, if there is a Standing Committee, has the support of the majority of the Standing Committee and bipartisan support.

The member for Churchlands asked whether we were going to be sneaky and rely on the legislation of this Parliament, which specifically sets out in the Interpretation Act that in the interpretation of legislation, the plural refers to the singular and conversely, the singular refers to the plural. The very structure of section 9(3a)(b) contemplates that there could be a majority of the committee who do not comprise an opposition member, because there is the conjunctive word “and”, and “bipartisan support”. It cannot be just a majority of the committee.

**Mrs J.M.C. Stojkovski:** I would like to hear more from the Attorney General, please.

**Mr C.J. Barnett:** Good contribution.

**Mr J.R. QUIGLEY:** It cannot be a simple majority of the committee; it has to have bipartisan support. It has to have the two things. The legislation contemplates that there might be a majority that does not include someone from the opposition party, so the safety is that there has to be someone from a party led by the Leader of the Opposition. I find it curious that the National Party would advance that it could never, ever sit on the Corruption and Crime Commission oversight committee, because the National Party’s position is that two members have to come from the party led by the Leader of the Opposition. That will forever exclude any member of the National Party, or any other minor party, from ever sitting on this committee. That would be a very serious step for this Parliament to take.

**Mr S.K. L’Estrange:** That’s actually not true.

**Mr J.R. QUIGLEY:** That would be very serious step for this Parliament to take, and it would have to be expressly spelt out in the legislation.

**Mr S.K. L’Estrange:** No, it just requires a change of standing orders, member. You know that.

**Mr J.R. QUIGLEY:** It would have to be spelt out in the legislation.

**Mr S.K. L’Estrange:** No, it does not.

**Mr J.R. QUIGLEY:** The argument of the National Party —

Several members interjected.

**Mr J.R. QUIGLEY:** — as advanced this afternoon —

**Mr S.K. L’Estrange:** You’re misleading the house. You know that’s wrong.

**Mr J.R. QUIGLEY:** Could I seek your protection, Mr Speaker? I sat here in silence.

**The SPEAKER:** Members, you have had the opportunity to speak. Now let the member have the opportunity to speak in silence, please.

**Mr J.R. QUIGLEY:** The argument of the National Party is that there has to be two members of the party of the Leader of the Opposition, which means —

*Point of Order*

**Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE:** Through you, Mr Speaker. I have the act in front of me: he is actually misleading the house.

**The SPEAKER:** What is the point of order?

**Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE:** The point of order is that he seems to be interpreting the act —

**Mrs M.H. Roberts:** You're debating!

**The SPEAKER:** There is no point of order.

*Debate Resumed*

**Mr J.R. QUIGLEY:** Thank you, Mr Speaker.

I find that curious. Just as to the diminution of the function of the Corruption and Crime Commission and overlooking this body politic—the Parliament of Western Australia, its officers and others—I would like for a moment to address the headline that was carried on the front page of *The West Australian* on the first day I attended cabinet. It was a banner headline—“Untouchables”. It reported a speech given at Murdoch University by Mr McKechnie, QC, the commissioner, who said that by reason of the interpretation of the legislation, he felt he could no longer investigate members of this chamber.

I attended upon both Mr McKechnie, QC, and the Solicitor-General of Western Australia to get to the bottom of this. He has been dealt out of the play of investigating members of Parliament, not members of cabinet, by reason of an amendment that the former Premier introduced into this chamber. During consideration in detail of the bill that amended the CCC legislation, removing from the CCC the jurisdiction to look into minor misconduct and taking that over to the Public Sector Commission, the member for Cottesloe, when sitting on this side of the house as Premier, sought leave of the Chair to read a considered statement on parliamentary privilege and what the CCC could look at. I did not realise it at the time, but the Premier's amendment significantly hobbled the CCC's oversight of members of this chamber. It allowed the CCC to continue to investigate members of cabinet because they were officeholders of the state, but as to members of Parliament, the CCC, by taking out of the reference “exclusively the province of the privileges committee” and just leaving in “privileges”, it meant that because the Parliamentary Privileges Act gave the parliamentary privileges committee jurisdiction—the member for Cottesloe laughs; this is the exact concern expressed to me by the Solicitor-General and the commissioner of the CCC, Mr McKechnie, QC, when I attended upon him —

**Mrs M.H. ROBERTS:** Mr Speaker, I would like to hear more from the minister, thank you.

*Point of Order*

**Mr C.J. BARNETT:** I do not dispute your decision, but as to the minister who then got the call, the time had not elapsed. There were still 11 seconds on the clock. I just make the point.

**The SPEAKER:** Thank you. I take your point.

*Debate Resumed*

**Mr J.R. QUIGLEY:** The commissioner pointed out that because the Parliamentary Privileges Act 1987 gave the committee the power to look at allegations of corruption and bribery against members of this chamber, he could no longer look at it because it was no longer confined to matters that were exclusively within the province of the privileges committee. Before the amendments were moved by the member for Cottesloe, the CCC could look at matters and conduct of members of Parliament—serious allegations against members of Parliament—generally. But as soon as the word “exclusively” was taken out, it broadened the protection of the Parliamentary Privileges Act, prohibiting the commissioner from investigating backbenchers for misconduct. It is something that the Labor Party will correct. I am not attributing, by way of a slur, like the member for Cottesloe sort of inferred against me —

**Mr C.J. Barnett:** What about you mentioning my son?

**Mr J.R. QUIGLEY:** It was mischievous.

**Mr C.J. Barnett:** How does that go down for a slur?

**The SPEAKER:** Members!

**Mr J.R. QUIGLEY:** I said, member for Cottesloe, that was the allegation made against you; it was not sustained. Because it was not sustained, there is no reason why the member should not have continued as Premier. No allegation has ever been sustained against me, but the member for Cottesloe came close to inferring that perhaps there is something wrong with me being Attorney General. However, the member for Cottesloe hedged his bets and went on to say, of the Attorney General —

I do not criticise him other than to remind people of the history.

I am not saying the Premier came in here to amend the legislation with the deliberate intent of protecting his backbench from scrutiny by the CCC, but that is exactly the effect of the former Premier's amendments. That is what led to the speech made by the commissioner, and that is what led to the headline in *The West Australian* that read "Untouchables". As a result of the amendments moved and passed by the former government, the CCC was outed from investigating members of Parliament, other than members of cabinet. Then the former government comes in here, dripping with hypocrisy, saying, "This is the first stage of the McGowan government hiding from transparency." Nothing could be further from the truth.

What is going to happen is that we are going to effect that amendment; we will change it back to what the definition was before, and all members will be equally subject to scrutiny by the Corruption and Crime Commission, not just the cabinet. Would the member for Warren-Blackwood agree that that is what should happen? He agrees! We will get rid of this headline. I will correct this mess that the previous government made. I am not saying that it was by mal-intent, but it comes close because the Premier at the time sought leave of the Chair—go back and read the *Hansard*—to read a statement to protect parliamentary privilege, and it had the effect of outing the CCC from investigating ordinary members of Parliament other than members of the cabinet.

I come back to the situation at hand.

**Mrs L.M. Harvey:** Thank you!

**Mr J.R. QUIGLEY:** We had to address this nonsense proposition. I had to put to the spear, one, that this was some plan by the Attorney General to control —

**Mr C.J. BARNETT:** Mr Speaker —

**The SPEAKER:** There is still time to go.

**Mrs M.H. ROBERTS:** Mr Speaker, given the time has elapsed, I seek the call to ask if the Attorney General can continue his remarks.

**The SPEAKER:** No, the member for Cottesloe was on his feet.

**Mr C.J. BARNETT:** I will be very brief. I want, again, to reflect on a little bit of history. It is good to see all the new members of Parliament in here listening. Sitting here watching, I had a great sense of *deja vu*. I am not going to restate the history of the four ministers under Alan Carpenter as Premier who were forced to resign because of investigations of the Corruption and Crime Commission. What reminded me, looking at your faces now, is when these issues of the lobbyists started to become prominent in parliamentary debate and in the media. That was not during Alan Carpenter's time as Premier; that was during Geoff Gallop's time as Premier—this speech, the Fortescue Metals Group legislation and other matters. Indeed, of those four ministers who were sacked or forced to resign, two were ministers in the Gallop government and the other two were parliamentary secretaries in that government; they were officeholders. Do not think this thing, whatever it might develop into, will not come to light; it takes time. Government members are sitting here now, and if this goes the wrong way—as I think it is going to—they, by implication, are compromised, as were those four ministers who became compromised during the Gallop years and it came to light subsequently. That is the reality.

As to the Attorney General, yes, I did refer to the fact that he has been subject to inquiries by the CCC, referred by the Legal Practice Board, and also there was a serious issue about divulging the identity of an undercover police officer. That investigation, I might say, was instigated, to the best of my knowledge, by the CCC. The Legal Practice Board also referred the issue relating to the Attorney General to the Corruption and Crime Commission. The point I make, Attorney General, is that I, as Leader of the Opposition for part of that time and as an opposition member, certainly never referred a member of Parliament to the CCC. I never sought to use the CCC for political purposes. The Attorney General thinks it is perhaps a smokescreen to make imputations, I guess, that I have somehow been investigated by the CCC, and he referred to two cases. One was the case of a heritage building, The Cliffe, in Peppermint Grove, which Mr Creasy wanted to redevelop. As his local member of Parliament, I certainly tried to assist him in getting a resolution of that issue. The allegation was repeated here today that somehow my son was involved. That is not the first time that my children have been brought into public debate by the Labor Party. My son immediately came to see me—he was a young adult at that stage—and he said, "I have never actually met Mr Creasy. During my stockbroking days I may have spoken to him, because he was a client in a company on share transactions." Do members know who was promoting the issue of Mr Creasy and the heritage listing of The Cliffe and opposing me? It was The Triffids, the rock group! When I told the media that this was all coming from a Triffids' groupie who lived in Sydney, the media ridiculed me, as they are prone to do, until finally it came out that it was all about The Triffids and nostalgia for a pop group—a very good pop group. Was the song "Long Road" or something like that? I cannot remember the song. That is how trivial that was.

The other matter was a parliamentary issue about staffing resources referred to the CCC by Eric Ripper. I can tell members—I do not know how many days it was—that in that situation, I immediately got a reply from the then

CCC commissioner that this had nothing to do with the CCC; it was a parliamentary issue and the CCC was not even going to look at it. Yes, you can get referred to the CCC when it is done politically, as the Labor Party did. In your case, Attorney General—I am not saying you are guilty of anything—you were subject to investigation by the CCC. It was not referred by the Liberal Party—it was not a political stunt—but by outside parties. The mere fact that that happened, I think, puts the Attorney General in a difficult position. If he were genuine in talking about integrity and respecting process, he would be on our side of this debate. He would be arguing for one Liberal and one Labor member from this chamber, and then we would not have a case for criticising him. For all of you sitting in the back sneering and giggling, you will rue this day!

**Mr J.R. QUIGLEY:** Mr Speaker —

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

**The SPEAKER:** And I am calling you to order, member for Cottesloe.

**Mr J.R. QUIGLEY:** Now I go back to section 9 of the Corruption, Crime and Misconduct Act 2003. The bill was debated in this chamber on 5 June 2003. At that time, the Attorney General was Hon Jim McGinty and his shadow was Hon Cheryl Edwardes. This can be found in *Hansard* on 5 June 2003 at pages 8288c–8305a. Some of us in this chamber can remember Hon Cheryl Edwardes; she used to sit where the member for Scarborough is currently sitting. She was diligent. In discussing this clause, this proposition that the opposition had to have two people on there never arose. It had to have someone from the opposition on there, because there had to be a member of the opposition on there to satisfy the requirements of section 9.

**Mr A. Krsticevic** interjected.

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Carine, I know you are a legal genius, but can we just hear what the member is saying. I call you to order for the third time.

**Mr J.R. QUIGLEY:** The matter was then discussed further on 5 June 2003 when, during debate, Mr John Hyde, who was Parliamentary Secretary to the Attorney General and subsequently the inaugural chairman of the joint standing committee, was asked by Hon Cheryl Edwardes, at pages 8316b–8338a —

Mrs C.L. EDWARDES: I pick up on something that the member for Perth said, and was raised earlier by the member for Churchlands: The standing committee, or whatever we ultimately appoint, must be a joint standing committee. It must comprise equal numbers among the parties and work in a bipartisan manner—it has been established in this manner for some time.

Mr J.N. HYDE: That is a different issue from the legislation.

Mrs C.L. Edwardes: Do you agree?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Attorney General responded —

Mr J.N. HYDE: No. It is a separate issue. The Parliament should decide such matters and it should be separate from the legislation.

He stated that it was separate from the legislation and that the legislation not have in it a requirement for two members of the opposition. I repeat —

Mr J.N. HYDE: No. It is a separate issue. The Parliament should decide such matters and it should be separate from the legislation.

The debate continued —

Mrs C.L. EDWARDES: I put it clearly on the record that the standing committee should be a joint standing committee. It should have equal representation among the parties and operate in a truly bipartisan way. It is a very important body.

Mr J.N. HYDE: I remind the member that the existing Joint Standing Committee on the Anti-Corruption Commission did not reach a position on this very issue. The fit and proper way to proceed is that Parliament decides under its standing orders whether our existing committee should be audited. It is up to Parliament to audit the committee. If we are happy with the current situation, it will proceed. Alternatives can be considered at that stage. The legislation should proceed without reference to that issue. I have an open mind on whether we should proceed with the committee or alternative arrangements. However, this legislation is not the place to make that determination.

This question was raised right from the outset, and right from the outset it was determined by the government that it would not be in the legislation; it would be subject to a vote of this Parliament. I repeat: as the Attorney General, apart from the knowledge about who was to be nominated as the chair of the committee, I had no say, took no interest and advanced nobody's name.

A very valid point has been made by the member for Hillarys; that is, if the opinion that I am advancing to the chamber this afternoon is wrong, or if the member for Hillarys' opinion is correct or wrong, that is a justiciable issue. We know that from Attorney General (WA) v Marquet. That is a matter that can be determined by the courts. I think it will be given quite short shrift in the courts—that is my opinion.

**Mrs M.H. ROBERTS:** I would like to hear more argument from the Attorney General.

**Mr J.R. QUIGLEY:** This is a justiciable issue. If the opposition thinks this is going against the legislation, it can take it to the court and say that this has not complied with the legislation. I am not the person nominating these members to the committee. As I said, I have taken no part in that. This is an independent committee. However the committee is constituted, the member for Dawesville is plainly wrong—it has no part in the oversight of any member of this chamber. It only plays a part in the oversight of the Corruption and Crime Commission itself. The commission itself is the body that will oversee members of this chamber; not the committee. I repeat: by reason of an amendment brought to this Parliament by the Barnett government, the commission was hobbled from looking at members of this Parliament, apart from the cabinet, which led to the headline “The Untouchables”. As the Attorney General, that is something I intend to correct. I will correct this mistake of the Barnett government and open up the transparency so that all members will come within the ambit of transparency. I will stand the argument on its head that says that what the government is doing this afternoon will hobble transparency and will cover up and go on a slippery slope. The slippery slope was when the former Premier brought into the chamber the screed that he was given to read out on parliamentary privilege and how important it was for this Parliament to maintain jurisdiction over its members. The word “exclusively” was taken out—exclusively the domain of the parliamentary privileges committee. It was opened up so that the protection applied to everything that the parliamentary privileges committee could look at, and that outed the jurisdiction of the CCC. The Labor government will correct that, and *The West Australian* in due course will note that it was the Labor government and me as the Attorney General who set matters right and who corrected the error of the previous government, to whom I give the benefit of the doubt and say that the government did not know what it was doing at the time.

It has been explained to me by the Corruption and Crime Commissioner and by the Solicitor-General, and we will fix up the Liberal's government error. We will increase the scrutiny of members of this Parliament by the CCC. To say that the government's nomination of members onto this committee will diminish the CCC's oversight of members of this chamber is errant nonsense.

**Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE:** This is a serious matter. It is not a matter that should bring into the debate other issues that the Attorney General may want to bring to this place in the future in and around changes on his ministerial agenda. This is a very simple issue that the government has made complex. The simple issue is this: standing orders say that the committee that oversees the Corruption and Crime Commission will have two members from the Legislative Assembly and two members from the Legislative Council. That is what the standing orders say. That is not in dispute. It was good to hear the Attorney General finally understand that.

When the Attorney General gave us bits of information earlier, he said that the Corruption, Crime and Misconduct Act itself said the Joint Standing Committee on the Corruption and Crime Commission had to comprise two members from each house. That is incorrect. The act says “an equal number of members appointed by each House”. That is not in dispute. It is just the standing orders that say two and two. The opposition actually agrees with parts of what he said. The standing orders say two and two; the act says equal numbers. We get that. Section 9 of the act actually requires, when the committee makes a recommendation to the Premier to appoint a commissioner, an acting commissioner, a deputy commissioner or a parliamentary inspector —

*Point of Order*

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** I am two seats away from the member yet I cannot hear what he is saying because of the noise from back there.

**The SPEAKER:** Members, if you want to have a meeting, go outside, please.

*Debate Resumed*

**Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE:** The act went so far as to define what “bipartisan” means. I forewarned the chamber when I started this debate today that the Attorney General may try to rely on the interpretation legislation to be sneaky with the word “members”. I forewarned members that he would do that, and he did that. He has clearly done that.

**The SPEAKER:** Member, can you talk through the Chair, please.

**Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE:** Looking at the act, the Attorney General is now deciding that the intent of this standing committee as defined by standing orders, as defined in the act, and as “bipartisan” was defined in the

act, that members will comprise equal numbers from the opposition and from the government. That is in the standing orders. The Attorney General went on to say that the Nationals could never have somebody on this committee by virtue of the act. That is incorrect, Attorney General, because the act simply states “equal number”. What is required to get the Nationals involved is a change to the standing orders of this place to accept more than two members from the government and two members from the opposition, and accept another member from this chamber so that the composition is increased to three. If there were three members from this place and three members from the other place, so long as the opposition has two members and so long as the government has two members on that committee, the act is being followed. That is the solution. Instead, the Attorney General is sending us off on some wild turkey shoot or chase somewhere with a lot of other issues, but the opposition is quite serious about this issue that we are debating today. This issue is that the integrity of the Joint Standing Committee on the Corruption and Crime Commission must be maintained and the integrity of this committee that oversees the most important integrity function of government—the Corruption and Crime Commission. The integrity of the construct of the corruption, crime and misconduct arena is so critical to the Parliament of Western Australia to hold senior public officeholders accountable for their conduct. It is so important that to just mess with this committee by mucking about with it and trying to politicise it and make this debate political is not doing this Parliament any favours at all. The solution is there for all of us. A mistake was made. Some members have argued that this was done intentionally. Some members have argued that this was a mistake.

**Mr D.C. NALDER:** I would like to hear more from the member.

**Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE:** It is up to members to decide whether they think the government did this intentionally or not. I am going to take the view that we just need to fix it. We need to fix the problem that has been created by deviating from the intent of the act and the conventions of this Parliament that have been followed since the Corruption and Crime Commission and the oversight committee were created. That is all we are saying: follow the conventions. The conventions are that we must have more than one member of the opposition on that committee, and there must be more than one member of the government on that committee. It is that simple. If the government has made a mistake in the upper house and put someone on the committee who was not from the government and not, by definition, of the opposition, that is a problem that was created in the other place. The government can argue ad infinitum and decide who was responsible for that, but the fact is that it happened. We are here to fix the problem with an integrity committee that is incredibly important to the democracy of this state, and the people of Western Australia will be looking at all of us to fix it. If members try to play politics with this, they are going down the wrong path. This needs to be solved, and it needs to be solved carefully, so that the integrity of this committee is maintained. It is good to see that the Premier has entered the chamber, because it is very important that, as an opposition, we get an opportunity to listen to the Premier's point of view on this. The Premier knows that the opposition has offered an olive branch. We have offered the government the opportunity to adjourn this debate, and go away and look at how we can change standing orders so that the government can get its two members from this place onto the committee and the opposition can get its single member of this place on this committee, so that the committee is satisfied that it has plural members of the opposition and the government and can still function with equal representation from both chambers. The committee can then conduct the functions of the act that it is there to do, and they are important functions. A solution can be found here. This does not need to be politicised and made ridiculous. It needs to be fixed, and I urge the government to take this seriously and help fix the problem.

**Mr J.R. QUIGLEY:** In closing for the government, I just want to say this. We are pleased that the opposition has now moved its ground, by reason of the speech just made by the member for Churchlands; that is, that the constitution of this committee has nothing to do with the oversight of members of this chamber or the other chamber. That is the function of the commission. The constitution of this committee looks only at how the CCC itself is operating. The only error that has been made in the oversight of members of Parliament was in the amendments made by the previous government, which led to Mr McKechnie's paper which stated that, as a result, he could no longer look at members of Parliament. This government will correct that. This government will dispense with the community concerns that were agitated by the headline in *The West Australian* about the “untouchables”.

Several members interjected.

**The SPEAKER:** Members, please, it is getting to the end of the day, and so is my patience. I am sure the Attorney General is getting to the end of his speech.

**Mr J.R. QUIGLEY:** Backbenchers and ordinary members of Parliament will be brought back under the umbrella of scrutiny of the CCC when the government moves to correct the error of the previous government. What is before the chamber at the moment in no way diminishes the oversight of any member of the Parliament of Western Australia.

*Division*

Amendment put and a division taken with the following result —

## Ayes (13)

Mr C.J. Barnett	Mr A. Krsticevic	Mr J.E. McGrath	Ms L. Mettam ( <i>Teller</i> )
Mrs L.M. Harvey	Mr S.K. L'Estrange	Dr M.D. Nahan	
Mr P. Katsambanis	Mr R.S. Love	Mr D.C. Nalder	
Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup	Mr W.R. Marmion	Mr D.T. Redman	

## Noes (36)

Ms L.L. Baker	Mr W.J. Johnston	Mr P. Papalia	Mrs J.M.C. Stojkovski
Mr J.N. Carey	Mr D.J. Kelly	Mr S.J. Price	Mr C.J. Tallentire
Mrs R.M.J. Clarke	Mr F.M. Logan	Mr D.T. Punch	Mr D.A. Templeman
Mr R.H. Cook	Mr M. McGowan	Mr J.R. Quigley	Mr P.C. Tinley
Mr M.J. Folkard	Ms S.F. McGurk	Ms M.M. Quirk	Mr B. Urban
Ms J.M. Freeman	Mr S.A. Millman	Mrs M.H. Roberts	Mr R.R. Whitby
Ms E. Hamilton	Mr Y. Mubarakai	Ms R. Saffioti	Ms S.E. Winton
Mr T.J. Healy	Mr M.P. Murray	Ms A. Sanderson	Mr B.S. Wyatt
Mr M. Hughes	Mrs L.M. O'Malley	Ms J.J. Shaw	Mr D.R. Michael ( <i>Teller</i> )

## Pairs

Mr I.C. Blayney	Mr K.J.J. Michel
Ms M.J. Davies	Dr A.D. Buti

**Amendment thus negated.**

*Motion Resumed*

**Mr R.S. LOVE:** Here we are; we are at a situation in which —

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

**Mr R.S. LOVE:** I beg your pardon.

Several members interjected.

**Mr R.S. LOVE:** I do not know where Pelago is. I represent an area that does not have any apartment buildings, so do not ask me about that. Members are chewing up everyone's time, so if they want to get home I suggest they be quiet.

**Mrs M.H. Roberts** interjected.

**Mr R.S. LOVE:** No; I am doing my job.

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Moore, speak through the Chair. Member for Girrawheen, do not interject.

**Mr R.S. LOVE:** Thank you very much.

As we have heard this afternoon, throughout this debate a situation seems to have developed because the other place did not appoint a Liberal and Labor representative on the Joint Standing Committee on the Corruption and Crime Commission. As the leader of the government said, that has led to some difficulties. Legally speaking, we need an equal number of persons from both the Assembly and the Council, and that can easily be satisfied. However, what cannot easily be satisfied is the requirement that bipartisan support be achieved. I heard the Attorney General, and I give him his due; he is a lawyer and lawyers know all about words and semantics, but this is not about just semantics. As my colleague the member for Warren–Blackwood pointed out, it is also a lot to do with perception. Perception is equally important in this case. If we are to decide the composition of this committee based upon a he said–she said analysis on the value of the “s” that appears after the word “member”, in the definition of bipartisan support under the Corruption, Crime and Misconduct Act, the public will not have confidence in the committee that is formed. I point out also that as a member of the National Party—the leader of the government said it, whether by interjection or debate—it is unfair that a member of the Nationals cannot sit on this committee and allow it to perform its functions properly. I agree; it is very unfair, so it is time that was changed.

Given the lateness of the hour, I will not move to suspend standing orders and seek to refer the motion to a committee or anything like that. I am sure my colleagues in the National Party have planes to catch or must leave due to other commitments. It is at the end of the day and members opposite are not in the mood to properly consider this very important matter. I very much support the Leader of the Opposition's view that more time should be taken to discuss this matter. I am not suggesting the government is deliberately trying to put in place a committee that does not have proper oversight, but a mistake has been made. As a National I would like it if a member of the Greens in the upper house and a member of the Nationals in this house could be on the Joint Standing Committee on the Corruption and Crime Commission and we could achieve bipartisan support as laid out by the Corruption, Crime and Misconduct Act. I am asking—the Premier is here, as is the leader of the

government and the Attorney General—all three to consider adjourning this debate here and now to allow proper consideration of the many conflicts, the perception that there may not be proper oversight through this committee; the difficulties of this committee, in my view; achieving some of the committee's aims and carrying out some of its functions. We should also consider that cross benchers and second parties in opposition et cetera are effectively barred by the interpretation of many, including some on this side of the house, from participating in the committee. I think that is wrong. I think all members of the house should be given an opportunity to put their name forward for that. I would very much appreciate the government considering adjourning debate on this matter and going away for the weekend and thinking about what can be done to solve this problem. In my view, the standing orders of this house may well need to be adjusted to allow for fairness so that members of the Nationals, Greens and others can sit on this committee.

**Mr D.T. REDMAN:** I would be delighted to hear more comments from the member for Moore.

**Mr R.S. LOVE:** There are a number of ways forward. There could be a change to the act, but that would take some time. There also could be a change to the standing orders. I am not a lawyer. I do not pretend to know about this sort of stuff. I am just a farmer; what would I know? Lawyers in this house seem to have different views. People who have training in this matter have different views. It really is not much good going out to the public with a committee in which there is no confidence from this house that it has been properly formed and can carry out its functions. How can we expect the community to have the same, or any, level of confidence in both this committee and any of the functions of Parliament?

We would all do well to consider that some complex matters need to be thought through. It could be that eventually the standing orders could be changed by the house. That would be easy enough to do. The proper course of action also could be to refer it to, say, the Procedure and Privileges Committee of the Assembly, which could look at the standing orders, make recommendations on changes to the standing orders and perhaps make further recommendations about the act. All those matters are complex. None of them should be solved at five minutes to six, when everybody understandably wants to go home, including me because I have a bit of driving to do to get to my next appointment.

This is something that we do not need to rush. I believe that we certainly need to seek government support to adjourn this matter. I am asking the government to consider that now—consider adjourning this matter, not putting it to a vote tonight, going away and at least having a think about what has been said and coming back with some thoughts about how we can make this a fairer situation, including for members of small parties. In that way, everybody in the community would have confidence in the committee going forward. I am not casting any aspersions on members of the government or saying that there is any ill-intent here. I do not care whether a mistake was made in the other place or whether it intended to do that. I think we can fix this problem, but I do not think it will be fixed to the satisfaction of all members of this place and the community by ramming it through at three minutes to six on a Thursday afternoon.

#### *Adjournment of Debate*

**MR D.T. REDMAN (Warren–Blackwood)** [5.57 pm]: I move —

That the debate be adjourned.

#### *Division*

Question put and a division taken with the following result —

Mr C.J. Barnett	Mr A. Krsticevic	Ayes (13)	
Mrs L.M. Harvey	Mr S.K. L'Estrange	Mr J.E. McGrath	Ms L. Mettam ( <i>Teller</i> )
Mr P. Katsambanis	Mr R.S. Love	Dr M.D. Nahan	
Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup	Mr W.R. Marmion	Mr D.C. Nalder	
		Mr D.T. Redman	
		Noes (36)	
Ms L.L. Baker	Mr W.J. Johnston	Mr P. Papalia	Mrs J.M.C. Stojkovski
Mr J.N. Carey	Mr D.J. Kelly	Mr S.J. Price	Mr C.J. Tallentire
Mrs R.M.J. Clarke	Mr F.M. Logan	Mr D.T. Punch	Mr D.A. Templeman
Mr R.H. Cook	Mr M. McGowan	Mr J.R. Quigley	Mr P.C. Tinley
Mr M.J. Folkard	Ms S.F. McGurk	Ms M.M. Quirk	Mr B. Urban
Ms J.M. Freeman	Mr S.A. Millman	Mrs M.H. Roberts	Mr R.R. Whitby
Ms E. Hamilton	Mr Y. Mubarakai	Ms R. Saffioti	Ms S.E. Winton
Mr T.J. Healy	Mr M.P. Murray	Ms A. Sanderson	Mr B.S. Wyatt
Mr M. Hughes	Mrs L.M. O'Malley	Ms J.J. Shaw	Mr D.R. Michael ( <i>Teller</i> )

#### *Pairs*

Mr I.C. Blayney	Mr K.J.J. Michel
Ms M.J. Davies	Dr A.D. Buti

Question thus negatived.

*Consideration in Detail — Motion Resumed*

**Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN:** Further to the debate on this matter —

**Mrs L.M. Harvey:** You're going to gag it.

**Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN:** If I was going to gag it, I would have done it earlier.

I want to report to the house a debate that has been held in the upper house. I do not have *Hansard*, so I cannot quote from it, but I want to highlight to the house a debate that was just had in the other place. This is what the debate related to: it is my understanding that Hon Alison Xamon stood in that place to clearly refute that she was a government member, as has been an accusation in the earlier part of this debate and during consideration. I want to highlight to the house that the Leader of the Liberal Party —

Several members interjected.

**The SPEAKER:** Come on, members; not long to go, hopefully!

**Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN:** I want to highlight to this house the comments by the Leader of the Liberal Party in that place, Hon Peter Collier. I will relate his response to Hon Alison Xamon standing in that place. He said that he supported there being a Greens member on the committee—yes, he did! It was a decision of that house, supported by the Liberal leader in the upper house. There is already one Liberal member in the upper house on that committee. The motion was moved in the other place. We do not control —

**The SPEAKER:** Minister, get back into your chair!

Several members interjected.

**Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN:** I will get back in my cage!

We do not control the goings-on of that place over there. But it is important to make the point that the decision was made, and the Leader of the Liberal Party in the other place had no problem with that.

Several members interjected.

**Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN:** The fact of the matter is that members opposite have kept arguing in this place about the legitimacy and the demand to have two members of the Liberal Party on that committee. The fact is that their leader in the other place stood up less than 10 minutes ago and said that he stands by his decision to support the motion. Members need to remember that when this motion to appoint the members was passed in the upper house, it was passed unanimously. There was no dissent. Remember, the other place now —

Several members interjected.

**The SPEAKER:** Minister, through the Chair.

**Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN:** Yes, through the Chair, Mr Speaker. There are not as many people over there! There are a lot more over here. However, I understand, Mr Speaker, that you wish to see a more appropriate vista.

The fact of the matter is that the Leader of the Liberal Party in the other place—the official Leader of the Opposition in that place—has just made that statement. Hon Alison Xamon has already made comment about the accusations and imputations made against her by the Leader of the Opposition in this place.

**Dr M.D. Nahan:** What?

**Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN:** Yes, she has. I think she said—I cannot say it, because I would not have used those words, being a short man myself —

**Dr M.D. Nahan:** You're misleading Parliament!

**Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN:** Have a look at what she said! She was offended because the Leader of the Opposition in this place continued to make the imputation that she was siding with the Labor Party or was in an alliance with the Labor Party. She is not. She was a nomination of the upper house, and that was carried unanimously—without dissent. The other house has determined that it is happy with the composition of the committee. We have a motion before this house, which we stand by and that we will be voting on when this debate is concluded.

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** The facts are these: the leader of government business in the upper house had a discussion with the Liberal Party members of the Legislative Council, and each party, as per the norm, put forward a nomination. Unbeknown to us, the Labor Party put forward a Greens nominee. Fact. We put forward, as is the norm, a Liberal nominee. Those nominees were put to the Legislative Council, and it voted unanimously. We voted on the nomination of the government and of the opposition. Fact. Why the government put forward Hon Alison Xamon, I do not know; we do not know. The Labor Party knows. That is its issue. We put forward our nominee, and the Labor Party put forward its nominee, just as we have done in this house. Whether this was an error or a plot, I do not know, and I really do not care. That is the fact. Now the Labor Party has come in here, and whether it is a mistake or a plot to get control or dominance of that committee, that is what it is trying to do. We then approached the Labor Party —

Several members interjected.

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** Those are the facts. The Labor Party sought advice from us about the composition or nominees for the committee. We put forward the member for South Perth. The government then put forward two of its members and did not propose to include the member for South Perth, which went against convention. Not only that, it brought into question the effective operations of the oversight committee itself because, according to the act, two people from the government and two people from the opposition—the Liberal Party is the opposition—are needed to select the senior staff of the Corruption and Crime Commission. It is strange. I listened to the Attorney General and he said, “The courts will decide that.” We have reasonable evidence that we are making an error in law and the Attorney General said, “That’s all right! Let the courts decide that down that track.” That is not how we should operate here—to see a potential error and let the courts resolve it. We have come to this place to try to resolve this issue.

There are a number of issues. The first is the government’s decision to put forward a member of the Greens, who is not a member of the government—that is why we are here. I did not denigrate her and say she is a member of the Labor Party, but that is the whole problem. Whether she said anything negative about me or not, the member who said that has walked out the door and he said he had no *Hansard*, so where did it come from? It is probably made up. We went into this debate constructively. We worked with the government. We put forward our submissions as per the norm. We expected the government to reciprocate in kind. We had no indication before we came here that the government had changed its mind. We had no proposal to do anything other than accept the government’s nomination in the upper house. It went through that and we expected to do so here. We then saw there was an anomaly and we proposed to alter it and perhaps expand or change the standing orders to increase the number of people on the committee and legitimately bring in minor or crossbench parties, potentially from both the upper and lower houses. It would also meet the requirements of having two people from the government and two people from the opposition on the committee. That is all reasonable.

We are not dealing with just an ordinary committee. We are dealing with the oversight committee for the Corruption and Crime Commission of Western Australia. This whole debate today has been unnecessary. Perhaps the government likes doing this, but I doubt if it likes it at this time of day, because it had no legislative agenda. This is fundamental. Again, if we go back to what we said, there were two issues today that the government would rue the day for. The first was the decision to go against the City Beach high school. We will see that down the track, but this is more serious. The government is undermining confidence in this Parliament and in the community in the oversight of the Corruption and Crime Commission and it is doing it explicitly, in a calculated manner.

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** Mr Speaker, I would like to hear more from the Leader of the Opposition.

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** Members opposite have been warned. It might lead to situations down the track in which the oversight committee makes an appointment—let us say the Corruption and Crime Commissioner—and it is overturned. As the member for Hillarys said, imagine the ramifications if the Corruption and Crime Commission appoints a person and that commissioner makes decisions, perhaps in the future about organised crime, and a crim gets pinged and put in jail and gets out because we in this house said we wanted to appoint the oversight committee improperly. That is what we are dealing with. The ramifications of this are profound, in this house, for the government as a whole, and more widely for the police and organised crime. Essentially, the government is saying, “We don’t care! We have the numbers. We won overwhelmingly and we don’t care about convention, the act or the ramifications. Cop it sweet!” The government will rue the day that it ever made this decision.

**MRS L.M. HARVEY:** I will not speak for long but I just want to summarise, particularly for new members in this place, what has actually happened. Despite the smokescreen that the Attorney General has put forward about the Joint Standing Committee on the Corruption and Crime Commission and the Corruption and Crime Commission having oversight of members of Parliament, the fact remains that the decisions of a government are made by the cabinet, and the CCC committee has oversight of cabinet ministers and their decisions of government. New members who are part of the parliamentary committee process and have not yet tabled or spoken to a report of a committee in this Parliament may not understand this, but being subject and party to committee deliberations gives the members of those committees a really good, sound understanding of what is being interrogated. They get to interview the witnesses and they are part of the deliberation on the findings and the recommendations of the committee. In addition, when that report is tabled in this Parliament those members of the committee will speak to the report: they will speak to what they learnt, to the findings and to the recommendations. The Premier and his members have effectively silenced the members of the Liberal opposition from being a party to the committee deliberations on the committee.

Several government members interjected.

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** Let me clarify that: government members have silenced the Liberal opposition members in the Legislative Assembly from participating in the deliberations of the parliamentary committee that provides oversight to the CCC. None of us will be party to the deliberations and investigations of that committee.

Everybody who has been on a parliamentary committee knows that during that committee process members are not permitted to talk to any other person about the deliberations of that committee. Hon Jim Chown will be on that committee. He cannot tell one of us about any single matter being discussed by that committee until the report is tabled, and only then can he speak to the report. That is what this government has done. It has said that no Liberal member in the Legislative Assembly can be on the oversight committee of the CCC. We will have two members aligned to the government and none of us will understand about the deliberations of that committee. We will have one voice in Western Australia speaking for the Liberal opposition—Hon Jim Chown in the other place. We had no problem with Hon Alison Xamon being on the committee. She is a fine individual with a very fine mind, but what we wanted in this place was for a member of the Liberal opposition to be part of this very important oversight committee. The Premier is walking out of the house while we are talking on this matter because he does not care. The most disgraceful thing for me to see in this Parliament over the last eight years was the members of this cabinet slapping each other on the back and laughing when they won that vote with their numbers—good work. You have made sure that none of us can be part of the deliberations of the CCC committee. That is what you have done. I hope you are proud of yourselves—it's disgraceful!

Several members interjected.

**The SPEAKER:** I'm calling you to order. You don't talk across the chamber. Deputy Leader of the Opposition, that is your third call to order today.

**MR S.K. L'ESTRANGE:** This is a very disappointing day for democracy in this place. I heard the member for Bassendean start to interject. He might not have heard some of the explanations in this debate that ensued earlier. It is very important to understand that the Corruption, Crime and Misconduct Act 2003 is clear. The act defines that bipartisanship is an important component of this oversight committee into the CCC. It defines it and it basically says members of the opposition, as defined in the act, and members of the government, as defined in the act. It does not stipulate the numbers in the act—that is true. The standing orders of this place define the numbers that make up this committee. We have simply put an olive branch out there to say that a mistake has been made. Some people say it has been done on purpose and others say it is a mistake, but I will give members the benefit of the doubt and say that a mistake has been made. We have ended up in this situation in which the government is not complying with the intent of the act by allowing only one opposition member on this committee. That is in the Corruption, Crime and Misconduct Act 2003. So, when the member for Bassendean talks about other crossbenchers, the act does not mention crossbenchers. It is very clear in its definition of bipartisanship. The standing orders could be altered to allow for crossbenchers to come in, but it is up to this Parliament and this place to do that. We know that.

This is a serious matter. We have heard much debate on it, and it is so serious that I think we need to hear from the Premier. We need to get the Premier's point of view on what we are trying to achieve for the Parliament; that is, that the act is being adhered to so that the functions of this committee can continue, as they have done since this committee was created. Every committee of this Parliament that oversees the Corruption and Crime Commission has been formed with the convention outlined in the act. It has not deviated from that since this CCC committee was created. If the government continues down the path I think it is going today, it will be the first time it has deviated from that convention and the first time it has interpreted the act differently from every other Parliament that has interpreted it. It is leaving itself wide open for criticism down the track. I put it to the Premier that, firstly, he give us his point of view on this very important matter; and, secondly, that he strongly consider adjourning this debate so that a solution can be found that satisfies the act and the needs of Parliament.

**Mrs L.M. Harvey:** The Premier is not speaking?

*Division*

Question put and a division called for.

Bells rung and the house divided.

**The SPEAKER:** Deputy Leader of the Opposition, you are on three calls. Do you want to go home five minutes earlier than everyone else?

**Mrs L.M. Harvey:** I thought we were allowed to talk.

**The SPEAKER:** No, you are not!

**Mrs L.M. Harvey:** Are we supposed to sit in silence?

**The SPEAKER:** It does not matter; you are still in the chamber. If you want to query my ruling, you can.

**Mrs L.M. Harvey:** I am not; I am seeking clarification. I do not understand. We have always done it.

**The SPEAKER:** I know that you are.

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

**The SPEAKER:** If you keep talking, Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

*Division Resumed*

The division resulted as follows —

Ayes (36)

Ms L.L. Baker	Mr W.J. Johnston	Mr P. Papalia	Mrs J.M.C. Stojkovski
Mr J.N. Carey	Mr D.J. Kelly	Mr S.J. Price	Mr C.J. Tallentire
Mrs R.M.J. Clarke	Mr F.M. Logan	Mr D.T. Punch	Mr D.A. Templeman
Mr R.H. Cook	Mr M. McGowan	Mr J.R. Quigley	Mr P.C. Tinley
Mr M.J. Folkard	Ms S.F. McGurk	Ms M.M. Quirk	Mr B. Urban
Ms J.M. Freeman	Mr S.A. Millman	Mrs M.H. Roberts	Mr R.R. Whitby
Ms E. Hamilton	Mr Y. Mubarakai	Ms R. Saffioti	Ms S.E. Winton
Mr T.J. Healy	Mr M.P. Murray	Ms A. Sanderson	Mr B.S. Wyatt
Mr M. Hughes	Mrs L.M. O'Malley	Ms J.J. Shaw	Mr D.R. Michael ( <i>Teller</i> )

Noes (13)

Mr C.J. Barnett	Mr A. Krsticevic	Mr J.E. McGrath	Ms L. Mettam ( <i>Teller</i> )
Mrs L.M. Harvey	Mr S.K. L'Estrange	Dr M.D. Nahan	
Mr P. Katsambanis	Mr R.S. Love	Mr D.C. Nalder	
Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup	Mr W.R. Marmion	Mr D.T. Redman	

---

Pairs

Dr A.D. Buti	Ms M.J. Davies
Mr K.J.J. Michel	Mr I.C. Blayney

**Question thus passed.**

**The Council acquainted accordingly.**

*House adjourned at 6.25 pm*

---

