



Parliamentary Debates

(HANSARD)

FORTIETH PARLIAMENT
FIRST SESSION
2017

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

Thursday, 12 October 2017

Legislative Assembly

Thursday, 12 October 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.

INTERNATIONAL PREGNANCY AND INFANT LOSS REMEMBRANCE DAY

Statement by Minister for Health

MR R.H. COOK (Kwinana — Minister for Health) [9.01 am]: I rise to inform the house that this Sunday, 15 October, is International Pregnancy and Infant Loss Remembrance Day. The day is observed in Western Australia and New South Wales, and now in Tasmania, and in a number of other countries. This is a day to remember the babies lost through miscarriage or stillbirth, or who have died shortly after birth. It also gives us an opportunity to respect and recognise the immense grief that is suffered by parents and family members, irrespective of the gestational age of the baby lost. It is a grief that can last a lifetime.

I would like to acknowledge in the chamber today Mr John De'Laney and his daughter Mary-Jane. It is because of the impassioned advocacy of John and his wife, Kate, that we are here today. As Kate grieved the loss of six babies that she miscarried, she wrote to the then Premier asking for a day to remember them. We officially recognised this day in 2014, with John coming to Parliament every year since.

Infant loss is an issue that affects most of us, whether directly or someone we care about. I remember members' heartfelt and heartbreaking stories when we spoke on this issue in Parliament, as they described the loss of their own children soon after birth or during pregnancy. With one in five Australian women still experiencing the loss of a baby in their lifetime, and with many experiencing two or more pregnancy losses, it is so important that we continue to recognise and respect the grief experienced when a baby is lost and ensure that there are services available to provide much-needed support. This day should not be limited to a handful of states. I will be writing to the federal government requesting that Pregnancy and Infant Loss Remembrance Day be recognised nationally.

The role of research in reducing the likelihood of loss remains critical. We have fantastic organisations in Western Australia that are at the forefront of better understanding the causes of, and ways to prevent, infant loss during pregnancy.

I ask members to wear the lapel ribbons today, ahead of Saturday, as a mark of respect and continued solidarity for everyone who has endured the heartbreaking loss of a child. I again thank John and his daughter Mary-Jane for being with us today as they continue to share their powerful story and raise awareness of an issue so close to their hearts.

Members: Hear, hear!

METROPOLITAN REGION SCHEME AMENDMENT 1291/41 — HERDSMAN–GLENDALOUGH PRECINCT

Statement by Minister for Planning

MS R. SAFFIOTI (West Swan — Minister for Planning) [9.04 am]: I present today for tabling metropolitan region scheme amendment 1291/41, which proposes to rezone land to urban and central city area zones in the Osborne Park locality. The amendment also reserves Hutton Street, from Howe Street to Jon Sanders Drive, as other regional roads. The proposed amendment will facilitate a mixed-use precinct accommodating commercial, light industrial, retail and residential land uses up to 25 storeys in height at key locations, following a local scheme amendment, structure planning and subdivision approval. The amendment area has been transitioning for a number of years from general industrial activities to light and service industrial, and to large format retail office uses, particularly south-west of Scarborough Beach Road. Accordingly, this amendment acknowledges the existing and proposed transition of land uses between the Stirling activity centre and Glendalough train station, and that the site has access to regional transport linkages and the amenity benefits of Herdsman Lake.

The amendment implements the recommendations of several strategic planning documents, such as the "Central Sub-regional Planning Framework", which forms part of the "Draft Perth and Peel@3.5 million" strategic suite of planning documents. These documents ensure that sufficient suitable land will be identified for future housing and employment to accommodate population growth. The draft framework identifies the amendment area as a corridor between the Stirling and Glendalough activity centres, which provides significant opportunities to accommodate increased medium-rise, higher density residential development.

The City of Stirling has prepared the Herdsman–Glendalough concept structure plan to guide the redevelopment of the amendment area. The structure plan provides direction for rezoning, structure planning and development within the precinct. The structure plan recognises the importance of employment and identifies the ongoing replacement of traditional industrial land uses to a mixture of office, commercial, showroom and retail uses. The structure plan provides for more intensive transit-oriented development around Glendalough, additional jobs through intensive business uses supported by potential light rail along Scarborough Beach Road, and additional residential opportunities throughout the mixed-use precinct.

In accordance with the statutory provisions for region scheme amendments, this amendment was advertised for three months. Thirty-three submissions were received, comprising 15 general comments, one comment of support and 17 comments of objection. Copies of the submissions and the Western Australian Planning Commission's report on submissions are also tabled today. I am pleased to now table the documentation for metropolitan region scheme amendment 1291/41 and I commend it to the house.

[See papers 861 and 862.]

HOMES FOR CARERS PROGRAM

Statement by Minister for Child Protection

MS S.F. McGURK (Fremantle — Minister for Child Protection) [9.07 am]: I rise to inform the house that the Homes for Carers program was a joint winner of the leading innovation category for Western Australia at the recent Australasian Housing Institute Awards. Delivered by the Department of Communities and Foundation Housing, the program's success shows that meaningful and robust partnerships can deliver innovative and cost-effective solutions to community problems.

Stable and secure housing is critical to positive life outcomes for children, families and communities. However, many vulnerable Western Australians live in overcrowded or insecure housing. This can compound their disadvantage and undermine their wellbeing. This includes children in out-of-home care. When safe and possible, the government will endeavour to place children with family. However, many family carers, particularly Aboriginal carers, live in public housing that is unsuited to their changed family circumstances. These environments can undermine the best efforts of supportive family carers to nurture and heal these vulnerable children. The Homes for Carers program focuses on working with Aboriginal family carers who live in public housing that is no longer suitable, by helping them to secure private rentals that accommodate their family size and in locations where they can maintain family connections to schools, sports clubs and community groups. Participating family carers receive rent subsidies as well as support with tenancy management and property maintenance from Foundation Housing. To date, nine families have been rehoused. As a result, 23 children can remain in long-term care with family members.

The Homes for Carers partnership has achieved positive results. For some families, it has prevented the breakdown of care arrangements. For others, it has enabled them to care for more children. Homes for Carers will support good life outcomes for the families involved and the communities they live in, as well as providing an opportunity for positive social investment. I congratulate the Department of Communities, Foundation Housing, participating landlords, carers and families on this award.

SEGWAYS — ELECTRONIC PERSONAL TRANSPORTERS

Grievance

MS L. METTAM (Vasse) [9.10 am]: My grievance is to the minister —

A government member: Where is the opposition?

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members!

Mr M.P. Murray: What have you done to all your mates?

Ms L. METTAM: They know the issue.

The SPEAKER: Members, we will hear this grievance in silence.

Ms L. METTAM: My grievance is to the Minister for Police; Road Safety. I refer to my correspondence with the minister dated 7 April 2017 regarding the concerns of my constituent Mr Terry Old over a review of the Road Traffic Code 2000 provisions for the use of segway personal transporters in Western Australia.

For those in this chamber who are unaware, a segway personal transporter is a self-balancing electric vehicle. It has two wheels that are divided by a platform for the rider to stand on. The rider manoeuvres the machine by leaning forward or backward, or tilting the handle bar to the left or right. The intelligent design of the segway automatically senses and responds to the user's body movements, making it easy to learn to operate. The segway machines are fully electric, incredibly quiet, produce zero emissions, and consume 11 times less energy than the

average car. With dimensions no larger than the average adult body and the ability to emulate human balance, the segway scooter uses the same space as a pedestrian and can go wherever a person can walk. They allow people at home and work to go farther, to move more quickly, and they increase the amount that people can carry anywhere that they can walk; that is unless they live in Western Australia. In WA, segways are classified under part 15, division 2 of the Road Traffic Code as an electric personal transporter and are restricted to being operated by authorised tour operators in declared EPT routes. This means that private individuals are not able to operate a segway and that tourism operators can use a segway in specifically designated areas only if they are an authorised EPT tour operator. Small business operators, such as my constituent Mr Terry Old of Busselton, are unable to import and sell segways to the public. In one fell swoop, regulations for the use of segways have increased red tape in our tourism industry, hindered the entrepreneurialship of small business owners and restricted the personal rights of many Western Australians. The reason for this is not concerns about shared use on footpaths, possible collisions with pedestrians or rider injury; rather, it is that the Road Safety Commission considers segways to be a road safety issue because in the event that they are ridden across a road, they are unlicensed and are not covered by third party insurance. Pedestrians and operators of bicycles, scooters and electric wheelchairs are allowed to cross the road without a licence or third party insurance. Private individuals are allowed to ride bikes and skateboards, drive gophers and use electric wheelchairs on shared paths without a licence or third party insurance. Why do we need such regulations for segways?

Segways are personal mobility devices. Similar to bicycles, motorised scooters and electric wheelchairs, they are not covered by third party insurance in the same way that cars, trucks and motorcycles are insured against compensation claims for injuries arising out of road accidents. If a segway rider is injured, they can use their common law right to prosecute their case in court. If a segway is driven in an unsafe manner and causes injury to another person, that person can use the civil courts to prosecute their case.

In most countries in which segway PTs have been addressed by regulators, they are allowed to operate in the same space as pedestrians and/or bicycles. The European Commission exempted segway PTs from its vehicle legislation, releasing them from regulation as a road vehicle. Many European countries, including Austria, France, Germany, Belgium, Italy and Greece already allow segways to operate on cycling lanes and pedestrian paths. In the United States, 44 states and the District of Columbia allow segway PTs to operate in the same space as pedestrians and/or bicycles. Canada has excluded the segway PT from its Motor Vehicle Safety Act, as have South Africa, Argentina, Brazil, Chile and Mexico from similar legislation. In Australia, it has been legal for individuals to use segways on footpaths across Queensland since 2013; and, earlier this year, the Australian Capital Territory changed its road regulations and now treats segways as pedestrian-type vehicles that are restricted to footpaths, cycle lanes and limited roadways.

People using segways in Queensland are restricted to a maximum speed of 12 kilometres an hour, while those who use them in the ACT are restricted to 20 kilometres an hour and they are also required to wear helmets, use bells, and utilise lights when riding in the dark. Other safety regulations include banning people under the age of 12 from using a segway, banning the use of mobile phones while using a segway and prohibiting drink-driving while using a segway. Certainly, the minister would agree that regulations are required for the safe use of segways in Western Australia. However, those regulations should be the same as those that apply to bicycles, scooters and other personal mobility devices. It is unfair to overly regulate one product just because it is new.

Although I am seeking a response from the Minister for Police; Road Safety about this important matter, I take the opportunity to again underline the importance of addressing the removal of unnecessary red tape from our daily activities. I ask the minister to give this matter the attention that it deserves.

MRS M.H. ROBERTS (Midland — Minister for Road Safety) [9.16 am]: I thank the member for her grievance. I do note, however, that as I refer to a segway, they are generically known as electronic personal transporters. I think there are probably some issues with the ownership of the name Segway. Generally, those in the transport and road safety area refer to them as electronic personal transporters.

The member for Vasse did write to me in early April, a couple of weeks after the government was sworn in. I inquire whether she raised this matter with the former Minister for Road Safety and the former government given that they had eight and a half years to fully licence segways for whatever purpose. She noted in her comments in the house this morning that Queensland gave approvals for segways in 2013 and that the ACT did the same earlier this year. If the member was so committed to getting rid of red tape to allow for the free rein of the use of segways on footpaths and shared paths, the former government could have done that any time in the last four or five years. Indeed, it could have done it using the same timetable as Queensland, had her government been of the mind to do so.

I will point out some of the difference between a segway and, say, for example, a mobility scooter. We allow mobility scooters on footpaths because generally those who ride them are elderly or have disabilities and they need them to get around. It makes sense that we allow elderly people and people with disabilities to get around on footpaths and shared paths. It is not fair to require that they use them on roads, so it is appropriate that they share footpaths and paths with cyclists and pedestrians. Motorised scooters and motorised cycles are restricted to 250 watts whereas I am told that in comparison a segway is powered at 1.5 kilowatts. A considerably more

powerful motor is used in a segway than is used in what are referred to as pedelecs, which is any power-assisted pedal cycle. I am also advised that they are fitted with unusual control mechanisms for handling and manoeuvring devices and so forth, so risks would be involved if segway users shared paths and footpaths with pedestrians, cyclists, children and elderly people. Clearly, regulation is an important part of it.

I recently approved the use of segways in Albany as part of a tourism venture; tour operators are already approved to use segways in designated locations.

Segways, or electronic personal transporters, are not approved in states such as Victoria, New South Wales, South Australia and Tasmania. In most of these areas it is important that we have some consistency from jurisdiction to jurisdiction. That is why, I am told, the National Transport Commission is considering proposed research that is relevant to the emerging market in all kinds of innovative vehicles. It will consider the Australian Road Rules, the Australian Design Rules and the Australian Light Vehicle Standards Rules to develop a more performance-based framework for vehicle classification that is fit for purpose and recognises differences across vehicle categories and types. The business case supporting that research is due to be presented to ministers at the Transport and Infrastructure Council meeting later this year. National consideration will be given to these issues.

There are already concerns about bicycles sharing paths with pedestrians on shared paths and footpaths and there are conflicts between pedestrians and cyclists. Adding segways in an unregulated way could cause further problems. Having said that, we are very mindful of the potential tourism benefits, which is why some tourism ventures have been approved. I was delighted to recently approve their use in Albany. It seems as though, after eight and a half years of opportunity to do something about it, the member for Vasse has now become impatient. Our government cannot sort out everything that the previous government sat on for the last eight and a half years, but we will progress this matter. I am very interested in finding out what occurs at the transport and infrastructure ministers' meeting in the latter part of this year and getting the advice of that research. Various states in Australia can potentially move together and put in place a sensible regulatory regime for the use of segways. Some things that need to be considered are restrictions on the speed at which they can travel, the size of the motor they can have and the circumstances in which they can be driven. This is sensible. As Minister for Road Safety, I put community safety first and that is what I intend to do in this circumstance.

STIMULANT REGULATORY SCHEME

Grievance

DR A.D. BUTI (Armadale) [9.22 am]: I grieve to the Minister for Health. As the minister would be very well aware, the Stimulant Assessment Panel was established under section 11(1) of the Health Legislation Administration Act 1984, which allows the Minister for Health to establish such committees and panels as they see fit in order to ensure that the purpose of the act or any other act to which it applies is carried out. The Stimulant Assessment Panel is appointed for the purpose of administering relevant areas of the Medicines and Poisons Act 2014 and the Medicines and Poisons Regulations 2016. The Stimulant Assessment Panel is responsible for providing advice to the CEO of the Department of Health on regulatory matters relating to the prescription of stimulant medicines.

Further, as part of the regulatory scheme, the Medicines and Poisons Regulation Branch of the Department of Health has, for some years, published annually on the stimulant regulatory scheme. Stimulant prescription rates for Western Australian children and adults have rapidly increased and there is compelling evidence of significant misdiagnosis of attention deficit hyperactivity disorder in Western Australian schoolchildren. As a result of that increase, I am concerned that the Medicines and Poisons Regulation Branch of the Department of Health has ceased the production of the Western Australian stimulant regulatory scheme annual reports.

As the minister would be very well aware, the Western Australian stimulant regulatory scheme was established in August 2003 under the Gallop government against a background of very high and rapidly rising prescription rates. It held prescribers accountable for the first time and, arguably, was the catalyst for an incredible 50 per cent fall in prescription rates for children between 2002 and 2010. That coincided with a 51 per cent fall in self-reported teenage amphetamine abuse rates over a similar time frame. These reductions were significant. Unfortunately, that good work seems to now be going in the wrong direction because since 2011 prescription rates have increased exponentially. The available data indicates that per capita child prescription rates are similar to the previous peak rates in 2002. Arguably, this rebound is a result of complacency and the mistaken belief that the problem was fixed. It seems that WA's prior history of regulatory capture, in which frequent prescribers—self-declared ADHD experts—were in charge of keeping themselves accountable, is repeating itself. In other words, the prescribers were in charge of regulating themselves and, as we know, self-regulation often has many flaws.

Very clear evidence of frequent misdiagnosis in Western Australia was published in the January edition of the *Medical Journal of Australia*. It published a summary of research that found that in Western Australian primary schools, children in years 1 to 5 who were born in June or before were twice as likely to be medicated for ADHD as their older classmates, who were born in the later part of the year and therefore start school at least half a year later. In other words, if students enter school in the younger cohort, there is double the chance that they will be medicated for ADHD compared with children who were born in the second half of the year.

Considering this evidence of diagnostic errors in Western Australia, I am concerned that we appear to be eliminating accountability measures such as the publication of the annual reports of the stimulant regulatory scheme. As I understand it, the Medicines and Poisons Regulation Branch of the Department of Health decided to cease the publication of those annual reports. In conclusion, I have difficulty understanding the justification for that decision. I believe that the annual reports need to be continued and that the 2016 annual report should be published as soon as possible.

MR R.H. COOK (Kwinana — Minister for Health) [9.28 am]: I want to thank the member for Armadale for bringing this issue to the chamber's attention. It is an important issue. As we know, stimulants play an important role in the medical community and the community generally. We also know that we have to be very careful about how they are administered and the level to which they proliferate in our community. That is why it is very important that stimulant medicines are regulated under the Medicines and Poisons Act to make sure that, as a community, we are constantly vigilant and aware of their use and ensure that it does not become too prolific.

The legislation requires the Department of Health to issue authorisations and approvals to prescribe, and to collect information on the dispensing of stimulants from community pharmacies. The gathering of this data is an important role that we play. The data is held by the Department of Health's monitoring of drugs of dependence system database. I understand that the medicines are prescribed through community pharmacies with the incidence of that prescription recorded, and, ultimately, consolidated in a central database. The Department of Health's Medicines and Poisons Regulation Branch conducts an analysis of the monitoring of drugs of dependence system database and produces an annual report related to the stimulants. As the member noted, this report has been published since 2004, with the gathering of data beginning in 2003. In recent years, the report has been published on the Department of Health's website in September. It is a widely anticipated report and one that health consumer groups and other health stakeholders keep a lookout for. In 2015, the report was 93 pages in length with 31 figures, 38 tables and four appendices, and it is starting to gather a wider group of data. Although the report is widely anticipated and read by people with a specific interest in this area, it is becoming increasingly cumbersome and somewhat difficult to read and being accessed by a shrinking group. We have put the production of that report under review. One reason is that the controlling legislation has recently changed and it is important to take advantage of that opportunity. As I said, the report has also become longer and more complex over time, so we have had the content and format comprehensively reviewed before its introduction this year. The review included a consultation process over August and September this year. We interviewed a range of stakeholders and asked them whether they consider the report to be of value, what specific data elements they found to be most valuable, what publication method and format is most accessible and how the report should be disseminated, which, to date, has been primarily through the Department of Health's website. I want to assure the member that we will continue to publish this report. It is an important part of the overall monitoring of the stimulant scheme. We will continue to make sure that that information is available to both health stakeholders and the wider public. As I said, we are in the process of interviewing a range of stakeholders to make sure that we get this report correct, and we are reviewing stakeholder feedback on the content and format of the annual report. I give the house an assurance that we will certainly continue to publish this report and we anticipate that it will be published in December this year, albeit a few months later than usual but in a new format consistent with that consultation process that has taken place.

I will just emphasise this government's commitment to making sure that we monitor very carefully and take very seriously the issue of stimulants in our community. Mr Martin Whitely, who was the member for Roleystone and Bassendean, was very vigilant on these issues and provided an important contribution to the public debate around stimulants in our society, particularly the prescription of stimulants to children diagnosed with attention deficit hyperactivity disorder. From that perspective, we will continue to make sure that we monitor very carefully the use of stimulants in our community and the prescription rates to children in particular. This report is an important part of understanding that pattern of prescription and monitoring the database to make sure that we are properly informed on these issues.

I would like to conclude by thanking the member for Armadale for bringing this to our attention. I can provide him with every assurance that this report will continue to be published on an annual basis, albeit a few months late this year, but in the new format.

WARWICK TRAIN STATION

Grievance

MR A. KRSTICEVIC (Carine) [9.35 am]: My grievance today is directed to the Minister for Transport. A number of my constituents have written to me to raise three separate issues that relate to Warwick train station. One is the continued lack of available car parking, even after additional bays were added. Another is the lack of security cameras to act as a deterrent to would-be thieves or to catch those who have done wrong, and the third relates to the blocked access way located at the northern end of the station.

Train commuters previously parked at Carine Glades Shopping Centre and either walked or caught a bus to Warwick train station. However, the shopping centre management was obviously not happy with this situation as

their customers were inconvenienced by commuters. They have now done a deal with Wilson Parking whereby all users of this car park can park for a maximum of only four hours or face a \$65 fine. I understand why the shopping centre management has taken this course of action. It should not have to provide parking for the commuters who use Warwick train station. One of my constituents who has to drop her children at school before work is not able to make it to Warwick train station until 8.50 am, by which time she is unable to find a parking bay. It is important for my constituent and many others who are in the same boat to be able to continue to drop off their children at school and park at Warwick train station to use the train system to get to work.

When I wrote to the minister about this problem, the response I received stated that the Warwick train station car parking facilities usually reached capacity by 9.30 am. In reality, however, my constituents cannot find a parking bay at 8.50 am, which is some 40 minutes prior. The lack of parking at Warwick train station is an issue that needs to be addressed. The minister also stated that there is ample capacity at the adjoining Stirling train station, which is approximately 7.8 kilometres to the south, and at the new multistorey car parking facility at Edgewater train station located approximately 9.8 kilometres to the north. She says that both of these stations always have car parking bays available. This is how it should be at all stations and the people who use the Stirling and Edgewater stations should be very happy with this news. However, this is not the solution for the people who cannot find car parking bays at Warwick train station. The suburb of Edgewater does not even adjoin Warwick; it is located north, past the Greenwood and Whitfords stations. Perhaps the minister bypassed both of these stations in her response because she is already aware of the existing parking problems at the Greenwood and Whitfords stations. The minister also stated that whilst the Public Transport Authority is committed to providing parking at stations when and where it can be provided, it is necessary to prioritise proposed improvements to achieve the greatest community benefit with the available funding across both rural and metropolitan projects in Western Australia. The parking problem at Warwick train station needs to be prioritised as a matter of urgency. Many people commute to and from this station and there is simply not enough car parking, bike safety or pedestrian access. The minister also stated that it is a regrettable but unavoidable fact that due to continuous population growth, limited land and finite financial resources, the PTA cannot provide a parking space at stations for all its patrons. Does this mean that the Labor government supports infill targets that will create more homes and bring many more people to already established suburbs, but it will not address the urgent need for additional parking at train stations? This is a recipe for disaster and will only add to the congestion problems on the freeway. The minister also stated in her response that the PTA urges its patrons to utilise Transperth feeder-bus services or consider walking or cycling to the station. This brings me to my second point.

Another one of my young constituents did the right thing and cycled to the train station on his brand new \$600 bike. He had applied to park inside the cage at the station, but had not received a reply by the time he needed to ride to the train station for the first time. What happened on the first day he used his bike was a tragedy. While he was at work, the padlock was cut with bolt cutters and a brazen thief stole his bike, which had been carefully parked in plain view and locked with a good quality padlock. Obviously, this is not only devastating for him financially, but also extremely frustrating as he thought he had taken all due precautions. When he reported the theft to police, he was told that this is an extremely common occurrence.

Upon returning to the scene of the crime, he looked around and noticed that there were no signs warning that there is a high risk of theft in this area. The Department of Transport must be aware that this is a common occurrence and should have a duty of care to commuters. The lack of signage needs to be addressed to ensure that commuters are aware of the risks. Additional closed-circuit television cameras also need to be installed to mitigate this risk.

My third point is that the pedestrian access way at the northern end of the station is blocked, forcing people to walk a further 150 metres to access the station. The primary reason for closing this access was to prevent the danger of buses and pedestrians crossing paths. The solution provided does not solve this problem, as pedestrians still have to cross in front of buses approximately 150 metres further away. Surely, creating a safer pedestrian crossing should be given priority over closing the northern access. I wrote to the minister about this issue on 13 September and am still waiting for a response.

I am not one to dwell only on problems; I am also about solutions. The car parking issues definitely need to be addressed; however, the provision of cycling infrastructure and pedestrian access at train stations should also be made a high priority to encourage more people to ride and walk to stations. This will be increasingly important as infill housing means that there will be many new residents coming into the area who will need to access train stations, whether they walk there or use bike shelters or car parking. The provision of new bike shelters, or the upgrading of existing facilities to fit more bikes into each shelter, would have the added benefit of much lower capital investment compared with the cost of providing facilities such as additional car parking and bus interchanges. This should be considered in tandem with increasing the number of car parking bays.

It is an unfortunate truth that thieves are becoming more desperate, and for this reason, additional CCTV cameras need to be installed and signs erected, warning would-be thieves that they are being watched. Hopefully, the thought of being caught will be enough of a deterrent for many.

The parking dilemma at Warwick train station needs to be resolved. I therefore urge the Minister for Transport to support pedestrians, prioritise the provision of additional car parking and bike shelters at Warwick train station, and ensure that more signs and cameras are located in optimal locations to deter thieves. I am sure that both the members for Balcatta and Kingsley would also support this upgrade for all their constituents. I thank the house for its attention.

MS R. SAFFIOTI (West Swan — Minister for Transport) [9.41 am]: I thank the member for Carine for his grievance. Of course, as part of our commitment to public transport, we are always looking at how we can encourage more use of our existing rail lines while we build new rail lines. I have tried to take all these grievances seriously.

Mr I.C. Blayney: That's good.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Compared with what the previous government did; yes, it is good.

We are always looking at how we can improve parking, security and access. Although I did provide a response to the member, we will continue to look at how we can improve security, cycle access and other aspects of train stations, in particular in the northern suburbs where there is significant population growth. We always have to see how we can better cater for those who want to use our train lines and access our public transport system.

I note that the member was in government for eight and a half years. I remember when people raised issues in Parliament, the member used to sit over here and say, "You guys complain about everything; everything is fine." He never raised these issues on behalf of the public when he was in government.

Mr A. Krsticevic: I did, as a matter of fact.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: No, you did not. You tabled a petition. That is all you did.

Mr A. Krsticevic interjected.

Point of Order

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: The member is continually interjecting. It is normal practice that grievances are held in silence and with respect. Given it is the member's own grievance, it seems bizarre that he does not want to hear the answer.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr S.J. Price): Thank you. There is no point of order, but can we hear the response to your grievance in silence? Thanks, member.

Grievance Resumed

Mr A. Krsticevic: We built additional bays.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The member can sit there saying things in this chamber again and again.

Mr A. Krsticevic interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Carine!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: He interjects during question time, all the time. When he was on this side, we heard nothing from him. He was a government member who did nothing. That is what he did. I take the issue seriously and will do all I can. The hypocrisy of this member who sat on this side, said nothing, did nothing —

Mr A. Krsticevic interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Carine, anymore and I will call you to order.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The member made political comments in his grievance so I will make political comments back. He did nothing and now he comes in trying to say that he cares about these issues.

Mr A. Krsticevic interjected.

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

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The member is asking for more expenditure, yet he helped kill off the increased royalty for the big end of town. Members on the other side have to take responsibility for what they have done. When they come in this house and ask for more expenditure, they have to face the fact that they are wrecking the finances from opposition. That is what they have to accept.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Minister! Member for Carine!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The member did nothing for eight and a half years and I have already heard from the members for Balcatta and Kingsley on issues to do with public transport, train stations and access more than I heard from the member in eight and a half years. I have heard more from those two members in six months than I did from the member for Carine in eight and a half years.

Mr A. Krsticevic interjected.

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

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I will work with the community to deliver better results, better access to the train station, more car parks and better cycling facilities. That is what I will do. But I resent the member making political comments in this house about this issue when he did nothing for eight and a half years and is wrecking the state finances from opposition. Opposition members have to take responsibility for what they did, when they come into this place and ask for more spending.

Mr A. Krsticevic: Take a padlock off. That is not more spending.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: No wonder he wrecked the finances; the member for Carine does not even understand what more spending is.

Mr A. Krsticevic interjected.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: As I said, I will work with the community and when constituents and residents raise issues, I take them seriously. I take every issue seriously. For the members on the other side, I remember that when I used to raise issues, I did not even get a letter back from the minister, let alone being able to actually read out one. I wish I could have read out letters from ministers. I never got a letter back from a minister.

Mr J.E. McGrath: I am still waiting for a letter from the Premier. I wrote it in March after the election; he still hasn't written to me. I just cop it.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for South Perth!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The member just cops it. I copped it for eight and a half years, more than the member for South Perth has ever copped it. I take the issue seriously, always looking at how we can get more outcomes and improve services out of our budget. Of course, we are passionate about rail lines. I understand the Leader of the Opposition today said, "Abandon Metronet." It is a party that does not care about public transport, rail lines and finances. I will not be lectured about budgeting or public transport by the Liberal Party—not now and not ever.

I take the issue seriously. I will see what I can do, but the member for Carine did nothing, raised nothing and used to insult us when we raised issues. When he sat on this side of the house, he used to say, "Everything is fine; my constituents are happy." He used to call us whingers when we raised issues to deal with the electorate. He sat on this side and called us whingers when we raised legitimate issues.

Mr A. Krsticevic: No, I didn't.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: You did.

Several members interjected.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: When we used to raise issues, we were "un-Western Australian". As I have said, as a minister I have tried to take issues and grievances seriously, and everyone understands that, but I will not cop politicking in the member's grievance when he did nothing for eight and a half years.

CARAVAN PARKS — LONG-TERM RESIDENTS

Grievance

MR B. URBAN (Darling Range) [9.48 am]: I rise today with a grievance for the Minister for Commerce and Industrial Relations about the Residential Parks (Long-stay Tenants) Act 2006. There are a number of lifestyle villages in Darling Range; Rockingham; Forrestfield; Kalamunda; Woodman Point, which is in Cockburn; and across the state. There is a whole new sector within our community in these caravan parks. Residents purchase a house and place it on a plot of land that they rent from caravan park owners, generally on a periodic or weekly lease. The industry governing body has heard its members and is seeking security in long-term leases on the land. The members would also like long-term security in leases.

The homes are covered by the Caravan Parks and Camping Grounds Act 1995 and in my opinion does not give assurance about the long-term security of a long-term resident. I have met with a large number of the great community of the Serpentine caravan park at a local town hall meeting at the Serpentine and Districts Golf Club. Great work was done by John and the residents to make the area fit into the beautiful backdrop of the Darling Scarp. They are at the entrance of the Serpentine Falls and at the end of the world renowned Kitty's Gorge walk. I took a community group of about 40 people on that walk just under three weeks ago. A number of issues were raised at the meeting, but the key issue was that they enjoyed where they lived; they enjoyed living in the Serpentine Caravan Park, and this is across all caravan parks.

The issue of the weekly lease of the land grows larger than inflation. The security of the residents is important, with the reality that residents are generally at the retirement end of life when they head to Serpentine for a sea change, leading to tranquillity, serenity and a very tight community network. As one walks around these villages,

as I do in Serpentine, one sees a road network of what looks like steel kit homes. Inside, they are no different from any other homes. They are furnished with modern furniture and trinkets that only grandparents have on show and they have a constant aroma of good old-fashioned cooking—and the kettle is always warm. It takes me back to my grandparents' houses in Lynemouth and Bedlington in Northern England, where food was always being cooked and life meant being surrounded by family and friends.

The visual sights of the gardens, both front and back, are of manicured lawns, potted colour with the odd gnome or two, and funny garden signs that indicate that they love that place. While campaigning and since, I have had the pleasure of sitting under a rear patio or two and listening to the serenity, with the birds in garden bushes, and speaking to residents who have had a life. They are retired servicemen from the Army, Navy and, unfortunately, Air Force, retired office workers, a union official and farmers, to name but a few. There is an array of accents from around the world and they all live in harmony with an active community network.

Will Safar, a local pharmacist, has at his own cost provided Serpentine with a chemist and doctor service for the ageing population. This is a much-needed service for the whole community, not just the retirement village. There are other issues, such as public transport, but I will not go into that today with the minister.

It was an absolute pleasure to provide Albert McNamara with a Western Australia flag that he placed on his brand-new white flagpole in his front garden, surrounded by gnomes and little signs. We stood there in silence for a period of time. Yes, Mr Acting Speaker, I did stand there in silence! I reflected on how that community is at one with itself. The WA flag was flying proudly with many other flags in the complex—Billy's flag of St Andrews, the Scottish flag; the Australian flag; the Dockers and Eagles flags; and even a family-crested flag. All the flags were flying high around the community.

Each of these units is purchased by the owners at a considerable cost. They are transported there and they are charged a fee by the landowner, similar to a strata fee, for the connected services that are provided to them. Often these fees are greater than a small house mortgage, which many have chosen to leave to downsize into that lifestyle. These places allow people to downsize and remain in areas where they have lived for most of their lives, such as Leo, who was a local farmer in Serpentine. When he and his wife were about 80 years old and the farm was far too big for them, they lived in the home and leased out the farm to surrounding neighbours. When that got too much—he was not making any money out of it—he decided that he would move into the lifestyle village. He loves it. He has been in that area for most of his life and he remains an active member in the Serpentine community.

Leaving the complex, as I do on so many occasions, I get angered at how this community and many like it is being exploited. I am not blaming the owners of the caravan sites, as they are allowed to charge those fees and they provide a great service and amenities to the village occupants. The current Caravan Parks and Camping Grounds Act is the round hole and the tenants are the square peg, and I want to change that. The reality is that the residents do not have security on their land lease. If they are asked to leave, they have to leave at a cost to themselves. I direct my comments to the Minister for Commerce and Industrial Relations today. I am really keen to have a corrected act of Parliament to cover these villages to protect the residents and landowners.

MR W.J. JOHNSTON (Cannington — Minister for Commerce and Industrial Relations) [9.55 am]: I am pleased to reply to this grievance. It is a very important grievance. I will provide some background. The Residential Parks (Long-stay Tenants) Act came into force in 2006. The long-stay villages are sometimes called lookalike villages because they are not retirement villages but in fact caravan parks, so the underlying tenure is controlled by the caravan parks regulations, but the separate Residential Parks (Long-stay Tenants) Act provides protection for those long-term residents. As the member for Darling Range explained, they own the house but the land belongs to the landlord. There is a very strong chance of a misalignment in the interests of the landlord and the tenant. It is well known that problems have arisen in this area. As I say, this is not a retirement village. I spoke a little while ago to a grievance from the member for Mount Lawley about retirement villages. However, these are called lookalike villages: they look like a retirement village but they are a long-stay caravan park.

The 2006 act was reviewed in 2012 as part of normal legislative review. That led in 2015 to the Consumer Protection Division preparing a decision regulatory impact statement to make suggestions about how changes to the act could occur to improve the circumstances of people in the sector. That three-year consultation process should have led to action. Unfortunately, in December 2015, after three years of consultation and despite the fact that no regulatory action has been taken by the government, for some reason the minister then set out a second round of consultation. Even though that was not needed, the report by the minister was tabled in February 2016, with further submissions to close in 2016, and a second decision RIS, a second set of consultations—the government had already had one; it then had a second—came down for the government on 1 November 2016. I would have thought that, given that only one decision RIS was needed, the former minister would have taken action, but despite two decision regulatory impact statements being submitted to the government, the former minister did not take any action. We have had this problem because of four years of inaction. I must say that yesterday I was pointing out the inaction of the member for Churchlands when he was the minister. This was not the member for Churchlands' inaction; this was the inaction of Hon Michael Mischin.

Mr S.A. Millman: “Mischin” inaction!

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: Mischin inaction!

On 24 July this year, four months after the election, I announced that cabinet had endorsed action to improve the position of residents in long-stay parks. The member for Darling Range raised the point that somebody might have a series of weekly tenancies. That arrangement will be removed. At the moment, there can be a temporary tenancy for up to 90 days. Landlords have been using that as a loophole by giving people tenancies of 89 days or less and then rolling them on. That will no longer be allowed. For people who have a long-term tenure, that will now be recognised and they will gain the rights of a long-term tenant rather than this loophole being exploited in the way it was never intended to.

The next thing is that disclosure obligations will be improved. There is always some level of misalignment between people’s understanding, and sometimes we get challenges in this area because the residents do not fully understand the obligations they are taking on. We want to make sure that there is a better understanding of those arrangements because we want to eliminate so far as possible those misunderstandings in the industry. We want to improve tenure and improve people’s understanding of the arrangements. The next thing we are going to do is remove the ability for people to have their tenancy terminated without any grounds. People who have been in a park for a while and have a long-term tenure can have that periodic lease terminated without grounds. We will require the landlord to explain why they seek to terminate a tenure and we will allow access to the State Administrative Tribunal to settle disputes. Obviously, we do not want everything settled solely on the basis of a Supreme Court decision. We will also allow the underlying leases to survive the sale of a park. At the moment, a park operator might sell to another operator—perhaps even one related company might sell to another—and the tenure for the residents ceases on the sale. This is unique; I am not a lawyer, but I understand having a lease survive the sale of land is very new. It is a new provision, so that will be very important. We will also not allow a lease to be automatically terminated on mortgagee-in-possession. That again, I am told by lawyers, is a unique arrangement to protect residents.

The member can see that we will improve the situation for people selling their home by making it easier for them, and not allow landlords so much involvement. We have a comprehensive program of reform that should have been done two years ago but the former government could not see its way fit to help these important residents.

JOINT STANDING COMMITTEE ON THE CORRUPTION AND CRIME COMMISSION

First Report — “The efficiency and timeliness of the current appointment process for Commissioners and Parliamentary Inspectors of the CCC”

Resumed from 14 September.

MS M.M. QUIRK (Girrawheen) [10.01 am]: I want to speak first on the first report of the Joint Standing Committee on the Corruption and Crime Commission, “The efficiency and timeliness of the current appointment process for Commissioners and Parliamentary Inspectors of the CCC”. As members will be aware, we have previously tabled that report and were given leave to speak briefly to the reports today. At the outset, I would like to thank my colleagues on the committee—deputy chair, Hon Jim Chown, MLC; Mr Matthew Hughes, member for Kalamunda; and Hon Alison Xamon, MLC. I also want to thank the conscientious and diligent committee staff, principal research officer, Alison Sharpe, and research officer, Vanessa Beckingham, for their efforts.

In the initial stages of the new committee, it has become necessary to quickly assimilate some longstanding and intractable technical issues that the previous committee had the benefit of—substantial oral and written submission evidence—through hearings and the luxury of lengthy deliberations. We, of course, have not had that luxury, so I thank my colleagues and research staff for their efforts in assimilating that information.

Thirty-first Report (Thirty-ninth Parliament) — “The efficiency and timeliness of the current appointment process for Commissioners and Parliamentary Inspectors of the CCC” — Tabling

MS M.M. QUIRK (Girrawheen) [10.03 am]: This thirty-first report of the Joint Standing Committee on the Corruption and Crime Commission of the thirty-ninth Parliament was laid on the table of the Legislative Council and the Legislative Assembly on 15 November 2016. It is titled “The efficiency and timeliness of the current appointment process for Commissioners and Parliamentary Inspectors of the CCC” and contains 25 findings and three recommendations. Due to the prorogation of Parliament and the dissolution of the Legislative Assembly on 30 January 2017, the Attorney General and the Premier did not have the opportunity to respond to the recommendations of the thirty-ninth Parliament’s committee. Given the importance of these recommendations, the current committee resolved to bring them to the new government’s attention by tabling them in this Parliament. The three recommendations in that report are, firstly —

The Attorney General prepare an amendment to the *Corruption, Crime and Misconduct Act 2003* to allow for the appointment of a Deputy or Assistant Commissioner to assist the Commissioner in the day to day work of the Corruption and Crime Commission.

Members who are familiar with this area will certainly know that has been an ongoing problem and causes great administrative difficulties. We therefore fully endorse that recommendation. The second recommendation is as follows —

The Attorney General prepare an amendment to sections 9(3a)(a) and 9(3b) of the *Corruption, Crime and Misconduct Act 2003* to:

1. Remove the role of a nominating committee in the appointment process for Commissioners and Parliamentary Inspectors; and
2. In lieu thereof, mandate that the Premier propose one name from a list of three people to the Committee for its bipartisan and majority support.

The third recommendation is as follows —

The Premier undertake a review of the internal processes for managing the appointments of Commissioners and Parliamentary Inspectors, with the aim of ensuring that they are more timely and efficient.

An expedient government response is particularly important to ensuring an efficient appointment process is in place at the end of this year following the expiration of the current Parliamentary Inspector of the Corruption and Crime Commission's appointment. I commend the report to the house, and, as I said, we hope for imminent resolution of the issues raised.

MR M. HUGHES (Kalamunda) [10.06 am]: I would like to add a few comments to the tabling of the report by the Chair of the Joint Standing Committee on the Corruption and Crime Commission this morning. In doing so, I also acknowledge that the body of this work was undertaken by the previous committee, chaired by Hon Nick Goiran. I would also like to acknowledge the work of the principal research officer at the time, Dr David Worth, and his assistant, Ms Jovita Hogan. I am conscious that this report was tabled in the thirty-ninth Parliament. Members have heard that this committee considers it important that this matter be brought before this Parliament to get a response to the recommendations.

By way of background, the Joint Standing Committee on the Corruption and Crime Commission began this inquiry into the issue in response to the current evident, very significant delay in the selection of persons to fulfil the important roles the chair referred to in her report tabling comments. That was after expressions of interest and responses to those expressions of interest by eminent persons for the position, I think, in relation to one particular expression of interest. The candidate, in fact, had not heard after nine months of expressing their interest. In part, this is something the committee was concerned about.

The house will be aware that the joint standing committee has a significant and important role at the end of an appointment process in the appointment of the positions mentioned this morning, principally the Commissioner of the Corruption and Crime Commission, the acting commissioner, the Parliamentary Inspector of the Corruption and Crime Commission and the acting parliamentary inspector. The committee's role in the selection processes is provided for in sections 9, 14, 189 and 193 of the *Corruption, Crime and Misconduct Act 2003*. For these appointments, the act requires the Premier to recommend to the Governor the appointment of a person with a majority and bipartisan support of both committees. Having said that, it was noted that both the current parliamentary inspector and the current commissioner, who at the time had recent experience of the selection process and had made important submissions, did not support the current process, which requires the use of a nominating committee. The recommendations of the thirty-first report of the thirty-ninth Parliament and the first report of the committee of this Parliament was that that nominating committee be dispensed with. The committee noted that no other Australian jurisdiction utilises a nominating committee as part of its selection process with the responsibility of supplying a list of candidates to the executive to fill such key roles in, or overseeing, its crime and corruption agency. That selection panel would include the Chief Justice, and there was some discussion about the judicial responsibility remaining somewhat separate from that of the executive. The current committee would be very appreciative if action could be taken to fulfil the recommendations of the report.

Second Report — "The ability of the Corruption and Crime Commission to charge and prosecute"

Resumed from 14 September.

MS M.M. QUIRK (Girrawheen) [10.10 am]: Like the Corruption and Crime Commission's first report, this report has previously been tabled. This report, "The ability of the Corruption and Crime Commission to charge and prosecute", is the current committee's endorsement of the previous committee's report. The thirty-third report of the Joint Standing Committee on the Corruption and Crime Commission in the thirty-ninth Parliament was laid on the table of the Legislative Council and the Legislative Assembly on 17 November 2016. It contained 48 findings and two recommendations. Due to the prorogation of the Parliament and the dissolution of the Legislative Assembly on 30 January 2017, the Attorney General did not have the opportunity to respond to the recommendations of the JSCCCC in the thirty-ninth Parliament. Given the importance of the recommendations

made by the previous committee, the current committee resolved to bring them to the new government's attention by tabling them in this Parliament. The committee notes that the recommendations refer to the Corruption and Crime Commission's annual report for 2016–17, which was tabled earlier this week and, given that it has already been tabled, the committee is amenable to changing the time frame of the recommendations to refer to the annual report for 2017–18.

As well as revisiting the oft-vexed question of the CCC's power to prosecute, the previous committee, very usefully, also reviewed the power to prosecute held by a number of Western Australian government agencies, including the then Department of Fisheries, the Department of Mines and Petroleum and the Department of Commerce. All administer acts that allow them to commence prosecutions. It was found by the previous committee that in those cases the powers to prosecute are clearly and expressly set out in their respective legislation but, in the main, any charges are laid and prosecuted by the State Solicitor's Office. The evidence obtained by the previous committee overwhelmingly supports the maintenance of a separation between the investigation of serious misconduct and the prosecution of criminal offences. It considered the approach taken by interstate and international anti-corruption agencies in reaching that conclusion. From my personal experience, having worked in an investigative capacity at the National Crime Authority for just under a decade, I think there is much merit in separating decisions about prosecution from investigations. It gives a level of objectivity and distance, which is required in making these important decisions.

The previous committee was not persuaded that it is either necessary or desirable for the CCC to be empowered to commence or conduct prosecutions for offences unrelated to the administration and enforcement of the Corruption, Crime and Misconduct Act 2003. That committee further recommended that the CCC include a specific update in its annual report on the efficiency and effectiveness of its arrangements with the State Solicitor for the commencement and conduct of prosecutions. There have been some notorious cases in which the time frame for bringing a prosecution has been unsatisfactorily long, and we believe that the efficiency of bringing matters to prosecution should be canvassed in the annual report of the CCC. In that regard, the report suggests that the Attorney General undertake a review into the efficiency and effectiveness of the commencement and conduct of prosecutions arising from CCC investigations and table a report, as I said, in the commission's annual report.

Finally, I again thank my colleagues on the committee: the deputy chair, Hon Jim Chown, MLC; Mr Matthew Hughes, MLA, member for Kalamunda; and Hon Alison Xamon, MLC; as well as the conscientious and diligent committee staff, principal research officer, Alison Sharpe, and research officer, Vanessa Beckingham. As I have previously noted, in the initial stages of the new committee it has become necessary to quickly assimilate some longstanding and intractable technical issues for which the previous committee had the benefit of substantial oral and written evidence through hearings, the luxury of lengthy deliberations and greater familiarity with the issues on hand. I thank my colleagues and the research staff for their efforts over the short time period, coming to grips with very longstanding technical issues.

MR M. HUGHES (Kalamunda) [10.16 am]: Again, I would like to offer a few comments and, in doing so, recognise the work of the previous committee under the chairmanship of Hon Nick Goiran. The issue dealt with in the Joint Standing Committee on the Corruption and Crime Commission's second report, "The ability of the Corruption and Crime Commission to charge and prosecute", was the ability of the CCC to prosecute its own charges. Members will be aware that the work of the committee in the thirty-ninth Parliament on this matter commenced on 26 June 2014 but, as a result of court action that touched upon the issue, the then committee made a decision to delay its proceedings and, ultimately, change its terms of reference. One of the important points in question was the ability of the commission to prosecute as well as investigate, and the committee chair has already gone through that process. The committee was very thorough in its examination of the issues, and looked at agencies in other jurisdictions charged with responsibility for integrity, finding that none had the express power to prosecute in their own right, other than the Independent Broad-based Anti-corruption Commission in Victoria.

The previous committee received 24 submissions, including from the then Attorney General, the current Corruption and Crime Commissioner and the Parliamentary Inspector of the Corruption and Crime Commission. It undertook closed hearings with the CCC commissioner, the parliamentary inspector, the State Solicitor and the Director of Public Prosecutions. The evidence obtained by the joint standing committee overwhelmingly supported the maintenance of the separation between the investigation of serious misconduct and the prosecution of criminal offences, and the report of this committee underscores that.

The first recommendation of the thirty-third report of the Joint Standing Committee on the Corruption and Crime Commission in the thirty-ninth Parliament, which forms the basis of the current committee's second report to the Parliament, was that the Corruption and Crime Commission include in its annual report for 2016–17 a specific update on the efficiency and effectiveness of its arrangements with the State Solicitor for the commencement and conduct of prosecutions. I note that the commissioner, in his report to Parliament, has made reference to that recommendation, stating that these arrangements, while not concluded, are still developing. It is heartening for the committee that the commissioner is alive to the issues that the committee had brought to the attention of the Parliament. Again, I thank the chamber for its time.

MR A. KRSTICEVIC (Carine) [10.19 am] — by leave: I also wish to speak on the tabling of the second report of the Joint Standing Committee on the Corruption and Crime Commission. It is very useful that this report was tabled in the last sitting week of the previous Parliament, because that has given members of the opposition the opportunity to look at the report so that we can speak on it with some knowledge. We need to make sure that when reports from the Joint Standing Committee on the Corruption and Crime Commission are tabled in the future, opposition members are given the opportunity to speak maybe the following week, because we obviously cannot look at the report and make constructive comments if the tabling of the report and the debate take place at the same time.

I want to talk about the ability of the Corruption and Crime Commission to charge and prosecute. I am concerned that a number of court cases have been thrown out because the court determined that the Corruption and Crime Commission had operated outside the mandate given to it under its governing legislation, the Corruption, Crime and Misconduct Act 2003. I refer in particular to the case concerning the WA Police Union. The report states in finding 33 —

On 15 July 2016 the Western Australian Court of Appeal found that the Corruption and Crime Commission's functions do not extend to the prosecution of offences the subject of investigations conducted by it, but which have no other connection with the CCC or the administration of its Act.

I am not concerned about the ability of the Corruption and Crime Commission to do its work while Hon John McKechnie, QC is head of the Corruption and Crime Commission, because he has been appointed appropriately through a proper bipartisan process. We have had a lot of discussion in this fortieth Parliament about the membership of the Joint Standing Committee on the Corruption and Crime Commission and whether the committee has been formed properly and legally. Obviously, the Labor Party has the numbers in this place so it can do what it likes. It is interesting that a week or two after the committee was formed, a highly accredited academic gave members a speech about how to interpret legislation. She said that Parliament makes the legislation and the judiciary interprets and applies that legislation. In the formation of the Joint Standing Committee on the Corruption and Crime Commission, the Parliament both made the legislation and interpreted and applied it. I am concerned that if in the future a new commissioner was appointed and there was not bipartisan support, someone might decide to challenge that in the Supreme Court or the High Court. They might look at the legislation, the conventions under which the committee has been formed in the past, the debate in the Parliament and the influence of the politics of the day. It would not take a knowledgeable lawyer long to pull that together and say that is very different from past conventions. From my perspective, the Corruption, Crime and Misconduct Act 2003 is pretty straightforward. I am not a lawyer, so I read these words at a very basic level in terms of what they say, not how they can be twisted or turned around. Our bible for interpretation is, of course, the Interpretation Act. That act states that if the legislation covers a certain point, the Interpretation Act does not need to be looked at.

Dr A.D. Buti: You're sounding like a good lawyer!

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: Thank you very much—coming from the member for Armadale, who is a very distinguished lawyer. I am concerned about the politics around the way in which we have set up the Joint Standing Committee on the Corruption and Crime Commission. I would hate to think that if a new commissioner was appointed, a tricky lawyer might be able to use the processes around the formation of this committee to get a lot of people off their prosecutions. I would hope the chair of the committee has made inquiries at the highest levels into the complications of that political decision. I would hate to think that the way in which Parliament has interpreted the legislation might impact on the ability of the Corruption and Crime Commission to charge and prosecute. The role of this Parliament is to apply the legislation. The government should have gone to the State Solicitor or another higher authority and said, "We are doing this for political reasons. We want to stack the committee in a certain way." The government could be doing that as a favour to the Greens, or because it wants to put another member on the committee so they can get their extra allowance. The government should be honest with the State Solicitor about its reasons for doing that.

Mr M. Hughes interjected.

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: I do not know the reasons; I am trying to show the sorts of things that could be —

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member, I am trying to get you back to relevance. You are straying quite a bit.

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: I am sorry, Madam Deputy Speaker. The relevance is that the ability of the Corruption and Crime Commission to charge and prosecute may be challenged in a court of law and the lawyers could nitpick at various things. We all know how lawyers operate. There are many discussions in this Parliament between lawyers, and none of them seem to agree. Generally speaking, most of them make sense in their arguments. However, one of them is occasionally a bit out of left field, but he is not here at the moment so I will not reflect on him.

Mr P.A. Katsambanis: I want to interject to make sure it is recorded in *Hansard* that I am here!

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: The member for Hillarys is definitely here and he is very well versed when he presents his arguments. He even supports the Attorney General when he introduces the member for Hillarys' own ideas but then obviously changes his mind.

I am seriously concerned that if the Corruption, Crime and Misconduct Act is not amended, once Hon John McKechnie, QC moves on, the ability of the Corruption and Crime Commission to charge and prosecute will be compromised. There is more than enough evidence on the record to support such a challenge. I am sure plenty of people would love to challenge on that point. I would hate to give them an out. I would hope that people like the member for Armadale and the member for Hillarys, who care about our community and care about justice, are able to influence this Parliament to do what is legally correct rather than what is politically expedient. I do not want a dark cloud to be cast over the ability of the Corruption and Crime Commission in future iterations to do its job.

I reiterate that it is important to provide an opportunity for the opposition to speak on reports of the Joint Standing Committee on the Corruption and Crime Commission when they are tabled in this Parliament so that there is a true reflection of the intentions of the Parliament. If that opportunity is not provided to the opposition, it will be a blight on the Corruption and Crime Commission that will be looked at by the courts when challenges are brought forward. We all take our jobs very seriously. Criminals should not be allowed to get away with their criminal activities. We have seen in the past that there are loopholes in our legislation that we obviously need to close. Sometimes we tighten them up correctly and other times we just do smoke and mirrors for political reasons without taking things to the extent that we need to make sure that criminals and people who need to be in jail stay in jail. I would like everybody in this house to support the chairwoman of the Joint Standing Committee on the Corruption and Crime Commission in making sure she is able to bring commonsense and the correct processes to bear when it comes to reports. I also implore her to make sure that we get a chance to look at the reports before they are spoken on if possible—that is, they are tabled first and we then get a chance to look at them and speak on them the following week to add something to them.

Third Report — “Annual Report 2016–17”

Resumed from 14 September.

MS M.M. QUIRK (Girrawheen) [10.30 am]: It is now my privilege to speak on the third Report of the Joint Standing Committee on the Corruption and Crime Commission, “Annual Report 2016–17”. As in previous instances, this was tabled at the last sitting of Parliament. Before I go into it, I say in response to the member for Carine that if he relies on convention in relation to one matter, he also needs to rely on convention and the fact that the normal procedure is that those members not on the committee get to review the report at the time it is tabled. In this committee, where there is a level of sensitivity, it is totally inappropriate that we give the opposition access to a report ahead of time. I am confident, having worked with Hon Jim Chown for a number of months now, without disclosing what happens in the committee, that I can make the general observation that he is bringing a robust and forensic analysis on all the matters before it. This is the annual report to the fortieth Parliament; however, as the committee was only established on 15 June 2017 following baseless concerns raised by the opposition, there was not much work undertaken by the committee in this Parliament in the two weeks leading up to 30 June. As I have said previously this morning, at the time Parliament was prorogued a number of reports, although tabled previously, had not yet been the subject of government response and we have had to revisit them in the time we have been meeting as a committee. As I have also stated this morning, it is worth noting that the committee is composed solely of members who are unfamiliar with the details of previous deliberations, hearings and evidence, and also of the intricacies of the legislation, as none of us had served in this role in the last Parliament. Clarifications of the requirements of the composition of the committee, the capacity to oversee investigations and minor misconduct by the Public Sector Commissioner, and doubts expressed about the power of the CCC to investigate members of Parliament are all live issues confronting the new committee.

I urge that the current deliberations in relation to changing some standing orders by the Procedure and Privileges Committee and elsewhere be expedited. This matter was raised by way of report in the last Parliament and we need to clarify the committee’s role in the oversight of misconduct investigations by the Public Sector Commission previously undertaken by the CCC. We also await clarification of the CCC’s capacity to investigate members of Parliament other than ministers. In recent times that was the subject of a legislative amendment that was later withdrawn.

Finally, I thank my colleagues on the committee: deputy chair, Hon Jim Chown, MLC; Mr Matthew Hughes, MLA, member for Kalamunda; and Hon Alison Xamon, MLC. I also thank, as I have said previously, the conscientious and diligent committee staff: principal research officer, Alison Sharpe, and research officer, Vanessa Beckingham. In the initial stages we had to quickly assimilate some longstanding and intractable technical issues about which the previous committee had extensive corporate knowledge and background. We will address a number of the live issues I have talked about in reports to be tabled in the coming months and, as I said, hopefully the change of standing orders will clarify our position in regard to minor misconduct. We are hopeful that the clarification of these and other issues through subsequent legislative amendment is imminent.

MR M. HUGHES (Kalamunda) [10.34 am]: I am thankful for the opportunity to speak briefly to the 2016–17 annual report of the Joint Standing Committee on the Corruption and Crime Commission. In doing so, I recognise, of course, that the report covers the committee of the thirty-ninth Parliament and the commencing work of the committee of the fortieth Parliament. I would also like to express my thanks to the principal research officer,

Alison Sharpe, and Vanessa Beckingham, who have provided me with excellent orientation in my work as a committee member and explained to me in great detail the parliamentary procedures and processes attached to this committee. Members will note that we have been dutiful in bringing before the house two important reports, which the chairwoman has mentioned, the recommendations of which would have otherwise lapsed as a consequence of the prorogation of the thirty-ninth Parliament. I am pleased we have been able to ensure that the house has been able to provide a means by which those charged with the responsibility to respond to those recommendations do so in a timely manner. I was particularly appreciative of the opportunity to meet with the Corruption and Crime Commissioner and his officers on 21 June, which is referred to in this report, and to deeply understand the issues confronting the commission with respect to its resourcing and investigative powers. I also touched upon, and it was reaffirmed, that this commissioner has no desire to be involved in a prosecutorial stance to take matters before the courts; that is, he sees the importance of maintaining that distinction between the investigative role of the CCC and the work of others charged with the responsibility of prosecuting those who have engaged in behaviours that would lead to criminal charges being pressed against them. Again, I am deeply appreciative of the opportunity to be a member of the Joint Standing Committee on the Corruption and Crime Commission and I promise this house that I will discharge my responsibilities being mindful of the concerns that the opposition has in respect of the composition of the committee.

MR W.R. MARMION (Nedlands) [10.37 am] — by leave: I want to make a brief comment. This morning I went to the Assembly chamber to see whether I could get a copy of the reports. Staff misinterpreted that I was seeking the fourth report and I was told that I could not get a copy of the report until it was tabled. That highlights the problem we now have in this house, the Assembly, of the opposition not being able to get reports. As it turns out, I could have got the other three reports because they were tabled last sitting.

Ms M.M. Quirk: Yes, that is what we were talking about.

Mr W.R. MARMION: Yes, but they did not realise that. Anyway, the point I am making is that in the norm, on the day that the report is tabled no-one from the opposition would be able to speak knowingly on the reports, because that would be the first time —

Ms M.M. Quirk: That is not right. Hon Jim Chown —

Mr W.R. MARMION: In this house. No-one in this house did.

Ms M.M. Quirk: You did not say in this house.

Mr W.R. MARMION: I am saying in this house. This house is different from the other house. In the Assembly the opposition does not have access to the committee reports at the time they are tabled and can obviously not comment on them with any knowledge. I really think that is an abuse of this Assembly and I was very disappointed, not taking anything away from the honourable members, all four of whom I hold in high regard. I am referring to the report that has members of the committee; that is why it is relevant.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member, keep it relevant, because this argument does not really address the issues.

Mr W.R. MARMION: I am bringing to the house's attention that in the future no-one on our side will be able to get up and talk about any of these reports.

Ms J.M. Freeman interjected.

Mr W.R. MARMION: Madam Deputy Speaker, I cannot concentrate when there are interjections.

The chair of the CCC committee in talking about the committee's report just said that she was getting clarity for members of Parliament who could be brought before the committee. That is a serious issue. If it transpires in the future that there is a negative report about, possibly, a member from this side of the house, that report will come in and two government members will be able to talk about that opposition member. That is a very important point. I think that that shows a failure of leadership by the Premier of Western Australia. If he aspires to be a great Premier and to do great things for Western Australia, he is failing dismally on this very important test—to make sure that probity and fairness is delivered in this house. It is no use making the excuse that there is a Liberal member from the other house on the committee. How precious is that? Each house is distinct from the other, so that argument fails.

I make this point: every time the CCC committee presents a report to this house, someone on this side of the house will get up and make the same point I am making now.

Fourth Report — “Parliamentary Inspector’s report on a complaint by Dr Robert Cunningham and Ms Catherine Atoms” — Tabling

MS M.M. QUIRK (Girrawheen) [10.41 am]: I table the fourth report of the Joint Standing Committee on the Corruption and Crime Commission, titled “Parliamentary Inspector’s report on a complaint by Dr Robert Cunningham and Ms Catherine Atoms”.

[See paper 865.]

Ms M.M. QUIRK: Before I speak to the report, I will briefly comment on the comments made by the member for Nedlands. I have to say, the evidence of the opposition's interest in these matters is clear by virtue of the fact that even though the report was tabled last week, the member for Nedlands was scrambling this morning, trying to get copies of the report. I think that actions speak louder than words. It is clear that the opposition is taking a debating point and is not interested in the merits of the issues. The member for Nedlands demonstrates a complete misunderstanding of the role of the committee when he suggests that the committee has the capacity to make findings on the conduct of members of Parliament, which it does not. I implore other members of the chamber to treat the member for Nedlands' comments with the contempt they deserve.

On this report, I thank, firstly, my colleagues on the committee for their assistance: Hon Jim Chown, MLC; Mr Matthew Hughes, MLA; and, Hon Alison Xamon, MLC. I am repeating myself, but, of course, I also thank the conscientious and diligent research staff: Alison Sharpe, principal research officer; and, Vanessa Beckingham, research officer.

This is the first substantive report of the committee and is an endorsement of the work of the Parliamentary Inspector of the Corruption and Crime Commission. As the report states, the role of the parliamentary inspector is incredibly valuable and we thank him for his efforts.

Before going to the committee's conclusions, I will spend a little time going through the chronology of this matter, which has dragged on for nine years. The matter has been raised previously in this Parliament, but I think that for the benefit of more recent members of the house, it is worth addressing the issues that arose prior to addressing the committee's conclusions and discussion of the parliamentary inspector's report. I heavily rely on the previous parliamentary inspector, Mr Steytler, QC, for the chronology in the earlier report on the matter.

In the early hours of 2 November 2008, Ms Atoms was walking near the Esplanade Hotel in Fremantle with Dr Cunningham and another friend, after celebrating her birthday. She had not been drinking. Dr Cunningham and his friends came across two men in the street. One had fallen into a garden bed and the other was trying to pull him out. Dr Cunningham and his friends were asked to help pull out the man who had become wedged in the bushes. In the course of lending aid, Dr Cunningham was pushed from behind into the same garden bed by an unknown person. After Dr Cunningham had extricated himself from the garden bed, he saw two police officers speaking to Ms Atoms nearby. As she turned and walked away from the officers, one of the officers grabbed her by the arm. She screamed in pain. Dr Cunningham approached the officer to ask what was going on. As he approached he heard the officer say to Ms Atoms in an aggressive tone, "You're required to leave Fremantle", to which she replied, "That's not really possible; I live in Fremantle." This comment related to a move-on notice that the officer was attempting to issue to Ms Atoms.

Dr Cunningham approached the officer and told him he was a solicitor. As he said this, the other police officer grabbed Dr Cunningham by the arm. Dr Cunningham again said that he was a solicitor and asked why Ms Atoms was receiving a move-on notice. Both police officers then placed Dr Cunningham's hands behind his back. One officer removed his handcuffs and armaments belt. I have to say, from my past experience, I would advise people not to identify themselves as lawyers in these situations. As a young prosecutor I once asked a police officer why we were prosecuting a particular person, and the officer said that they had failed the test, to which I naively replied, "What test?" The officer replied, "The attitude test." As the officers pulled Dr Cunningham's arms behind his back he asked them to be careful with his left shoulder as a football injury had restricted the movement of his left arm. One officer pushed Dr Cunningham into the street whilst handcuffing him. Once he had been handcuffed, the other officer kicked Dr Cunningham very hard in the legs a number of times in an attempt to trip him, notwithstanding that he was wearing spectacles. Dr Cunningham was further pushed into the street towards a parked police van. He heard someone shouting from the balcony of the nearby Esplanade Hotel, "Stop the violence." That bystander was recording the incident. Dr Cunningham was then tasered, which caused excruciating pain. He fell to the ground on his face whilst handcuffed and as he lay on the road he suffered several electric shocks to his back. Ms Atoms was also tasered.

A more senior police officer arrived. Dr Cunningham told him that he was a solicitor and that all he had done was to ask one of the officers a question. The officer responded by saying words to the effect—I am quoting—"Mate, we don't give a fuck who you are or what you were doing." Dr Cunningham saw the arresting officers looking up towards the balcony from which the person had shouted earlier. They were counting the floors leading to that balcony. Dr Cunningham was then roughly put into the back of a police van with Ms Atoms. He asked several police officers why he was under arrest. His question was ignored. At no time was Dr Cunningham told that he was under arrest. Dr Cunningham asked that the handcuffs that had been overtightened to be loosened because he was in pain. His request was ignored.

At the Fremantle Police Station, Dr Cunningham asked if he could be given medical assistance. One of the officers replied—again I am quoting—"We don't give a shit about you, mate. You can always make your way to the hospital when we let you out of here." Shortly afterwards, Ms Atoms, who was nearby, made a phone call on her mobile phone. While she was in mid-sentence, the officer took the telephone from her and said words to the effect, "If you know of anyone else with a camera, tell them to bring it down here so we can delete the images."

Dr Cunningham, whose wrists were bleeding and who was suffering the after-effects of being tasered, again asked for medical assistance. This was refused. Dr Cunningham asked if he could speak with the most senior officer at the station. His request was eventually granted and he was taken into a separate room where he spoke to a sergeant. Dr Cunningham told her what had happened. Afterwards, Dr Cunningham was provided with bail, which contained a condition preventing him from attending the Esplanade Hotel. Dr Cunningham had planned to return there to see whether he could find any witnesses to the incident. He refused to sign the bail form containing this condition. Eventually, this condition was removed. After being charged and released, Dr Cunningham and Ms Atoms were charged with the offence of resisting arrest. Both Dr Cunningham and Ms Atoms were spoken to outside the station by the sergeant to whom Dr Cunningham had earlier complained. As outlined in the report, Dr Cunningham says that the sergeant said —

“Look guys, I am really sorry about what happened to you two tonight. We have a problem in WA whereby there is a shortage of police. Recently, the government has been recruiting police officers from the UK. Many of these guys have had little training and they can go a little overboard at times. Look, I am really sorry, ok?”

Eventually, both Dr Cunningham and Ms Atoms pleaded not guilty to criminal charges in the Magistrates Court and received from WA Police disclosure materials in respect of the prosecution. This included CCTV footage obtained from Marine House in Essex Street. Dr Cunningham also alleges that his office was broken into, which he believes was related to the prosecution. Also, the CCTV footage that was made available had gaps, including gaps of 13 seconds, one minute and 12 seconds, and 32 seconds respectively. The first of these occurred at the approximate time that Dr Cunningham was being kicked and tripped, and the second and third occurred at the approximate times that both were being tasered.

The matter went to the Magistrates Court on 29 April and after cross-examination of the first witness called by the prosecution, one of the arresting officers, the police prosecutor—I have to commend him for this—suggested to Dr Cunningham’s legal representative that he make a no-case submission. The submission was made and accepted by the magistrate. The charges were dismissed and \$15 000 in costs were ordered in favour of Dr Cunningham and Ms Atoms. The magistrate was extremely critical of the officer who gave evidence and made adverse findings about his credibility and also found that he was evasive and imprecise. The magistrate also noted the admission that the summary of facts was inaccurate. She believed that there had been collusion between the two officers in formulating their statements, which was further reinforced by the fact that both statements contained exactly the same spelling error, terminology and wording. Despite this, the officers continued to maintain that the statements were prepared completely independently.

In December 2008, prior to the hearing, Dr Cunningham complained to the Corruption and Crime Commission, and the CCC referred the complaint to WA Police. In May 2010, after being acquitted, Dr Cunningham wrote to the police about the incident and asked them to reopen the investigation. He was told that the police would review the court proceedings. He also wrote to the CCC asking it to investigate the complaint, given the outcome of the prosecution. On 10 July, Dr Cunningham received an opinion from the CCC that misconduct on the part of one or more of the officers may have occurred and that the CCC had asked for the police file. On 21 July, the CCC wrote to Dr Cunningham informing him that it had decided to refer the complaint back to WA Police for investigatory or other action. There is a substantial amount of correspondence, and time does not allow me to go through it all.

Dr Cunningham and Ms Atoms then took civil proceedings in the District Court. In 2016, both successfully sued three police officers involved in the incident. In December 2016, Her Honour District Court Judge Davis gave comprehensive reasons in a 241-page judgement for the plaintiffs. She awarded damages to Dr Cunningham assessed in the figure of \$110 304, and Ms Atoms was awarded damages assessed in the sum of \$1 024 822.11. She found that both plaintiffs were honest and conscientious in their evidence. Significantly, because of the malice shown by police officers in their treatment of Dr Cunningham and Ms Atoms, Her Honour awarded general, aggravated, exemplary and special damages to both. She found that the police officers’ use of excessive force constituted battery, Dr Cunningham’s imprisonment was neither lawful nor justified, the officers acted in malice in their dealings with Dr Cunningham, and the bringing and continuation of criminal charges amounted to a misuse, or wrongful or unreasonable use, of power for a purpose other than proper invocation of criminal law.

Dr Cunningham then effectively asked whether, in light of these matters and the extensive and very detailed findings of the District Court, the CCC would reopen the matter. The CCC refused to do so and Dr Cunningham then complained to the Parliamentary Inspector of the Corruption and Crime Commission, and that is the report that we have tabled today. There are comprehensive details annexed to the parliamentary inspector’s report, which I have been able to only quickly skim over. This is a significant matter and the committee entirely endorses and concurs with the findings of the parliamentary inspector, which were effectively at odds with those of the Corruption and Crime Commission.

We believe this report is significant for a number of reasons. First, it demonstrates how valuable the role of the parliamentary inspector is. His close examination and provision of independent bias without fear or favour serves

as a bulwark against complacency, inertia or, even worse, incompetence. Second, we believe it sets out a course of conduct by the CCC and, to a lesser extent, WA Police that reflects badly on both organisations. Third, the report begs the question that if the Corruption and Crime Commission declines to independently investigate a matter such as this, what are the characteristics of a case that it would be prepared to take on? Moreover, the oft-repeated assertion by the commission that it does not have the resources to undertake further examination of the matter, in light of the comprehensive 2016 findings of the District Court, is simply indefensible. As the previous parliamentary inspector, Chris Steytler, QC, found, there were credible and serious allegations, so members of the committee were really confounded that this case was considered unworthy of the commission's ongoing attention. How is it that such scrutiny by the commission is regarded as not being in the public interest? The recommendations of the parliamentary inspector are in the strongest terms available to him within his jurisdiction. The disinclination of the CCC to review the incident after evidence had been tested in civil proceedings may stem from the desire of the current commissioner to draw a line across past sub-optimal practices. Reference is made on more than one occasion in correspondence with the PICCC that many of the matters currently in contention were issues dealt with by his predecessors over a period of nine years and he was unwilling to revisit them.

The desire for quality improvement and more robust procedures in future cases is commendable and laudable. Similarly, it is conceded that the commission's scrutiny would, at best, result in a non-binding opinion and certainly would have no power to lead to prosecution action on its own motion, but the committee rejects this. The public interest suggests that WA Police deliver more proportionate disposition of the matter and this needs to be initiated by the commission making recommendations for this to occur. There will be ongoing concerns with the integrity and the capacity of the Corruption and Crime Commission to oversight internal police investigations or its own independent inquiries if, at this stage, it is not prepared to assess whether systemic deficiencies or procedures were present throughout the assessment process of this case over the years.

Finally, the most cursory examination of the efforts over many years of Dr Cunningham and Ms Atoms to have the incident reviewed leads to the conclusion that it was only their considerable persistence and resources, as well as a familiarity with the law, that enabled them to do so. This leads to the inevitable conclusion that others in similar circumstances would have capitulated at a much earlier stage. In the same way that we encourage access to justice with the legal system, the Joint Standing Committee on the Corruption and Crime Commission is highly uncomfortable with the situation in which serious misconduct and breaches of integrity standards can be disclosed only after such long, protracted and tenacious efforts.

MR M. HUGHES (Kalamunda) [11.00 am]: I will be reasonably brief on this because I believe that reports from another committee need to be tabled. My parliamentary colleague is very eager to make a contribution on that matter so I will be brief.

The chair has gone through the history of this matter in quite close detail. I have to say that as a parent in my 60s, I think of these people who were out for a good time celebrating someone's birthday and went to someone else's aid. One understands that there can be tense situations in any circumstance in which police officers have to police areas such as the Esplanade where people may be described as revelling in the experience of other birthday parties or whatever it might be. They were caught up in a process whereby in going to someone's aid, they ended up tasered, handcuffed and taken to the lock-up. There was a cover-up of what may have gone on in the street with the excessive use of force by police officers. This is not to say that this is standard behaviour by the police force, but it is certainly something that required substantial investigation by the police, given their responsibility to look at their own house and make sure that it is in order.

I am absolutely flabbergasted that the incident happened in 2008 and we are still talking about it in 2017; it is a long time. I think it is important that we take the point made by the committee chair that the only reason that it has got to this point of the Parliamentary Inspector of the Corruption and Crime Commission insisting that the Corruption and Crime Commissioner exercise the power that was given to him by the Parliament to look at serious matters of misconduct by the police is that two highly educated persons doggedly pursued their civil rights. This was not a trivial matter. Yet, for whatever reason, the CCC refused to proceed along that path. These people pursued the right to have the searchlight played across what occurred in the street and at the police station, what occurred as a result of the police investigating itself, and the evidence provided in the Magistrates Court to discredit the attempt by the police to proceed with what I regard as a malicious prosecution and an abuse of power. The parliamentary inspector sees it for what it is. The committee urges the commissioner of the CCC to see it in the same way. This is a matter of great concern to the public and cannot be ignored any longer. It requires the commissioner to take note of what the parliamentary inspector has said and to re-examine what happened and why it happened. In that way, we can ensure that it does not happen again in the future. That is what the work of the commissioner and the CCC is all about.

Others may be less skilful in their ability to prosecute their own self-interest. From my point of view, it goes to the heart of why we have the organisation of the CCC. We want to ensure that instruments of the state do not mistreat the citizens of the state. I fully endorse the recommendations that have been provided by the committee in light of

the report that the parliamentary inspector has provided to the joint standing committee. This has been before the joint standing committee previously. At that time, the joint standing committee stated —

When an apparent serious and credible complaint alleging excessive use of force by police is made to the CCC, it is plainly the role of the commission to conduct a full and independent investigation. As stated by the committee in ... an earlier report, —

To Parliament —

the committee is firmly of the belief that the CCC's priority should be on improving its oversight of WA Police, as the committee believes that the CCC's most important function is to ensure that the work and role of WA Police is not hampered by misconduct or corruption.

The parliamentary inspector's report on this matter has strengthened the committee's belief that the CCC should be doing significantly more. When will the commissioner hear what the joint standing committee is saying and what the parliamentary inspector is saying about this matter? He should do something about it.

DR A.D. BUTI (Armadale) [11.06 am] — by leave: We have just heard significant contributions from the chair of the committee and the member for Kalamunda, who is also a member of the Joint Standing Committee on the Corruption and Crime Commission. We are all diminished in this place by the fact that it has taken all these years for a report on this case by the Parliamentary Inspector of the Corruption and Crime Commission to finally be tabled in this Parliament. This matter was first raised in this Parliament in 2011 by the then shadow Attorney General as a matter of public interest. The government at the time did not appear to take great interest in the matter. The member for Girrawheen, who is the chair of the committee, outlined a chronology of this event. As she was doing that, many members were surprised to hear the details of this case. If one goes through the facts of this case, it is hard to understand how the police were not brought to account until many years later. It took a civil action at considerable financial and personal cost to Ms Atoms and Dr Cunningham.

I think it is on record, but before I continue I should state that they are friends of mine and that I used to work with Dr Cunningham. Members have heard the basic facts of the case, which went all the way to the District Court. Members have heard of the consistent battles and the effort of Dr Cunningham to have this matter addressed by the CCC. At every turn, the CCC did not act in a positive manner. I have just received a copy of the report that has just been tabled. If members turn to page 19, which is part of the parliamentary inspector's report that is an appendix to the tabled report, they will see some points he mentions that came out of the District Court decision by the honourable Justice Davis.

We heard that Ms Atoms and Professor Cunningham were successful in pursuing that case. We should be aware that they received damages because of the wrongs that have been committed against them. I will go to some of the points in this document. It states —

3. Very little of the evidence given by police officer Traynor as to what occurred on the footpath at the time of the incident was supported by CCTV footage; on critical issues his evidence was manufactured or reconstructed in an attempt to put himself in the best possible light or to justify what he did; his evidence was inconsistent and neither accurate nor reliable, and Her Honour was unable to accept any of his evidence unless it was inherently probable or corroborated by other acceptable evidence;

Further down, it states —

6. There were no reasonable grounds for the police officers to suspect that Ms Atoms committed a breach of the peace or the offence of disorderly conduct or was hindering or obstructing the officers; there were no reasonable grounds for the officers to give her a move-on notice, or for telling her that she would be getting such an order; there were no reasonable grounds for the officers to ask her for her name and address ...

And there was —

no lawful reason to touch, grab or detain her, and—

The police officer's —

... restraint and detention of her was unlawful;

These are the words of a judge of the District Court, as summarised by the Parliamentary Inspector of the Corruption and Crime Commission —

8. The three police officers acted with malice in their dealings with Ms Atom, and the bringing and continuation of the charges against her by officer Clark amounted to a misuse, or wrongful or unreasonable use, of power for a purpose other than the proper invocation of the criminal law;
9. There was no justification for the arrest of Dr Cunningham and it, and everything which followed his arrest, was unlawful;
10. The force used to arrest Dr Cunningham and his subsequent treatment by police officers Traynor and Clark was unnecessary and excessive, and there was no justification for tasing him ...

I actually went to the initial hearing on this matter in the Magistrates Court, where the charges were brought against Dr Cunningham and Ms Atoms, and I saw some of the closed-circuit television footage. The footage does not actually show the tasing, but it is hard to believe that in Western Australia in the twenty-first century this has happened and the police officers were not brought to account by either internal investigation or the Corruption and Crime Commission. We have to remember here that the former parliamentary inspector, Justice Steytler, came across this matter by chance because Dr Cunningham bumped into him at the Law School at the University of Western Australia where they were colleagues.

I wish I had all day to talk about this case. Another issue not raised in this report is that when Dr Cunningham was working at UWA, his office was broken into and the hard drive was taken from his computer. I used to work in that building so I know that a person would have to have known where his office was. My view is that it was not a random burglary. I also raised in this house previously the intimidation that they both endured as a result of pursuing this case. An allegation was made that one day a police officer knocked on the door of Ms Atoms' apartment holding some paperwork that indicated her car had been involved in a hit-and-run accident, which did not take place. The allegations that were made by Ms Atoms and Dr Cunningham have now been proven to be correct. The institutions that we live under in Western Australia have failed them. It was only through the fact that they have a good knowledge of the law and were very determined individuals that this case was pursued in the District Court. It could be argued that the District Court case dealt with their personal issues—that is true, obviously—but Dr Cunningham's continual efforts in asking the Corruption and Crime Commission to investigate this is not only for him, it is for every citizen of Western Australia. As I said, how the internal investigation and the initial CCC report could say that no excessive force was used in this case is truly beyond comprehension. Dr Cunningham and Ms Atoms have pursued this case because they want to live in a society—I think the member for Kalamunda mentioned this—that protects civil rights; not just their civil rights but the civil rights of all Western Australians.

Dr Cunningham and Ms Atoms had gone out for an evening in Fremantle and were minding their own business. Actually, Dr Cunningham was being a good Samaritan because he had stopped to help someone who had fallen into a garden bed outside the Esplanade Hotel. As a result, he and Ms Atoms were tasered and treated appallingly by the police officers at Fremantle Police Station. Their efforts to have the police officers brought to account were disregarded. They endured a criminal prosecution, but by lunchtime the police prosecutor had decided there were grounds for a no-case submission. In that hearing, a police officer gave evidence and, if I remember rightly, the defence lawyer asked one of the police officers, "Did you corroborate with the other police witness with regard to your statement?" He answered that he had not. The lawyer then said, "Well, it's funny how on that line of your statement you have the same spelling mistake as he does." As the magistrate in that hearing stated, the evidence of the police officer was unreliable, and when it got to the District Court it was proven to be unreliable. This goes beyond some of the matters that I have just mentioned. I think the member for Girrawheen mentioned that footage was taken of the incident by Dr Mark Brophy. A number of witnesses were also present, but footage was taken of the incident. Police went back to the person who took the footage and confiscated it, so there was also a cover-up. This case is appalling because this incident occurred in 2008 and it is only now, in 2017, that justice is finally being addressed.

EDUCATION AND HEALTH STANDING COMMITTEE

Second Report — "Annual Report 2016–17"

Resumed from 14 September.

MS J.M. FREEMAN (Mirrabooka) [11.17 am]: I rise to speak on the Education and Health Standing Committee's second report, titled "Annual Report 2016–17". I thank the member for Girrawheen for agreeing to move it down on the notice paper and speaking on her report first. I also thank the previous committee for its good work in its last report. It was an honour to be in this place and listen to the submissions on what was a very serious issue. In speaking to this annual report, which was tabled during the last sitting, I first want to put on record a thankyou to the previous chair of the committee, Dr Graham Jacobs, who was not returned to the Parliament this term. It should be noted that we no longer have a medical practitioner in the Legislative Assembly, with both Dr Graham Jacobs and Dr Kim Hames leaving, which is a bit sad given how helpful Dr Jacobs was whenever we had a medical issue. I recall the current Minister for Transport having quite a serious rash at one stage and Dr Graham Jacobs was an absolute asset to have in the House at that point in time. He was also an asset to have as the Chair of the Education and Health Standing Committee, and I want to put it on record that we wish him well in his next career and his life, given that he was not returned to Parliament for this term.

In the chair's foreword in the report, I have written about the sentiments of the committee. It states — As chair, Dr Jacobs was committed to achieving outcomes designed to benefit the taxpayers of this State, and to questioning waste and mismanagement. His compassion shone through in his consideration of witnesses, particularly community members, and his desire to deliver useful documents that set out achievable change for the better is to be commended.

I wanted to put on the record in this house that we appreciate his efforts and wish him well.

The annual report goes through two periods: the final months of the previous Parliament from July to November 2016 and the current committee's activities from its formation on 23 May until 30 June 2017. I particularly want to note a couple of the reports completed during the previous Parliament, one of which was the independent public school report that we put before the Parliament titled "IPS Report Card". I also want to put on record that the actions of government at the time against the chair and the questioning of the chair's motives for the report were frankly disrespectful to the intention of the committee and the chair to bring out a report that was about highlighting some of the issues around independent public schools. I point out the chair's foreword of the report, which states —

Independent Public Schools, particularly early adopters, have benefitted by being able to recruit the best teachers. This benefit is at the expense of later adopters, and schools which have not become Independent Public Schools, who must accept redeployees, and are likely to be staffed with teachers who are less suitable for the school environment and have less experience. A 'two-tiered system' is reinforced, whereby more capable schools receive more benefits, and less capable schools fall further behind.

I note that the response from the previous government was very negative and tried to make out that it was a political report, which it never was, given the make-up of the committee. In saying that, I am looking forward to the current government's response to the report in terms of its implementation, and I understand it has taken it quite seriously.

I also want to comment briefly about the "Learnings from the message stick" report. The final report came down very late in the piece and the previous government did not put in a response. I understand the current government intends to give some response to the committee and we are looking forward to that. I want to highlight a comment from the chair's foreword, which states —

A glaring issue for us was that no one—no one organisation, no one agency—takes ownership nor leads the response to improve the wellbeing of Aboriginal people. The Committee could not identify who takes ultimate responsibility and is accountable for government action.

"Learnings from the message stick" was a report on the inquiry into Aboriginal youth suicide in remote areas. It is a very important issue, and one that the coroner is currently looking at and that we all need to take an interest in. I note that as part of that process there was also a final report from the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Suicide Prevention Evaluation Project. That report concludes with recommendations for government and other activity pertaining to Indigenous suicide prevention. One of the strong recommendations was for the use of justice reinvestment principles for a range of upstream diversionary activity for Indigenous young people away from the criminal justice system. I commend the team on that recommendation. In terms of personal experience, the Wadjak Northside Aboriginal Community Centre works with young people at risk within the youth justice area. It would absolutely benefit young people to work with the centre before they become at risk to give them exposure to and pride in culture, to build their confidence in themselves and their future and to give them an understanding of their own strengths to forge a future in the community. We really need to look at justice reinvestment. I understand the government is committed to that and is considering a number of areas. I also point out that this report—it is something that came through strongly in our message stick report—outlines that a common success factor in community-based interventions or responses to Indigenous suicide was that they were developed and implemented using a foundation of Indigenous leadership in partnership with Indigenous communities. The ATSIPEP report goes on to state that the involvement of elders is not separable from community leadership and states —

Generally, suicide prevention activity should aim to employ community members. 'Peer to peer' context is a common feature of several successful programs, particularly those aimed at young people.

I suggest that if people want a good summary of what has occurred in Aboriginal youth suicide prevention and the many reports around Aboriginal wellbeing and progress, the "Learnings from the message stick" report is a very good summary. It is a very good report that takes into account all those issues, projects and recommendations of previous reports. It is a good summary of that and it should not be consigned to being "just another report", given the work that was done by the committee and the chair.

I would like to talk briefly about the e-cigarettes report that we tabled in this house. Since that time, we have had a response from the Minister for Health and the government, and I thank the Minister for Health for the response. He noted the federal Standing Committee on Health, Aged Care and Sports inquiry into the use and marketing of electronic cigarettes and personal vaporisers in Australia. He also noted the Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee inquiry into the Vaporised Nicotine Products Bill 2017 put up by Senator Leyonhjelm. The Senate inquiry into that bill has concluded and the committee has made a finding not to support the bill or any lessening or broadening of issues around vaporised nicotine products at this time. The Standing Committee on Health, Aged Care and Sports inquiry continues. In the government's response, the Minister for Health refers to the precautionary principle for e-cigarettes that places the burden of proof on the proponents of the particular activity—in this case, manufacturers and importers of e-cigarettes—to demonstrate the safety and utility of their product.

I just want to put clearly and firmly on the record that I am not necessarily a supporter of e-cigarettes. I want to put that on record because sometimes people think that because we brought that report to the house, that is my position. My position is not based on that. My position is that we, as a Parliament, are faced with an unregulated market and the supply into that unregulated market. Despite the Department of Health and various others, including the minister, repeating to us that it is illegal and that it cannot occur, it is occurring. My concern is that it is occurring in a manner that contributes to, rather than decreases, the health risk. My only concern is that by continuing to say, “We are on a precautionary principle and our precautionary principle is that it is illegal, it does not occur and we are not going to do anything about it”, we are failing the community. One of the issues in the documentation that the minister sent to the committee was a submission to the Standing Committee on Health, Aged Care and Sport that outlines the market aspect of it. The government response discusses the fact that there is a market, and goes on to state —

The Western Australian Government strongly supports a precautionary approach to the regulation of e-cigarettes. Until there is clear and demonstrable evidence that these products are not harmful to the health of users and people around them, or alternatively, there is an accurate understanding of the extent of any harm which they may cause, it is not good public health policy to let these products into the market place.

I hate to tell the government that they are in the marketplace. To say that they are not there is not good public health policy. It is like saying, in relation to the taxi industry, that Uber does not exist. It did exist, the government did not respond, and we ended up with a problem. The response states, further on —

... the Western Australian Government respectfully considers that effective monitoring and enforcement of any partial restriction would be extremely difficult. There is no visual means of determining the chemical nature of the inhalable matter contained in electronic cigarettes. Even if originally supplied as a nicotine-free device, they are easily modified to deliver nicotine or a range of illicit substances.

Although I commend the minister for the response, and I note that the Department of Health will conduct a review of the Tobacco Products Control Act in 2018, we need to be on the front foot, which is a better public health response. I also note the Eliminate Cancer Initiative funded by Nicola and Andrew Forrest is seeking advice on mounting a case seeking compensation from tobacco companies, based on the Canadian lawsuits, and I congratulate them on that. I am not sure about the other proposal of raising the smoking age to 21. I do not think that setting up another illegal trade, as is happening with e-cigarettes, would be a responsible way to go. I do not think it would be effective. People aged 21 do a lot of other things, such as paying taxes and so on, so I do not think that that would be an appropriate response.

I want to end by talking about the committee’s current inquiry into vocational education training in schools. It is a great inquiry. We have had some excellent submissions from various school organisations, including the principals’ association and the State School Teachers’ Union of WA. The Department of Education provided a great submission, as did the Department of Training and Workforce Development. It is a complex area that has grown in student participation. Those excellent contributions will give the committee the capacity to make a good policy contribution in this Parliament that the government can then utilise and assess, and produce outcomes that benefit students. The parent and child health centres that we have in our schools came from a report of the Education and Health Standing Committee.

We must remember the benefit of committees in advancing the public policy debate. I therefore want to place on record that I understand that the Department of Education is currently developing guidelines, and in fact sent a memo to all staff about giving evidence to committees. That memo struck fear into a few hearts, as I understand, because they fear being questioned. I understand that the Department of Education is now developing guidelines. I do not think fear was the intention of the department. I think the intent was to make people aware, so that they can give good contributions. I understand, given the department’s excellent contribution to our committee, that it would not be its intention to intimidate people. I want to put on record that it would be greatly appreciated if those guidelines do not cause fear or trepidation in independent contributions from union members who hold positions in the State School Teachers’ Union, members of the WA principals’ association or other representatives, such as chairs of independent school boards. It is really important in the public debate to put those views out there. Committees can take confidential evidence. We do not want a situation in which people feel trepidation about what they want to contribute to the debate. Education has always been an area in which there has been broad policy debate, and debate about structure and delivery to the community, and we want to make sure that the parliamentary committee, in both education and health, can continue to provide the rich context it always has. In the development of any guidelines, circulars or memos, people should take into account that we will work with government and departments to make sure that we have the best possible outcomes for students and patients. That is the purpose of committees. We hold that responsibility very dearly. I have gone through some of the reports that have delivered on those things, and are part of that public debate. I want to maintain the good, cohesive, collaborative relationship that we have established, so that we can produce great reports that contribute to the public debate.

MS S.E. WINTON (Wanneroo) [11.37 am]: I would like to contribute briefly to debate on the annual report of the Education and Health Standing Committee. Before I do, Mr Acting Speaker, I would like you to indulge me in welcoming students from Carramar Primary School, and their teacher, Sue Simpson, who are in the Speaker's gallery this morning and will be joining me for lunch.

I firstly acknowledge my fellow committee members and the chair of the committee, the member for Mirrabooka. As a new member of Parliament, it has been an interesting exercise to be part of this committee process, so I am delighted to present the annual report for the Assembly's consideration. I would like to also acknowledge the ongoing work of the committee staff. As a new member of Parliament and a new member of the committee, I really appreciate the support, guidance and mentoring that they have provided to me and all members of the committee.

Ms J.M. Freeman interjected.

Ms S.E. WINTON: The chair of the committee, the member for Mirrabooka, is also very grateful for the support she receives.

Given that I have only a few minutes, I want to take this opportunity to address just one inquiry report mentioned in the annual report—that in relation to independent public schools. Although I was not on the committee, having been a teacher for 27 years, I know all about independent public schools quite intimately, so I think I have something to offer in that regard. Let us be clear, and the committee chair did articulate this: the report on independent public schools by the standing committee was scathing. I want to take this opportunity to read into the record some of the comments in the executive summary to the report, "IPS Report Card: The Report of the Inquiry into the Independent Public Schools initiative". It states in part —

The introduction of the IPS initiative has had no significant effect on the academic or non-academic performance of students, including those with additional needs ...

Further, while the DoE acknowledges that teacher quality is paramount in improving student outcomes, it is not clear to the Committee how the IPS initiative directly promotes improved teacher quality. This ought to be the primary focus of future educational reforms.

Members might remember that I said in my inaugural speech—being quite passionate as a former teacher—that I will always, always advocate and support the notion that teacher quality impacts on student outcomes.

The report made 43 findings and 21 recommendations. Recommendation 1 was —

The Department of Education should focus on improving teacher quality and teaching practices as the most influential method of improving student outcomes.

I cannot help but say that our government has done a fair bit to help achieve that by re-establishing in our schools the level 3 classroom teacher status.

Finding 6 was —

Improving student outcomes should be a key priority of any future educational reform.

Finding 14 was —

The Independent Public School initiative has reinforced the existing inequalities within the public education sector.

Finding 27 was —

Principals of Independent Public Schools are burdened with greater administrative responsibility during the transition process and beyond. Principals therefore have less opportunity to focus on being educators.

Finding 28 was —

Due to the reduction in numbers of central and regional office staff, there is less support, guidance and training available to Independent Public School principals.

That is no small wonder, because the IPS system was gutted by the former government.

The report goes on and on, and I would have liked more time to talk about it in detail. The committee did an incredibly fantastic and detailed job in looking at independent public schools. As I have said, it made 43 findings and 21 recommendations.

Mr M. Hughes: Did the government respond?

Ms S.E. WINTON: I am glad the member for Kalamunda asked about that. The government did respond, as all good governments should do. However, I am very disappointed about the response by the former government. Of the 43 findings, 38 were rejected; and of the 21 recommendations, 17 were rejected. Those findings and recommendations were not even acknowledged. They were just rejected. The former government's response is stunning. As a new member of the committee, I am interested to know whether the work that we do at a committee level is taken seriously and whether this important parliamentary process achieves any outcomes. I am stunned that three of the four

recommendations that the government did accept revolved around acknowledging that there needs to be more professional development for parents on IPS boards. Beyond that, the former government did nothing to address the serious concerns raised by the Education and Health Standing Committee of the thirty-ninth Parliament.

The chair of the committee, the member for Mirrabooka, has highlighted her concerns about the response of the former government to the IPS report. The committee submitted a report in objection to the former government's response to the IPS report. In effect, the committee had to defend itself against the government's response. The committee's response states in part —

The Report's findings and recommendations were made based on the evidence the Committee received during the inquiry. The Government Response devalues the evidence of submitters and witnesses, upon whose ready participation the oversight role of parliamentary committees depends.

As a new member of Parliament, I am starting to understand how serious this is. As the member for Mirrabooka said, the committee is currently conducting an inquiry into vocational education and training in schools. We are hearing from witnesses. I cannot imagine that we would devalue their evidence so much as to dismiss it out of hand. That is quite unbelievable.

Before my time expires, I want to read from the chairman's foreword to the IPS report. It states in part —

The Committee's concerns that the IPS initiative exacerbates a two-tiered system by allowing IP Schools to select the more appropriate teachers, leaving less suitable teachers available for positions at non-IP Schools, was a major concern raised ...

That was not acknowledged by the former government. I find it disappointing that since I have been a member of this place, the member for Scarborough has been focused on challenging this government when we are trying to fix the mess that the previous government left in the education system. The member for Scarborough should be trying to help fix the system. IPS is a good idea. However, good ideas need to be implemented well. The new Perth Children's Hospital was a good idea, too, but it needs to be implemented well. We are fixing the budget mess. We are also going to fix the education mess and make sure that the IPS system does what it was set up to do—improve outcomes for students in all public schools.

I will conclude with this comment: the Mark McGowan government is committed to giving all children a quality education, no matter where they live and no matter which school they go to. Thank you.

MR W.R. MARMION (Nedlands) [11.46 pm]: I also want to speak to the second report of the Education and Health Standing Committee, titled "Annual Report 2016–17". This is the first time I have been a member of a committee, and I have only positive comments to make. I will be representing the committee not as a member of the Liberal Party but in bringing to the committee my expertise and life experiences. I am sure that the reports the committee will produce will not be biased. The committee has great representation. The chair of the committee is the member for Mirrabooka, I am the deputy chair, and the other very important members are the members for Kimberley, Moore and Wanneroo. We represent a wide cross-section of this house. We also represent a wide geographical cross-section of Western Australia. That is quite difficult to get on a committee that comprises five members.

I would like to acknowledge the wonderful work done by the committee's principal research officer, Dr Sarah Palmer, BA (Hons), PhD, and the research officer, Ms Jovita Hogan, BA (Hons). I look forward to the future and the important role the committee can play in education and health policy in Western Australia.

This week is Mental Health Week. The committee can do some positive work to ensure that the mental health policies delivered by this government are effective. Suicide prevention must be the first and foremost issue. We need to ensure that the work we do on suicide prevention is as effective as it can be in addressing the alarming suicide rate, particularly among young people. I need to apologise to the house—as a replacement member on the committee from this side of the house, I am not a doctor! Dr Graham Jacobs, the former chair of the committee, was one of two doctors in this house at the time, and we now do not have any doctors in this house.

Dr A.D. Buti: You have got a doctor in front of you!

Mr W.R. MARMION: I recall an incident when the proceedings of the house had to be suspended for a couple of minutes. During an estimates committee, one of the directors from the Department of Mines and Petroleum, Beverley Bower—who incidentally studied engineering in my year at the University of Western Australia—fell over at the back of the chamber. Graham Jacobs, who was sitting close by at the time, made sure she was looked after. Western Australia is such a small place that it turned out that the acting chair of the estimates committee at the time, Wendy Duncan, was in the same class at school as Beverley Bower, and they actually fought each other for dux of Methodist Ladies' College at the time. Unfortunately, I cannot bring medical expertise to the house or the committee. The closest I can come is that I was chief of staff to Hon Peter Foss when he was Minister for Health, so I have a little bit of background from many decades ago in this area. I am looking forward to our committee working efficiently and effectively to implement or assist the government in good policy development in education and health.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE*First Report — “Budget Briefing 2017–18” — Tabling*

DR A.D. BUTI (Armadale) [11.50 am]: I present for tabling the first report of the Public Accounts Committee titled “Budget Briefing 2017–18”.

[See paper 866.]

Dr A.D. BUTI: I do not intend speaking on the report apart from saying thank you to the principal research officer, Tim Hughes; and research officer; Kyle Heritage; and also to my fellow committee members, deputy chair, Mr Dean Nalder, member of Bateman; Mr Barry Urban, member for Darling Range; Mr Simon Millman, member for Mount Lawley; and Mr Vince Catania, member for North West Central.

JOINT STANDING COMMITTEE ON DELEGATED LEGISLATION*First Report — “Observations arising from the Committee review of the City of Joondalup Local Government and Public Property Amendment Local Law 2015”*

Resumed from 14 September.

MS E. HAMILTON (Joondalup) [11.50 am]: I rise to speak on the first report of the Joint Standing Committee on Delegated Legislation, titled “Observations arising from the Committee review of the City of Joondalup Local Government and Public Property Amendment Local Law 2015”. The report I tabled advises the house of the need to obtain a response from the government about the recommendation made by the previous Joint Standing Committee on Delegated Legislation of 2013 to 2017 in its eighty-seventh report of the same title. The eighty-seventh report raised important issues relating to determination-making powers in local laws that may impact on the existing rights of groups or individuals. The concerns raised in the eighty-seventh report are relevant beyond the local law in question, as many local laws include the power to make determination devices. The report made one recommendation to the government. The eighty-seventh report was tabled in both houses on 8 September 2016 and a government response was due to be tabled in the Legislative Council on 8 November 2016; however, it transpired that the report was not debated in this house and the government’s response to the recommendation was not tabled prior to the prorogation of the Parliament on 30 January 2017. The committee is of the view that it is important for the government to consider the issues raised in the eighty-seventh report and advise the houses of its response to the action recommended in the report. For the reasons outlined in the eighty-seventh report, the committee agrees with and reiterates the recommendation in the report. The committee’s reiteration of the same recommendation in this report will ensure that a government response on the matter is provided to the Legislative Council, as is required under standing order 191, and provide the Legislative Council with an adequate opportunity to consider the issues raised in the eighty-seventh report. I commend the report to the house.

Second Report — “Town of Cambridge Local Government and Public Property Local Law 2016”

Resumed from 14 September.

MS E. HAMILTON (Joondalup) [11.52 am]: I rise to speak on the second report of the Joint Standing Committee on Delegated Legislation, titled “Town of Cambridge Local Government and Public Property Local Law 2016”. The report I tabled advises the house firstly, that the Town of Cambridge did not follow the mandatory sequential procedure prescribed in section 3.61 of the Local Government Act 1995 when it made the Town of Cambridge Local Government and Public Property Local Law 2016; secondly, the procedure in section 3.61 required the town to first obtain the Governor’s approval to apply the local law to places outside its district before making the local law—the town failed to obtain the Governor’s approval; thirdly, being invalidly made, the local law offends the committee’s term of reference 10.6(a) in that it is not within the power of the act; and fourthly, the committee recommends that the local law be disallowed. I commend the report to the house.

Third Report — “Procedures for dealing with consequential amendments to delegated legislation following enactment of primary legislation” — Tabling

MS E. HAMILTON (Joondalup) [11.53 am]: I present for tabling the third report of the Joint Standing Committee on Delegated Legislation, titled “Procedures for dealing with consequential amendments to delegated legislation following enactment of primary legislation”.

[See paper 867.]

Ms E. HAMILTON: The report I have just tabled advised the house of the administrative arrangement between the Joint Standing Committee on Delegated Legislation and the Parliamentary Counsel’s Office, which I will refer to as the PCO. The arrangement facilitates more efficient coordination and delivery of explanatory memoranda from government agencies to the committee in limited circumstances. Occasionally, the enactment or amendment of primary legislation will necessitate consequential amendments to a suite of statutory instruments, including delegated legislation. Some such amendments may simply replace old terminology or update references in statutory definitions. In some circumstances these consequential amendments affect delegated legislation

administered by a range of government agencies. Under usual procedures outlined in the Premier's Circular 2014/01, explanatory memoranda would have to be produced by the various affected agencies for every amending instrument, all signed by the relevant ministers and chief executive officers. The committee and the PCO have come to an administrative agreement whereby in these limited scenarios the affected agencies are able to supply explanatory memoranda to the committee under modified procedures. In essence, it has been agreed that in circumstances in which the passing of primary legislation results in consequential amendments to instruments of delegated legislation administered by agencies other than the one responsible for the new legislation, the committee will accept the explanatory memoranda that has been signed by the CEO of the responsible agency acting in a coordinating role on behalf of other agencies and signed or initialled by the minister responsible for that agency. Under the arrangement the PCO and/or the relevant responsible agency should advise the committee staff either in advance or in the relevant explanatory memorandum when the explanatory memorandum material is being supplied, pursuant to the arrangement. The committee in the thirty-eighth and thirty-ninth Parliaments entered into similar arrangements with the PCO. The arrangement has evolved over the years and the report informs the Parliament of the terms of the current arrangement. I commend the report to the house.

PAY-ROLL TAX AMENDMENT (DEBT AND DEFICIT REMEDIATION) BILL 2017

Introduction and First Reading

Bill introduced, on motion by **Mr D.A. Templeman (Leader of the House)** on behalf of Mr B.S. Wyatt (Minister for Finance), and read a first time.

Explanatory memorandum presented by the Leader of the House.

Second Reading

MR D.A. TEMPLEMAN (Mandurah — Leader of the House) [11.56 am]: On behalf of the Minister for Finance, I move —

That the bill be now read a second time.

This bill seeks to amend the Pay-roll Tax Act 2002 to temporarily introduce a progressive payroll tax scale in Western Australia for five years from 1 July 2018. In response to downward revisions of general government revenue in Western Australia of \$5 billion since the March state election, the state government has had to introduce several fiscal repair measures in the 2017–18 state budget to return the state's finances to a more sustainable footing. One of those measures is the temporary introduction of a progressive payroll tax scale from 1 July 2018 to 30 June 2023. Under this scale, rather than paying a rate of 5.5 per cent, Western Australian employers with an Australia-wide payroll exceeding \$100 million will pay an effective marginal tax rate of six per cent on the part of their Western Australian payroll exceeding \$100 million relative to their Australia-wide payroll and an effective marginal tax rate of 6.5 per cent on the part of their payroll exceeding \$1.5 billion.

To give effect to the new progressive scale, formulas have been devised that take into account all relevant factors to arrive at a single rate to apply to an employer's total Western Australian wages. Employers that operate in Western Australia and elsewhere in Australia will pay the same effective rate of tax on their Western Australian wages as employers with the same wages that operate solely in Western Australia.

It is estimated that around 1 300 employers will be affected by these amendments. This represents around eight per cent of all employers that pay payroll tax in Western Australia or less than one per cent of all employers in the state. Importantly, employer groups with annual Australia-wide payrolls of less than \$100 million, which comprise the vast majority of employers that pay payroll tax in Western Australia, will not be affected by these amendments.

Given the temporary nature of the payroll tax increase and its application to only a small number of the largest businesses in this state, the state government does not expect this proposal to have a significant impact on employment in Western Australia. This measure is estimated to raise around \$435 million over the period 2018–19 to 2020–21. Other amendments necessary for the implementation of the temporary progressive payroll tax scale are contained in the Pay-roll Tax Assessment Amendment (Debt and Deficit Remediation) Bill 2017.

The associated explanatory memorandum contains further details on the amendments.

I commend the bill to the house.

Debate adjourned, on motion by **Ms L. Mettam**.

PAY-ROLL TAX ASSESSMENT AMENDMENT (DEBT AND DEFICIT REMEDIATION) BILL 2017

Introduction and First Reading

Bill introduced, on motion by **Mr D.A. Templeman (Leader of the House)** on behalf of Mr B.S. Wyatt (Minister for Finance), and read a first time.

Explanatory memorandum presented by the Leader of the House.

Second Reading

MR D.A. TEMPLEMAN (Mandurah — Leader of the House) [12.01 pm]: On behalf of the Minister for Finance, I move —

That the bill be now read a second time.

This bill seeks to amend the Pay-roll Tax Assessment Act 2002 to complement the amendments to the Pay-roll Tax Act 2002 that are contained in the Pay-roll Tax Amendment (Debt and Deficit Remediation) Bill 2017. That bill temporarily introduces a progressive payroll tax scale from 1 July 2018 to 30 June 2023. Under the Constitution Acts Amendment Act 1899, bills imposing taxation must deal only with the imposition of the tax, which means that administrative matters relating to the introduction of the progressive payroll tax scale must be contained in a different bill from one that imposes the progressive scale. This bill provides the supporting administrative provisions for the imposition of the progressive scale. The associated explanatory memorandum contains further details on the amendments.

I commend the bill to the house.

Debate adjourned, on motion by **Ms L. Mettam**.

SALARIES AND ALLOWANCES AMENDMENT (DEBT AND DEFICIT REMEDIATION) BILL 2017*Declaration as Urgent*

MR M. McGOWAN (Rockingham — Minister for Public Sector Management) [12.03 pm]: In accordance with standing order 168(2), I move —

That the bill be considered an urgent bill.

I will speak briefly on the urgency motion to explain the why, from the government's point of view, the Salaries and Allowances Amendment (Debt and Deficit Remediation) Bill 2017 is an urgent bill. This matter was the subject of some discussion in question time yesterday. The bill essentially freezes the salaries of members of Parliament, ministers, judicial officers, senior public servants and heads of government trading enterprises for a period until the middle of 2021, and contains a direction, if you like, by the Parliament to the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal over that time. We know the reasons for it. It is unpleasant, but the state's finances are in such a state that we need to show leadership in this place and elsewhere in respect of the determinations of the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal. That is the purpose of the bill. I think it is very straightforward, and I think most members would understand the reason it is urgent.

So members are aware, the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal is required to make a ruling for members of Parliament by 30 November this year—that is the end of next month. The tribunal can make a ruling at any point in time between now and then, but 30 November is the final date on which it must issue a ruling. Any time between now and then, the SAT can make a ruling. It can ignore the government's point of view on these issues, so it is important that we deal with this legislation prior to that time. In addition, in any given year the tribunal makes around 40 variations to salaries, allowances and the like in the categories that it covers. At any given point in time the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal has the opportunity to make a ruling.

The Salaries and Allowances Tribunal does a good job; we all understand its purpose. It has been managing these issues for around 30 years, but the financial situation that confronts the state is unprecedented and that is why this bill is required. It will set a good example for the remainder of the public sector. I repeat, for members' knowledge, the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal is required to make a ruling in relation to public servants by 30 November. Therefore, we want to deal with this legislation as soon as possible to ensure that that matter is dealt with. On top of that, the SAT makes up to 40 variations each year on issues that relate to people's salaries and allowances. At any given point in time, determinations can be made. That is why the bill must be dealt with urgently. It is nothing more sinister than that. We think it is a simple and straightforward matter for this Parliament to deal with.

DR M.D. NAHAN (Riverton — Leader of the Opposition) [12.07 pm]: This declaration of urgency motion is a cheap political stunt by the Premier. There is no reason whatsoever for this bill to be dealt with urgently. First, in June this year the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal froze public servants' wages for one year. The SAT made a determination for parliamentarians in December last year, which was brought into effect on 12 March this year, that froze parliamentary allowances and wages for a year. By the way, that was the second year in a row that the SAT froze parliamentary wages and allowances. The SAT is required to accept, and has had a long history of accepting, the wages policy of the government. Indeed, it has gone beyond that by restraining senior public sector wages. The Premier's argument that this bill is urgent is vacuous. It is a stunt.

This is a serious issue. The Premier is taking personal responsibility for the determination of all wages of the judiciary, parliamentarians and senior executives in the public sector—overriding the SAT. I might add that we had a briefing yesterday, and the public servants who briefed us could not answer the majority of the questions about the detail and the conditions upon which certain issues were excluded from the bill. There is a raft of

exclusions from the bill and they could not explain the rationale for those exclusions and the importance of them. Also, when the bill's policy was first mooted in May this year, it included senior executives and chief executive officers of local government. Now that is out, and there has been no explanation provided. This bill is not urgent. The Premier is concocting a story to override the SAT and to freeze wages that are already frozen. He could go through the normal process, brief Parliament as appropriate, and proceed with the bill, but he is bringing this bill on as a cheap political stunt.

Mr A. Krsticevic: Another one.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: It is another one, and it brings us to the heart of this government: this government has broken every convention than can be imagined.

Several members interjected.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: The government has broken every convention that members can imagine.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members!

Dr M.D. NAHAN: It has stacked the Joint Standing Committee on the Corruption and Crime Commission. Ministers have been refusing to answer questions in Parliament. In fact, the Minister for Mines and Petroleum yesterday said that he did not want to answer questions on notice. He said that he did not have to. He has not answered them. He had a whole range of them. He said that he was above Parliament to answer those questions. That is what he said. The government and the Premier are setting the standards in this place, and they are as low as they can go. This is just another step in undermining the Parliament, undermining the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal and undermining the processes of government. The Premier is taking over the responsibilities for the wages and conditions of the judiciary. He just said, "Do it urgently! Don't debate it! Don't be briefed on it! Don't see the ramifications of it!" In fact, our colleagues in the National Party have not even been briefed on this bill. The Premier is demanding that we support it. This is a cheap political stunt by a Premier who is nothing but a man of cheap political stunts. We do not have the numbers in this house. The government won in a landslide, but it will be held accountable for this one. This bill has all sorts of anomalies in it. We will debate these anomalies. There are certain exclusions that are clearly designed to benefit the other side.

Mr D.J. Kelly: Like what?

Dr M.D. NAHAN: We will go through them—do not worry about that! The member for Bassendean can just relax. We are going to go through this, but there is no urgency in this bill whatsoever. It is a cheap political stunt by a cheap Premier.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members!

MRS L.M. HARVEY (Scarborough — Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [12.11 pm]: I, too, rise to speak on the urgency motion. It is a complete sham that the Salaries and Allowances Amendment (Debt and Deficit Remediation) Bill 2017 is urgent. The Premier said that the next determination of the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal will be on 30 November. That is 15 sitting days away, or seven weeks. The Premier announced this initiative back in May. How many months ago was May? It was a long time ago. The Premier has shown absolute arrogance and contempt for this Parliament by coming into this place and giving us a briefing on legislation that he wants us to pass through here and rubberstamp as urgent. This legislation will freeze salaries, which sounds like a great concept. We had a briefing but they did not even give us the legislation. We got a two-page briefing note on legislation that that man says is so urgent that we have to suspend standing orders and get it through this place. It is utterly ridiculous!

Let us go back to the last thing that this Premier said was urgent. Let us go back to the last bill that was declared urgent by this Premier. It had to go through the house on the last day of sitting of the week of the budget. All the new members of Parliament over there had to put aside their carefully prepared budget reply speeches because we absolutely had to get the dangerous sexual offenders legislation through. So we did. We sat late. We worked on that dangerous sexual offenders legislation. We put it through, we interrogated it, we did our job as an opposition, and then what happened? It went to the Legislative Council. Where is it? Has it been debated? Is it urgent in there? No. Once again, the declaration of the DSO legislation as an urgent bill was a complete political stunt to get the Attorney General's backside out of a sling, because DAL was about to be released. Contrary to the Attorney General's rhetoric in opposition, he did not direct the Director of Public Prosecutions to keep DAL behind bars. He did not take an action to cause DAL to stay behind bars. His rhetoric in opposition was completely different from his actions as Attorney General. Every member of this place was inconvenienced by having their budget reply speeches truncated so that we could get that man's backside out of a sling. Where is the DSO legislation? It is languishing in the Legislative Council while they try to work out what to do with their time. Now we have 15 days of Parliament left. We could have had seven weeks to appropriately deliberate on this legislation.

Instead, we get treated with contempt by an arrogant Premier who has absolutely no regard for the proper processes of this Parliament. Our partners in opposition, the Nationals, have not even been given a briefing on this urgent and important legislation. The people who need to scrutinise the bill have not even had it explained to them. We had public servants sitting down with us and saying that they did not understand why it is urgent either. They could not explain why it is urgent.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members!

Dr M.D. Nahan interjected.

Mr B. Urban interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Darling Range and member for Riverton! The Deputy Leader of the Opposition has the call.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Once again, the Premier still thinks he is an opposition leader. He is operating like an opposition leader's stuntman with the ridiculous things that he is pulling. If the Premier wanted proper process, if he really wanted this bill to be rushed through and for us to agree to it, why did he not bring the legislation to us before yesterday so that we could scrutinise it and afford it passage through this Parliament? He did not do that. He did not commence the drafting of the legislation back in May when he said it was really important that this happen. Now this Parliament, which the Premier has treated with contempt, is expected to rubberstamp this bill through. We do not have the numbers. We do not have the power to block this in the Assembly. We have to rely on the Legislative Council to perhaps have the time to examine and interrogate this rushed piece of legislation that the Premier has brought to this place with an urgency motion. The Premier knows that it is not urgent, we know that it is not urgent and the media knows that it is a cheap political stunt.

MS M.J. DAVIES (Central Wheatbelt — Leader of the National Party) [12.17 pm]: I also rise to question whether the Salaries and Allowances Amendment (Debt and Deficit Remediation) Bill 2017 is urgent. Given that Labor has now been in government for seven months and that this was one of the positions it had articulated well going into the election campaign, why has the government had the discourtesy to bring the bill before the house with only half a day for anyone to even think about it? The Deputy Leader of the Opposition was absolutely correct: the utter contempt that the Premier and the Premier's office have shown the Nationals is mind-boggling. There was not one offer of a briefing. Do members know what the Premier's office said? It said, "We briefed the Liberal Party, so we don't think we need to brief you. You should have been invited to their briefing." I tell the Premier now that every one of his other ministers has the courtesy to contact my office and offer a briefing. The Premier is arrogant. He has not offered us the opportunity to understand what is so urgent about this bill.

Several members interjected.

Point of Order

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: The Leader of the National Party of the state of Western Australia should be afforded some respect.

Several members interjected.

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: There is an absolute rabble interjecting on the member.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr T.J. Healy): Members! Please allow me to hear the point of order. Can the manager of opposition business please say that again.

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: The point of order is that I cannot hear the Leader of the National Party because of the amount of noise from members opposite.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members, thank you. The Leader of the National Party will be heard in silence, please.

Debate Resumed

Ms M.J. DAVIES: I was articulating the fact we have not even been shown the courtesy of being offered a briefing, let alone given a briefing note. In our time in government, if we offered a briefing to the opposition, there was usually the courtesy of the minister being available but certainly there was an appropriate amount of time for the opposition to consider that. This is not urgent. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition and the Leader of the Opposition have articulated that the government has brought on other bills as urgent and they are now languishing in the upper house. The Premier clearly has no courage of his convictions in that regard. He is now asking us to debate something that is important. The National Party is not saying that we do not want to debate this very important issue. We think it is something that should be canvassed in this Parliament, but the fact that the Premier is declaring it urgent means that he either cannot manage his own business in the house or that he is so arrogant that he does not think that this important issue deserves the criticism and critique of the opposition of the day. I say to the Premier's office that the explanation that we were given was substandard and arrogant, and

that comes from the person who leads that office. I point out that without that briefing we are unable to do our job and scrutinise exactly what the Premier is saying he wants to bring forward. That is the job of the opposition. How do we do that without seeing the legislation and being offered a briefing to ask the questions? Clearly, even the public servants were put in a very awkward position. They were at least given an opportunity to respond to questions, but from all accounts they could not answer them. It is completely unacceptable. We are very happy to debate this very important issue. We understand that there is concern in the community and we are happy to have that debate in this house. We are not happy about the Premier not managing the business of the house appropriately and not showing us the courtesy of even offering us a briefing so that we can form an opinion appropriately and do the job that the opposition is supposed to do. The government will get it through this house after this debate. The government will rubberstamp it and shove it up to the upper house, which is not a house that the Premier has control over. He should learn some lessons from hung Parliaments in the past and do some work with the crossbench and the members of the opposition to make sure that these very important issues, which the Premier says are incredibly urgent, can have the passage through Parliament that he so desires.

The last four times the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal has met, it made no changes to our salaries or there was an increase in line with the government's wages policy. Determination 2 of 2016, with effect from 12 March, made no change to salary and electorate allowances. Determination 1 of 2016 made a 1.5 per cent increase to the basic salaries of members of Parliament, which was in line with the government's wages policy of the time. The other two were exactly the same. The SAT, as an independent body, takes the current circumstances into consideration. It considers the financial circumstances and what is happening in the economy and makes a determination. We are happy to have that discussion during debate on this bill, but it is not urgent. This is a farce and it is a demonstration that the Premier has no control or understanding of how to manage the business of this house and, clearly, the other house, where the government needs to talk to the crossbench to get the legislation through if it is as important as the Premier says it is. It is completely in contempt of the opposition. The Premier's office is an absolute disgrace and that comes from him.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Minister for Water, I am on my feet. I call you to order for the first time.

Question put and passed.

Second Reading

Resumed from 11 October.

DR M.D. NAHAN (Riverton — Leader of the Opposition) [12.23 pm]: Let us be clear that there was no case to bring on urgently the Salaries and Allowances Amendment (Debt and Deficit Remediation) Bill 2017. This is just a cheap political stunt by a Premier and a party who specialises in them. Let it be clear to everybody that for the last 40 years the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal, or something equivalent, has determined the wages of parliamentarians, the judiciary and senior public servants. All parties agreed that its determinations would be independent of the political process and not made by the Premier of the day. This bill will rescind that for four years. It will give the powers to freeze and also excise from that freeze a whole range of conditions that I will go through. The government proposed this in May of this year and it is consistent with its election commitments. It has taken some time. Obviously, the policy has been altered somewhat along the way. I mentioned that earlier statements indicated that it would include the CEOs of local governments but it does not. There has been some alteration of policies along the way.

Is this a significant change? This is a significant change that gives the Premier of the day the power to determine the wage rates of the judiciary and other senior public servants. It sets a precedent. Why can the government not do this for the Industrial Relations Commission and public servants across the board? If it is going to do it for people covered by SAT, why does it not do it for the rest? Why does it not override the Industrial Relations Commission? By the way, this is being done by a Labor Party, which I thought, as part of its DNA, supported independent negotiations and arbitrations through the IRC. Obviously it does not care. This will set a precedent for future governments to look at overriding—at least for public servants paid by the state—independent assessments of wages and conditions. Note that precedent; it was done by a so-called Labor government.

What is the need for this? For some time the SAT has operated with recognition of the wages policy of the government of the day. I will go back to a December 2016 ruling about remuneration and conditions of parliamentarians. In that ruling, the SAT took into consideration the public sector wages policy statement of 2016 and the financial position and fiscal strategy of the state as per the budget and other statements. In other words, it took into consideration the requirements, the fiscal policy, the wages policy and the condition of the state. For the second year in a row it froze for the next year all wages for parliamentarians from 12 March 2017. At least through to March of next year, this bill is redundant because salaries have already been frozen. An important issue is that SAT also determined some changes to car allowances. That decision was made by SAT in December, during the term of the previous government. It did not come into effect until 12 March, which was after the state election. As members well know, in the past, parliamentarians had the choice of a car or money in lieu. The determination took

away the right to a car from the government and gave money in lieu, but it allowed those parliamentarians who were returning to Parliament with a lease that was long outstanding to retain the car for the remaining term of the lease. When the lease expired, they had to take money in lieu. One important point that I will come back to later is that it did not deal with the allowances and rights of members of cabinet and parliamentary secretaries. It came into effect on 12 March. On the double dipping ministers, the Premier said, in his usual manner of using weasel words, that it was all done on our watch. That is false. He has been seriously misleading Parliament and the public on this for months. I will come back to that repeatedly. This is supposedly about wage restraint.

In June of this year, the SAT made a ruling on the wages and allowances of senior public servants and the judiciary. Again, after taking into consideration the new government's wages policy and the fiscal position, it froze the wages of senior public servants and the judiciary for another year. The wages of various types of employees such as parliamentarians, Clerks of Parliament, the judiciary and senior public servants are already frozen. It was done by the SAT. What is the purpose of this legislation now? It has been brought on urgently, but what for? The wages are already frozen. That is why in the debate about the suspension of standing orders to bring on urgently the Salaries and Allowances Amendment (Debt and Deficit Remediation) Bill 2017, we pointed it out quite clearly. At the time members could see by the look on the Premier's face that he knew he had been caught out with a cheap, political stunt on a very serious issue. He is setting a precedent, and I will go back to that precedent because it is very important. He is setting a precedent that if the government of the day believes it has the fiscal need to do so, it can override independent tribunals that rule on wages and conditions of public servants. Members should note that that is what this government is doing; it is setting a precedent and we will not forget it. This issue will come up again. The Premier, in earlier statements on implementing his policy to increase wages by only \$1 000, indicated that he wants to get that policy through enterprise bargaining agreement negotiations or the Industrial Relations Commission. I believe that Western Australia Police is dealing with the Industrial Relations Commission now. The government has failed to get the police negotiations through because it did the dirty on the police. It made an offer to the police and had it accepted, but then the government reneged. The government did not do the same for the firies and their mates because they donate to the Labor Party.

Mr B. Urban: The police are our friends too.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: No, they are not.

Mr B. Urban interjected.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Yes, I have heard from the same people. If the member thinks that the police support his government's condition of \$1 000 rather than 1.5 per cent, as offered, then he is dreaming.

Anyway, I get back to the issue. The Premier said that if he does not get his policy through these EBAs, and tens of thousands of public servants are covered under EBAs that are coming up for negotiation, he will bring in similar legislation to override the Industrial Relations Commission and all EBAs; he will legislate to override EBAs. This is the first step along the line if he does not get his way—note that. There is no need for this to happen. The Salaries and Allowances Tribunal is an institution that has for decades been reasonable when looking at wages policy, the budgetary position of the state and the labour market generally, and it has come down with conservative decisions on wages, remunerations and conditions. It has been very open to advice from the Premier's office—we know that. This legislation is not needed at all. In fact, if SAT acted oddly against the needs of the community and the government and did offer conditions above the wages policy—that is, a freeze for the people under consideration here—then the government should override it at that time, not pre-emptively, because basically it is overriding a major institution. What is our position on this?

Mr B. Urban: Wreck it? At least you have admitted this.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: I did not say anything. What is our position? It is quite clear: the Liberal opposition supports wage restraint. I go back to a document that was released—sneakily, I might add—by the Treasurer the other day. This document has been available for some time. It is a legislative requirement for this document to be released by the end of September. He released it after the budget and at a time early in the morning when the media was not around because he wanted to hide it. It is the 2016–17 *Annual Report on State Finances*, which is an assessment of the last year of the previous government. What does it show? There is some doctoring of data at the margin, but it shows that in the 2016–17 budget, revenue was in freefall. We had a catastrophic drop in revenue. It improved through the year, mainly from iron ore prices. However, it basically shows significant expenditure and wage restraint. Wages increases through the 2016–17 year averaged two per cent—the lowest in 30 years in this state. Even if this policy is put in place and the government adheres to it, especially in the forward estimates, which are just fabrications, do members know what the wages growth will be? It will be two per cent. The problem we have, of course, is that in 2017–18 the salary growth is 6.6 per cent, which is a massive increase in salaries next year. Some of that is in redundancies, but it is largely a large increase in employment numbers.

Mr M. McGowan: No.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Yes, it is. The government is hiring a bunch of educational assistants. The only year to pay any attention to is 2017–18; after that the rest are all complete fiction with slippages and other things moving around. In that year, the wages bill will go up by 6.6 per cent, a threefold increase on the previous year, and this government is saying that we are fiscal wreckers! How can salaries be increased threefold relative to us in the previous year, and relative to the policies in place, and we be called fiscal wreckers? It is a hallucination, but nonsense is what the government specialises in.

Mr M. McGowan: You said that you were going to tell us your position. What is your position?

Dr M.D. NAHAN: I am talking. The Premier should just sit down and be quiet.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members!

Dr M.D. NAHAN: We showed wage restraint over the last few years by bringing it down. We did so by working with the institutions that we have. We argued a case through the Industrial Relations Commission and with SAT and we achieved our aims and targets—in fact, we overachieved. Yes, we had a 1.5 per cent policy, which is higher than the government's, but we achieved it. We also went through a rigorous process that identified in advance how it would be achieved. It was not just some study like, for example, the health sustainability study that this government was planning to achieve efficiencies with of over \$200 million. The minister is now tiptoeing through the hospital system saying, "Look at us. We are going to spend more money." Most of the government's expenditure policy or that upon which it is basing its reductions and expenses in the out year are not there; all they are is a study. We had a whole range of policies. We had 5 500 voluntary redundancies and we went in with a successive reduction in our wages policy, which we met.

Mrs M.H. Roberts: Next you will be telling us that you were great financial managers.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Members opposite have done —

Mr P. Papalia interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members!

Mr P. Papalia: You think you are so good that it was a mistake that you lost the election.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: It surely was a mistake putting a junior minister like the member in charge of some of the most important industries.

Mr M. Hughes interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr T.J. Healy): Member for Kalamunda, I call you to order for the first time. Leader of the Opposition, you can talk to the Chair. Minister, you will have an opportunity to contribute to the debate, so please allow the member to speak.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: We support wage restraint and we have a track record of doing so. This report that was issued two days ago shows that categorically. Even with these measures put in place, this government will not meet that policy—guaranteed. It was put into the budget, but when it comes to next year, watch for the blowouts—just watch. We have time, we are here for three and a half years; we are here for the long haul. But back to the point. We support wage restraint and we have a track record of doing so and achieving it. In particular, we support wage restraints for people who can most afford it, and the people covered by this proposal can afford it.

Very few people covered by this are earning less than \$100 000. Most parliamentarians have had wage restraints under us for the last two years, and we support the continuation of it. We support wage restraints across all the areas covered by this legislation, but we have some problems with the legislation itself.

I go back to point out that next year the McGowan government, even with this legislation, will see wages and salary growth at 6.6 per cent in 2017–18. It never got that high in the last term of the Barnett government. What the hell is going on? The government might have some explanation—I look forward to hearing it—but this is interesting. How is it possible to claim wage restraint and increased growth over the forward estimates by threefold in one year? It just shows that these guys are vacuous. We do not support the override of an independent statutory body like the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal. It is a step back of 40 years. That a Labor government is doing that, and has mooted the idea of overriding the Industrial Relations Commission altogether if it does not get its own way is interesting, and sets a precedent that future Liberal–National Party governments will look at and take into consideration. The experience of the former government is that the SAT is a cooperative body that reflects the wages policy of the government of the day. We looked at the actions of the SAT over the last four years; that is verified. When the budget went into real trouble starting halfway through the 2013–14 year, the SAT started implementing restraint across all the agencies, not only in the wages rates and allowances. It never exceeded the wages policy of the government, and in most cases it went below it. This government, in a symbolism that will count for nothing because the SAT is already doing this, has come out and said that this freeze will save \$16 million, maybe \$20 million—I have heard both figures—over the forward estimates, but that is not true, because the wages and allowances of the judiciary, senior public servants and parliamentarians, the people covered,

are already frozen for at least a year. The government counts that as a result of the budget, which is double counting. It makes no sense. This is a very dangerous path for the Premier, not just this one—the man is dicey, arrogant and one-sided. You are either with him or agin him. If you are with him, you are rewarded; if you are agin him, he will go at you. We have seen that. This is a government tightly controlled by a small cadre of unions.

Several members interjected.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: They are! It is a union movement that represents 7.3 per cent of the private sector workforce. They fund and elect members. Most government members come from them. They cannot comb their hair without the union's permission. Some of them do not need to do it! This is a government that put the policy of determining the salaries and conditions of public servants and the judiciary in the Premier's hands. That is what this legislation is going to do and that is what the government wants it to do. Just note, all backbenchers, that the Industrial Relations Commission will override enterprise bargaining agreements across the board next, if it does not cajole unions to support its wages policy. I suspect the police will be the first one off the line. To reiterate, the Liberal opposition supports wage restraints, particularly amongst those in the best position to pay, such as the people covered here. However, we have serious reservations about the mechanisms that are being adhered to; I will start going through some. The government has the numbers, 41 to 13, and the legislation will pass, but the precedent set will go on.

We have sat in this house, many times, over many bills, and I remember being a backbencher for four years. It is a difficult job because we come into Parliament to make a difference, represent our electorate and get involved with policy and important decisions, and our role is that we have to support the government of the day. The government of the day depends upon the marginality or otherwise of members' seat, and backbenchers often do not have very much to say or to do. This government's backbenchers have it particularly difficult, because the reality is that there are not too many goodies to give out, because there is not that much free cash. Every additional expenditure is borrowed.

Ms A. Sanderson: Thanks to you.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: No, no.

Mr M. Hughes: That is how you operate; it is about giving out goodies. We have a government.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Yes, yes. You people come from unions, but some come from the business sector, which is good. It is quite nice to see real businessmen in the Labor Party, but most come from a union background.

Several members interjected.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Yes. Most of them come from a union background.

Several members interjected.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Most of them come from a union background or are the agents of a union. We have heard them. We have listened to their inaugural speeches when they saluted their union boss.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members!

Dr M.D. NAHAN: But the real issue is that this is attacking what I thought was a core value and institution of the Labor Party. It is your party if you want to do this. We do not. We think this is flawed in process, argument and need, but we are not going to block it. But you guys should because it is going to come back to haunt you.

What are some of the detailed issues with this bill? Again, as we mentioned in the slight debate about whether this is urgent or not—of course it is not—we got a briefing yesterday by a number of public servants. I will not mention their names; I do not want the member for Cannington to go at them. They were experienced people who knew the history of the issues and could answer most of the questions about the past. We did not get a draft legislation—they did not have it or were told not to give it to us, more likely. Imagine that: members of Parliament who are asked to urgently address an important money bill being refused to be given a draft or a copy of the legislation. Imagine it. This is the contempt the government holds for Parliament, and the Premier wants us to support him. Be it on his head. We went through a range of its raft of exemptions from this. A whole raft of them. Most of them they could not explain forward. There were complications, difficulties, not enough time, they did not know how to do it and they did not know why. That was the briefing we got on this bill. For instance, we asked a question of the Treasurer. We got the usual blustering and name-calling. We asked him whether the senior executives, the CEOs of the government business enterprises, were covered by this legislation. Are some of the highest paid public servants covered? For instance, the one I think he mentioned, or maybe it was the Premier—the head of Racing and Wagering Western Australia with a \$600 000 salary covered? Are the heads of Synergy, Western Power, Horizon Power and Water Corporation and others covered? He did not know; he just blustered, babbled and whatnot as usual. It was very colourful, but it lacked substance. We asked the public servant, “Why not?”, and he said, “I don't know; it's complicated.” Life is complicated; that is why they are public servants,

but the government has not worked this thing through. As a reason for curtailing the wages of the senior level of the public service, the government highlights the case of the head of Racing and Wagering Western Australia, but he is not included. Why not? The government does not know; it is complicated. We want to know why not, and if it is complicated, solve the bloody complication. Tell us why it has not bothered to address the complication. The minister did not know; he is not here. It is just more contempt. We asked the Minister for Local Government yesterday. When the Premier mentioned this measure earlier on, he said it would include the chief executive officers of local government authorities, but they are excluded. His explanation in the paper was that we do not pay for them.

Debate interrupted, pursuant to standing orders.

[Continued on page 4750.]

PROFESSOR DAVID BLAIR

Statement by Member for Nedlands

MR W.R. MARMION (Nedlands) [12.51 pm]: Recently the Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences awarded the 2017 Nobel Prize in Physics to three American scientists, Rainer Weiss, Kip Thorne and Barry Barish, who were behind the discovery of gravitational waves. However, this was truly an international collaboration of research from over 20 countries and approximately 1 000 scientists. Many people do not realise that, if not for the tireless work of University of Western Australia physics professor David Blair and his team, this fundamentally important discovery would not have happened. Professor Blair has been working on gravitational waves since 1973, with the concept first predicted by Albert Einstein around a century ago. The fundamental issue solved by UWA researchers and David Blair was the sensitivity and isolation of the equipment used to actually detect the waves. Researchers spent over 10 years just focusing on technology relating to the detection equipment and controlling instabilities that arose from its use. The level of accuracy required from the equipment is incredible and highlights the brilliance of our local scientists right here in Western Australia. In its announcement, the Royal Academy said that this discovery promises a revolution in astrophysics. With our Gravitational Research Centre in Gingin and over 40 years of experience in the science, I believe we are well placed to take part in the breakthroughs yet to occur using this new discovery. Congratulations again, Professor Blair and his wonderful team.

WANNEROO SECONDARY COLLEGE CARRAMAR PRIMARY SCHOOL

Statement by Member for Wanneroo

MS S.E. WINTON (Wanneroo) [12.52 pm]: As a past student of Wanneroo Secondary College, it was my pleasure to speak at the school's Harmony Day assembly, which celebrates the 30-plus countries represented in the college's cohort. As someone who came from Germany when eight years old, I love that the college is embracing and promoting multiculturalism. The students who spoke or performed were Czarinna Mae Empleo, Noreen Ocden, Daniella Aguadera, Andrhea Escobio, Cheanne Ballon, Kiara Gregorio, Mitche Dimarucot, Marielle Latoza, Regine Gerna, Taylor Reriti, Cumorah Ellison, Pharyn Ellison, Lepeta Jackson, Hasan Murray, Isaac May, Jesse Shore, Tara-Leigh Mellitchey, Jordan Wright, Mrs Claire Harley and the performing arts dance group, and teachers Dayna Brown, Selena Gerrand and Veronica Kennedy. Thank you very much.

I would also like to welcome the students of Carramar Primary School, who are here right now in the Speaker's gallery with teacher Sue Simpson: Lewis Mayes, Caitlin Dale, Jasmine Van De Peppel, Tiahna Joyce, Madelaine Latham, Callum Baker, Ngarimu TeNana, Emily Woods and Deannica Ross. It is a joy to host them for lunch and talk about democracy and citizenship. Their conversation and questions have been refreshing and give me great confidence for the future. I loved being a teacher for 27 years, and now I love being the member for Wanneroo, supporting the work of my schools, students, parents and teachers.

PARABURDOO COMMUNITY HUB

Statement by Member for North West Central

MR V.A. CATANIA (North West Central) [12.53 pm]: Last week I attended the sod-turning ceremony, at the Peter Sutherland Oval, for Paraburdoo's \$15.7 million community hub, on which construction will commence later this month. The project includes the relocation of the Karingal Neighbourhood Centre, a new multipurpose sports court, gym, poolside amenities, oval amenities, softball diamond and improvements to the lesser hall. These spaces and facilities are exciting additions to Paraburdoo, as they improve the lifestyle and wellbeing of the town for long-term sustainability. Congratulations to the community, shire president Kerry White, and councillors Linton Rumble and Ivan Dias, who have fought for 30 years to get this project up and going. Thanks also go to Rio Tinto, the Shire of Ashburton, and the National Party's royalties for regions for funding this important project. This project will be transformational for Paraburdoo and will make the town an even better place to live and raise a family. This is why royalties for regions is important, and why the Labor government should not scrap royalties for regions. It is only because the money was put into the account of the Shire of Ashburton that this project was not quashed.

FORRESTFIELD UNITED SOCCER CLUB*Statement by Member for Forrestfield*

MR S.J. PRICE (Forrestfield) [12.54 pm]: On Saturday, 23 September, Forrestfield United Soccer Club overcame Mandurah City 6–3 on aggregate to seal a spot in the top flight of Western Australian football and will be playing PS4 National Premier Leagues WA football next season. Forrestfield led 3–0 from the first leg, but in a classic second leg at Securitas Protect Stadium in Mandurah, Mandurah City was back in the tie early scoring after only two minutes of play. Sani Sinclair then levelled the score with a crucial goal not long after for Forrestfield United. Mandurah City then added two more unanswered goals before half-time, heading into the break, with a 3–1 lead, with Forrestfield just up with 4–3 on aggregate—and it was game on. Whatever the head coach, Rod Banjac, said at half-time worked, because Forrestfield looked lively after half-time. Sani Sinclair scored again, this time from the penalty spot, making the score 3–2, and Benny Rogers then put one into the back of the net, making it 3–3 and putting Forrestfield in control at 6–3 on aggregate. At the final whistle, coaches, players and supporters celebrated on the pitch, as Forrestfield United Soccer Club sealed a spot in the top flight of Western Australian football for the first time since 1986. Congratulations to all the supporters; the president, Andy Osborne, the vice-president, Phil Barker, and the executive committee; and to the victorious Forrestfield United team that played on the day, led fabulously by the captain of the team, Liam Merigan. Well done and congratulations to everyone.

GOLD ROYALTIES CAMPAIGN — GOLDFIELDS MINING ACTIVITY**SIMONE DE BEEN — KALGOORLIE–BOULDER CHAMBER OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY RAILWAYS FOOTBALL CLUB***Statement by Member for Kalgoorlie*

MR K.M. O'DONNELL (Kalgoorlie) [12.56 pm]: I formally wish to thank the people of the goldfields and the gold industry for supporting me in my fight against the introduction of a gold royalty. It was great to hear that goldminer Northern Star will accelerate plans to start a formal apprenticeship program to employ between 10 and 20 apprentices in Kalgoorlie–Boulder before the end of the year, as well as activating 10 drilling rigs, with five staff per rig. Bill Beament, the executive chairman of Northern Star, has said that the Liberal Party's decision will secure Northern Star's \$50 million investment in underground mining training by creating a school of excellence in the City of Kalgoorlie–Boulder. Raleigh Finlayson, the managing director of Saracen Mineral Holdings, has said that a deferred \$3 million drilling program at Carosue Dam goldmine, 120 kilometres north east of Kalgoorlie–Boulder, will now commence. Ron Sayers, the managing director of Ausdrill, which employs 400 people in the goldfields, has said that the Liberal Party's decision will help secure the viability of its exploration division.

I would also like to congratulate Simone De Been, who has recently been appointed chief executive officer of the City of Kalgoorlie–Boulder Chamber of Commerce and Industry. She replaces Hugh Gallagher, who for many years ran the CCI. He was heavily involved in community sport and cricket.

I would also like to congratulate Railways Football Club in Kalgoorlie–Boulder for winning the Goldfields Football League grand final, particularly the coach, Rhett Foster, and players Josh Rymer and Ryan Booy, all friends whom I have known since we were in primary.

BUNBURY COMMUNITY ARTS, CULTURE AND HERITAGE*Statement by Member for Bunbury*

MR D.T. PUNCH (Bunbury) [12.57 pm]: Community arts, culture and heritage are an important part of the life of Bunbury and Dalyellup. I am impressed with the diversity of the Bunbury arts scene, and in particular the role of community groups in providing a place where people can meet, build relationships and find support, as well as providing a vehicle for artistic expression. The Stirling Arts Centre in Bunbury supports over 15 groups involved with everything from pottery, painting and woodcraft to needlework. With over 200 members, it is a major part of the community arts fabric of Bunbury and Dalyellup and communities across the south west. I especially want to acknowledge the chair of the centre, Margaret Perkins, who works tirelessly to support the centre, and the centre manager, Mr Graham Lush. The centre committee is developing plans to improve facilities at the centre, which is a heritage-listed former technical college. The improvements will enable the Stirling Arts Centre to host events such as this year's Western Australia Day event, which was attended by the Premier. My congratulations go to the committee and staff, and the membership. They have a centre they can be proud of.

Likewise, I have met with Maureen Eaton, the chairperson of the Bunbury Musical Comedy Group. This group struggles with increases in costs, especially council rates on its building, yet is able to provide a fantastic community service, hosting productions and providing a vehicle for young and old to participate in the theatre. I have also met with Bunbury's Rock 'N' Roll High School, run by Louise and Ian Kirk, which provides a great service for local youth seeking musical careers in production and performance. Bunbury Regional Art Gallery is an important venue, providing access to local artists to exhibit their work, and contributing to the development of the visual arts in the south west. I particularly note the work of Julian Bowron as director. I also note the fantastic work of the Bunbury Oral History Group. The Bunbury Multicultural Group is doing fantastic work in bringing to Bunbury and the south west the vibrancy of music and art from many different cultures.

Sitting suspended from 12.59 to 2.00 pm

DISTINGUISHED VISITOR — RT HON LORD JACK McCONNELL*Statement by Speaker*

THE SPEAKER (Mr P.B. Watson): Today in the Speaker's gallery we have Rt Hon Lord Jack McConnell of Glenscorrodale. He is a former First Minister of Scotland. We welcome you here today.

[Applause.]

VISITORS — NEWMAN COLLEGE AND CARRAMAR PRIMARY SCHOOL*Statement by Speaker*

THE SPEAKER (Mr P.B. Watson): Just as important, the year 12 students from Newman College and the member for Wanneroo's guests, the teachers and students of Carramar Primary School, are also in the Speaker's gallery.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE**SALARIES AND ALLOWANCES AMENDMENT (DEBT AND DEFICIT REMEDIATION) BILL 2017****497. Dr M.D. NAHAN to the Premier:**

I acknowledge the staff and students from Dudley Park Primary School from the electorates of Dawesville and Mandurah.

I refer to the Premier's media statement of 10 October 2017 about the Salaries and Allowances Amendment (Debt and Deficit Remediation) Bill 2017 in which he said —

“WA's highest paid employees, including politicians ... need to accept that they need to do some of the heavy lifting.

Can the Premier confirm that he refused to relinquish his fat cat pension scheme in 2000 —

Mr W.J. Johnston: Where's Colin?

Dr M.D. NAHAN: We will get to that.

The SPEAKER: Members, let the question be asked in silence.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: I will start again. I refer to the Premier's media statement of 10 October 2017 about the Salaries and Allowances Amendment (Debt and Deficit Remediation) Bill 2017 in which he said —

“WA's highest paid employees, including politicians ... need to accept that they need to do some of the heavy lifting.

Can the Premier confirm that he refused to relinquish his fat cat pension scheme in 2000 and as a result he will receive hundreds of thousands of dollars a year for the rest of his life while Western Australians struggle to pay their electricity bills?

Mr M. McGOWAN replied:

Prior to answering the question, I acknowledge in the gallery today one Ruby Quigley and the year 5 class from Our Lady of Grace School in North Beach. Members might realise that I am doing this on behalf of the member for Butler. Ruby is a lovely little girl and I am sure her classmates are lovely young students.

The government has brought in prospective legislation. It does not remove any entitlements from any members of Parliament. It ensures that we set the right example for pay across the public sector. We continue to persist with this legislation. All the vibes I was getting before lunchtime in Parliament from the opposition leader were that the opposition is going to oppose this legislation. Can members imagine that in the environment that this state faces, with this shocking debt and deficit left to the government and people of Western Australia by the former government, the Liberal and National Parties are prepared to —

Several members interjected.

Mr M. McGOWAN: The Liberal and National Parties are prepared to go out there and say —

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for South Perth, I call you to order for the first time.

Mr M. McGOWAN: The Liberal and National Parties are prepared to say to the people of Western Australia that they do not support these measures. What I would like to see from the Liberal and National Parties —

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members, it is not a shouting match. You will have an opportunity to ask a supplementary question.

Mr M. McGOWAN: I would like to see the Liberal and National Parties support the revenue and savings measures that this government is bringing in, rather than some of the pathetic personal attacks that the Leader of the Opposition is bringing forward before this Parliament that I think reflect very, very poorly on him.

SALARIES AND ALLOWANCES AMENDMENT (DEBT AND DEFICIT REMEDIATION) BILL 2017

498. Dr M.D. NAHAN to the Premier:

I have a supplementary question. Will the Premier immediately agree to relinquish his gold-plated pension and bring his entitlements into line with all other members' entitlements?

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Do we all want to go home early today or do we want to have question time?

Mr M. McGOWAN replied:

I am looking at the member for Cottesloe while I answer this question, but all I say to the Leader of the Opposition is —

Several members interjected.

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

Mr M. McGOWAN: All I say to the Leader of the Opposition is that the legislation that we have brought before Parliament is entirely reasonable. It ensures that we, as members of Parliament, set the right example. I implore the Liberal and National Parties to support this legislation.

Several members interjected.

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

GOLD ROYALTIES — 2017–18 STATE BUDGET

499. Mrs L.M. O'MALLEY to the Premier:

On behalf of the member for Southern River, I acknowledge members of an overseas Chinese investment association from Zhejiang province in the gallery.

I refer to the Liberal Party's decision to put the state at risk of another credit rating downgrade. For the benefit of those opposite, can the Premier explain —

Dr M.D. Nahan interjected.

The SPEAKER: Leader of the Opposition, you obviously want to go home early today.

Mrs L.M. O'MALLEY: For the benefit of those opposite, can the Premier explain how the opposition's rejection of the gold royalty increase puts WA's credit rating at risk?

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Geraldton, I call you to order for the first time. You can hide there, but I can hear you. You can start again, member, if you want to.

Mrs L.M. O'MALLEY: The second part of the question is: can the Premier outline the reasons why a downgrade in WA's credit rating is bad for the state?

Mr M. McGOWAN replied:

I thank the member for Bicton for the question. I congratulate her on being an excellent representative of this Parliament. She has run a small business, has raised a family and has fought hard to win an electorate in an area that she cares about deeply.

I remind the house that when we handed down the budget last month, Moody's commented on the budget and indicated that the government showed good resolve in dealing with the financial situation that we face. We put in place tough budget decisions to manage the situation that we confront. We said right from the beginning that our view is that the burden of budget repair should be shared across the entire community. We went out and talked to all elements of the community and said that the burden of dealing with the budget situation in Western Australia needs to be equally shared across the Western Australian community.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members! Member for Carine, you are on two calls.

Mr M. McGOWAN: The people who have not shown any resolve are the Liberal and National Parties in this state. The reason I can say that with some authority is that their poor budgetary performance now stretches back for nine years. I remind the house that when the 2014 downgrade occurred under the former Liberal–National government, Moody's indicated —

The state's assumption on royalties is underpinned by a fairly optimistic forecast for iron ore prices.

It indicated that the then state government's budgetary situation incorporated a weak policy response and a lack of fiscal resolve. That is what Moody's had to say about the former Liberal–National government. When we went to a negative watch in April 2015, Standard and Poor's indicated —

This potential slippage reflects, in our view, limited political will to make difficult decisions.

That is what Standard and Poor's said about the former government. Moody's indicated that we show good resolve. When they were in government, the Liberal and National Parties showed no resolve to deal with the situation confronting our state. All they did was make it worse year in, year out. They had no resolve then and they are continuing to wreck the state's budget in opposition. I want to make this statement to the house: if there is a further credit rating downgrade in Western Australia, it will be the Liberal and National Parties' fault.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Very funny, member for Cottesloe, but no-one else is laughing. Member for Bateman.

Mr M. McGowan: I haven't finished my answer.

The SPEAKER: Sorry; you sat down. Premier.

Mr M. McGOWAN: I just want to repeat this: if there is a further credit rating downgrade in Western Australia, it will be the Liberal and National Parties' fault.

SALARIES AND ALLOWANCES AMENDMENT (DEBT AND DEFICIT REMEDIATION) BILL 2017

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

I thought we heard that the first time! On behalf of the member for Carine, I would like to acknowledge in the public gallery this afternoon the year 5 and 6 students from Our Lady of Grace School.

Given that the Premier is slugging Western Australian households with massive electricity price hikes, taxing small businesses and cutting Western Australian jobs, will he start showing some leadership, give up his gold-plated pension, switch to the superannuation scheme of his backbench —

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Minister for Mines and Petroleum, I call you to order for the first time.

Mr D.C. NALDER: Will the Premier start showing some leadership —

Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Dawesville, I call you to order for the second time.

Mr D.C. NALDER: Will the Premier start showing some leadership, give up his gold-plated pension, switch to the superannuation scheme —

Ms S.F. McGurk interjected.

The SPEAKER: Minister for Child Protection, the member is on his feet. I call you to order for the first time.

Mr D.C. NALDER: Will the Premier start showing some leadership, give up his gold-plated pension, switch to the superannuation scheme of his backbench, and make his ministers pay back the double-dipping on their car allowance?

Mr M. McGOWAN replied:

I have before me the Leader of the Opposition's imprest account report for his travel to the United States on 18 December 2010, and I would like to quote from it. The cost of the travel was \$14 495, and I just want to quote the second paragraph. It states —

In Vancouver, I had a family holiday from 18 December 2010 — 3 January 2011.

A 17-day holiday right up-front! At the end of the report, the Leader of the Opposition has this to say. He obviously cut and pasted some information and it states —

On Sunday, 9 January 2011, I flew on United Airlines from Denver, Colorado to San Francisco for a family holiday until Monday, 17 January 2011.

It is the height of hypocrisy for members opposite —

Several members interjected.

Withdrawal of Remark

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: The Leader of the Opposition knows that that is unparliamentary and impugns the Premier's reputation, and he should withdraw.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Mr Speaker, he is saying that —

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Just wait! When a point of order has been made, there is silence. You cannot get up and change your mind about it when you have done it. Will you please withdraw.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Saying that he is a fraud? I withdraw it.

The SPEAKER: You are sailing very close to the wind.

Questions without Notice Resumed

Mr M. McGOWAN: I point out that when the opposition refers to decisions made by the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal when the Liberal Party was in government and tries to say that it is somehow the responsibility of the current government, it is frankly preposterous. However, I note that the member for Bateman is a lot happier in opposition than he was in government.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: I will get back to you, member for Churchlands. I call you to order for the first time.

Point of Order

Mr D.C. NALDER: I refer to standing order 94 with regard to relevance and answering questions. The answers we are getting have no relevance to the question at all.

The SPEAKER: That is not a point of order. Get back to the point, Premier.

Questions without Notice Resumed

Mr M. McGOWAN: The member for Bateman asked the question. Every day when I look at him, I see a much happier person than I did when he was on this side of the house. I was actually paying him a compliment! He is getting happier as the days go by.

Back to the question, all the superannuation arrangements are in place —

Dr M.D. Nahan interjected.

The SPEAKER: Leader of the Opposition!

Mr M. McGOWAN: The superannuation arrangements in place were put in place by the government of Richard Court, of which the member for Cottesloe was deputy leader. Those are the arrangements that exist today, and it was a decision of the Liberal Party.

SALARIES AND ALLOWANCES AMENDMENT (DEBT AND DEFICIT REMEDIATION) BILL 2017

501. Mr D.C. NALDER to the Premier:

I have a supplementary question.

Mr D.J. Kelly interjected.

The SPEAKER: Minister for Water, I call you to order for the second time.

Mr D.C. NALDER: Can the Premier confirm that he is the only member in the house who will receive a pay rise through increased pension entitlements, and that there is one rule for him and another rule for every other Western Australian, just like his October 2000 vote?

Mr M. McGOWAN replied:

This is a fanciful and silly line of attack by the opposition. All I can say to the opposition is this: it needs some coaching.

METRONET

502. Mr Y. MUBARAKAI to the Minister for Transport:

I refer to comments made by the Leader of the Opposition, who today urged the government not to build Metronet and, in so doing, punish my community by scrapping the Thornlie–Cockburn train line. Will the government take that advice from the Liberal Party and scrap Metronet; and, if not, why not?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI replied:

I thank the member for Jandakot for that question and for his commitment to public transport in this state. The Liberal Party has shown yet again its complete disdain for public transport in Western Australia and its disrespect for the Western Australian community. Today the Liberal Party said that the government should abandon Metronet. It is acting in opposition as it acted in government—wrecking the finances and walking away from election commitments. That is what it did in government.

Dr M.D. Nahan interjected.

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

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: It has learned nothing from the past. It wrecked the finances and it abandoned its election commitments—Ellenbrook rail line, MAX light rail. It walked away from its commitments and the public punished it for that. Now, in opposition, it is acting in the same way. It is wrecking the finances. Yesterday it showed that it was more keen on protecting goldmining millionaires than it is on delivering public transport in this state. That is what it is doing.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: I call the member for Vasse to order for the first time.

Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup interjected.

The SPEAKER: If you want to keep interjecting, member for Dawesville, you will be going home very early.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: It wants to destroy jobs in this state; it wants to destroy projects. Let it be on the record: it wants to destroy construction project jobs in this state. That is what it wants to do. It wants us to cut projects. It wants to kill jobs, just when the economy is starting to get on its feet again. At an industry body dinner last night, what was on the board for all the industry players to see? It was Metronet. It is creating enthusiasm and certainty, and the Liberal Party wants to destroy it. Just when we are out there, creating jobs, it wants to destroy them.

Several members interjected.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: What is wrong with these guys?

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Yes, and there is a rabble on both sides of the chamber at the moment. I will start calling people to order.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: When the Liberal Party was in government, it wrecked the state's finances, increased unemployment —

Mr D.C. Nalder interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Bateman, you will have a chance to ask a question.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: When in government, the Liberal Party wrecked the state's finances, increased unemployment and basically tore up its election commitments and it wants to do the same thing in opposition from the grave. We are working hard with the federal government and our new supporter of the Ellenbrook rail line, Hon Christian Porter. He is the first Liberal Party member to support the Ellenbrook rail line and he is 100 per cent behind it.

Mr D.C. Nalder interjected.

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

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The member for Bateman could have asked me during my five hours of estimates questions! As I recall, the opposition did not ask one question about Metronet in the five hours of questioning in estimates.

Let me get back to the key point. We are working to secure funding. We will stand up for Metronet, stand up for WA jobs and stand up for economic growth in this state.

SALARIES AND ALLOWANCES AMENDMENT (DEBT AND DEFICIT REMEDIATION) BILL 2017

503. Ms M.J. DAVIES to the Minister for Police:

I refer to the minister's decision to keep her parliamentary pension entitlement while denying —

Dr M.D. Nahan interjected.

The SPEAKER: When a member interjects on someone from their own side of the house, I think there is a problem. Let the Leader of the National Party have her say.

Ms M.J. DAVIES: Thank you, Mr Speaker.

I refer to the minister's decision to keep her parliamentary pension entitlement while denying police officers the pay increase that her government promised. Has she given up her entitlement; and, if not, will she do so today or risk being labelled a hypocrite?

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order, members!

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS replied:

Mr Speaker, I might just inquire whether that question is in order as it does not pertain to my portfolio.

The SPEAKER: That is not a proper question.

PAY-ROLL TAX ASSESSMENT AMENDMENT (DEBT AND DEFICIT REMEDIATION) BILL 2017

504. Ms E. HAMILTON to the Premier:

I refer to this government's commitment to fix the state's finances and to the efforts by some in the community to put the entire burden of budget repair on households. Can the Premier outline why the increase in payroll tax for large companies is important to fixing the financial mess left by the previous Liberal-National government?

Mr M. McGOWAN replied:

I thank the member for Joondalup for the question; she is an outstanding local member of Parliament.

The legislation that was read in this morning involves a payroll tax levy on less than one per cent of businesses in Western Australia. The purpose behind the measure is to assist the government share the burden of fixing the state's budget across the community. As members know, we have lost \$5 billion since the *Pre-election Financial Projections Statement* was published, and this budget repair measure will assist us to deal with that. This measure will raise \$435 million across the forward estimates and is supported by a range of businesspeople. I have here some words by Dale Alcock, a senior businessperson in Western Australia. I go to lots of functions and events and most businesspeople I meet—in fact, anyone who has commented on this measure—has told me that it is a fair and reasonable measure given the circumstances faced by the state. It will impact on only a very small group of businesses, less than one per cent as I said, but it will rake in some significant support for the state government to manage the budget. I would like to think, and I hope, that the opposition will support this important budget repair measure through the Parliament so that it can be put in place.

The Chamber of Commerce and Industry of Western Australia has raised issues about it and I indicate that in the lead-up to next year's budget, I am more than happy to enter into a discussion, a dialogue, with the CCI about the issue of thresholds for the smaller businesses in Western Australia that might be caught by payroll tax. I realise that payroll tax is unpleasant for business and I will enter into that conversation, that dialogue, in light of the financial circumstances that confront us at the time. Obviously, in the meantime we hope for significant improvement in our GST situation, which, no doubt, will help those conversations. I understand that there is some concern in the business community about particularly the lower end, the smaller to medium-sized businesses, which have 10 employees and the like, that are caught by the payroll tax net. As I indicated, in the lead-up to next year's budget, we will engage in conversations with the CCI to make sure that we understand the issues and look at what is possible in the financial circumstances we face.

SALARIES AND ALLOWANCES AMENDMENT (DEBT AND DEFICIT REMEDIATION) BILL 2017

505. Mr A. KRSTICEVIC to the Minister for Public Sector Management:

In addition to the minister's outrageous gold-plated pension, can he confirm —

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Minister for Water, I call you to order for the third time.

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: In addition to the minister's outrageous gold-plated pension, can he confirm that the annual gross household income paid for by Western Australian taxpayers to the power couple, the member for Cannington and the President of the upper house, is more than \$830 000?

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Excuse me! Member for Armadale and Minister for Mines and Petroleum, I call you to order for the first and second time.

Ms R. Saffioti interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members, your Premier is on his feet. Minister for Transport and Minister for Tourism, I call you to order.

Mr M. McGOWAN replied:

The only way I can respond to that question is by saying that the Liberal Party has reached a new low.

SALARIES AND ALLOWANCES AMENDMENT (DEBT AND DEFICIT REMEDIATION) BILL 2017

506. Mr A. KRSTICEVIC to the Minister for Public Sector Management:

I have a supplementary question. Will the minister immediately demand that the member for Cannington pay back the \$5 300 from double-dipping on his car allowance?

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members, I will close it down.

Mr M. McGOWAN replied:

We have, or have had, in the gallery a senior figure from British politics. I doubt he has ever seen anything as low as this.

MINES SAFETY AND INSPECTION LEVY

507. Mr S.A. MILLMAN to the Minister for Mines and Petroleum:

I refer to the mines safety and inspection levy. Why upon coming to government was the mines safety and inspection levy account \$10 million in deficit; and, how has the minister listened to industry's concerns, addressed the mismanagement of the account and corrected the abominable situation?

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON replied:

Thank you very much, member for Mount Lawley, for a very good question that is relevant to the state's finances and important to the people of this state. I answer this question as the proud husband of the first woman elected as a Presiding Officer in the Parliament of Western Australia.

Government members: Hear, hear!

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Does everyone want to have a chat, get a cup of tea and sit down? It is question time, guys. When I stand on my feet, you be quiet.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: I was surprised when I came to government to find that the former government had not acted on the advice from the Department of Mines and Petroleum that it was not collecting the correct amount of revenue for the mine safety levy. Let me make it clear that the mine safety and inspection regime in Western Australia is an industry-funded activity. Let me explain that to the former minister, because he seemed not to understand this. That means that the money raised from the levy pays for that government activity and has to be in balance. If it is in surplus, we can discount the levy the following year to bring the account back into balance. But if a deficit is run, that means that the government is having to pay additional costs. It adds to the budget deficit in the state. It is what they call a black hole. I was not aware of the fact that the former minister had not reacted to the advice that he had received that he needed to deal with this matter; that is, there had been a \$4 million deficit at the end of 2015–16 financial year and we were on track for our \$9 million or \$10 million deficit at the end of the 2016–17 financial year.

I acted to overcome the inaction of the past. I worked with the agency to increase the levy so that we can recover the debt and we can recover the black hole that was left by the failure of the former minister to react to the advice he received from his department. Following the decision that I made with the agency, I spoke to the two main representative bodies in the industry—the Association of Mining and Exploration Companies and the Chamber of Minerals and Energy. I did two things. First, I told them what was happening and invited them to talk to the department. The other thing I did was make a commitment to them that I would work cooperatively with them to create a system similar to the one run by the federal government for the National Offshore Petroleum Safety and Environmental Management Authority, which is the offshore regulator for health and safety, by which that industry can see three years in advance what the expected costs are and what the expected levy will be. This is an easy solution. It was not exactly hard to find this solution. The difference was that I was prepared to put the interests of Western Australians first, listen to advice from the agency and act.

I have here in my hand—I notice nobody is asking me to table these documents, but I am going to table them anyway—two letters. One is to Mr Howard-Smith, the chief executive officer of the Chamber of Minerals and Energy. One is to Mr Simon Bennison, the chief executive officer of the Association of Mining and Exploration Companies. In these letters, having already had discussions with them privately, I outlined to them in a formal sense so that they could take it up with their members, what the arrangements would be for the future. They both made the point that this was the first occasion in eight years that a minister had consulted them before decisions were made. That was the first time there was proper consultation about this important issue.

We cannot allow these black holes. It is the \$10 million, the \$8 million and the \$100 million—they all add up. It was interesting that a member on the other side talked about increasing debt. There was a 1 000 per cent increase in debt during the time of the Liberal government—a 1 000 per cent increase in debt. Now we know why. Members opposite were not prepared to take the actions that they had to take. They have come into opposition and taken the same approach to opposition that they used to take to government. I table these two letters.

[See papers 868 and 869.]

CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE — CIVIL LITIGATION — STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS LEGISLATION

508. Mr P.J. RUNDLE to the Premier:

I refer to the statute of limitations legislation that the Premier promised my constituents the Beale family from Esperance would be introduced as a matter of priority.

- (1) Given that there are only five weeks of Parliament remaining, will the Premier commit to introducing the legislation this year?
- (2) Will the Premier commit to declaring the legislation urgent to allow the legislation to pass before the Christmas recess?

Mr M. McGOWAN replied:

(1)–(2) I thank the member for Roe for the question. It must be said that it is the first decent opposition question during question time. It is a real issue and I appreciate that there are people across Western Australia who are impacted by the situation as it currently exists. The current situation is that if a person is a victim of a child sex predator, their capacity to pursue legal action expires after six years. In effect, that means that at the age of 24, their capacity to take legal action expires. Of course, the evidence shows that it normally takes 22 years for a person to come to terms with what occurred. Therefore, the statute of limitations has expired for most people who are victims. We committed in opposition to remedying this situation.

The Attorney General is currently working on this legislation. There are a couple of complexities. I will explain one to the member for Roe. There is complexity around an organisation or an individual that may have existed at the time of the offence or may have had a certain identity at the time of the offence, and that identity may have changed in the meantime. We want to make sure that those people or organisations that were responsible—not just the government, but other institutions—can be held accountable and cannot avoid responsibility merely because an individual who worked for them might have left or moved or the name of the organisation may have changed. Therefore, there are complexities in the drafting process to make sure that we capture that and enable those people who want to pursue this legal action to undertake that. That is an ongoing piece of work.

Ms M.J. Davies: You didn't think there were any of those complexities last year.

Mr M. McGOWAN: Seriously, this is dealing with the victims of child sex offenders. I am trying to answer the question —

Mrs L.M. Harvey interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members! Member for Scarborough!

Mr M. McGOWAN: I am trying to answer the question with as much information as I can provide to the member.

Ms M.J. Davies interjected.

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

Ms M.J. Davies interjected.

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

Mr M. McGOWAN: There is that complexity around the legislation.

The second complexity is this: the commonwealth is currently working on a redress scheme, and we have to make a decision about whether to opt in or opt out of the commonwealth redress scheme. My understanding is that the commonwealth redress scheme will commence on 1 July next year. There is complexity around that as well, because if we opt in to the redress scheme, who picks up the cost? Secondly, does the cost or any payout from that get deducted from any legal action? The third complexity is to ensure that we, as much as is humanly possible in the drafting, reduce the amount of any payout going to legal advisers as opposed to going to a victim. The Attorney General is probably better informed than me, but they are the three complexities that I am aware of that we are working on. We have had meetings with the Solicitor-General, the State Solicitor, and various elements of government on a number of occasions —

Mr J.R. Quigley: And with victims.

Mr M. McGOWAN: — and victims on a number of occasions trying to work out these complexities to make it as good as we possibly can for victims. We would like to introduce the legislation this year. It is a matter of whether we can resolve all those issues prior to introducing the legislation. I would think that the member for Roe, as someone who cares about this issue, would agree that we have to get it right before we introduce it and not do something in which a victim might pursue legal action and one-third or one-half of the proceeds be taken by lawyers. A victim might take legal action and the entity against which they have taken legal action either does not exist or the individual involved has left and, therefore, the organisation claims no responsibility. They are all complexities that we are trying to work through, but we remain committed to what we said before the election.

GOLDFIELDS ARTS CENTRE

509. **Ms A. SANDERSON to the Minister for Culture and the Arts:**

I refer to the praise the minister recently received in this house from the member for Kalgoorlie and the recognition of the astounding work that the minister has been doing in his community. Can the minister advise the rest of the house what he has been doing to deliver for the people of Kalgoorlie?

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN replied:

Mr Speaker, I thank —

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member, speak to the Chair, please.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: I thank the member for Morley for her question. We have had an interesting question time today. I want to acknowledge the member for Kalgoorlie, and I mean this sincerely. We have byplay and some good humour across the chamber. The other night the member for Kalgoorlie acknowledged the government's efforts to secure the future of the Goldfields Arts Centre in Kalgoorlie–Boulder. It is very important. It is an issue that Hon Kyle McGinn is also passionate about, as is the local council, of course. The wonderful Esther Roadnight, who I understand is a Freeman of the City of Kalgoorlie–Boulder, was passionate about it on behalf of the friends of that place. We had some good byplay. The member for Kalgoorlie, I suppose, attempted to lay some praise on government and there was an attempt to muzzle him, but, in good humour, he finally got his words out. It is important, particularly given the question time we are about to conclude, that there is acknowledgement when good things happen in communities. The good thing that has happened now for the community of Kalgoorlie–Boulder and the goldfields generally is that the Goldfields Arts Centre, which, for a number of decades has provided an important facility for local and touring product, has become a centre where cultural arts and education focus is delivered.

I am pleased that the member for Kalgoorlie has come to this place and when he stands to speak, he does it in a positive way. I hope he does not lose that and become bitter and twisted like some of his colleagues who sit around him. It is important to note that when we represent a community, no matter what side of Parliament or what party we may represent, essentially, we represent the people who put us here. I appreciated his comments the other night when he finally got out his praise. It is a message for everyone here. We have a very big task to address the budget situation that this state faces. It is a situation that we as a new government have been dealt by the previous government. We need to work together to address the challenges that face the state. Sometimes it might help if members opposite took a leaf out of the books of the three new opposition members of this place and, when government does the right thing, acknowledge it and work with government so that we can deliver quality outcomes for the people of Western Australia no matter where they live in this state.

I applaud you, member for Kalgoorlie. You are probably one of the most affable people I have met in my 17 years in this place and I think you and I will become very good friends over time.

STATE FINANCES — EXPENSE GROWTH

510. Mrs L.M. HARVEY to the Premier:

- (1) Can the Premier confirm that his government's first budget has forecast expense growth at 3.7 per cent from 2016–17 to 2017–18 compared to one per cent growth over the same period in the *Pre-election Financial Projections Statement*?
- (2) Can the Premier confirm that this is a massive \$542 million increase in expenses growth and explain the reason for this expenses growth?

Mr M. McGOWAN replied:

- (1)–(2) I can confirm that the member opposite should look in the budget where she will find all the figures. It is true that in the budget there is a wages growth component of around six to seven per cent. That comprises 4.5 per cent inherited wages growth because of enterprise bargaining agreements that were undertaken prior to the state election and a component of the remainder, I think, is the voluntary targeted redundancy scheme that the government has put in place. The other issue, as the Treasurer said in his budget speech —

Mr D.C. Nalder interjected.

Mr M. McGOWAN: Why did the member for Bateman not ask the question; he is the shadow Treasurer?

Mr D.C. Nalder interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Bateman!

Mr M. McGOWAN: He is as happy as Larry sitting over there, isn't he? He is as happy as a pig in mud. I remember him sitting here being angry all the time. I must say that opposition suits the member for Bateman!

Mrs L.M. Harvey: This is about the state's finances.

Mr M. McGOWAN: I think opposition is permanent for you.

Mrs L.M. Harvey: It is about \$542 million.

Mr M. McGOWAN: From memory, expense growth over the forward estimates is under two per cent. That reflects extremely well compared to that of the former government. The first budget of the former government in 2009 had multiple levels of expense growth over the first budget of the Labor government. As the Productivity Commission indicated, it was that first four years of the former government that really, really hurt Western Australia. Page 10 of the Productivity Commission report concerning the GST states —

... Western Australia's experience has been an unprecedented outlier —

That is true —

exacerbated by earlier budget decisions of the WA Government.

Again, this is the Productivity Commission, a very conservative black-letter organisation. It states —

... the WA Government —

It is referring to the former government.

based its spending decisions on the assumption that a 0.75 GST relativity floor would be introduced.

How it assumed that and why it assumed that, without any evidence, was wishful thinking upon which the former government gambled the future of Western Australia. It was a gamble that, under the former government, the people lost; under us, the people finally have a government that is responsible.

STATE FINANCES — EXPENSE GROWTH

511. Mrs L.M. HARVEY to the Premier:

I have a supplementary question. Back to expenses growth: the *Annual Report on State Finances* released two weeks ago revealed that expenses growth for 2017–18 had risen a further \$1.41 billion. That is the Premier's budget. What will the Premier do to rein in the expenditure?

Mr M. McGOWAN replied:

My colleague and former Treasury officer, now Minister for Transport, said the member for Scarborough had declined to ever ask a question of her because she is intellectually superior to some people in this house.

Mr S.K. L'Estrange: Switch chairs!

Mr M. McGOWAN: She would do a great job here, my friend. She has the deputy Liberal leader absolutely terrified. The deputy Liberal leader is absolutely terrified of the Minister for Transport. She is so frightened she cannot bring herself to ask the minister a question.

Mrs L.M. Harvey: I have asked lots of question on notice.

Mr M. McGOWAN: She indicated to me that the document the member for Scarborough is referring to is retrospective, not prospective.

SALARIES AND ALLOWANCES AMENDMENT (DEBT AND DEFICIT REMEDIATION) BILL 2017

Appropriations

Message from the Governor received and read recommending appropriations for the bill.

Second Reading

Resumed from an earlier stage of the sitting.

DR M.D. NAHAN (Riverton — Leader of the Opposition) [2.49 pm]: I will resume from where I left off. I would like to make a few comments about some of the issues that were raised in the question time just finished and in previous question times, and of course the rhetoric from the government that brought down the budget. Everyone recognises that the Labor Party is in a difficult financial situation. It went to an election in 2008, 2013 and 2017 with a massive increase in expenditure. In 2008, it thought it had it. In 2013 it was warned about iron ore prices, which it ignored, and came down with the mother of all expenses. It went to the 2017 election, committed to Metronet and a raft of other expenditure and put out a report to the public, not to Treasury—it avoided that—and said, “Here's our plan. It's fully funded. It's all costed. We've got it all covered.” It said it could afford it and pay down debt like a mortgage. It said it could eliminate the deficit over the forward estimates, not increase any taxes or charges, not impose a gold royalty increase and keep electricity charges at the forward estimates price. A month later, the government came up with this rhetoric that the books were so terrible that it could no longer do it. It did a con job on the public of Western Australia, and it is continuing with that.

The Premier of Western Australia is one of the most dishonest politicians that I have ever met. What he is doing in this budget process is still the same. For the record, I will outline what the budget does in deficit, debt and expending. The *Pre-election Financial Projections Statement*, which is a Treasury document, indicated as clearly as possible that the next government, which is this government, must have a debt reduction plan. The Labor Party went to the election and chose not to have such a plan. We had a plan, which we put forward, and it was rejected. The Labor Party offered no alternative. As a result, the Labor Party inherited the stock of debt at the time and saw the trajectory of where it was going. It was comfortable with that. It told the public that it had this under control but of course it did not. What we see in this budget is that each year, beyond the PFPS—beyond the situation that it inherited—the level of deficit and debt is continuing to increase. Each year the debt and deficit under the Labor Party's policies go up. Over the first three years, the debt goes up by \$4.5 billion above what was in the PFPS. Above the situation it inherited, debt will go up by \$11.6 billion—a 36 per cent increase in debt under its

watch. The government is blaming us for wrecking the budget. What has it been doing? It knew what the figures were and it came in with these policies. The reason debt will go up is that the government is spending too much on the promises it made. Government members keep saying to us, “How dare you ask us to break promises!” We are in a swamp of broken promises under this government. Everything it has done is broken—taxes and fees and charges. It is breaking promises across the board. The reason for that is that the policies it put to the public were untrue and it had to break them. Its task is to decide which ones to break. That is the choice it has. I know that; I knew it before the election. That is the clear case now.

The government is wrecking the budget. Especially since the phoney forward estimates, debt will not stop at \$43.6 billion because the government committed to a whole list of things that are not in the budget. The Ellenbrook rail line is not there, the Byford rail extension is not there and Karnup station is not there. Medihotels will probably be privatised. The Minister for Water loves that one. That would be a public–private partnership. Dare I say it but Serco will probably run it. The expansion of Joondalup is another privatised development but that is not in the budget. Geraldton Hospital, Bunbury Hospital, and Collie Hospital are not in the budget. The list goes on. All these promises are not there yet. Debt will go up by \$11.6 billion. That is the context we live in.

The government is trying to blame everything on us. The government is meeting the expenditure policy that it got elected on and it cannot afford it so it is trying to cut other promises, particularly no increases to taxes and other fees. Today we are dealing with something that the government brought on to fund its election promise—that is, to freeze the wages of highly paid public servants, parliamentarians and others. The government brought this on as part of a scam, in urgency. We have already dealt with this. There is nothing urgent about this at all. The government is overriding the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal, which it does not need to override because SAT froze the wages of parliamentarians and public servants for another year. It has a long history of adhering to the wages policy of the government of the day, which in this case is to freeze wages, so there is no need to do this.

I want to go through some of the anomalies that were not explained to us, and the exemptions that are of concern. I dealt with one. Another relates to the senior executives, particularly the chief executive officers, of government trading enterprises, including Racing and Wagering Western Australia, Synergy, Horizon Power, Western Power and the Water Corp. That is the big issue. They are exempted. Why? One of the justifications for this, as indicated, is that the highest paid public servant, according to the Premier—I think he is right—the CEO of RWWA, is exempted. Why?

Another exemption that is very strange is redundancy payments for members of Parliament. Why are they proposed to be exempted? I understand that the redundancy benefit is so many months of pay after so many terms. The government has frozen wages. Why does it want to exempt redundancy payments when they are based on salary and so many terms of service? Is the government proposing to change the terms of service? The wages are frozen. Is the government proposing or considering changing the payout rate per term? Members of Parliament would get three months’ pay for one term, six months for two terms and I think nine months for three terms. Is the government proposing to change that? Wages are frozen. That is okay. Is the government thinking about changing the number of months that members get as redundancy pay? When we put it to the advisers, they were not sure. There will be a lot of redundancies after the next election, mainly on the government side. A lot of people will be leaving; there will be a lot of one-term members. Is the government considering expanding the redundancy arrangement for politicians; and, if so, why and how? It must be, otherwise it would not exempt it. It is not telling the public that it is thinking about giving an additional benefit to politicians who exit this place and they are going to be exempted from this freeze. Why?

There is another issue that again was not explained to us by the advisers yesterday. In the last few paragraphs of the advice, it states that once the freeze ends on 1 July 2021, the tribunal may not make a compensatory determination. In other words, it cannot go back and say, “You lost all this money during the period of the freeze” and give the government a lump sum to make up for it. However, upon terminating the wages and conditions after 1 July 2021, it can take into consideration the lack of increases over those four years and make a higher wage determination. In other words, it is allowed to make a great big back tax, and if it did that, there would be hardly any benefits to this. That is explicitly built into the bill. The tribunal can take into account changing the circumstances since the freeze commenced; for example, if the CPI increased by five per cent in total over the freeze, the tribunal could provide for remuneration increases of five per cent to be applicable from 1 July 2021. The Public Sector Commission probably provided that information to me. I assume the government is thinking that after this freeze it will give everybody a massive wage increase. That is what the government will be doing if it allows the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal to backcast. The government will allow it to backcast. The government did not tell the public that. It has not made that clear in its discussions. To be fair, the Public Sector Commission told us about that but it does not make sense.

Mrs M.H. Roberts: You’d better get off that grassy knoll sometime.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Yes, yes. You have been in this place for a long time and your contribution is —

Mrs M.H. Roberts interjected.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Yes, yes. You will be here a long time, given your pension. If I were on your pension with your pension benefits, I would be here for a long time. But you know what? The amount of money you get for your pension is probably about double your wages: are you going to freeze that increase in pension? No. The government is freezing everybody else's allowances, wages and superannuation contributions. Is the Minister for Police going to stand and take leadership? Under this situation the Minister for Police will get an increase when no-one else does.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr R.S. Love): Members! Members!

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Minister for Tourism!

Dr M.D. NAHAN: The Liberal opposition supports wage restraint, particularly on this one. We have real problems with the Premier overriding the SAT. It sets really significant standards of change and it will override other independent tribunals going forward. I suspect he will do that next. It particularly relates to judges and Parliament; that is, he will be determining the wages and conditions of the judiciary. That is what the Premier will be doing. We really have a problem with all these exemptions. I hope and trust the Premier will come and explain it, but in the usual way he will probably just bluster. I would like to move an amendment.

Amendment to Motion

Dr M.D. NAHAN: I move —

To delete “now” and insert after “time” —

after the member for Rockingham has moved his gold-plated and exorbitant entitlements in line with all members of Parliament elected after 2001, to ensure he, too, is sharing the burden of budget repair rather than expecting every single Western Australian other than himself to share the burden

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Thank you, members. Have you finished your contribution, Leader of the Opposition?

Dr M.D. NAHAN: I have moved an amendment.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Yes, I am aware of that. We are just getting a copy done of the proposed amendment.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Okay.

The ACTING SPEAKER: And the question will be that the amendment be agreed to. In the meantime, carry on. The member for Bateman has the call.

MR D.C. NALDER (Bateman) [3.02 pm]: I will speak to the amendment. This strikes right at the heart of leadership. I imagine that the Premier has taken a stance on the remuneration of senior public servants, members of Parliament and the judiciary as an example of leadership. I think taking this lead in looking at the remuneration of the most senior people in the state government warrants closer investigation of the leader of the state—the Premier of Western Australia—to provide a little closer examination of his actual remuneration. We question whether he really is taking a leadership role in ensuring that the measures he is applying to all members of Parliament, the leaders of bureaucracy and our judiciary, are applied equally to himself.

It is important to understand what makes up the remuneration. Every member of Parliament is on a base level salary. Irrespective of whether someone is the Premier, a minister or a backbencher, we are all on exactly the same base level of salary. For additional duties we receive a higher office allowance. What is not known by many people is that the Premier is on a different rate of remuneration than every backbencher who sits as part of the government. Excluding his higher office allowance, the Premier is on a different remuneration rate than every backbencher in government.

The question how this came about and why has it occurred. It is important to understand how these two remuneration levels could have been created. I think it is important for the members of this house who are voting on this bill and amendment to understand how this has come about. In October 2000 a private member's bill came before this house. The bill stated that the government wanted to change the remuneration standard and remove the pension scheme from all future members of Parliament. The bill intended that the new superannuation scheme would apply to all members from 1996 onwards. The bill made it voluntary for new members of Parliament between 1996 and 2000, and they were given the choice as to whether they stayed on the old scheme or shifted to the new scheme. The Premier entered Parliament after the 1996 election. He voted for the removal of the pension scheme for everybody other than himself moving forward. He chose to stay on the old scheme. We are talking about the leader of this state. He chose to continue to receive that, but voted in favour of having it removed for those of us who joined Parliament after 2001.

It is really interesting that there was little understanding of the impact on a member of Parliament's remuneration. Up until 2013 that had never been assessed. I have a copy of a paper presented to the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal, and I am conscious that members of both sides of the house were briefed on this paper. It goes through the financial impact on all future members of the removal of that scheme. This finds that for the average service period for a member of Parliament, it had the effect of halving the remuneration of MPs. So all those people who voted to remove it but keep it for themselves, in effect halved the remuneration of all future members of Parliament. The Premier is one of those people who voted. Because he started after the 1996 election, he had a choice. The legislation did not provide a choice for members who were there after.

Several members interjected.

Mr D.C. NALDER: What does this mean?

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Minister for Tourism!

Mr D.C. NALDER: There is an interesting report in the Parliamentary Library. If anybody is interested in what happened and what the old pension scheme was, it is a report on parliamentary and judicial superannuation arrangements in Western Australia as of February 1998. There are three particularly interesting pages—pages 40, 41 and 42. It actually goes through how to calculate a pension and the commutation of a lump sum benefit under the old scheme. Once a member has been in the house for 20 years, they are entitled to 75 per cent of a backbencher's salary. Then for higher office, they have to have been in higher office for only 11 years to receive 75 per cent of those higher office payments. If we do the rough calculations, that would suggest that the Premier, if he left today, would receive a pension of around \$200 000 per annum for the rest of his life. He could commute that to a lump sum if he chose to. But that does not apply to everybody else in this house who joined since 2001. They are all on the same remuneration. As I said, for exactly the same role the Premier—this is excluding the role as Premier in the higher office—is on the equivalent of double the remuneration of an average age, average service period member of Parliament.

I fast-forward to the bill that has been presented today. The bill seeks to freeze the salaries of members of Parliament. We on this side do not necessarily disagree with that. However, we want to ensure that all members of Parliament are treated in the same way. We want to ensure that the leader of this state, the Premier of Western Australia, shows leadership —

Mr P. Papalia interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Minister for Tourism!

Mr D.C. NALDER: — and applies the same —

Mr P. Papalia interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Minister for Tourism, I call you for the second time.

Mr D.C. NALDER: We want to ensure that the Premier applies the same standard to himself as he is seeking to apply to the other members of this chamber. We want to ensure that the Premier is consistent in his approach and treats himself the same as he has treating you guys across the chamber and the rest of us in this house. This is not about members on this side seeking a benefit that is greater than the benefit that the majority of members on the government side are receiving. We want to ensure that all members are treated in the same way. I can assure members that under this bill, members are not treated in the same way. The remuneration of members who entered Parliament after 2001 will be frozen. That flows through to the superannuation entitlements of those members. However, guess what? Over this four-year term, the Premier will get a dramatic increase in the pension to which he will be entitled for the rest of his life. Based on the assumptions that were delivered to the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal in 2013, the Premier is on the equivalent of double the remuneration that will be paid to any future Premier of Western Australia. The Premier had the choice at that time to be on the same superannuation system as every other member of the Parliament of Western Australia, and he chose not to do that. The Premier is now the leader of this state. We expect the Premier to set the same standard for himself as he is seeking to set for every other member of this house. The Premier voted to remove those benefits for all members elected after 2001. We now want the Premier to show leadership and hop onto the same superannuation scheme as other members of this Parliament. We are not looking for the Premier to be on a worse scheme than the scheme other members are on. We want him to be on the same scheme. Should the Premier be on a superannuation scheme that is different from the superannuation scheme of other members?

Mr D.T. Punch interjected.

Mr D.C. NALDER: I have no idea what the interjection is about. We want the Premier to set a standard for himself that is consistent with the standard set for every other member of this house. I cannot understand how any member could vote against that. We want the Premier to be treated in the same way as any future Premier will be treated. If the Premier sets that example, we will applaud him and move forward. This amendment calls on the Premier to

apply the same standard to himself as he is applying to every other member of this chamber. I think it is pretty clear. A vast amount of work was undertaken into the remuneration impact of the removal of the old pension scheme. The removal of that scheme has more than halved the net value of the remuneration of members of Parliament who were elected post-2000. The Premier voted for that to occur but protected it for himself. The Premier has set the standard. The Premier was happy to vote to retain a benefit for himself but remove that benefit from every other member of this Parliament. The Premier had the choice to put himself on the same platform. We are seeking for the Premier to make that choice and be treated the same as every other member of this Parliament. The Premier will still get the higher office allowance and all the benefits that go with that. We want the Premier to be on the same remuneration scheme as other members—nothing more, nothing less.

I support the amendment and look forward to the support of other members to ensure we have a consistent standard moving forward. Thank you.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr R.S. Love): Members, I have a statement to make. As a point of clarification, during the second reading debate on the Salaries and Allowances Amendment (Debt and Deficit Remediation) Bill 2017, the question before the Chair has been that the bill be now read a second time. The Leader of the Opposition is proposing a reasoned amendment to this question in accordance with standing order 170 by deleting the word “now” and inserting after the word “time” the following —

after the member for Rockingham has moved his gold-plated and exorbitant entitlements in line with all members of Parliament elected after 2001, to ensure he, too, is sharing the burden of budget repair rather than expecting every single Western Australian other than himself to share the burden

Therefore, the question before the Chair is that the word to be deleted be deleted.

MR V.A. CATANIA (North West Central) [3.16 pm]: I rise to support the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition. It is fair that all members in this place are on an equal footing. This is the point we are trying to make. I do not know why we are having this debate and why this bill moved by the Labor Party is so urgent when we have other legislation that needs to be dealt with, as the member for Roe brought up today. That is what should be dealt with. It taints members of Parliament in the eyes of the public when we have these sorts of debates. What taints members of Parliament even more in the eyes of the public is the hypocrisy in this place when the leader of one political party says that we need to freeze wages to save money, and he is on a superannuation scheme that the majority of Western Australians would dream to be on.

Mr W.R. Marmion: It’s like winning Lotto!

Mr V.A. CATANIA: That is a very good point—it is like winning Lotto!

Members opposite are all good members of Parliament. I know that a lot of members opposite would love to be on the old superannuation scheme, which now applies to only a few members of Parliament. The conversations that we have in the corridors and the conversations we have had in the past have all been about whether it is fair to have a two-tiered system in this Parliament. I know that the member for Mandurah; Leader of the House agrees with that. How can one member of Parliament earn over \$100 000 a year more than another member of Parliament who is doing exactly the same job? I do not know how anyone in this house can accept that. I certainly do not know how anyone in the public arena can accept that. I would love to be on the old pension scheme, and I am sure other members would, too. However, it is not reality in the community. We need to reflect community expectations. The days have long gone when a member of Parliament can walk out of this place with a pension worth millions of dollars given their length of service or the higher office they have held. I do not think that is acceptable. I do not think that meets community expectations. We would all like to have a pay increase. We would not be human if we did not want a pay increase. Members on this side may agree with the bill when it comes to freezing wages. However, we cannot accept a situation in which some members of this Parliament will not be affected by the wages freeze and will be earning more money than other members in this place yet are trying to portray that they are good corporate citizens and good citizens of Western Australia.

Members opposite all have their heads down. They were jumping up and down before. Does the member for Bunbury support someone else in this place getting extra money while they move a bill to limit what other members are earning?

Mr D.T. Punch interjected.

Mr V.A. CATANIA: I do not know which electorates some of these members represent. Does the member for Collie–Preston, who is scratching his head, support the Premier earning a rolled-gold pension when the member for Collie–Preston has been in Parliament for 17 years? When are members opposite going to stand and say that enough is enough? The hypocrisy that exists in this place is incredible. We have seen it in the gold royalty and iron ore debates.

Several members interjected.

Mr V.A. CATANIA: Are you the rat? Are you the rat who took the photo?

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members! Silence.

Withdrawal of Remark

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: Acting Speaker, there was a derogatory term attributed to the member while he was speaking and on his feet. I ask that that term be withdrawn.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr R.S. Love): I do not know whether I heard that.

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: The member for Perth continuously called him a rat. I ask that that be withdrawn.

Mr J.N. Carey: I withdraw the comment that the member is a rat.

Debate Resumed

Mr V.A. CATANIA: They may call me the rat, but I know who has the gold tooth, and that is the Premier. Let us get back to the hypocrisy that exists in this place. If members opposite do not support this amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition, when we walk out of this place, they ought to hang their heads in shame. This hurts the reputation of members of Parliament.

Mr J.N. Carey: You will never be a minister. You were overlooked. You are overlooked for everything.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Perth!

Mr V.A. CATANIA: Member for Perth, for the last eight years I have heard that. Back in 2009 I heard people say that I would not be a member in 2013. In 2013, I heard people say that I would not be a member after 2017. Members, I am still here and I am proud of what I have represented and what I have been able to do for my communities. Now government members have the chance to do something for Western Australia and ensure that, in their words, everyone bears the burden of the financial situation. Members should lead by example, get rid of gold teeth and ensure they put a proper filling in their teeth like everyone else has—unlike the Premier with his gold tooth.

MRS L.M. HARVEY (Scarborough — Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [3.23 pm]: We do not want to labour this point for too much longer, but I will stand to make some remarks in favour of this amendment. We made it very clear during the urgency debate for this bill today that this legislation is a political stunt. This legislation is not going to achieve anything that the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal is not already doing. Clearly, this stunt is going to rapidly backfire on the Premier. Effectively, it will freeze the salaries of all members of Parliament for the next four years. All of us understand that. It is great retail politics. People in the community hate members of Parliament getting pay rises. But what they hate more is gold-plated pension schemes that allow members of Parliament to be paid year in, year out until the day they die. If they predecease their spouse, their spouse gets two-thirds of that salary until they die as well. That is the Premier's gold-plated scheme.

It should be noted that the Premier is not in the chamber now for his own legislation and nor are many members, although the opposition members are all here. The Premier is asking all of us to have our wages frozen and all those newly elected members of Parliament and members who have been elected subsequent to 2001, who are on a different scheme, to effectively reduce our super entitlement. There will not be any pay rises so, therefore, we will not be adding any more to our super and we will not receive any increases. He knows that even if this is wildly unpopular with his backbench, the retail politics will work. If the backbench decides to boot him out, he is all right, Jack. He has a fantastic pension. He will get paid, on our estimates, \$200 000 a year for the rest of his life at taxpayers' expense. We are saying to the Premier, quit the rhetoric. Do not talk the talk, walk the walk. Do the decent thing and move from the old parliamentary pension scheme into the modern superannuation arrangements like everybody else. That is a couple of million dollars of savings. We have been told today that a couple of million dollars matters. A couple of million dollars will go to this Premier, who is asking everybody else to have a pay cut because there will be no increases for other members of Parliament over four years. Our salaries will not keep pace with CPI. He is effectively asking us to take a cut.

The Premier should step into the twenty-first century and have superannuation entitlements that are consistent with those of every other person in the community and all his colleagues in this chamber. Walk the walk, Premier, who is not in the chamber. Move into the modern superannuation arrangements. He should get rid of those aged gold-plated entitlements and show the Western Australian community that he is personally prepared to help with the budget repair, just as he has asked police officers and nurses to do. The government is asking businesses to pay more payroll tax and householders to pay 11 per cent more for electricity. They are not getting a gold-plated pension scheme. The government is asking everybody in the community to take a hit except for the Premier. We are saying, modernise. The Premier is only 50 years old. Step into the modern superannuation environment and take a hit like the rest of us are for budget repair.

Division

Amendment put and a division taken, the Acting Speaker (Mr R.S. Love) casting his vote with the ayes, with the following result —

Ayes (16)

Mr C.J. Barnett	Mrs L.M. Harvey	Mr S.K. L'Estrange	Dr M.D. Nahan
Mr I.C. Blayney	Mr P. Katsambanis	Mr R.S. Love	Mr D.C. Nalder
Mr V.A. Catania	Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup	Mr W.R. Marmion	Mr P.J. Rundle
Ms M.J. Davies	Mr A. Krsticevic	Mr J.E. McGrath	Ms L. Mettam (<i>Teller</i>)

Noes (33)

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

Pairs

Mr D.T. Redman	Mr B.S. Wyatt
Mr K. O'Donnell	Ms S.F. McGurk

Amendment thus negatived.

Second Reading Resumed

MRS L.M. HARVEY (Scarborough — Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [3.31 pm]: I once again rise to speak to the Salaries and Allowances Amendment (Debt and Deficit Remediation) Bill 2017. We have already established that there is no urgency in bringing this legislation forward because it seeks, in effect, to have the Parliament endorse the actions of the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal, which already freezes salaries as required and has made decisions consistent with the government of the day's wages policies virtually since it was formed. The Salaries and Allowances Tribunal was formed back in 1975 by the government of Sir Charles Court. I would like members to be aware of what was formed in the first place.

Prior to 1975, there were different tribunals and processes in place for determining the salaries and allowances of ministers of the Crown, the Parliamentary Secretary to the cabinet, officers and members of Parliament, magistrates, special division officers of the public service, and other full-time statutory offices. Before the Salaries and Allowances Act was enacted, there were different processes and time frames for the determination of increases in salaries and allowances. Indeed, in the federal jurisdiction and in other states, because of the differing electoral timetables and processes in every state, an agreement was reached between the Premiers and the Prime Minister of the day to try to move towards a more consistent format in which an independent board was set up to determine the salaries and allowances of members of Parliament. In Western Australia prior to 1967, members of Parliament set their own salaries and debated them in the Parliament, which is hardly an appropriate mechanism in any event, and meant that at that time the remuneration of members of Parliament would always be politicised—not unlike the situation in which we find ourselves in this chamber today.

When Sir Charles Court set up the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal, he made a point of saying in his second reading speech that he believed it needed to be an independent tribunal composed of three members appointed by the Governor, one of whom should be appointed by the Governor to be the chairman of the tribunal. He also believed that a person occupying an office within the jurisdiction of the tribunal should be ineligible for appointment to the tribunal. He was very emphatic in his belief that the establishment of a single tribunal with the functions he outlined would eliminate the dissatisfaction and concern that had often been felt in the past because of the accidents of timing and inconsistencies of approach that were inevitable when the remuneration of separate groups of officials was being determined by more than one authority. He made the point during the second reading debate on the legislation that the reason for setting up the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal was to create certainty that members of Parliament could not have input into or control over the determination of their salaries; he also believed that it was inappropriate for members of Parliament to determine the wages and salaries of senior public servants.

That is the independent process that was set up and, in effect, this amending legislation interferes with that independent process, but it interferes with it in a way that, given the current economic climate, potentially does not go far enough. There are a lot of inclusions and exclusions in the legislation, including, for example,

termination payments for members of Parliament; they are exempted from the freeze. The legislation also does not extend to government trading enterprises—corporations such as Synergy and Western Power. That is indeed curious. Western Power’s annual report shows that in 2016–17 there were seven individuals in the executive who received salaries of between \$351 000 and \$655 000 per annum. Those salaries will not be subject to the freeze imposed by this legislation. I would have thought that if we are trying to be effective in reining in expenses growth, we would acknowledge that expenses growth often comes from Synergy, Western Power and other non-government entities. Indeed, as has been debated in this chamber before, Western Power is responsible for \$8 billion of state debt, and it certainly needs more investment if it is going to keep the poles and wires network up to an adequate standard. If we were looking at opportunities for Western Power to save some cash to put into its poles and wires network instead of into salaries and wages, we could apply the freeze to those seven individuals at the top who earn between \$351 000 and \$655 000 per annum; but they are not part of this legislation. I do not know if that is because the legislation was rushed or because there was a requirement to bring it on as a stunt this week because the government did not do the work required in the Legislative Council to get its gold royalty rate increase through. I do not know what the reason is, but it is not there. Indeed, if the government were serious about the need to restrain wages growth, one would think it would include those entities.

At Synergy, there are nine individuals in the executive who receive between \$354 000 and \$580 000 per annum. Synergy is our energy retailer and I am sure that all the mums and dads and the families who have been hit with bearing more than their fair share of budget repair, with an 11 per cent increase in the supply charge on their electricity bills, would appreciate seeing those senior executives doing their bit for budget repair and having their wages frozen; yet they are not included in this bill. Not one of those nine individuals earning up to \$580 000 a year will be subject to a freeze as a result of this legislation and there is certainly no freeze on electricity prices in Western Australia—they have been upped absolutely savagely.

The government has not done due diligence with this legislation. In the interests of trying to get the legislation passed expeditiously, it has not given the opposition any opportunity to scrutinise it to understand it. We have had 24 hours to consider this legislation. We convened a special party room meeting this morning to discuss this bill with a two-page briefing note. What a ridiculous way to run government—absolutely ridiculous. The government said that this legislation is important; it brought it on and declared it urgent. I do not know whether this bill will languish in the Legislative Council. I doubt that the government has done any work with the crossbench in the Legislative Council to get it through expeditiously. It will no doubt try to blame the Liberal Party if the bill fails in the Legislative Council, but the fact is that when the government has a minority position in a house of Parliament, it needs to do the work with the crossbench to get legislation through, similar to what Malcolm Turnbull and Hon Mathias Cormann are doing in Canberra. They need to work with the crossbench and make amendments to legislation if necessary so that that legislation is acceptable to everybody in the interests of getting it through so that the government can get on with its business. The government said that this measure is a key part of its budget repair strategy, yet it has not given the opposition or, indeed, any Legislative Council members the opportunity to scrutinise it and assist with budget repair. It is a bloody big call. Excuse me; I forgot where I was. It is nearly beer o’clock! It is a big call to ask the opposition to rubberstamp this legislation and pass it through Parliament urgently when the government has not done the work required to get that cooperation.

Amendment to Motion

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I move —

To delete the word “now” and insert after the word “time” —

after the government amends the Parliamentary Superannuation Act to freeze any increases in pension benefits of those members elected prior to 2001 until 1 July 2021

MR D.C. NALDER (Bateman) [3.42 pm]: I refer to the issue of two different levels of remuneration for members of Parliament in this chamber. The findings of the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal and earlier analysis of changes to the defined benefits scheme show that people were of the view that it would be difficult to ascertain the financial impact because the impact on individuals would be different. It was not until 2013 that someone said that if we took an average age and an average service period, we could determine the average impact on a member of Parliament. It was found that their remuneration, taking the net present value of the pension scheme, would reduce by greater than 50 per cent. Effectively, the remuneration of members of Parliament was halved.

The Premier has rushed in the Salaries and Allowances Amendment (Debt and Deficit Remediation) Bill 2017. He has not allowed the opposition—I refer to both the Liberal and National Parties—time to scrutinise the bill to ascertain its merits or understand its finer details to ensure that we are comfortable with it. It is being rammed through the house.

One element of this bill is the financial impact that it will have on members of this chamber. We would expect that all members would be treated equally. Again, I reiterate that they are not being treated equally because of a decision that was made in October 2000. The freezing of members’ remuneration does not apply equally to everybody.

[Quorum formed.]

Mr D.C. NALDER: A case in point is that although benefits for members who have joined Parliament since 2001 will be frozen, the pension entitlements of the Premier, who joined Parliament after the 1996 election, will continue to grow over the next four years, and they will grow quite excessively because of his high office.

It is interesting to do a bit of analysis and look at the 1998 report on parliamentary and judicial superannuation arrangements, which is in the Parliamentary Library. It shows that the increase in pension entitlements that the Premier will receive over the next four years will be in the order of what the members for Collie–Preston, Mandurah and Cockburn would be able to generate from their superannuation for their entire period in Parliament. The increase in pension entitlements that the Premier will receive over the next four years will be greater than or equal to what those members of Parliament can generate after 16 years of service. That issue is not attended to by the bill. I reiterate that the Premier is creating a different standard for himself from the one that he is applying to every other member of this house. He is calling for austerity measures and wants a freeze on members' salaries for four years. We are not necessarily opposed to freezing members' salaries for four years, but we expect members of this house to be treated equally. If the Premier wants to show leadership on this issue, he will accept the amendment so that the freeze will also apply to his superannuation pension entitlement. We are not asking him to remove it altogether and to lower himself to the same standard that applies to the rest of us. We think it would be good leadership if the Premier demonstrated to members of this house that he is no better than anybody else in his Labor government team. But, alas, he chose not to and voted against the measure that would have him treated with the same standard that applies to other members of Parliament. In moving this amendment, we want the Premier to apply austerity measures to himself and freeze the increase in pension entitlements that he will receive over the next four years. I think that is fair and reasonable. He will continue to get the pension, and even if he leaves after the end of the next four years, he will still receive circa \$200 000 a year. The members for Collie–Preston, Mandurah and Cockburn would not be able to generate what the Premier will receive from an increase in pension entitlements just over the next four years. We ask him to apply austerity measures to himself in the same way that he is applying austerity measures to the rest of the chamber and to put a penalty on his entitlements. He should show leadership on the issue and freeze the increase in his pension entitlements. That will go a long way to showing leadership in this matter.

MR V.A. CATANIA (North West Central) [3.49 pm]: I have been doing a bit of research into this amendment and the Parliamentary Superannuation Legislation Amendment Bill 1999. That legislation was introduced by former Premier Mr Richard Court. I will read out the start of the bill's second reading speech. It is a very short bill—not too long. The second reading speech by former Premier Richard Court states —

This Bill introduces a number of changes to the superannuation arrangements for state parliamentarians; namely, closing the existing scheme to future members of Parliament; allowing certain current members to withdraw from the existing scheme and transfer to the new arrangements; transferring responsibility for changes to the rules of the existing scheme to an independent statutory authority, the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal; and empowering this independent tribunal to determine the level of superannuation for future members of Parliament and for any current members who choose to withdraw from the existing scheme.

I will not read out the whole second reading speech, but it continues —

Closing the existing scheme to future members of Parliament will require the introduction of new superannuation arrangements for such members and for any current members who choose to withdraw from the existing scheme. Only those current members who were elected at or following the 1996 general election will be eligible to withdraw from the existing scheme.

I think someone brought up before that anyone elected prior to the 1996 election was not eligible to withdraw. It continues —

In conclusion, the Bill honours a commitment the Government made to the people of Western Australia regarding closure of the existing parliamentary superannuation scheme. Importantly, the Bill resolves potential conflict of interest ... by transferring the responsibility for making changes to the existing scheme from Parliament to the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal.

That is very important, members. The responsibility was transferred to the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal. It continues —

I commend the Bill to the House and, for the information of members, table ...

It goes on. That was the second reading speech read by former Premier Mr Richard Court. If members look at *Hansard*, they will not see much debate on this legislation but there was quite a vigorous debate by the member for Willagee in opposition at the time, Mr Alan Carpenter, another former Premier. I will not go into it but he probably gave the lengthiest speech out of everyone on why the legislation needed to change to transfer the responsibility to the independent Salaries and Allowances Tribunal.

The now Premier, the member for Rockingham, made a contribution. Mr MacLean, the then member for Wanneroo, was explaining some of the things in the bill and the contribution that the member for Rockingham

made at the time was, “You are not in the class of ’96.” He was referring to the fact that the member for Wanneroo at the time had been elected prior to 1996; therefore, he did not have to make the decision about whether to leave the superannuation scheme. The bill provided that members elected prior to 1996 did not have a chance to make that decision but members who were elected at or after the 1996 election could make that decision up until 2001. That was the contribution that the member for Rockingham at the time, the now Premier, made. I will put on the record for members opposite that this is not a dig at someone who does not deserve to have this superannuation scheme. It was legislated in 1996. Members could keep it if they wanted or pass it up.

Being a country member of Parliament, I am upset that our allowances change rapidly, without us even knowing. Just before December last year, the tribunal changed our ability to have a lease vehicle to getting an amount of money. I have argued this case and it is good to see the SAT people sitting at the back because they need to know that I represent the largest electorate in Western Australia, at just under one million square kilometres. This year I am on track to make 140 000 kilometres in my lease vehicle, which equates to about \$25 000 in fuel. The allowance that is now given to regional members is, I think, \$42 000 a year, and \$25 000 of that has to go into fuel. Given that I have one million square kilometres to cover, I cannot just drive around. I have to fly from Perth to Tom Price, Exmouth or wherever and I need to use hire cars. I have to take that hire car money out of that \$42 000. I reckon I probably spend between \$15 000 and \$20 000 on hire cars a year, just to be able to get around the electorate. That does not leave much to get a car. With cattle, camels, wild pigs and kangaroos—you name it—we need to have vehicles that are safe. The amount of \$42 000 a year may cut it for someone in the city who can run around five square kilometres, but when we have to drive on roads that are 600, 700 or 800 kilometres of dirt at every hour of the morning and night, we need a vehicle that has the best ability to protect us. The \$42 000 that is given to us, with \$25 000 in fuel this year and the cost of hire cars, just does not cut the mustard. It makes the job harder to do because we cannot represent our community. It makes the job harder because our safety is put at risk. I hope that the members of SAT who are sitting in the Speaker’s gallery understand that.

The Salaries and Allowances Amendment (Debt and Deficit Remediation) Bill 2017 will prevent SAT from looking at those anomalies that exist for regional members of Parliament who cover large electorates. It will stop the tribunal from reflecting on what members need to do their jobs, such as a simple thing like a vehicle. I say to the Premier and members opposite that it is all about ensuring that we can do our jobs on a level playing field so we can represent our communities. I get upset when I see legislation like this and decisions made by the independent tribunal that do not allow members of Parliament to do their jobs in a safe manner, which everyone expects. Whether people are a public servant or work for a community, they expect to have all the safety equipment they need on the vehicle that they use to travel around and do their job. These changes occurred under the previous government, not under this government, because it was an independent body that made the determination. This legislation takes away the ability for members of Parliament to say, “Hang on a second. We can’t do our job. We cannot represent the community we were elected to represent because we don’t have the tools.” Being the member for North West Central, a car is absolutely vital to get around at all hours of the day and night, to get from the border of the Northern Territory to the coast and from South Australia and back.

There is a fundamental problem in being able to represent regional Western Australia with the tools we have been given under the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal. This legislation stops us from arguing our case with SAT, which has a duty of responsibility and care to make sure members of Parliament have vehicles and the necessary safety equipment in place to enable us to do our job. I expect that all members would agree to that. A lot of members opposite have been union officials who would stand up for their workers. If they did not have the tools they needed to do their jobs, they would be marching in the streets. As members of Parliament, the only marching we can do is to the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal. This legislation will take away the ability for us to say to the tribunal, “Hang on a sec; we’re elected to represent our electorates but we can’t do that with the tools you are providing us with.” I know that regional members opposite understand this because it is a constant fight to ensure that we have the tools we need to represent our communities. The Speaker, the member for Albany, has them, as does the member for Collie–Preston. They have been strong advocates in making sure they have the tools necessary to represent their community. I am saying that this legislation prevents us from doing that. Perhaps the Premier can consider how we can be given those tools so that we can be comfortable in knowing that we can do our job. It is not about whether our pay is frozen; it is about ensuring that we can do our job. I hope the Premier can consider that because this legislation allows him to ensure that determinations reflect the ability of members of Parliament to do their job. All I ask is that conditions for members of this place be equal in allowing them to represent their communities. Conditions for members of this place are not equal—they are not equal. All I ask is that the Premier consider an amendment to ensure we can be given those tools—forget about the pay.

Mr T.J. Healy: There are plenty of tools!

Mr V.A. CATANIA: No; this is serious. Over the last seven months I have had to take my car to the panelbeater three times. Thank God, it was due to only hitting a kangaroo. I have always missed everything else by, as one would say, “a cockroach’s”.

Ms A. Sanderson interjected.

Mr V.A. CATANIA: There is the problem.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members! Thank you.

Mr V.A. CATANIA: As I said, read page 6577 of the bound volumes of *Hansard* of Thursday, 4 May 2000, which members can find in the Parliamentary Library. Read the debates by former Premier Alan Carpenter and of former Leader of the Opposition and former Treasurer Hon Eric Ripper. Read the one-liner that the now Premier made, “You are not in the class of ‘96.” Read the debates! The party of members opposite—the party to which I once belonged—argued against superannuation entitlements.

Mr J.N. Carey: Flip-flop, flip-flop!

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Perth!

Mr V.A. CATANIA: The only flip-flopping is what the member for Perth does.

Mr J.N. Carey: Flip-flop, flip-flop!

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Perth!

Mr V.A. CATANIA: The Labor Party argued strongly for change to the superannuation scheme, and that affected the superannuation of members who were elected in 1996 and in 2001. I urge members opposite to use their sense and think about the hypocrisy that we reflect to the community when we create legislation like this that leaves us on an unequal footing. It has been a systemic situation among past governments and that is the case right now: if it does not suit me, I will not support it; because it suits me, I will now support it. That is what people do not like. I support the amendment.

DR M.D. NAHAN (Riverton — Leader of the Opposition) [4.04 pm]: This Salaries and Allowances Amendment (Debt and Deficit Remediation) Bill freezes all allowances and wages for parliamentarians. In conjunction with freezing our salaries, it freezes our annual superannuation contribution increases. It freezes everything—salaries, allowances and superannuation contribution increases—except for those of a few people whose conditions are under the old scheme. The old scheme is complex but covers the Premier’s conditions. Over the next four years, the Premier will receive a very large increase to the value of his superannuation through the defined pension scheme. The conditions of everyone whose conditions are not under that scheme will be frozen for four years as a matter of urgency. The Premier’s superannuation will increase annually. We think that is unfair and we ask the Premier not to ditch the whole scheme, but to freeze it for the four years of the scheme until 1 July 2021. In other words, we ask the Premier, as an act of leadership, to put himself on the same footing as everyone else. He is saying that everyone must bear some of the financial burden. The annual increase to his superannuation is substantial. It is a large annual increase in value that he will receive for life or, if he wants to, he can cash it out. It amounts to large amounts of money and will go up each year. No-one else will get that. He is saying that everyone should share the pain and that all their allowances, superannuation and salary be frozen, except his. He is the leader. It is very simple. If members opposite vote against this amendment, they will be voting for him to receive payments that no-one else in this Parliament will get. Do members opposite think that is fair?

Division

Amendment put and a division taken with the following result —

Ayes (16)

Mr C.J. Barnett	Mrs L.M. Harvey	Mr S.K. L’Estrange	Dr M.D. Nahan
Mr I.C. Blayney	Mr P. Katsambanis	Mr R.S. Love	Mr D.C. Nalder
Mr V.A. Catania	Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup	Mr W.R. Marmion	Mr P.J. Rundle
Ms M.J. Davies	Mr A. Krsticevic	Mr J.E. McGrath	Ms L. Mettam (<i>Teller</i>)

Noes (33)

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

Pairs

Mr D.T. Redman	Mr B.S. Wyatt
Mr K. O’Donnell	Ms S.F. McGurk

Amendment thus negated.

Second Reading Resumed

MS M.J. DAVIES (Central Wheatbelt — Leader of the National Party) [4.11 pm]: I would like to make a short contribution to this —

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms J.M. Freeman): Members, if you need to have a conversation take it outside. That includes you!

Ms M.J. DAVIES: I will make a very brief contribution to cover the points made earlier in the debate on the urgency of the Salaries and Allowances Amendment (Debt and Deficit Remediation) Bill 2017. I will also reiterate some of the concerns the member for North West Central raised.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: And you, member for Churchlands!

Ms M.J. DAVIES: I wish to point out that the National Party understands that no member in this house likes what it looks like inside and outside this house when we debate our own salaries. We should not be dwelling on it. But the arrogance with which this has been brought on and the urgency the Premier is saying this bill has has not been substantiated today. I reiterate that it is incredibly disappointing that, once again, we have not received a briefing on the detail of this bill. That would have given us an opportunity to perhaps canvass some of the concerns raised by the member for North West Central and others on how this could potentially impact regional members of Parliament. It is a serious concern.

Again, we understand that people do not like members of Parliament talking about our salaries and allowances. I think for the most part we are incredibly well remunerated for what we do, and we also have an understanding that we cannot operate outside the bubble the state is operating in. We do not have a question or concern in relation to that. But this decision may well impede allowances, particularly those of regional members of Parliament. We have raised this with the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal again and again. There is a constant conversation around, “Well, you may well have better communications these days, so you don’t need to drive across your electorate.” That is actually not the case. Members in small metropolitan seats understand the value of being able to have face-to-face conversations with their constituents. That is near on impossible in electorates the size of mine, North West Central, Roe and those of some of our other members, including that of the member for Moore. It takes an incredible amount of time to get across those electorates, and the allowances have to accommodate us being able to service the electorate. It is not about our personal gain; it is about being able to execute our duties as members of Parliament. That would have been one of the questions we would have asked if we had been given the courtesy of a briefing.

Again, I think we were offered a 15-minute briefing by the Premier’s office after the debate had started in this house. If that is the standard this government wants to set around legislation in this house, it is a very, very poor one. I have to say that it is not shared by all cabinet ministers. We have previously been offered briefings by ministers, separate from the opposition, and we have taken them up. We take our roles very seriously. But what happened this afternoon is, quite frankly, a farce. I do not agree that we can do our job appropriately and discuss things that may have an impact on us doing our jobs properly in our electorates and being able to question and ask questions of the Premier and ministers responsible if we have not been given that opportunity to raise those questions.

Another thing drawn to my attention is that we are having a debate in the context of what has been discussed today around the superannuation of some of the members in this place, and the fact that the Premier is asking everyone to tighten their belts and doing it under the premise of reducing debt and this debt repair that is constantly pushed forward as the reason we all have to tighten our belts. Police officers are not getting pay rises, royalties for regions has had a whole raft of consolidated revenue shunted into it and our households are paying more in power and water fees, which has been threatened again. The threat from the Premier is that if the government cannot get its revenue measures through so it can pay for its election promises, it will keep hitting households more and make a grab for cash from the gold sector, and also payroll tax, which is one of the most insidious taxes. In any of the levers the government has to pull, that is a tax on jobs. That is in direct opposition to what this government came to power on, which was a mantra of “jobs, jobs, jobs”.

We are all being asked to pay more for the fact that the Labor Party came to government without a financial plan, it still does not have a financial plan, and then we have this debate. It had a position on this prior to coming to the election. I am quite sure I recollect this was an election commitment that was debated prior to us having a new government in Western Australia. It has taken seven months, and we now have an urgent bill. It does not stand up or pass the pub test. The thing drawn to my attention just today is that while we are asking for all these revenue measures—we are all being asked to tighten our belt, and I have no problem with that; as a member of Parliament I am quite happy to contribute as long as it is about paying down debt and not about paying for Labor’s extravagant election commitments—we have apparently had six additional staff offered to the Greens, One Nation, the Shooters, Fishers and Farmers Party and the Liberal Democrats. That equates to around \$600 000 for additional

staff, and that to me stinks. That stinks. That seems to me to be the Labor Party cosying up to the crossbench. That probably explains why the government did not feel the need to come and talk to the National Party and brief us on the Salaries and Allowances Amendment (Debt and Deficit Remediation) Bill 2017, because it had already handed over some money for some additional resources to the crossbench at a time when we are all being asked to tighten our belts. It is absolute hypocrisy, and I cannot believe that the backbenchers are happy for all that to occur and for additional funds to go to crossbenchers while we are debating this as a matter of urgency and we are asking households to pay more for their household water and power charges. They are likely to have to do that again, because this government has no financial plan. It really does strike me that every time this government is not able to meet some of the revenue measures it has introduced, it will go everywhere but not to the two companies in this state that could actually make meaningful budget repair. It will go everywhere but. We have had the Premier threatening households with further increases to their power and water charges and the Treasurer threatening to go for a bank tax that we all know will inevitably come back to the public. It will go everywhere except sit and have a sensible conversation with two companies that have benefited enormously from the support this and previous state governments have provided over many years, so that they can contribute to budget repair. It must be a meaningful contribution to budget repair, not the amount that is to be generated from all the mean and nasty revenue measures introduced in the budget; not the mean and nasty measures that have been introduced by this Labor government, none of which contribute to reducing debt.

Dr A.D. Buti: Is the gold royalty increase mean and nasty?

Ms M.J. DAVIES: The member has absently no leg to stand on, because there is no reduction in debt. Members opposite are out there peddling this myth that we all have to do more, and the government has asked for all these sectors to pay more so that there can be a reduction in debt. It is simply not true.

We have concerns about how this debate was brought on, and the fact that we have not been provided with a briefing. We absolutely have concerns about this constant myth being peddled to the public that this is all about reduction in debt, when it is actually about paying for the government's election commitments. The government made so many of them, and it is making no effort to mitigate the problem. I agree with some of the statements of the Leader of the Opposition. Metronet could be clipped back. The government could actually cut the cloth, but it will not, so it will come to mums and dads, businesses and the gold sector for an amount that does nothing other than help the government deliver on those election promises, and it is not good enough. It is absolute hypocrisy that we are here today. I agree with the member for North West Central that some real concerns have been raised about the effect the application of this bill will have on the ability of regional members of Parliament to adequately service their electorates. I look forward to some assurances from the Premier, or his advisers—I am not sure that they will be able to answer, because they did not seem to be able to answer the questions of the opposition in the briefing—and I would very much like some answers on how that might be dealt with because there is a concern.

Mr M. McGowan: Just so that you are aware, they are public servants.

Ms M.J. DAVIES: Thank you, Premier. You are incredibly condescending.

Mr M. McGowan: These people you are insulting are public servants.

Ms M.J. DAVIES: No insult—it is not their fault that they have not had the correct instructions or understanding about why this legislation was brought in. It is not their fault that they cannot answer the questions. It has been rushed through, when the government has had seven months. There is no disparagement of the public service. I have worked with many, and they have done their job, undoubtedly, but it is absolutely the Premier's fault that this debacle has occurred this afternoon, and we have had to sit here all afternoon debating something that, quite frankly, is probably unnecessary. However, we will do our best to make sure that this goes through, and we will try, in the time that we have been given, to understand the ramifications of this legislation. It would be very courteous of the Premier, given that no courtesy has been shown to date, if he could assure us that some consideration would be given to the issues raised by the member for North West Central, and some of the other concerns that we would have raised, had we had a briefing. We have some concerns that we have articulated, and we look forward to the response from the Premier as we go through the rest of this farce this afternoon.

MR M. MCGOWAN (Rockingham — Minister for Public Sector Management) [4.23 pm] — in reply: I am pleased to respond on behalf of the government to the second reading debate on the Salaries and Allowances Amendment (Debt and Deficit Remediation) Bill 2017. I understand that a range of issues have been raised by the opposition. Just so that we clarify a few things, I said earlier, but I will repeat it for the record, that the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal is due to make a ruling on the salaries and allowances of members of Parliament by 30 November 2017, but it could be any time between now and then. On top of that, the tribunal makes up to 40 variations each year. It is therefore very important, if the government has a new policy, that we provide direction via this legislation prior to that date. Although there is anticipation amongst all of us that the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal would hopefully follow the government's wages policy in these things, it is important that we make these issues absolutely crystal clear, and that is what this legislation is all about. That is the reason it needs to be dealt with as soon as possible.

One of the opposition members, I think it was the Leader of the Opposition, said that salaries had already been frozen by decisions already made, and therefore the legislation was not needed. I have here the tribunal determinations for 2016. The increase was 1.5 per cent for the special division officers in the public service; for members of Parliament, 1.5 per cent; and the judiciary, 1.8 per cent. Therefore, in the three main areas covered by this legislation, the pay was not frozen.

Dr M.D. Nahan: That is 2016, right?

Mr M. McGOWAN: Is the member asking me about 2017? He is right; I will start with 2017. In 2017 the adjustment was zero for each of those areas—public sector special division, members of Parliament, and the judiciary. For 2016, in the special division of the public service, it was 1.5 per cent; for members of Parliament, 1.5 per cent; and members of the judiciary, 1.8 per cent. For 2015, it was zero per cent for each of those categories. For 2014, it was three per cent for the public service special division; 3.8 per cent for members of Parliament; and 2.5 per cent for the judiciary. In 2013 the increase was 2.6 per cent for the public service special division; 2.6 per cent for members of Parliament; and the judiciary 2.6 per cent. In 2012, for the public service special division, it was 3.25 per cent; members of Parliament; 3.25 per cent; and the judiciary, three per cent. In 2011 it was 3.6 per cent for the public service special division; members of Parliament 4.3 per cent; and there may well have been two increases in that year for the judiciary—three per cent and 3.5 per cent. There were increases in earlier years, but that takes us back six years. Just to be clear, over the past six years, in two years there were no increases, and in five of the other years there were increases varying from 1.5 per cent to 4.3 per cent depending on the position held.

Obviously, the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal, as members have said, is an independent body, and can make its own determinations. Our view is that this is an unfortunate piece of legislation. I would prefer not to be standing here dealing with this legislation, but I will tell the house that Treasury suggested this to the government. It was Treasury's idea to ensure that the most senior people, and perhaps the most public people in the public sector, which is the judges, politicians, CEOs and the like, set the right example. Treasury proposed this to us as one of the early budget savings measures, and although it raises \$16 million to \$20 million, as one of the early budget savings measures it was a good way to show the public sector workforce that those people at the top were setting the right example. It was not something that the government dreamed up. Treasury came to us with this idea. When people say that salaries were already frozen, they were not. As I said, in the course of the last six or seven years, there were two years in which they were and five years in which they were not. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition referred to the fact that it is an independent process.

Mr W.J. Johnston: That is right.

Mr M. McGOWAN: Yes. That is a good point, member for Cannington. It is an independent process. It would be nice if we could leave the existing arrangements in place. However, as I have said ad nauseam, it is important that we set the right example for the wages of members of Parliament, the judiciary and others, particularly because of the government's new wages policy. It is an independent process under the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal. We want to ensure that outside of government control, a wage increase is not given to people at the top that people at the bottom do not receive. We could have done what the Deputy Leader of the Opposition suggested and leave it alone—advised the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal of our wages policy, and hoped it would follow that policy. However, we have decided that is not the right course of action and we need to set a clear example early on, and that is what we have done.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition said on the one hand that the independent process is good, and on the other hand she said—I wrote down the words—that it does not go far enough. I think the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is referring to why local government has not been included in this bill. It was originally our intention to include in the bill chief executive officers and elected councillors in local government. As the former Premier will attest, I kept asking the drafters where the legislation was at and about certain things that we wanted to see happen. The advice that kept coming back to me was that the deadline was fast approaching when the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal would need to make a decision about wages, and that if we were to include local government in the bill, it would delay the drafting of the bill. I was advised that it would be complex and require technical amendments to the Local Government Act 1995; and, in any event, it would have no impact on debt and deficit for the state government. I therefore advised the drafters to leave local government out of the bill and deal with the main game, which basically is the area for which taxpayers, as opposed to ratepayers, are responsible.

I was advised further that under the Local Government Act, councillors can be remunerated in a range of ways. The tribunal may determine a per-meeting fee or an annualised fee for attendance at council meetings. Those fees are mutually exclusive. Local government councils have discretion to choose to apply one or other of those fees. This applies also to some allowances for CEOs and a number of fees, allowances and expenses for elected council members. Therefore, if the bill were to freeze remuneration for CEOs and elected council members, it would need to address the discretion available to local government councils to choose between the different ways of remunerating councillors and CEOs. That is a complex issue, because some councillors are paid an allowance and others are paid a meeting fee. Therefore, in order to remove that complexity from what should be a relatively

simple piece of legislation to deal with debt and deficit remediation at the state government level, I advised the drafters of the bill to leave out local government. That was the reason behind that.

The bill is clear in relation to officers who are in the special division of the public service. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition suggested that we widen the bill to incorporate other people. We had to draw the line somewhere. We elected to select the people at the top, if you like. I regard members of Parliament and ministers in the same category as those people. We therefore made the decision to deal only with that group of people. We could cast it as wide as doctors in hospitals or principals in schools. Some doctors in hospitals are paid significantly more than all of us here. It is difficult to determine where to stop and how to define it. We left some of those things alone, because, as we know, simplicity and ease in drafting is sometimes better than trying to deal with all sorts of situations.

The member for North West Central raised the question of an anomaly such as a vehicle issue that might cause a danger for a member of Parliament. The explanatory memorandum states —

New subsection 10E(3) provides that the regulations may prescribe a kind or class of remuneration to which section 10E does not apply. This provides a mechanism of exclusion by way of prescription, to provide flexibility, should the need arise or future circumstances so require.

If there is an obvious example of unfairness, or a person's health and safety or life is at risk because of an anomaly, the case should be brought to the government's attention, and we could exclude that circumstance from the law by way of regulation and allow the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal to deal with that issue. That should provide sufficient flexibility for special cases, and I think that is a fair thing. That is currently provided for in the act. If members of Parliament make a good case, I will be more than happy to deal with it.

I do not intend to deal with personal issues about members in this place. A member or former member's personal circumstances should not be targeted via a specific law or regulation. I suspect most members of Parliament would agree that dealing with the personal circumstances of individuals is not a wise way in which to legislate.

That covers, as far as I can tell, the substantive issues raised by the opposition. We still have the third reading debate if members want to raise further matters, and that will enable me to get advice from my advisers at the back of the chamber.

Dr M.D. Nahan: What about the senior executives of government trading enterprises?

Mr M. McGOWAN: What is the Leader of the Opposition's specific question?

Dr M.D. Nahan: Are they covered?

Mr M. McGOWAN: Page 9 of the explanatory memorandum lists the people who will be covered. As I understand it, the two most senior executives in the government trading enterprises will be covered by the legislation. I am happy to provide more detail during the third reading debate or during consideration in detail if that is what members want to do. However, we need to bear in mind that we still have a lot of things to deal with today and time is getting away from us.

I also flag that a small amendment may be put in place in the upper house to clarify the issue of catch-ups at the end of the period in June

Dr M.D. Nahan: You are flagging an amendment already?

Mr M. McGOWAN: Governments often amend legislation.

Dr M.D. Nahan: You want us to pass something and you are flagging an amendment!

Mr M. McGOWAN: That is not unusual in Parliament.

Dr M.D. Nahan: You moved that this be made an urgent bill and now you are flagging an amendment before we have even passed it.

Mr M. McGOWAN: I am happy to stay here all night. I am trying to be as conciliatory as possible. Parliament often deals with amendments —

Dr M.D. Nahan: Not before you pass the bill. Put the amendment in here.

Mr M. McGOWAN: Issues come up and I am happy to stay here, but I suspect most members do not want to do that. The upper house has a role and I am happy for that to be dealt with in the upper house. If members opposite want to go into the consideration in detail stage, fire away. I am more than happy.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members!

Mr M. McGOWAN: I am happy to go into the consideration in detail stage if members want to.

Dr M.D. Nahan: I thought it was urgent. Amend it.

Mr M. McGOWAN: I am happy to go into the consideration in detail stage if members want to. That is up to members opposite. We want to make sure that there is clarity for the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal at the conclusion of the pay freeze with any catch-ups. The purpose of the bill is to avoid catch-up pays. We want to make sure that that is absolutely clear in the legislation. I am happy to go into the consideration in detail stage. There might have to be some suspensions of standing orders and the like to deal with it here or we can deal with it in the upper house. It will come back here and we can debate it then. There are easy ways of dealing with this. It is up to members. As I said, I love Parliament. I love being here, so I am happy to stay here and debate because I find it enjoyable, but then I look at the member for South Perth and he looks like he is fading away! Maybe he wants to go home to bed. That is a question for the opposition. It is really up to members opposite.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

Leave granted to proceed forthwith to third reading.

Third Reading

MR M. McGOWAN (Rockingham — Minister for Public Sector Management) [4.41 pm]: I move —

That the bill be now read a third time.

DR M.D. NAHAN (Riverton — Leader of the Opposition) [4.42 pm]: I want to say a few things about this process. First, the Premier came in yesterday and said that the Salaries and Allowances Amendment (Debt and Deficit Remediation) Bill 2017 is urgent. The Premier admitted today that all the people covered by this legislation already have their wages frozen. The Premier stated that an issue for parliamentarians will be covered sometime in November, but he did not provide any evidence of it. I cannot find it on the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal website. I guess I have to accept that view. The Premier twice ruled out amendments we suggested to make sure that everybody's salaries, allowances and superannuation were frozen, except his own. The Premier ruled that out twice. Then the Premier came in with that speech. We asked the Premier about the senior executive officers and the Premier gave a waffly response. The Premier said that he will respond to that in his reply to the third reading debate and we expect the Premier to do so.

The Premier said that the amendment we raised might be made in the upper house. In other words, the Premier brought in a half-baked bill and declared it urgent. Before the second reading debate was over, the Premier concocted another amendment that he cannot deliver to this house. The Premier said that it may go to the upper house. That is absolutely pathetic. We have had a long debate in this community about the salaries of public servants, but most of it—I can remember on my watch—has been about the senior executives in the electricity industry and also Racing and Wagering Western Australia. The Premier cannot answer whether they are covered by this bill. When the Premier sold this to the community, he particularly highlighted the chief executive of RWWA's \$600 000-plus salary. He is not covered by this bill. I admit that it is complicated, but he is not covered. This is urgent. The Premier is leaving out some of the people whose salaries are of most concern.

Let us put it into context. The Premier reported to the media last week that he would bring in this bill urgently. The Premier did not tell us. Yesterday, the Premier give us a briefing in which we did not see the legislation. The Premier did not give the National Party the courtesy to talk to it at all. Its members have to vote. Then we received a briefing and a range of issues were not discussed. The Premier stands and gives us a perfunctory statement about what the bill will do. Do members know what he knows? Nothing. He says that this bill was brought to us by Treasury. Treasury suggested that to me when we were in government. They also repeatedly suggested to me that we override the Industrial Relations Commission. We looked at what that would mean. We did not accept it. Governments govern; Treasury does not. Treasury is the minister's advisers. The government makes the policy. This is the government's decision. Do not try to blame it on Treasury. The government decided to do this. But then standing up here, almost finishing his second reading reply, the Premier says, "Oh, by the way, we might have an amendment." When asked what it is, he told us to wait and see in the upper house. Then he babbled about something towards the end. I know what the problem is. We highlighted it.

The problem is listed in the briefing notes from the Public Sector Commission—that is, under this legislation the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal is prevented from doing catch-ups and making up the difference and the lost money during the four-year freeze, but it is not. Clearly, it would consider raising wages after the freeze to compensate for the lack of increases over the four-year freeze. The government probably identified that flaw. It knew about it before. We cannot believe that it did not. But it is worried about the public sector optics. This is all about the people in the press gallery, not here. This is all about getting people up there to report in the media the Premier's little stunt. He now knows he cannot sell to the community the idea of a catch-up by parliamentarians in particular. He said that maybe we should do something. That is so sloppy and shallow. It is pathetic. But that is our Premier.

By the way, this bill is going to go to the upper house. If the upper house takes its task as the house of review seriously, it will look at this legislation and think that it has flaws all the way through it. It will go to a committee.

I am not in control of that, but it will go to a committee if the Premier has an amendment such as that. The Premier also mentioned chief executive officers of local governments. That is complex—hell yes! From the Office of Shared Services experience, we know that dealing with the pay and conditions across the public sector is complex. That was the basic flaw of Shared Services, so I directed it to eliminate dealing with the CEOs of the councils. He cannot answer the question about the CEOs of the government’s biggest agencies. He has an amendment because the media might worry about that and he is trying to say, “Hurry up! I will stay here forever. It is coming closer to the end of Friday; get it out.” The Premier is rushing this bill. This is one of the worst examples of parliamentary legislation overriding an independent tribunal to freeze wages and conditions for a raft of people who already have had their wages frozen. The Premier does not know what he is doing and he is not answering the questions. It is absolutely pathetic, and he is the Premier. He is exempting himself, in part, from this process through his special superannuation scheme that will accelerate significantly over this freeze. That is the government we have and the people of Western Australia will see more and more of this over the next three and a half years.

MR S.K. L’ESTRANGE (Churchlands) [4.49 pm]: I rise to speak to the third reading of the Salaries and Allowances Amendment (Debt and Deficit Remediation) Bill 2017—a bill that was introduced yesterday with a clearly unnecessary sense of urgency. I want to reiterate the points we would like the Premier to take into consideration with regard to how we see this bill progressing.

First of all, it needs to be understood and acknowledged by the Premier that the Parliamentary Liberal Party of Western Australia understands full well that the government has 41 members and we have 13, and that this legislation will pass quite comfortably through this chamber for the government. But that does not give the government a licence to rush through a piece of legislation that is frankly unnecessary, given that the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal, an independent authority, makes determinations on the executive salaries of judges et cetera anyway. As the Deputy Leader of the Opposition pointed out earlier, it deliberates and makes its decisions based on the government of the day’s policy agenda. That is what it does; it looks at the policy agenda very carefully and always has, so to rush this legislation through today is frankly an abuse of Parliament.

The Liberal opposition supports wages restraint, so let there be absolutely no argument on that issue. We support wages restraint, but we are very, very concerned about the government overriding an independent statutory body—in this case, the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal. As a mature democracy, this Parliament long ago realised that there needed to be an independent body for determining the wages and conditions of those in government and the judiciary. This bill changes that, and that is something that all members in this place need to think carefully about.

If this bill is passed, the Premier will effectively be in charge of the wages and conditions of members of Parliament and the judiciary; that is effectively what this bill will do. It is removing that power from an independent statutory body, and giving it to the Premier. I am not convinced that the people of Western Australia will be comfortable with that. It will take some debate, no doubt.

The old saying that all power corrupts but absolute power corrupts absolutely is something that we should all be mindful of, because each little piece of legislation that vests more and more power and authority in the Premier and away from independent statutory bodies is a slippery slope for the Parliament of Western Australia.

Mr W.J. Johnston: Are you voting against the legislation?

Mr S.K. L’ESTRANGE: We are voting to support wages restraint, minister.

Mr W.J. Johnston: So you’re voting against the legislation?

Mr S.K. L’ESTRANGE: Let me continue my speech.

Mr W.J. Johnston interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms J.M. Freeman): Minister, I note that you rushed back to your seat from over there, and up until that point of the debate, the member had the floor. Can we let the member continue to have the floor, thank you, minister.

Mr S.K. L’ESTRANGE: The Salaries and Allowances Tribunal has always acted on the policy settings of the government of the day and, as we have heard today, it has already frozen the salaries and conditions of the people whose salaries and conditions this bill proposes to freeze. It has already done it, so we know that there was no urgency today. We know that this was nothing more than a political stunt to grab a headline, but I do not believe the people of Western Australia are that silly. I believe that they will see that this bill could have been debated and passed later this year and that the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal would have watched that debate closely. It would have said, “Okay, there’s a debate in play; we won’t make a determination because the government of the day has a bill moving through the Parliament to take this off us.” Does the government really think the head of the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal would have actually thought, “Oh, let’s quickly give all judges and senior public servants a pay rise before the Premier and his government get this bill through”? To think that that could have happened is ludicrous. We know there was no urgency to this today. We know that.

We also know that other Parliaments have looked at this issue closely. I refer to an article that was published in the *Sydney Morning Herald* back in 2011 headed “Federal politicians’ pay will be set by independent tribunal”. It states —

The government argues these changes will provide more transparency and independence in setting parliamentarians’ remuneration by placing the level of MPs salary with the tribunal.

We are taking a retrograde step with this legislation. The government has the numbers and the mandate to govern, and we support wages restraint, but we are cautioning the new Premier and his new cabinet that they are embarking on a new path linked to the wages and salaries of judges, senior public servants and members of Parliament.

I refer now to a 1999–2000 federal Parliament research paper published by the Department of the Parliamentary Library’s Information and Research Services titled “Remuneration of Members of the Parliament of Australia”, which states —

The remuneration of Members of Parliament has always been a contentious issue. The last government-appointed inquiry into parliamentary remuneration, the Kerr Committee, which reported in 1971, recommended that parliamentary salaries should be determined by an independent tribunal.

Again, this is nothing new. Although this bill has been introduced in the guise of budget repair measures, people have looked at this issue long and hard for some time. The paper continues, further along —

It was intended that the work of the Remuneration Tribunal would de-politicise the issue of parliamentary remuneration and conditions.

Unfortunately, we have taken a step back in time to re-politicise the setting of wages and conditions for judges, senior public servants and members of Parliament. I say again: nobody on this side of the chamber argues that there should not be wages restraint in these difficult economic times, and we accept that the people of Western Australia are doing it tough out there in the economy and that wages growth across the state is pretty much at around zero to 1.5 per cent. We accept that. There is no argument from us that there is a need for wages restraint, but we caution the government that it is actually going against all the advice given over the last 40 years with regard to this matter. The government is choosing to do this; what precedents will this set, and what path will it send us down?

It concerns me that this legislation had to come on today and be made urgent. The government went to the election on two clear platforms: a jobs and growth platform and a debt reduction platform. I have already explained that this legislation is not urgent because the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal would not make a determination knowing that this legislation was part of the government’s agenda, but the government has brought it on as urgent, ahead of its own budget. It has actually pushed its own budget back from moving through this place to deal with this bill as a matter of urgency. Surely the government’s budget is more urgent. The Labor Party went to the election saying that debt reduction would be a key focus if it were to win government, yet the government has pushed its own budget back to debate this topic. I think the government has put itself in a very dubious place.

The other significant issue the Labor Party took to the election was jobs and growth. It has read a jobs bill in to this chamber, but it has not yet been debated. If the government is serious about the people of Western Australia and is concerned for their welfare —

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms J.M. Freeman): Member for Churchlands, I would just like to point out the scope of the third reading debate. The scope of the debate is more restricted than debate at the second reading stage, and is limited to the contents of the bill—that is, the matters contained in the clauses and schedules of the bill. It is not in order to open or repeat debate on matters discussed during the second reading or consideration in detail stages. I just bring you back to the bill, if you could do that.

Mr S.K. L’ESTRANGE: Thank you, Madam Acting Speaker. I probably did digress because I am concerned that we are debating a bill that I do not think is urgent or cuts to the chase of significance in terms of budget repair for the people of Western Australia, which is the context in which this Salaries and Allowances Amendment (Debt and Deficit Remediation) Bill 2017 was brought into this house. I do not think it is urgent, and we should have been debating the budget first before we got onto this. The Salaries and Allowances Tribunal would have fully understood the agenda of the government to make sure that it did not do anything to usurp the government’s authority and its policy settings.

I will conclude this third reading contribution by saying, first and foremost, that the Premier had an opportunity today to show true leadership on this issue when he was presented with two amendments. He could have said, “I, too, will make sure that my remuneration package is in line with all the remuneration packages of my backbench.” We are not talking about his additional Premier’s allowance; we are just talking about his remuneration package. We accept that Premiers work longer hours than other people in this place, as do ministers, and they get an allowance to compensate for that. I am not saying that we should equalise everybody’s pay here, but he had the opportunity to ensure that the settings for his remuneration were the same settings used for his backbench.

Mr P. Papalia interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member! Continue, member for Churchlands.

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: We were looking for that leadership and we did not get it.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member, can I just bring you back to the bill. You did not get the amendment through, and it is a third reading contribution. Minister, I am bringing the member back to the bill.

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: The second point I wish to raise is that it is an unnecessary bill. We know that it sets a precedent for Parliament to set the salaries and conditions of judges, and we do not know exactly how that will play out into the future and the impact it could have. This bill will overturn the safeguard of the independent Salaries and Allowances Tribunal and put the McGowan government in charge of the wages and salaries of the judiciary, and the dangers of that do not need to be overestimated.

Finally, the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal has in the past, does now and will continue to watch closely and listen to the policy settings of government before it makes its determinations on those salaries. There was no need for this bill to be introduced to change the wage restraint policy settings of the McGowan government. But we understand, as I said earlier, and I will conclude on this point, that the government has a mandate to govern. It has 41 members in this place so the bill will move through here pretty quickly. However, the fact that the Leader of the Opposition towards the end of the second reading debate realised that the Premier said that he may make an amendment to the bill in the upper house tells us that the drafting of this bill probably was not scrutinised closely enough by the Premier and his cabinet. The fact that we were briefed on this only yesterday means that we have had no time to discuss it with industry, economists, the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal or any of the bodies or key stakeholders that will be impacted by this legislation, so we could not go into consideration in detail. How could we go into consideration in detail for a line-by-line analysis of this bill when we saw it for the first time only yesterday and the Nationals did not even get a briefing? We are now left with a government that has the majority to allow this bill to go through. We can only guess at whatever was in the amendment that the Premier talked about earlier. Maybe when he gives his third reading reply speech today, he can table that amendment so that, at the very least, we can review it and understand what it was about—after this bill has moved through this place. Maybe he does not have that amendment that he talked about and it has not yet been drafted. Maybe the answer to the question that was posed today by the Leader of the Opposition is not there because the government did not thoroughly inquire into its own bill.

Firstly, I worry about why this bill was urgent. Secondly, I wonder why the briefing process was so rushed. Thirdly, I wonder why no due process has been afforded to the Legislative Assembly to critique this properly. We are now left with the Premier to table his amendment, if he has it, in his third reading reply speech so that the bill can move through this place and go to the other place. Hopefully, those members can get some further information and be in a position to debate and critique this bill properly.

MR V.A. CATANIA (North West Central) [5.04 pm]: I want to reiterate some of the commentary that I made before about regional members of Parliament. I am glad that the Premier said that proposed section 10E of the Salaries and Allowances Amendment (Debt and Deficit Remediation) Bill 2017 has the ability to look at anomalies that could cause harm or injustice to members of Parliament. While we have people from the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal in the gallery and the Premier in the chamber, I want to reiterate that we need to ensure that everyone has the ability to work in their electorate in a safe and proper manner. All that I ask for to come out of this piece of legislation is that the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal, under the Premier's leadership, who now has control over what happens with the tribunal, does what is right and protects members of Parliament while doing their job and allows the constituents whom they represent to access their member of Parliament; that is all that I ask for. This is a conversation that I have with my wife and kids: "Dad, why are you leaving at one o'clock in the morning? Why are you going and not coming back until three o'clock in the morning after a day of driving, and have you got your will in order?" That is a conversation that members just do not want to have. I urge the Premier and the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal to do what is right and fair, and to enable regional members of Parliament to have the tools to do their job, as the city members of Parliament have. I have just under a million square kilometres to cover in my electorate around regional Western Australia. The member for Moore has the same issues, as do the members for Central Wheatbelt, Roe and Kimberley, in particular, who is probably in the same boat as I am. We risk our lives travelling all through the night and day, by car, to get to a meeting 600 or 700 kilometres away, and then we try to get back to see our loved ones because regional members of Parliament do not get to see them often. What has been presented by the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal is unfair when it comes to a motor vehicle allowance or charter allowance. We cannot do our job with what has been proposed. Since this is an urgent bill, I urgently ask the Premier to step in and right the wrongs. I urge the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal, which meets next week, to ensure that it protects the ability for members of Parliament to do their job and travel safely throughout their electorate, because that is not protected under the current rules. All I can say is that this is an urgent matter that looks after members of Parliament and their wellbeing so that they can return safely to their families. I do not want to see any harm come to any member of Parliament, but with the

way things are set up, something will happen, and we do not want that to be the avenue of change. I want the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal and the Premier to know that this is an urgent bill with issues that need urgent attention, or else there is the potential for problems into the future.

MRS L.M. HARVEY (Scarborough — Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [5.08 pm]: I am not going to labour the point but I would like to make a few remarks in closing. I am astonished at the process that we have seen here today. The Premier, in his reply to the second reading debate, flagged that he has an amendment. The legislation was given to us yesterday but a briefing was not made available to us. We have been sitting in the Parliament all day debating this legislation, and the Premier now flags that he has an amendment and does not even show us what it is to try to get our concurrence to pass the Salaries and Allowances Amendment (Debt and Deficit Remediation) Bill 2017 through this place. I am astonished! That is the contempt with which the Premier treats this Parliament. For those backbenchers who are new and have not been in this place long, that is an unusual process. Generally, amendments to legislation are passed as a result of opposition scrutiny and scrutiny through the proper processes of Parliament, in which, if a flaw is found in the legislation, an amendment is put during consideration in detail and it is passed. The process we now have means that this legislation will go to the Council and, because an amendment has been flagged, I suspect it will likely send this bill to a parliamentary committee. An amendment being flagged after the bill has passed this place, before it has been given proper consideration, is a red flag to the members of the Legislative Council. It considers itself a house of review. It will look at that as tardy work on behalf of the Premier. I do not know whether we are seeing a complete failure in understanding how to prosecute a legislative agenda or a complete failure in a stupid strategy—a stunt being pulled by the Premier thinking, “I know what to do. I’ll try to wedge these guys, this Liberal opposition, into running with this wages restraint. I’ll bang them about the head about budget repair and pull this stunt to bring half-cooked and underdone legislation into the Parliament.” By the Premier’s own admission, it is flawed.

Let us go back through what has happened here. We were told at very short notice that this legislation was going to be read in and the Premier was going to declare it urgent. We were challenged by the Premier and told that we would be budget wreckers if we did not rubberstamp this legislation. We have cooperated with this process. We established that there was no urgency. In his second reading speech, the Premier himself read out all the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal determinations that proved that it had made zero increases in salaries or had made increases consistent with government policy. That proved absolutely that the legislation was not required. The SAT had been doing exactly what the government had been flagging on wages policy for the last few years. Why did the Premier say that this legislation was urgent and he needed to bring it in here? I think it was flawed. The Premier gets a D minus for legislation and for not getting his homework done. He gets an F for strategy. The stupid stunt that he pulled backfired today and now he looks like a complete fool. He does not know how to craft legislation or bring it to this place. He has shown how utterly arrogant he is in treating us with contempt and treating the Nationals with contempt—he did not even give them a briefing. He brought in legislation that, by his own admission, fails and needs to be amended. Now it will go to the Council and I hope that the Council sends this to a committee to teach the Premier a lesson on how to do his work properly. I really do! It will not have any impact whatsoever on the SAT determinations.

Point of Order

Mr M. HUGHES: I know that I am a novice in this place but should we not be talking about the bill rather than the process? I thought we had got over that.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member is free to refer to what she referred to in the second reading debate in the third reading debate.

Debate Resumed

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Perhaps the member for Kalamunda thinks similarly to the member for Darling Range; that is, that I should not be a working woman and that I should be letting my husband go off in the car and I should stay at home and look after my kids. Maybe that is the problem! Is that the problem?

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Sit down! Members do not stand up in this chamber and yell across the chamber. Member, I think that what you are saying is inappropriate. Get back to the third reading debate, please.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Thank you, Deputy Speaker. I do not have much more further to add except that the Premier has a hostile —

Point of Order

Dr A.D. BUTI: I seek the Deputy Speaker’s ruling. As we know, under standing orders we cannot cast aspersions on another member’s character in this chamber. I think that what was said of the member —

Several members interjected.

Dr A.D. BUTI: Members are supposed to hear points of order in silence. What was said by the member for Scarborough of the member for Darling Range and to the member for Kalamunda definitely casts a negative aspersion on their characters. I would ask the member for Scarborough to withdraw those.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Further to the point of order, Deputy Speaker, I was referring to comments the member for Darling Range made in this place in his speech on Tuesday night. In that speech he made reference to one of the government's plans for his electorate. I cannot quote it directly, but he said that he needed a train line, I think it was, because he needed a congestion-busting initiative for the men in his electorate who are caught driving the one family car when they go to work while their wives and children are at home.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am going to interrupt you. This is not a point of order. I think that we have moved on in this discussion. I would like the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to rise again and contribute to the third reading debate.

Debate Resumed

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Thank you, Deputy Speaker. In closing, I think we will be on a very disappointing run for the next four years if the Premier is going to lead with this kind of treatment of the Parliament. We have seen it twice now. We saw it with the dangerous sexual offenders legislation that had no urgency once it left this place. That was a stunt to get the Attorney General's backside out of a sling, quite frankly. That stunt has been pulled again because the Premier failed to negotiate with the crossbench in the Legislative Council to get the gold royalty through. He has pulled a stunt with this SAT legislation, saying that it is urgent and needs to be brought in for immediate budget repair. We know, and by his own admission the Premier has proven, that it is not required. These two stunts showed total disrespect for Parliament and the opposition members of Parliament. A pattern has been set here that can only be a very good thing for us in 2021.

MR C.J. BARNETT (Cottesloe) [5.16 pm]: I will be very brief. As the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has said, this has been a pure stunt. The new members in this house have just had a wasted day. They have just lost a day of their lives that they will never get back.

Ms M.M. Quirk: If this is so important, why did the opposition not go into consideration in detail?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: That is an interesting interjection—and right on cue. Why did we not go into consideration in detail? We offered to go into consideration in detail because the Premier had foreshadowed an amendment. Opposition members said, "Okay; move the amendment. We will go into consideration in detail. Move the amendment and then this house would be finished with it." But we did not have the amendment. We asked for a copy of the amendment and gave the Premier the opportunity of going into consideration in detail and moving his amendment and presumably, if it was an appropriate one, passing it. But he did not do it! Why did he not do it? I suspect that it is because he does not have the amendment. I suspect that it has not been drafted. If that is the case, he could have said so. That is fair enough. Sometimes errors in bills are discovered on the way through. If the government were really serious about getting this through quickly, it would have moved the amendment or, if it was not ready to move the amendment because of drafting issues—which might be credible—it should have simply adjourned the debate, moved the amendment on Tuesday, completed the third reading and got it, as a complete bill, to the upper house. The government would have done that if it was urgent but it has not done that. It will go to the upper house where it may go to a committee. It will have to come back here and may be debated again. There has been no real urgency and no display of urgency. This is a day that new members will never get back.

MR M. McGOWAN (Rockingham — Premier) [5.18 pm] — in reply: I thank members for their contributions. I will make it absolutely crystal-clear to the house that the amendment we will move in the upper house clarifies a clause to ensure that the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal, as of 1 July 2021, will not be able to take account of the consumer price index in the period between now and then and will not be able to engage in back pay or catch-up payments. It absolutely clarifies the situation because I do not want the people of Western Australia to have any indication whatsoever that there could be any prospect of that sort of thing happening. That will be moved in the upper house, which is quite standard behaviour. To clarify, the pay freeze will apply to a range of executive officers in government trading enterprises. They are Synergy, Western Power, Horizon Power, Water Corporation, Bunbury Water Corporation, Busselton Water Corporation, Western Australian Mint, Fremantle Port Authority, Southern Ports Authority, Mid West Ports Authority, Pilbara Ports Authority, Kimberley Ports Authority, Racing and Wagering Western Australia, Western Australian Land Authority and Western Australian Treasury Corporation.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

APPROPRIATION (CAPITAL 2017–18) BILL 2017*Third Reading*

Resumed from 11 October.

MR Y. MUBARAKAI (Jandakot) [5.20 pm]: I would like to continue my remarks from yesterday on the Appropriation (Capital 2017–18) Bill concerning my electorate of Jandakot. In all my conversations and interactions with the residents of Canning Vale, they had one clear message for me and the government—alleviate traffic issues on Ranford Road. The population growth in Harrisdale and Piara Waters has created an increase in traffic on Ranford Road because it is a preferred route for residents from those suburbs to access Kwinana Freeway rather than using Armadale Road. This project will ensure that Ranford Road traffic is alleviated, while providing true transport options for the residents of Canning Vale and surrounding suburbs, whether they want to get to work, a place of leisure or an event in the city or Burswood.

When I have attended mobile meetings in the community, people have shown increasing interest in this project because they know the impact it will have on their lives. It will improve access around the metropolitan area, reduce journey times and ease congestion. As I have mentioned, population growth is a significant feature of the issues faced in the Jandakot electorate. I am proud that Jandakot—particularly Harrisdale, Piara Waters and Treeby—has become a hub for working families with young children who have chosen to establish and invest their lives and social capital in Jandakot. As we all know, the children in our community will go on to be the next productive members of society as adults and it is critical that we support this transition by providing the best education opportunities we can.

I am pleased that the McGowan Labor government recognises the importance of investing in our children's future through our commitments to deliver the highest standard of education to children in Jandakot. The state capital budget includes \$15.6 million for the new primary school in Piara Waters. The Forrestdale south west school will open its doors to its first students as early as 2018. The first stage of the school to open next year will cater for kindy and pre-primary students, with years 1 to 6 opening in 2019. Up to 200 new students will be part of the first cohort of the new school next year. It will be a very special grand opening. Of course, the school will be highly multicultural with up to 52 different language groups expected. The new school will provide enrolment relief to Piara Waters Primary School and Harrisdale Primary School. Although sitting just outside the Jandakot electorate, Canning Vale College is set to undergo \$2 million worth of upgrades as part of the 2017–18 state budget. Many students residing in the Jandakot electorate attend the college so that investment will have a very strong impact in Jandakot. The funding will allow the college to improve classroom space and student services, with a new purpose-built student service centre. This will allow the college to better meet the health and wellbeing needs of students through the assistance of youth support officers, chaplains and engagement coordinators all in one location. I am pleased also to understand that funding will allow the college to build extra hard basketball and netball courts. We know how important physical activity is for mental and physical health as well as social inclusion.

Transport has been a significant issue in Jandakot and, of course, this all comes back to the unprecedented population growth within the southern corridor that we have experienced and continue to experience. I am pleased again to say that the state capital budget includes strong investment in local roads and important community infrastructure and facilities, with several significant road projects funded. There is \$237 million in the budget for the Armadale Road–North Lake Road bridge project, which will be funded by the commonwealth and state governments as part of a significant \$ 2.3 billion investment in road and rail infrastructure. The bridge will help address seriously frustrating congestion in Cockburn Central resulting from the growth of the Cockburn Gateway Shopping City, surrounding commercial, retail and residential development and proximity to the Cockburn Central station and Kwinana Freeway. It will provide a direct link between Armadale and North Lake Road, bypassing congestion at Cockburn Central station and the Cockburn Gateway shopping centre. We will see improved access to Kwinana Freeway to and from the north as well as easier access to Cockburn Central station. The bridge will support residents and commercial expansion in Cockburn and Armadale. It will complement other significant road improvements in the southern metropolitan corridor.

Also in the budget is \$145 million to make Armadale Road a dual carriageway between Anstey Road and Tapper Road. This project will upgrade almost seven kilometres of a section of Armadale Road from Tapper Road to Anstey Road. This is the last section of the single carriageway between Kwinana Freeway and Armadale. The project will upgrade the road from one suited to a semi-rural environment to an urban road able to service the increased growth and development in the area, servicing growth and providing prosperity. Armadale Road is a strategic freight route, connecting the south west and the south east corridor. It is one of the main east–west links within the Perth metropolitan transport network. The link passes through industrial areas, rural subdivisions, and recently developed and planned residential subdivisions, and connects Armadale subregional centre and Albany Highway, forming part of the route to Fremantle port. This project will improve not only access to the new residential developments to Cockburn train station, Cockburn Gateway shopping centre and the Jandakot industrial

area but also the strategic freight route connecting the south west and the south east corridors of the Perth metropolitan area. This vital upgrade project will provide additional lane capacity to improve safety and operational efficiencies in the area, along with better access and traffic flow. As is very important to many in the electorate, travel times along Armadale Road will reduce, and that means people will spend less time in their cars and more time with their families.

It is exciting to know that investigational work is about to commence that will inform the road upgrade design. A series of investigational works will be carried out over the next three months on the road reserve between Anstey Road in Forrestdale and North Lake Road in Cockburn Central. The community will be able to see that happening and that work is steaming ahead and that the end result is not too far away. The Metropolitan Road Improvement Alliance has been doing an excellent job keeping the community informed and involved and I am pleased to have been working with the alliance to ensure that the right stakeholders, local community organisations, groups and individuals are being put forward to join the project's construction reference group. Also included in the budget is \$112 million to connect Murdoch Drive to Kwinana Freeway and Roe Highway, for which I recently attended the first meeting of the construction reference group along with a number of local community stakeholders who are keen to advocate for their communities to ensure the most positive outcomes for the project. This road connection was first identified as a key component of the Murdoch Specialised Activity Centre structure plan, last revised in 2014. The structure plan states —

... that the success of the activity centre will depend upon the staged delivery of key transport infrastructure to ensure an appropriate level of accessibility to and within the centre, in particular the provision of a southern access route.

Once fully developed, it is expected that the Murdoch activity centre will become one of the largest employers outside the Perth CBD, creating up to 35 000 jobs. This project will support the ongoing development of the Murdoch activity centre and help it to meet its economic potential as a major employment, education and research centre. It will also provide better access to Fiona Stanley Hospital from the south for patients and emergency vehicles. Access to the Murdoch activity centre and Fiona Stanley Hospital from Kwinana Freeway northbound is currently limited to South Street, via Murdoch Drive. During busy periods, we can see severe congestion happening on South Street and on the freeway, leading to an increased safety risk, which will abate once the extension is built. Of course, safety is paramount but this project has the added benefit of providing shorter, more predictable journey times for those who live and work in the Murdoch precinct. To round out the significant half billion-dollar investment in Jandakot roads is the \$49 million committed to widening the northbound section of the Kwinana Freeway from Russel Road to Roe Highway. Many of those in the Jandakot community and surrounds rely on the freeway to get to work and to go about their daily business. Nothing is more frustrating than the time lost trying to get to an important appointment or to simply get home from work so we can see our families or to enjoy some time to ourselves. Experiencing the growing impact of the growth in traffic volumes over recent years, the congestion and flow breakdown on the freeway northbound has been a growing frustration for many. Upon completion, this widening project will reduce travel times and address congestion for our road users, not just in Jandakot, but across Perth's southern suburbs. This project complements the Armadale Road– North Lake Road bridge and the Smart Freeways project that will enable traffic to move more effectively through this critical part of the metropolitan road network via some excellent technology-based initiatives.

With regards to health in this budget, anyone who has ever suffered an injury or a serious illness or had a family member in hospital will know not only how stressful that situation is, but also how important the provision of good health care is from the very first presentation, all the way through to recovery. Ensuring that the quality of each stage and level of care is carefully considered is incredibly important. With significant population growth in Jandakot, we need to not only improve transport and education, but also ensure our community members are looked after in the event that something untoward does occur. A strong investment in health in the McGowan government's first budget will ensure that the Jandakot community benefits from election commitments that are putting patients first. I remember during the election campaign standing on the site of WA's first medihotel, located alongside Fiona Stanley Hospital, with the future Premier and the future Minister for Health. The medihotel will help reduce waiting times in emergency departments and waiting lists for elective surgery by ensuring patients who are not ready to be discharged but no longer need that high level of care can recover in comfort, with family and loved ones close by in a convenient location. I am pleased that the community of Jandakot will soon have this state-of-the-art facility on its doorstep. To complement this, I am pleased to also see in the budget \$2 million to help establish urgent care clinics, which will reduce pressure on emergency departments by ensuring non-priority patients do not have to sit in emergency rooms for hours waiting for treatment. The clinics are an innovative and commonsense way of treating patients with non-life threatening conditions that will reduce pressure on busy emergency departments. My constituents in the seat of Jandakot can be assured that immense work is underway that will improve the way they access care, if and when they happen to need it.

Aside from health, crime and safety is another issue that my constituents in Jandakot do not really want to think about, but have to as a fact of life, so it is important that the government is providing the services that are there for them when unfortunate circumstances arise. As part of the McGowan Labor government's election commitments

to make Armadale and Cockburn police stations 24/7 and extend operating hours at Canning Vale Police Station, it was recognised that some infrastructure improvements were needed for these facilities. As a result, \$300 000 has been budgeted to complete works at Canning Vale Police Station to support the extended trading hours. I stood with my parliamentary colleagues at the first rally and saw firsthand how important this issue is to the community. I want to thank Minister Roberts for her swift action in prioritising community safety in the south eastern corridor, especially in Forrestdale, Harrisdale and Piara Waters, which are the fastest growing new housing suburbs in WA. We are already providing a much-improved policing service for the people of Forrestdale, Harrisdale and Piara Waters by ensuring the community has greater in-person access to police assistance. This means, positively, a stronger police presence and boosted community safety in Jandakot.

With regards to Local Projects, Local Jobs, I am pleased to say that we have allocated \$224 300 to Harrisdale Primary School for shade structures. Harrisdale Primary is a new primary school that opened in 2016 and has grown faster than any other government school in Western Australia. The school has more than 800 students and many parents were expressing concerns about the need for more shaded areas. I am glad that this money will be allocated for the much better use. The grant will provide these structures and I am glad to say that the Harrisdale Primary School P&C association has taken such an active role in advocating for the needs of students and were able to get this fantastic opportunity for the school. P&C associations are a fantastic asset to our schools and it continues to be a pleasure working with Harrisdale parents. Just a few weeks ago I also enjoyed spending a morning with Minister Murray at Piara Waters Junior Football Club to present a cheque for \$20 000. It was also a pleasure to assist the ARKS Rugby Club to secure another \$15 000 toward a scrum machine and training equipment. Finally, I have been pleased to help the Australia China Youth Business Association, with a grant for \$7 500.

In conclusion, I am confident to say that we have listened to the concerns, issues and ideas of the Jandakot community. In delivering this budget, we have shown that we have a very strong and focused plan for this community that focuses on their needs and addresses the massive growth that Jandakot is experiencing and will continue to experience.

DR M.D. NAHAN (Riverton — Leader of the Opposition) [5.39 pm]: I also wish to speak on the Appropriation (Capital 2017–18) Bill 2017. We have just heard the contribution of the member for Jandakot to this debate. The member did a very good job advocating on behalf of his electorate. However, in doing that, he has highlighted many of the problems with this budget and this government. I am not criticising the member for Jandakot. He is doing the best he can. He is a good local member, actually.

This budget is flawed by one thing. Many of the projects and initiatives outlined in this budget are good. Many of those projects and initiatives are what our government would have done had we had the money.

Mr D.J. Kelly: But did not.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Some of those projects we were doing. The real issue is how we fund these things. The government has committed to its large Metronet expenditure. A large amount of that Metronet expenditure has been redirected from the money that we had allocated to the Perth Freight Link. The commonwealth had also allocated money to the Perth Freight Link, and the government reallocated that money. I know it is late in the day and members opposite are not listening, but I need to make this point. The Perth Freight Link was ready to go and would have been in full swing in 2017–18. A large amount of that money was to be spent in 2017–18. It is clear from the budget papers that virtually none of that money will be spent in 2017–18. It will be spent in the out years. The reallocation of that money from the Perth Freight Link to Metronet has, at best, postponed thousands of jobs, if not destroyed jobs.

The fundamental flaw in the removal of the Perth Freight Link is that there will now be no southern access to the Murdoch activity precinct and Fiona Stanley Hospital. The member for Jandakot outlined in great detail how southern access is essential to the development of that precinct and to reduce congestion. The Perth Freight Link was designed in large part to address that need. The government has now come up with a second best or third best option. Under that option, the government will need to make Farrington Road, which is currently a two-lane road, a dual carriageway. That dual carriageway at Farrington Road will need to go through the Beeliar wetlands, slightly to the north of where the Perth Freight Link would have gone. Unlike what our government did with the Perth Freight Link, the government has not done any environmental assessments, there are no plans for remediation or for a bridge over the wetlands, and there has been no community consultation. The government will do more damage by dualling Farrington Road than would ever have been the case with the Perth Freight Link. The government may say the opposition lost that debate. The government won the election on a policy of axing the Perth Freight Link. That will cause diabolical harm to the environment of that area, and cause congestion. The damage will be significant. The member for Jandakot, being a good local member, will hear more about this in the future. Watch this space!

The second issue I want to raise is hospital spending. The government has a plan for a sharp reduction in hospital spending. That is understandable. Our government spent \$7.5 billion on hospital investment.

Mr D.J. Kelly: A lot of that was on the Serco contract!

Dr M.D. NAHAN: I will go back to hospital spending and the privatisation of hospitals. An important issue in my electorate is Bentley Hospital. Bentley Hospital provides maternity and mental health services. It is an old hospital and needs investment. In our last term in government, the member for Cannington and the member for Victoria Park as the local member were advocating strongly for further investment in Bentley Hospital and promised to do so. Our government spent some money on that hospital to maintain maternity and other services. However, in this budget, the government has pulled \$10 million out of Bentley Hospital and has redirected that to Royal Perth Hospital. That is exactly the opposite of what the government said it would do. We will ensure that the government is held accountable for that. I know from the visits I have had from clinicians, nurses and patients at Bentley Hospital that the retribution has started. The government misled those people. It did not tell them the truth.

Another area is medihotels.

Mr S.A. Millman: A great policy!

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Let us see!

The government has \$2.63 billion of additional capital expenditure across the forward estimates. How will the government fund that? Some of it is good stuff. Some of it is funded by the commonwealth—\$1.2 billion—and the government has redirected nearly \$500 million from the Perth Freight Link. However, most of that money has been borrowed. The government went on a borrowing spree. The government knew it did not have the capacity to fund large commitments like Metronet, but it went ahead anyway thinking that it could fool everybody. The government has concocted stories, and the budget situation is now even worse. The fiscal position going forward is more severe than we ever expected. In each year of the forward estimates relative to the *Pre-election Financial Projections Statement*, debt will grow by \$11.6 billion. If the government wants to know what the reactions are, it need only go through the speeches given by its members on the capital and recurrent bills. They are selling these projects here, there and everywhere—more and more money. They are all good projects, but the government cannot afford them. The government's story is blame the former government. The blame is with this government and its high level of expenditure.

In question time today, the Minister for Transport responded to a statement that I had made. I did not say the government should eliminate Metronet. I never said that. I said that because the government does not have the money and will need to borrow to pay for Metronet, the solution is to postpone or cut back Metronet. The minister said, "We made these promises! How dare you ask us to cut back on them!" The minister referred to MAX light rail. The government made those promises. However, it has no money to fund those promises. That is why debt is going up. I predict that in two years, net debt in this state will scream to \$50 billion, at least in the forward estimates. Watch this space! State debt is already climbing to \$44 billion in the forward estimates. That is without including the Ellenbrook rail line, at a cost of \$1 billion; the Byford rail extension, at a cost of I do not know how much; Karrinyup station; and medihotels. It also includes the expansion of Joondalup Health Campus. The member for Joondalup said that a deal has been done with Ramsay Health. There is no mention of that in the budget. She said that a study has been done to commit to that expansion. She bagged the commonwealth for not funding that expansion. I have never heard of the commonwealth funding a public hospital in that way, but that is beside the point. A deal has been done. I suggest that the government has privatised in large part the expansion of Joondalup hospital. It will be funded not by a capital injection but by charging a higher fee to provide services to public patients. That is exactly what the Minister for Water has been braying about over the past four years. The government is expanding the privatised state of the hospital system. I do not necessarily agree with that. I would like to see the cost of the capital through that. That is what the government has done, but it is not in the budget.

I refer to medihotels. We looked at this initiative quite a bit because it was a policy in the eastern states. I think Victoria had 11 of them. It has closed down virtually all of them. Do members know why? They did not save any money. Some facilities in Victoria were publicly provided, but most of them were private. By the way, there are no estimates of costs or future costs or organisation for medihotels in the budget. The one that I have read about in the paper has been announced for the Murdoch precinct. Both the building and the operation of the hospital were contracted out to the private sector. It is privatisation of the provision of public services to patients. The government has privatised the public hospital estate and it will do it elsewhere. I am not necessarily complaining. I am making it quite clear that if the costs are right, it is not a bad idea to contract out the provision of public hospital services to the private sector. We did that in Midland, Peel and Joondalup. The Labor Party went out there, in the last term, braying and complaining about the privatisation of public health services and promising to bring them back on. But Labor's major initiative during the election was a medihotel and that is exactly what it is doing. You are frauds, but that is normal.

The real problem with the medihotels is that they will increase costs. They have to. That is why Victoria closed them down. As I understand it, public patients will be moved out of Fiona Stanley Hospital, which is in Murdoch, to the medihotel. How is that supposed to save money? The argument is that the medihotel has a lower cost a day. Let us accept that. But saving money by moving a patient to a lower-cost facility, means that we cannot have

a patient in Fiona Stanley Hospital. When Victoria set up the medihotels, it closed beds. Is the government going to close any beds in Fiona Stanley Hospital? I do not think so. I have never heard any reference to that. If all the government does is increase the number of patients, have a patient in Fiona Stanley Hospital, move them to a medihotel and put another patient in Fiona Stanley Hospital, costs will increase. The government has not told anyone, but medihotels are an act of privatisation—at least the first one in Murdoch—and will increase the cost of the hospital system. They will service more patients, which is good, but the government cannot masquerade this as an efficiency drive. It is absurd. The government is getting away with it so far. The developers love it because there is work for them to do, but as we go on, we will see it come back to haunt the government, because the major issue in its budget is that after 2017–18, spending on the health system has been cut by 20 per cent in the forward estimates for 2018–19, 2019–20 and 2020–21. Policies such as medihotels are not going to help the government at all. It is facing one hell of a budgetary crisis in a few years and that is why debt is going to go screaming to \$50 billion.

As has been indicated, one of the things that the government has done is to redirect a hell of a lot of money from royalties for regions to recurrent and capital purposes. In capital, \$250.8 million was taken out of the royalties for regions budget and reallocated to election commitments. It will come at a cost, because it pulls a lot of projects away from other places. Politically, the government did that for Collie, Albany and Mandurah. Mandurah and Dawesville are now in the regions.

Mr D.A. Templeman: They always have been.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: It is very strange that Metronet goes to the rural areas. Why is it called Metronet if it goes to Mandurah? The government relabelled that whole line as part of Metronet and it goes to regional areas. I think “metro” is the Greek word for city.

Several members interjected.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: The government has redirected a massive amount of money to a couple of seats—Albany, Collie–Preston and Mandurah. I do not know why.

Mr J.R. Quigley: Did we win all those?

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Yes. I think the government is putting in large amounts of money now because it will get some departures in those seats. They may not be lost in the next election but perhaps before the next election.

Mr D.J. Kelly: Maybe we should put some money in Riverton then.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: The government has denuded all expenditure in Riverton. Do not worry about that, mate. The government has pulled everything back, as it does with most safe Liberal areas. It has denuded expenditure in every area that it could and pulled it into Labor electorates. It has politicised the allocation of capital funds to the education system more than any government ever has.

Talking about schools, in my electorate Willetton Senior High School has 2 300 kids. The local member from the Legislative Council, Hon Sue Ellery, has been advocating for the expansion of Willetton Senior High School since before I came into this house. When we decided to rebuild this school, she praised us and took credit for it. It was a very hard school to rebuild because of its size. It is hard to rebuild a school when it has 2 300 students and has to continue to operate. We had the final \$11.7 million build scheduled. Given that it had bipartisan support, the school was pretty confident that it would not be pulled. The last part of the building program that was going to be undertaken was for 24 new classrooms. The government has pulled every bit of the \$11.7 million. No classrooms are going to be built and the school is relegated to 26 demountables going forward.

Mr M. Hughes: Why didn't you direct those classrooms to Kalamunda?

Dr M.D. NAHAN: There are 26 demountables and 2 300 kids. The local member, who is now the Minister for Education, advocated strongly for it and promised to give bipartisan support and the first thing she did was pull the money out of her local school and redirect it elsewhere. Thanks very much from the people of Willetton and the 900 kids who go to that school from outside the area, particularly from Canning Vale! Within a week of Labor coming to government, the minister was onto the board of Rossmoyne Senior High School and telling it not to ask for any money. By the way, that school has 2 100 kids.

Mrs M.H. Roberts: Pity you broke the bank then.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: The government redirected the money to Labor electorates. The member for Midland says that we broke the bank. The government inherited a difficult position and it consciously and purposely has made it worse. Under this government, because of its expenditure, debt will increase by \$11.6 billion. Debt is going up each year and the deficit is going up each year, despite increasing revenue, because the government is blowing it.

Mrs M.H. Roberts interjected.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: What is the government doing?

Mrs M.H. Roberts interjected.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: I never. The deficit next year under this government will be the highest in history.

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Members! Leader of the Opposition, address the Chair.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: We will be here for three years plus, and the government thinks it got away with a smart one, but people will realise that the government went to that election promising a large capital spend and delivering on a large capital spend without any capability of funding it, except by borrowing. That is what the government has done. It made those promises and they are not affordable. The government's tactic now is to go out and blame us, but it is not our capital spend; it is the government's. If the government gets Metronet up and operating, including the Ellenbrook line and the others, it will have a massive increase in operating costs to match it. Currently with operating costs, the fees recover only about 27c on average, going down. That is the government's decision. Ellenbrook will not recover anything more than 15 per cent of the operating costs of that line.

Dr A.D. Buti interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms J.M. Freeman): Member for Armadale!

Dr M.D. NAHAN: The government has gone in there with a large capital spend and no way to fund it. It is all on the debt and the government is going to be held accountable for it. The government said that it came in here with a mandate to repair the budget, and it has failed. If that is what the government calls repairing the budget, God help us. My reading is that the government is adding, through its own decisions, \$11.6 billion in debt. I have listened to every government member brag about the levels of expenditure the government has increased, where it is going, the magnitude, the generosity of the government and whatnot. The government cannot go out there into the electorates increasing spending left, right and centre, and claim to be fiscal fixers.

When we come back next year to address the budget I will, not gleefully, point out that unless Malcolm Turnbull saves the government's bacon with a GST redistribution—make no mistake, it will be up to Malcolm Turnbull, because Bill Shorten will not do it—then good luck to the government, and good luck to everybody. Without that, the government is going to be in a diabolically difficult position in a couple of years because of the decisions it has made here. Yes, we faced difficult times; yes, we spent a large amount of money; yes, debt grew under us. But the government is going to see debt screaming towards \$50 billion because of its decisions. The government inherited debt of \$32 billion, and if it goes to \$50 billion, this will be a one-term government.

MR D.A. TEMPLEMAN (Mandurah — Leader of the House) [6.03 pm] — in reply: I am speaking on behalf of the Treasurer to close the third reading debate on this bill. Given my extensive knowledge of economics—the GST and others —

Mr S.K. L'Estrange: You must have played Keynes at some point!

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: I always remember when I was shadow Minister for Local Government last year or the year before being invited by *The West Australian* to a business roundtable, under the impression that I was going there to talk about red tape. When I got there the convener said, "Thanks for joining us, shadow spokesperson. Of course, you know the topic is GST." I think I made some really outrageous comments about what should happen to the GST back then. Thankfully, they were not printed. They may come back to haunt me.

Dr M.D. Nahan: What were they?

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: I cannot tell the member. I forget what I said. I was obviously delusional.

On behalf of the Treasurer, I would like to thank the members who have contributed to the debate on the Appropriation (Capital 2017–18) Bill 2017. This brings to a close for this chamber, the bringing down of the first McGowan government budget by the Treasurer; member for Victoria Park. On his behalf, I thank the members for their contribution and I am sure that debate will continue as the estimates process will continue in the upper house next week. I thank all members for their contributions.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

House adjourned at 6.06 pm

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Questions and answers are as supplied to Hansard.

MINISTER FOR ENVIRONMENT — PORTFOLIOS —
SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE — REDEPLOYMENT

1683. Dr M.D. Nahan to the minister representing the Minister for Environment; Disability Services:

In respect of all departments and agencies within the Minister's portfolios:

- (a) How many Senior Executive Service (SES) staff were redeployed to departments, other than the Public Sector Commission, between March 17 and July 1 2017;
- (b) What was each staff member's originating department, position title and salary;
- (c) What was each staff member's new department, position title and salary; and
- (d) What was the reason given for their redeployment?

Mr R.R. Whitby replied:

Please refer to Legislative Assembly Question on Notice 1686.

MINISTER FOR ENVIRONMENT — PORTFOLIOS — SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE —
EMPLOYMENT TERMINATION

1700. Dr M.D. Nahan to the minister representing the Minister for Environment; Disability Services:

In respect of all departments and agencies within the Minister's portfolios:

- (a) How many Senior Executive Service (SES) staff had their employment terminated between March 17 and July 1 2017;
- (b) What was each staff member's department, position title and salary;
- (c) What was their payout at the time of termination; and
- (d) What was the reason given for their termination?

Mr R.R. Whitby replied:

Please refer to Legislative Assembly Question on Notice 1703.

MINISTER FOR ENVIRONMENT — PORTFOLIOS —
SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE — REDEPLOYMENT

1717. Dr M.D. Nahan to the minister representing the Minister for Environment; Disability Services:

In respect of all departments and agencies within the Minister's portfolios:

- (a) How many Senior Executive Service (SES) staff have been redeployed to the Public Sector Commission between March 17 and July 1 2017;
- (b) What was each staff member's originating department, position title and salary;
- (c) What is their new position title and salary in the Public Sector Commission; and
- (d) What was the reason given for their redeployment?

Mr R.R. Whitby replied:

Please refer to Legislative Assembly Question on Notice 1720.

MINISTER FOR ENVIRONMENT — PORTFOLIOS — SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE — RESIGNATIONS

1734. Dr M.D. Nahan to the minister representing the Minister for Environment; Disability Services:

In respect of all departments and agencies within the Minister's portfolios:

- (a) How many Senior Executive Service (SES) staff have resigned between March 17 and July 1 2017;
- (b) What was their annual remuneration prior to resignation;
- (c) How long was left on their contract at the time of resignation; and
- (d) What was the reason given for resignation?

Mr R.R. Whitby replied:

Please refer to Legislative Assembly Question on Notice 1737.

MINISTER FOR ENVIRONMENT — PORTFOLIOS — SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE — REDUNDANCIES

1751. Dr M.D. Nahan to the minister representing the Minister for Environment; Disability Services:

In respect of all departments and agencies within the Minister's portfolios:

- (a) How many Senior Executive Service (SES) staff have been made redundant between March 17 to July 1 2017;
- (b) What was the remaining period for their contract;
- (c) What was the total amount of their payout; and
- (d) What was the reason given for their redundancy?

Mr R.R. Whitby replied:

Please refer to Legislative Assembly Question on Notice 1754.

ATTORNEY GENERAL — PORTFOLIO — VEHICLES

1785. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Attorney General:

In respect of the Minister's portfolio responsibilities for any of their departments, agencies, government trading enterprises or boards I ask:

- (a) as at 1 July 2017 are there any vehicles owned or under lease which have not been procured through existing state fleet arrangements and if so:
 - (i) what is the make, model and associated cost of each vehicle;
 - (ii) what is the registration nature of each vehicle (i.e. q-plate etc.);
 - (iii) were any accessories fitted to the vehicle and if so, what were they and what did they cost; and
 - (iv) why was each vehicle procured external to the state fleet arrangement; and
- (b) as at 1 July 2017, how many vehicles were owned or under lease which were procured through the state fleet?

Mr J.R. Quigley replied:

[See tabled paper no 864.]

ATTORNEY GENERAL — PORTFOLIO — STAFF — TERM-OF-GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

1802. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Attorney General:

In respect of the Minister's portfolio responsibilities for any of their departments, agencies or government trading enterprises, I ask:

- (a) as at 1 July 2017 how many people were employed on a "term of government" contract, and if any:
 - (i) on what date did each person sign their contract;
 - (ii) what is the job title of each person; and
 - (iii) what is the salary and entitlements provided to each person; and
- (b) as at 1 July 2016 how many people were employed on a "term of government" contract?

Mr J.R. Quigley replied:

(a)–(b) None, not applicable.

ATTORNEY GENERAL — PORTFOLIOS — END-OF-FINANCIAL-YEAR PARTIES AND SPECIAL EVENTS

1959. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Attorney General:

In respect of the Minister's portfolio responsibilities for any of their departments, agencies, government trading enterprises or boards I ask:

- (a) were any parties or special events held at the taxpayers expense, to celebrate the end of the 2016–2017 financial year, and if so:
 - (i) where was the event/party held;
 - (ii) what was the breakdown of total costs of the event/party; and
 - (iii) who attended the event/party?

Mr J.R. Quigley replied:

(a) None, not applicable.

CORRECTIVE SERVICES — CORPEX

1972. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Minister for Corrective Services:

During the 2016-2017 financial year, did any member of the CorpEx have oversight or decision-making provisions on any Corrective Services tender panel, and if so:

- (a) what was the name and title of that CorpEx member; and
- (b) what tender did each CorpEx member have oversight or decision-making ability, including the tender nature, value and final decision?

Mr F.M. Logan replied:

The Department of Justice advises:

(a)

Corpex Member	Title	Role
Jenni Collard	Assistant Commissioner, Rehabilitation & Re-Integration	Evaluation Panel Member
Rodney Alderton	Director, Procurement Contracted Services	Evaluation Panel Member
James McMahan	Commissioner	Delegated Authority to award
James McMahan	Commissioner	Delegated Authority to award
Penny Kennedy	A/Executive Director, Procurement & Contracted Services	Delegated Authority to award
Rodney Alderton	Executive Director, Procurement & Contracted Services	Delegated Authority to award
Tony Hassall	Executive Director, Operational Services	EOI Shortlisting Evaluation Panel Member
Tony Hassall	Executive Director, Operational Services	RFP Evaluation Panel Member
James McMahan	Commissioner	Delegated Authority to award
Mala Dharmananda	Executive Director, Strategic Capability and Review Division	Evaluation Panel Member
Tony Hassall	Executive Director, Operational Services	Evaluation Panel Member
James McMahan	Commissioner	Project Steering Committee Member
Rodney Alderton	Executive Director, Procurement & Contracted Services	Delegated Authority to award

- (b) Relates to matters that are commercial in confidence and this will not be provided.

ATTORNEY GENERAL — PORTFOLIO — DRONES

1990. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Attorney General:

Since 1 January 2017 have any departments, agencies, commissions or Government Trading Enterprise (GTE) within the Attorney General's portfolio of responsibilities purchased a drone and if so:

- (a) what was the make and model of the drone and at what cost;
- (b) were any accessories purchased and if so, what were the accessories and what was the cost of each; and
- (c) why was the drone purchased?

Mr J.R. Quigley replied:

One drone was purchased by the Department of Justice, Corrective Services division.

- (a) Drone: Phantom 3 Dts 7K HD Drone (for training purposes)
Cost: \$689.00
- (b) Accessories are as listed in (a) above and are as per cost.
- (c) To enhance the Special Operations Group's capability to conduct aerial observation at custodial facilities, during routine and emergency operations.

PRISONS — BULLYING

2000. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Minister for Corrective Services:

Will the Minister provide a breakdown of bullying which has been reported by prison or youth justice officers at each facility:

- (a) between 1 January 2017 and 31 August 2017; and
- (b) between 1 January 2016 and 31 August 2016?

Mr F.M. Logan replied:

Given the very general nature of this question it would be helpful if the Member could provide further clarification on what is meant by “bullying” and what types of incidents are of interest to him.

PRISONS — ASSAULTS

2002. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Minister for Corrective Services:

Since 1 January 2017, have any prisoners or detainees have been hospitalised as a result of an assault, and if so:

- (a) what is the breakdown of assaults by prison or detention centre; and
- (b) in each instance how long was the detainee or prisoner hospitalised (by days) and in what hospital?

Mr F.M. Logan replied:

The Department of Justice advises:

- (a) That the categories used for reporting assault data do not separate out assaults that involved treatment at hospital. Both assault and serious assault incidents may or may not include hospitalisation. The table gives a breakdown of assaults between 1 January 2017 and 25 September 2017

Serious assault and assault incidents, Adult prisons and Youth detention in Western Australia, 1 January to 25 September 2017

Facility	Against Prisoner			Against Staff			Total
	Assault	Serious Assault	Total	Assault	Serious Assault	Total	
Acacia Prison	11	4	15	6	2	8	23
Albany Regional Prison	9	1	10	3	0	3	13
Bandyup Women’s Prison	21	5	26	9	1	10	36
Boronia Pre Release Centre	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Broome Regional Prison	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bunbury Regional Prison	13	3	16	1	0	1	17
Casuarina Prison	31	9	40	8	5	13	53
Eastern Goldfields Regional Prison	14	1	15	13	1	14	29
Greenough Regional Prison	10	5	15	3	0	3	18
Hakea Prison	52	8	60	7	1	8	68
Karnet Prison Farm	1	1	2	0	0	0	2
Melaleuca Remand and Reintegration Facility	4	0	4	4	0	4	8
Pardelup Prison Farm	0	1	1	0	0	0	1
Roebourne Regional Prison	3	1	4	2	0	2	6
Wandoo Reintegration Facility	2	0	2	0	0	0	2
West Kimberley Regional Prison	8	0	8	3	0	3	11
Wooroloo Prison Farm	4	0	4	0	0	0	4
Banksia Hill Detention Centre	16	0	16	15	3	18	34
Total	199	39	238	74	13	87	325

- (b) That identification of assaults where hospitalisation has occurred, and the amount of time spent in hospital is therefore not readily available from the Department’s systems and would require a manual review of individual incidents.

MINISTER FOR EMERGENCY SERVICES — PORTFOLIOS —
CONFERENCE, SEMINAR AND WORKSHOP ATTENDANCE

2016. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Minister for Emergency Services; Corrective Services:

Since 1 January 2017, have any officers or board members of a department, agency, Commission or Government Trading Enterprise (GTE) within the Minister's portfolio of responsibilities attended a conference, seminar or workshop organised by a private organisation for which attendance was paid for by the department, agency, Commission or GTE, and if yes:

- (a) what was the name of the event attended by the officer or board member;
- (b) on what date was the event;
- (c) where was the event held;
- (d) how many officers or board members attended;
- (e) what is the name of the organiser or facilitator of the event; and
- (f) what was the ticket or entry cost of attendance for each officer or board member, and what was the cost of any travel or accommodation as part of the officer or board member's attendance?

Mr F.M. Logan replied:

The Office of the Inspector of Custodial Services advises:

- (a) Towards Elimination of Restricted Practices
- (b) 26 April 2017
- (c) On-line virtual
- (d) Two
- (e) WAAMH
- (f) \$25

The Office of Emergency Management advises:

[See tabled paper no 863.]

The Department of Fire and Emergency Services (DFES) advises:

- (a)–(f) [See tabled paper no 863.] for date range 1 January 2017 to 16 March 2017.
- (a)–(f) [See tabled paper no 863.] for date range 29 June 2017 to 7 September 2017.
- (a)–(f) Please refer to LA QON 1539 for date range 17 March 2017 to 28 June 2017.

The Department of Justice advises:

[See tabled paper no 863.]

WATER CORPORATION — MURCHISON PROGRAM

2087. Mr V.A. Catania to the Minister for Water; Fisheries; Forestry; Innovation and ICT; Science:

I refer to a Water Corporation trial known as the Murchison Program, introduced by the previous Minister for Water, to improve aesthetic water quality being conducted in several Murchison towns:

- (a) how many water treatment units were fitted in each of the following towns as part of the trial:
 - (i) Cue;
 - (ii) Meekatharra;
 - (iii) Mt Magnet; and
 - (iv) Sandstone;
- (b) for the same towns, how many recipients of trial units were residential and how many were commercial;
- (c) what were the results of the trial;
- (d) does the Minister support wider-scale adoption of water treatment options trialled in the Murchison and at what cost could this be achieved;
- (e) has Water Corporation identified a more economical way to improve water quality in these towns; and
- (f) if the Minister doesn't support implementing water treatment on a wider scale, how will these towns endure the impacts of low-quality water on their households and businesses?

Mr D.J. Kelly replied:

- (a) (i) 14.
(ii)–(iv) Nil. The trial program was in Cue with the learnings used for the localities of Meekatharra, Mt Magnet and Sandstone.
 - (b) (i) 12 residential and 2 commercial.
(ii)–(iv) Nil.
 - (c) The reverse osmosis units performed effectively removing salts, improving taste and reducing scale formation, while the softeners' performance was variable.
 - (d) For these towns, it is more cost effective to implement a centralised water treatment facility. However, household-scale technology may have applications in other locations.
 - (e) Yes.
 - (f) The Water Corporation is progressing with a three-year project to build a centralised water treatment plant at the four towns in the Murchison region, starting with Cue.
-

