

**SUPPLY BILL 2020**

*All Stages — Standing Orders Suspension — Motion*

**MR D.A. TEMPLEMAN (Mandurah — Leader of the House)** [3.16 pm] — without notice: I move —

That so much of the standing orders be suspended as is necessary to enable the Supply Bill 2020 to be introduced forthwith without notice and to proceed through all stages without delay between the stages.

In speaking briefly to this motion, there was obviously some discussion by government about ensuring that supply can continue for the payment of various public servants et cetera in the event that our state budget might be delayed or disrupted. I want to put on the record my thanks to the Leader of the Opposition, through negotiations with the manager of opposition business in the Assembly. I also acknowledge and thank the Leader of the Nationals WA for the National Party's understanding and support with regard to the urgency of this bill. I also acknowledge Hon Sue Ellery, the leader of government business in the other place, and the various parties and Independents, for their indication that the Supply Bill will be passed by both houses of Parliament before the houses rise on Thursday of this week, and I acknowledge the cooperation of those members.

**MR Z.R.F. KIRKUP (Dawesville)** [3.17 pm]: The opposition obviously supports this motion and the suspension of standing orders and looks forward to the Supply Bill getting through this house before the dinner break. This is an extraordinary measure for an extraordinary time. I appreciate the negotiations and conversations that we have had with the Leader of the House and the Leader of the Opposition, together with the Premier, in making sure that we can expedite the bill through this place and through the Parliament in record time, obviously reflecting where we are and what we are about to encounter. It is a good preparatory measure, I suppose, in the event that we cannot meet and the Parliament cannot sit in order to pass the budget.

**MS M.J. DAVIES (Central Wheatbelt — Leader of the Nationals WA)** [3.18 pm]: I would like to thank the Leader of the House for the inclusion of the Nationals WA in these discussions. We of course support the motion to enable the swift passage of the Supply Bill 2020. We appreciate the fact that we have been consulted on this matter as this has progressed.

**THE ACTING SPEAKER (Ms M.M. Quirk)** As this is a motion without notice to suspend standing orders, it will need an absolute majority in order to succeed. If I hear a dissenting voice, I will be required to divide the Assembly. Question put and passed with an absolute majority.

*Introduction and First Reading*

Bill introduced, on motion by **Mr B.S. Wyatt (Treasurer)**, and read a first time.

Explanatory memorandum presented by the Treasurer.

*Second Reading*

**MR B.S. WYATT (Victoria Park — Treasurer)** [3.20 pm]: I move —

That the bill be now read a second time.

This bill seeks supply and appropriation from the consolidated account for recurrent and capital purposes during the 2020–21 financial year of \$13 638 632 000. This bill is introduced as an important contingency in the event that COVID-19 means that the 2020–21 recurrent and capital appropriation bills are not passed in time to achieve supply for the new financial year. Supply is an integral element of the Westminster system of government and successive state governments and Parliaments in Western Australia have accepted and understood that the intent of supply is to give authority for expenditure from the commencement of a new financial year pending the passage of the consolidated account appropriation bills. The 2020–21 budget is due to be delivered on 14 May 2020 and the Financial Management Act 2006 provides two months' automatic supply if the appropriation bills are not passed before the end of the financial year. However, COVID-19 could delay the introduction and passage of the appropriation bills for the 2020–21 budget, meaning their passing by the end of August 2020 may not be possible. In that event, a standalone supply bill authorising supply will be required. Accordingly, the Supply Bill 2020 provides for interim appropriations out of the consolidated account to fund the core activities of government agencies until around December 2020. This will ensure crucial public services can continue to operate and that all public sector workers such as nurses, teachers, police officers and public transport staff can continue to be paid. It is the intention that this bill will only be proclaimed in the event that the passage of the budget appropriation bills by 1 September 2020 does not happen.

Given the uncertainty of COVID-19 and its impact on the community, the government believes this precautionary measure is prudent. The Leader of the Opposition has been consulted on this approach and I thank her for her support. The Leader of the Opposition will be consulted again prior to this legislation being proclaimed if it appears

Mr David Templeman; In; Mr Zak Kirkup; Ms Mia Davies; Acting Speaker; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mrs Liza Harvey;  
Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Terry Redman

---

that developments with COVID-19 require this course of action. I also thank the Leader of the Nationals WA and all members for their cooperation in the passage of this most unusual bill.

The \$13 639 million amount in the Supply Bill 2020 is based on 50 per cent of appropriations approved by Parliament for the 2019–20 financial year. These moneys may be issued and applied to the works, services, and purposes for which the consolidated account will be appropriated for by Parliament for the financial year ending 30 June 2021. The bill prescribes a general monetary limit on the drawings against the consolidated account. By so doing, it overcomes the problems that otherwise could arise by prescribing monetary limits on the individual appropriations as usually detailed in the estimates of expenditure.

I commend the bill to the house.

#### *Appropriations*

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

#### *Second Reading Resumed*

**MRS L.M. HARVEY (Scarborough — Leader of the Opposition)** [3.24 pm]: I rise on behalf of the Liberal opposition to support the Supply Bill 2020. It is not unprecedented to have a bill such as this enabling a supply to a government. As I recollect, a supply bill was initiated during the term of the former government in 2013 and again in 2017, which was related to the state general election impacting on the ability of the government to organise a budget that recognised, acknowledged and included election commitments. However, the circumstances within which this chamber contemplates this Supply Bill are certainly unprecedented in the state of Western Australia.

I will make some remarks about this legislation. I was very pleased and would like to place on the record my thanks to the Premier for calling me on Sunday afternoon with an update on what had been happening with the Council of Australian Governments meetings that have been coordinated by phone hook-up. He has been keeping me updated with the latest decisions. I also appreciate the work and effort of those who support us in Parliament with their advice, the Clerk and the Deputy Clerk, who are talking us through the issues that we face as a chamber, with the Constitution requiring that we pass the budget and budget estimates process in order to enable supply for the government, how important that process is and how important it is to make sure there are alternative arrangements should budget estimates not be able to occur, as may be the case in these circumstances. In response to those conversations that I had with the Clerk and the Deputy Clerk, I took it upon myself to speak to Hon Alison Xamon, the leader of the Greens, and also the member for Central Wheatbelt, the Leader of the Nationals WA. We have been working together to try to minimise the time required for senior health and law and order bureaucrats to provide us with briefings by coordinating briefings between the Greens, the Nationals WA and the Liberal Party in opposition so that we can all be informed and briefed with the latest information, and have less impact on those leaders of our bureaucracies who need to manage a not insignificant crisis in our community. I thank the Leader of the Nationals WA and also Hon Alison Xamon, the leader of the Greens, for their collaboration in trying to coordinate and provide bipartisan support for the approaches needed at this time.

Although I acknowledge that times like these require all members of Parliament to rise above the usual cut and thrust of politics, it is our responsibility as an opposition to hold government to account for its response. Members in this place will recall that we have been applying significant pressure on this government to do something to stimulate the domestic economy. Although the Treasurer and the Premier say that we are in a very good place to respond to coronavirus issues because of their management and delivery of a budget surplus, which is not disputed, what has been mismanaged is the domestic economy. Small businesses in WA find themselves in not a very resilient state at all to ride this coronavirus issue. The economic impact of the coronavirus has been felt in our small businesses today, and that is on top of what has been a very sluggish economy, with very poor demand and discretionary spend drying up. That has impacted hospitality, tourism and the small business sector. Indeed, that impact is being felt now. We have been calling for a more urgent response to the coronavirus from this government from as early as the start of this year. It seems to us, as observers of this process, that the government only realised that there might be an issue with the coronavirus for Western Australia on 22 January. That was when we first started to hear some commentary from this government on the coronavirus. I do not believe that the government was taking this issue very seriously at all, not in the context of what was happening in the rest of the world at the time.

I want to draw members' attention to a summary of actions that were taken in other countries as early as 30 December 2019. That was when a Wuhan authority announced the "pneumonia of unknown cause". As a result of those comments and the actions in Wuhan, Hong Kong, Macau and Taiwan immediately tightened their inbound screening processes. On 3 January, Thailand began screening passengers arriving from Wuhan at four different airports, and Singapore also began screening passengers at Changi airport. On 6 January, the Chinese Premier urged decisive and effective efforts to prevent and control the epidemic. Beijing and Guangdong reported an additional three cases and 13 laboratory-confirmed cases respectively. Shanghai confirmed its first case, bringing the total

Mr David Templeman; In; Mr Zak Kirkup; Ms Mia Davies; Acting Speaker; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mrs Liza Harvey;  
Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Terry Redman

---

number of laboratory-confirmed cases in China to 218. On 6 January 2020, the investigation team from the National Health Commission of the People's Republic of China confirmed that coronavirus could be transmitted between humans. On 21 January, the World Health Organization announced that it would hold an emergency meeting on the virus the following day to determine whether the virus was a public health emergency of international concern. The Panamanian government enhanced its sanitary control and screening measures at all ports of entry in order to prevent the spread of the virus. On 22 January, North Korea closed its borders and banned foreign tourists because of the virus. The World Health Organization's emergency committee was unable to reach a consensus on whether the outbreak should be classified as a public health emergency due to a lack of information.

It was only on 22 January that we started to get some commentary from this government on the coronavirus and the response to it. We started to see the government turn its mind to what might be required to cushion Western Australia and, indeed, to protect the health of our citizens and to protect our economy and jobs. What we have been calling for and what was needed at that time was very consistent and coherent advice, a public health campaign and an education campaign for everybody in Western Australia to help them understand what might occur as a result of the coronavirus and the actions that the government was taking to ensure that people in Western Australia could feel safe, and they knew their health and their jobs would be protected. Instead of getting this reassurance that there would be a public health campaign, building confidence in the community around that protection, we had inconsistent messaging from the government on a number of things, which has added to the panic that we have seen in our stores.

I think the Minister for Tourism said that the biggest risk to Western Australia from the coronavirus was a lack of tourists coming to Western Australia. The biggest threat to Western Australia from the coronavirus is clearly the health of our vulnerable populations. That is the biggest risk. That is where the attention should have been. Instead, the government has been in denial over this issue and has come to the party very late indeed. I will raise that problem during this debate.

Back in January, when it became evident that other countries were taking very decisive action around their citizens, the Department of Health should have been ordering all those essential supplies and equipment such as portable ventilators, neonatal ventilators, testing kits and protective gear for our hospital workers. It should all have been initiated on 6 January 2020. We could have been ahead of the game. China is our biggest trading partner. All the businesses involved in the mining and gas sectors in Western Australia knew exactly what was happening in China. They were preparing their workforce back in December and early January 2020. The government did not start preparing until mid-January, when it was dragged to the table kicking and screaming.

I have just been passed a message from John XXIII College, which states —

I am writing to you with an update on the College's response to the COVID-19 virus.

I have been notified today that a parent in our College community has tested positive to COVID-19. In line with the processes outlined for such a case, the family is now in self-isolation.

We have had our first case of a family in a school community that has tested positive to COVID-19. We knew this was coming.

**Mr B.S. Wyatt:** A family or a mother? Be careful what you say.

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** It was a parent.

**Mr B.S. Wyatt:** Right, so is it somebody in the school?

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** It was a parent from a school.

**Mr B.S. Wyatt:** There are lots of parents. Be careful what you say, member.

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** I will repeat exactly what I read out —

I have been notified today that a parent in our College community has tested positive to COVID-19. In line with the processes outlined for such a case, the family is now in self-isolation.

**Mr B.S. Wyatt:** Just be careful what you say from now.

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** That is exactly what I said. I know that the member is sensitive about this issue.

As the opposition has said, the government could have been doing a number of things back in early January and it simply was not.

I will return to the inconsistent messaging. The opposition has been calling for an additional stimulus package to deal with the economic impact of the coronavirus to Western Australian businesses. On 11 March, the Treasurer said that there would not be a stimulus until the budget comes down in May. Then on Thursday, 12 March, the Treasurer said in this place, in response to a question from the member for North West Central —

Mr David Templeman; In; Mr Zak Kirkup; Ms Mia Davies; Acting Speaker; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mrs Liza Harvey;  
Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Terry Redman

---

We have a budget coming out very soon that will have a range of responses and a range of incentives to support businesses and Western Australians regardless of where they live.

On 11 and 12 March he said that there would be no stimulus —

**Mr B.S. Wyatt:** Did you say there would be no stimulus? Just quote that.

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** The Treasurer said —

... that will have a range of responses ...

On 16 March, the government announced its stimulus package. The opposition and members of the community have been quite critical of the stimulus package, and I will tell members why. The energy assistance package only goes to commonwealth concession cardholders. It does not extend, for example, to an expansion of the hardship utility grant scheme for all those struggling families that currently cannot pay their bills—the self-employed, tradies, casual workers, the working poor and those people in the gig economy. They get nothing from this stimulus package. No business with a payroll of under \$1 million gets anything from this package.

I want to read to members an email that came into my inbox today. This business has been open since 1983, the year I graduated from high school, so some time ago. It states —

I am writing to you to let you know the devastating impact the current COVID-19 and recent bushfires and floods have/and are having on our Osborne Park manufacturing business.

We are a family business that manufactures souvenir jewellery for the tourism industry (including for places such as the Perth and Royal Australian Mints, National Airport Retailers and most major Tourist destinations around the country) and have been operating for over 30 years. **Yesterday I stood down all 19 employees.**

With an effective ban on all overseas tourists, we have received no orders this week, and do not expect any in the foreseeable future.

19 Employees are now out of work in your electorates. Our largest customer has suspended any supplier payments, and alone owes us over \$100,000.

Other than the \$25,000 Federal grant announced, which we should qualify for, and the \$17,500 State grant which we DO NOT qualify for, is there any other assistance your Governments can make available to support our local manufacturing and jobs before we cease to exist altogether? Ideally some form of rescue package which ensures staff can continue to be paid.

That email is from a small business owner. I know what it is like to be a small business owner who wants to keep paying their staff and look after their families because they have become part of their family, who wants to look after their staff's health by protecting them in the workplace and who wants them to have a future in their business. That is all any small business owner wants. Members, the kicker with this, which is the thing that I absolutely love about the Aussie spirit, is the way this gentleman finishes his email —

We do have warehouse and logistics capabilities if there is any functions which we can perform in order to facilitate any Govt strategies around distribution of goods or materials.

He has no customers and he has had to stand down all his staff, yet his final words were to offer logistical support to the government should it require it in this moment of community need in which Western Australia finds itself. That is the quintessential Western Australian small business philosophy, and that is why I am so angry and distressed that there is nothing in the financial assistance package for them. The payroll tax relief will not kick in until 1 July and those businesses may have closed their doors by then. As far as we can tell—perhaps the Treasurer can answer my query in his reply—this package does not contemplate what is proposed on 1 July with the grouping provision threshold for payroll tax being raised to \$1 million, which is, I suspect, where the government's \$1 million cut-off has come for the payroll tax relief. The businesses captured by the lower threshold, the \$950 000 threshold, are paying payroll tax for the next six months and they are not eligible for the \$17 500 relief because they fall under the \$1 million threshold. Admittedly, from 1 July they will not have to pay payroll tax, but what about their cash flow between now and 30 June? There is nothing in the package for them unless they can rely on the commonwealth government to get the \$25 000 grant out to those businesses as quickly as possible. That \$25 000 will mean that a small business retailer—I have personal experience of this—can keep the payroll going for a month so that they can keep people employed and keep money flowing into households for two weeks, a month or whatever it might be. It all helps; every little bit helps. They want a little bit of help from the state government, which is happy to come in here and talk about its great budget surplus and the record revenue streams coming in from the GST and a stable iron ore price, but it is not prepared to tell us how it can help all small business operators who are laying off staff. Nineteen staff from one business in my electorate were laid off and they do not know what their future is. The business does not know what its future is. A supplier is not going to pay him over \$100 000 from an outstanding debt so does that mean that this small business owner will lose his house? I expect it probably does if no

Mr David Templeman; In; Mr Zak Kirkup; Ms Mia Davies; Acting Speaker; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mrs Liza Harvey;  
Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Terry Redman

---

relief is provided. This is why we have been calling for a more urgent response to the dire economic circumstances in which so many of our small businesses find themselves.

The other thing missing from the package is assistance for the not-for-profit sector. The member for Carine asked a question about that today. The not-for-profit sector is experiencing increased demand and has been for quite some time. It provides food packages and hardship assistance to more families than ever before, including families who run small businesses who cannot put food on the table. The not-for-profits have been doing that and calling for help for the last 12 months, but it has fallen on deaf ears. It has not received the assistance its needs from this government. Foodbank, Anglicare, St Vincent de Paul and the Red Cross have significant issues trying to source groceries. Not only do they have insufficient funds to buy groceries, they are having problems sourcing groceries for the most vulnerable people in the community who turn to the not-for-profit sector week to week just to put food on the table. They need some help and there is nothing in this assistance package for that sector. The sector will have to wind back its services unless it gets assistance from this government.

We have also been calling for the government to bring forward construction projects, such as Roe 8 and 9. We know that the government is not committed to those projects but those are the sort of projects that it can bring forward. Our hospitality, tourism and retail sectors will be impacted because social distancing is difficult in those environments. However, social distancing can be managed in construction so jobs can flow through and people can get to work in the construction sector and be safe in that workplace if we get community spread of the flu virus. We are asking the government to give urgent attention to these matters and to urgently listen to the needs of small business owners. I read the email of just one manufacturing supplier in my electorate, but I tell members that my favourite cafe in West Perth has closed because it could not afford to keep its doors open. A number of cafes and restaurants are looking to close their doors. I have been contacted by a restaurateur who has a payroll of \$500 000. He is suffering generally from the decline in discretionary spend in Western Australia but he is trying to keep as many jobs open for his staff as possible. Staff are rationing hours to share the love, but if customers stop coming through his doors, there is nothing in the government's rescue package for him. He has been in operation for years and has provided a fantastic service, but a fantastic service at a time when the community is somewhat panicked and frightened to spend money on anything but toilet paper, pasta and rice. Those sorts of businesses will not get customers through their doors and they need help or they will go under. It takes a long time to wind back unemployment once jobs are lost and it takes a long time to stimulate an economy. I accept that we are in a long-term game, but we can save some of these businesses with urgent action now.

I accept that at this time people in the community are looking for strong leadership, decisive actions and clear communication. As we come through this crisis, we will be defined by the way that we have treated the frailest in our community during this time of distress. It is about the kindness that we show to the elderly, the vulnerable and those with a disability who need our assistance. This will be defining for us both socially and economically. Make no mistake, members; this coronavirus event will change our society forever. Let us all work together to make sure that we change our society for the better so that we can look back on these times and say how proud we are of the Western Australian community because in a time of crisis, fear and anxiety, it stood up for those most vulnerable in our community and demanded that the government provide some assistance and support for those people. We want to be proud that we stood up for small businesses to ensure that some of the surplus and revenue that goes into the Treasury coffers went to the small business sector to keep it afloat. We should be able to stand at the end of this and say that we are proud of the actions that we took, proud of the actions the state government took and proud of the investment that the state government put into the health system to ensure that those people who needed the most critical care during the crisis received that critical care by a happy and healthy workforce, which was provided with the right protective gear so that they could remain healthy and continue to deliver care to those who found themselves in the hospital system as a result of exposure to this virus.

In conclusion, members, I say definitively that we must ensure that this health crisis does not turn into a jobs and economic crisis. The opportunity is there for this government to take decisive action. Other states have put together very broad and well thought out stimulus packages to help small businesses. Queensland and Tasmania have announced zero interest or low-interest loans to small business to help them get through the crisis. Tasmania is putting money into its not-for-profit sector. It is putting out grants to small businesses to help them deal with structural change and change management for their employees. It is not hard. If the government looks to the other states that are providing strong, decisive leadership in the face of this economic crisis that we find ourselves in, it will see the blueprint that can be adopted. Copy it shamelessly! There are great ideas in Tasmania and Queensland. If I were the Premier, hopefully, I would have been out of the blocks before those states, with a significant stimulus package that ticked all of the boxes for all of those sectors in our community. Western Australia has not been leading in this space, but there is an opportunity now to pick up the great ideas from the Premiers of Queensland and Tasmania and bring those ideas forward and put them on the table for our small businesses in Western Australia. I implore the Premier and the Treasurer to use this as their opportunity to define their leadership and to prove to the community of Western Australia that they care more about people's health, jobs and the micro-economies of our households than they do about their budget surplus and their money.

Mr David Templeman; In; Mr Zak Kirkup; Ms Mia Davies; Acting Speaker; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mrs Liza Harvey;  
Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Terry Redman

---

**MS M.J. DAVIES (Central Wheatbelt — Leader of the Nationals WA)** [3.51 pm]: I also rise to speak to the Supply Bill 2020. I commend the Leader of the Opposition for the contribution on behalf of the Liberal Party and the opposition in this place. These are challenging times. As has been noted, what we are doing is not unprecedented, but the time that we have had to consider this matter is very short. As members of the opposition, we will take the opportunity to raise some of those concerns in this place as we add our support to the passage of this bill. But, as the Leader of the Opposition has done, we will add to some of the concerns that we see in the community, particularly from a regional perspective. I note and thank the Leader of the House and the Speaker for bringing together those of us who had a conversation last Thursday in the Speaker's chamber, to start the discussion about what would happen should our Parliament no longer be able to function. Since that time, a number of things have obviously escalated rapidly in the flow-on from the national cabinet meeting, with announcements that have flowed from both a federal and state level.

In the last three days, there has been a significant change in the way that people are viewing what is happening in Western Australia. I have certainly felt that from my community's perspective, having been out in my electorate prior to us returning to Parliament last week. I was there this week, and there is a definite shift change from a community perspective. It is unusual for us to be asked to consider legislation with a time line this short, but we are faced with the real possibility that the Parliament may not be able to function, and it is right that we as members of the Parliament plan for that possibility. Of course this is disruptive to the government's agenda, and we understand that it is most disruptive to our state economy and, most importantly, to those who are at risk from a health perspective. It is very challenging to hear Chief Medical Officers, the Prime Minister and the Premier confirm that from an Australian perspective a significant number of people will not survive this, and that will have a real cost at a human level for our communities beyond the decline of this pandemic in Western Australia, Australia and the globe.

In respect to the second reading speech that the Treasurer made, one of the discussions that we had last week with the Leader of the House was that the Leader of the Nationals WA would also be consulted at the trigger point. Although we were not insistent on it being part of the bill, and we were not insisting on it in terms of approval, we would like that to be considered. Certainly, we are not looking to impede any processes, but in the effort to maintain some level of bipartisanship and make sure that we are all on the same page, we would welcome being consulted if that could be added as part of the second reading debate. We certainly have no intention of delaying the passage of this bill.

I will, however, as I have said, take the opportunity to put on the record our concerns about this rapidly escalating emergency from a regional perspective. Although we acknowledge that there are currently no reported confirmed COVID-19 cases in regional WA and that we have to be proportional in our response as we talk about the health and the economic response that we make as a government, I would say that there is a degree of concern and anxiety out there because we, in regional communities, are more remote and have some unique challenges in dealing with some of these emergencies. Although we may not be dealing with an emergency right now, because we are not living on top of each other and we have the luxury of being removed, I can say that people are moving freely at this point, as they should be, within these communities, and that will become a reality. This then comes back to those concerns that we raise on a regular basis in this place around the ability of our health system in regional Western Australia to cope with that, and the issues around our emergency services. As the Leader of the Opposition raised, there are some sectors of the communities, such as small business and the like, that are really going to struggle. Aside from those very big players in the mining sector in regional Western Australia, the majority of our businesses are small businesses or, in fact, microbusinesses and sole traders. A large number of non-government not-for-profit organisations that make the wheels of our communities turn will be feeling the pain as well.

I think it is worth putting some of those challenges on the table. I hope that, in the context of this Supply Bill, we understand that there will be an increased requirement for funding from this government into the community in addition to the stimulus package that has already been announced. From a regional perspective, where we know it is more difficult to do business, to attract workers, to sustain our health and education systems, that will come with an added expense outside our major metropolitan areas.

In relation to health, in particular, and the reason that the member for Roe asked the Minister for Health today about the process for people living in regional WA to access testing if they suspect that they are suffering from COVID-19, there has already been conflicting advice off the back of announcements around the PathWest facilities last week and then the advice on the Department of Health's website that that announcement is no longer the case and that people must go to a GP. I have people in my communities, and certainly from other members of Parliament, expressing concern that they are not absolutely clear on what they are supposed to do. In fact, I have had people try to work their way through that system already only to be pinged between their GP and the hospital, because, quite rightly, there is concern about having people who could potentially have COVID-19 in either of those places. Therefore, absolute clarity about the process and measures that we are going to put in place needs to be provided. It needs to be consistent and accurate, and when it changes, it needs to be clearly articulated.

Obviously, we have hospitals in major regional centres, but this is not the case in a number of our smaller communities, particularly through the wheatbelt, midwest and great southern. I appreciate that the Leader of the Opposition and myself had a briefing today from the director general of Health and the Commissioner of Police, and they acknowledged that this is a moving feast, and we do too; but these are concerns that people are contacting our offices about right now. We have real concern about that reliance on GPs, where we do not have GPs in the regions, and we extend that concern to our St John Ambulance Western Australia and Royal Flying Doctor Service—where do people present to? There is already scepticism in our communities about what to do if it is a real emergency and if you are somebody with a compromised immune system. My friend with metastatic breast cancer lives in my electorate and she is very concerned about what should happen if she suspects that she is suffering. She lives in a small community outside of a major regional centre. We already know that people can get pinged from their local general practitioner to their local hospital to their next regional centre, and then probably bumped to Midland Public Hospital. I do not think that someone in that situation, with a compromised immune system, would want to be doing that with the volunteers from St John Ambulance, who would then be taken out of the community. They are the sorts of things that we are seeking clarity on. That gets harder the further away a patient is from the Perth metropolitan area. We are talking about areas that are very remote, such as the member for North West Central's electorate. That is a significant concern right across the state.

I also have some concerns about not-for-profit and non-government organisations. We are already starting to hear some of them saying that they will literally go bankrupt as a result of having to cancel events that have been organised to support their communities. We have already spoken about the Goldfields Children Charity Ball. Without any degree of support, that charity will be left to go bankrupt, and that would be a real shame, because it does some wonderful work in supporting children and has been around for some time. It is the same situation for all our agriculture shows. I know that the Dowerin field days events committee was meeting last night, and the Merredin show has already been cancelled. These might seem like frivolous things, but they are volunteer organisations that contribute significant amounts of money to our towns and are important to the local economy. Those volunteer organisations will also be left out of pocket because the people who supply those events are also small businesses or microbusinesses that cannot afford to wear those costs. At the moment, we are seeing no stimulus package or support for those types of events and organisations that will have a real and ongoing, lasting effect. We want them to come back when it is safe for those events to be reconstituted, and they simply will not be able to if they have been forced into bankruptcy.

As I mentioned very briefly this morning, I was at the WAFarmers conference on Friday, and we have had a number of calls from the horticultural sector. VegetablesWA and WAFarmers were on the brink of seeding from a broadacre perspective. We also have a very important supply chain of fresh fruit and vegetables coming from our regions, and they are reliant on overseas workers for not only making sure that we can get the crop in, but also vegie picking, packing—the whole shooting match. Those are very important economic activities in our regions. This is an issue for the federal government, but I hope that both the Treasurer and the Premier are pushing it through at the national cabinet level. We echo the calls from the industry for an extension of 417 visas for the backpackers who are already here and have experience in Australia. They probably do not want to return to Europe or other places that are likely to be under far more pressure. We could keep them here in Australia and Western Australia to support our agricultural and horticultural sector. That can be done immediately. We talk about short-term and medium-term plans that need to be put in place. Seeding is about to start. If we cannot get the crop in, that will have an impact on our exports and the ability of our agricultural sector to meet our trading partner agreements and the economy there. We want to make sure that our supermarkets have fresh fruit and vegetables now and continue to do so. They can grow them—there is no doubt about that. We have a very efficient horticultural sector here in Western Australia, and farmers will put more crops in to meet that demand. We should not worry about running out of food, but we need workers to assist us to do that.

Certainly, there are discussions around freight subsidies. We have a centralised market for fruit and vegetables. We currently have a structure that is hilarious—it has served us at the moment but will probably come under some scrutiny—under which fruit and vegetables come down from Carnarvon, go through the central market and are sent back out to our regional communities. There may be some discussions with industry about how to support that and make sure that we are not adding extra cost to not only the punter at the end, but also our growers, and how that might work in the circumstances that we find ourselves in. They are ongoing discussions, but, certainly, I would like to see an extension of 417 visas to allow people who are already here to stay in Australia so that we can use their expertise. It is not as simple as grabbing someone who has found themselves out of work because we have lost a worker in a cafe down the main street in one of our regional centres, particularly if we are talking about the broadacre sector, which uses \$1 million rigs to put in crops. Workers can be trained—I am not suggesting that we could not potentially have some sort of job matching—and that would be something for the state government to look at to assist industry to make sure that we are meeting those needs. However, in the short term, I would very

Mr David Templeman; In; Mr Zak Kirkup; Ms Mia Davies; Acting Speaker; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mrs Liza Harvey;  
Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Terry Redman

---

much like to make sure that that is something we have pushed from a state perspective, and we have raised with our federal colleagues as well.

I refer to the small business and payroll tax issue—the stimulus package—that has been canvassed already by the Leader of the Opposition. These issues are seriously concerning from our perspective because there are many, many small businesses, micro and sole traders who are really under pressure. If members go to the Small Business Development Corporation Facebook page, they will see that an announcement has been made about a hotline, which I think is a good idea. In question time, we asked the Treasurer about trying to create a shopfront for all those questions, because, without doubt, there are things that relate to the small business sector and the health sector, but there are other questions that people are raising with us as members of Parliament and no doubt with members of the government that are distracting those who are trying to manage this situation. If we could have a properly resourced one-stop shop to not only present some of those frequently asked questions, but also direct traffic to the most appropriate person within government, I feel that would take some of the angst from us as members of Parliament and the public. The 1800 number that is currently being used for health queries is the commonwealth number and, quite frankly, I do not want to talk to anyone in the commonwealth about issues in Western Australia. We come up against that issue when we are dealing with drought and other national rollouts. The operators of that hotline do not understand the situation here in Western Australia. They would not have the first idea of where Mukinbudin or Meekatharra is. When someone has a health concern, they do not want to spend the first five or 10 minutes of their conversation with someone in Canberra explaining that there is no doctor in their town, and the Royal Flying Doctor Service will not come because it has no ability to do so. From a state perspective, we ask the government to seriously consider putting a flavour behind that from trusted and credible sources within Western Australia and our public service to assist us to do our job. It would certainly alleviate some of those concerns.

I turn to the small business package. There is a whole raft of concerns on that SBDC Facebook post. In the last two minutes, I have scrolled through that post, and there is a raft of feedback from small businesses and micro-traders who have already lost their business. They can see nothing from the government that supports them. They are not businesses that can necessarily be supported by us buying a coffee or going out for dinner. They are childcare centres and businesses that will ultimately be impacted because people will make very personal decisions. I think that is a challenge, and we certainly look forward to the government making announcements that will support that small business sector. As I say, in regional Western Australia, we welcome the freezing of utility payments, but I suspect that the government will need to do more than that in the long term. I agree wholeheartedly with the Premier: I hope that the number one thing discussed in the national cabinet will be to try to help small businesses that have no income by pausing those small business loans and potentially mortgages if they have equipment.

[Member's time extended.]

**Ms M.J. DAVIES:** Small businesses may be unable to service those loans. There is no value in banks reclaiming or calling in a loan if there is no value to that asset in this environment. The Treasurer would have our full support to push that at the national cabinet level. Again, we have raised that with our federal colleagues as well.

From a Nationals WA perspective and from a regional perspective, undoubtedly, there will be other issues emerging as we move from the medical crisis into that economic crisis. I am always very careful with my commentary, as I know my colleagues in the Nationals have been in their electorates, to have said: we must be looking to credible sources of information. We are trying not to make it worse or to increase the anxiety in our communities, but I can say that it is real, as the Treasurer will have felt in his own community. Certainly, if we add distance, isolation and difficult supply chain management, people who live on pastoral stations or are outside major regional centres, for instance, only have access to small service stations in town. I know that people in the metropolitan area go to the shops daily to do their shopping, as they should, but people in regional WA cannot do that. I know from reports that people in my own electorate are travelling all over the electorate to shop, and some of that behaviour is starting to occur out there.

**Mr V.A. Catania:** Geraldton to Shark Bay.

**Ms M.J. DAVIES:** I hear about people who are going from Northam out to Merredin, and the member for North West Central just said that people from Geraldton are going to Shark Bay. That is not an insignificant drive. They also cannot do that on a daily basis, and an elderly person, with no form of transport, cannot do that to get toilet paper. We will be doing everything we can to support those communities. Regional Western Australians are very good at looking after their communities. I have no doubt that local governments and not-for-profit organisations will step in. But there is not a great deal of support for those not-for-profits that are already stretched as they deal with the challenges that face them as a result of people who struggle to pay their household bills and manage outside this crisis. I suspect that will continue.



Mr David Templeman; In; Mr Zak Kirkup; Ms Mia Davies; Acting Speaker; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mrs Liza Harvey;  
Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Terry Redman

---

We will try to ask respectful questions in this place to get clarity for our constituents, because that is what this place is about. I hope that the offer made at the briefings that we had today with myself, the Leader of the Opposition and Hon Alison Xamon from the Greens continue so that we can contribute to the effort of keeping everyone calm.

In closing, I refer to the consultation with the Leader of the Nationals WA as part of the trigger, but, as I said previously, we will not be holding up the passage of this bill. We believe it is a prudent move and we thank the government for the consultation with our party to this point on these matters.

**MR D.C. NALDER (Bateman)** [4.11 pm]: I also rise to comment on this special Supply Bill 2020. I also support the comments of the Leader of the Opposition and the Leader of the Nationals WA, who have said that it is a prudent act to undertake in these unprecedented times that are facing Western Australia. In so doing, I want to raise a few questions, which I hope the Treasurer can respond to in his response rather than necessarily in consideration in detail. One of those is in relation to the point around special stimulation packages and those sorts of things that have been undertaken in the past 24 hours by the government to ensure that this Supply Bill covers those special needs. As the Premier indicated this afternoon, it is likely that more will be required on the part of the government, and I will come to that in a little bit. However, the question is: does this supply bill cover those needs? I believe it will, but I would like the Treasurer to respond on the record to cover that aspect.

In talking about the government's response yesterday and the implications on the Supply Bill moving forward, I urge the government to be cautious about the mixed messages it has been sending the community. A week ago the Premier told people to go out and buy a car and to stop panic buying, and this week he released a pandemic plan that clearly advised people to have 14 days' supply of food at home, which in itself incited people to rush out and buy in case they are locked up. I do urge caution. We saw that again yesterday after the government's announcement of a stimulus package in which people were told that their household charges would be frozen. We deal with these issues a lot so we understood what the government was inferring in that message, but a lot of people assumed that they would not need to pay water or power bills. Again, the mixed messaging creates confusion in households and people become uncertain. It is that uncertainty that results in actions by people that are not calm and measured. Therefore, I call on the government to be careful.

During question time today, I received a text message telling me that this morning, car loads of people turned up in the town of Brookton, 140 kilometres east of Perth, and stripped the shops bare of items. People living out in regional Western Australia are having visitors coming in and raiding their stores. They are clearing everything off the shelves and that is leaving those people with no option other than to come to Perth to get essential items. The behaviour being exhibited around Western Australia is causing real concern, and that is why the government's messaging is essential. We believe that the messaging from the government could have been better.

Also, I want to talk about these special announcements and make sure that the amount that has been laid down—assuming the special announcements are covered—is enough. As a part of that, I want to highlight one big gap in the announcement yesterday. The government alluded to looking after small businesses with special grants, yet when I look at the number of businesses in Western Australia, as at 30 June 2019, there were around 232 000 businesses, 150 000 of which are sole traders; nearly 65 per cent of the total number of businesses in Western Australia are sole traders. The next category in the Australian Bureau of Statistics data—those with one to 19 employees—account for another 33 per cent of businesses in Western Australia, 77 000 of them. When I look at the sole traders and the smallest of businesses with one to 19 employees, they account for 97 per cent of businesses in Western Australia. When we look at payrolls, we need around 12 employees. Because there is no accurate data from the government for me to accurately state this, it is around 12 employees. We know that the majority—well over 90 per cent—of businesses in Western Australia have no benefit flowing from the announcements made by the state government yesterday. It is the most vulnerable businesses in Western Australia, sole traders and small companies, who do not employ a lot of staff. They do not have the balance sheets, like the big end of town has, to ride through crises. Even though this crisis will hurt everybody, it is that small end that will hurt most. The government has a glaring gap in the package that it announced yesterday. I believe the government will have to do something more to support small businesses in Western Australia. That is the reason I asked that question. I believe the government has either made a glaring omission or actually knows at this point that it has not dealt with vulnerable businesses in Western Australia that will receive no support from the Western Australian government.

The next question I have for the Treasurer, which I hope he will cover in his second reading reply, is: on the basis that we need to enact this bill, assuming we cannot deliver the budget, which is a possibility, what level of transparency is there? I know this cannot be enacted in legislation, but these are special times. I call on the Treasurer to say whether information will be available from the government as to how we are tracking along the way. Will there be a monthly update to provide some level of transparency? Special powers are being invested in the government during this special time and, therefore, I think that it warrants special communication from the government—not a piece of legislation, but more an assurance from the Treasurer as to how much information

Mr David Templeman; In; Mr Zak Kirkup; Ms Mia Davies; Acting Speaker; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mrs Liza Harvey;  
Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Terry Redman

---

will be provided along the way so that we have a sense and some level of transparency about how the finances are tracking for the government. I believe that would be a prudent approach for the government to take, to provide the opposition a sense of a greater information. We are all part of this process. We are all saying that the government is taking the appropriate level of action in this special Supply Bill, but I also believe that it would be prudent for the government to provide a higher level of transparency around the information than would normally be expected because of the special circumstances around this supply bill. I would be interested in the Treasurer's response to that.

I do not have a lot more to add. Finally, there is a question about whether this bill will be enough, given it is part of the normal processes through to December. We hope it is. I believe that we have been prudent in taking perhaps more time than we might otherwise have taken to cover those things. I am concerned about the special needs that might exist in our community and might force the government to act, so I just highlight that issue for what it is worth.

I have nothing further to add. I commend the government for bringing this bill to the house and consulting with the various parties within Parliament, and I look forward to the bill's speedy passage through both chambers.

**MR D.T. REDMAN (Warren-Blackwood)** [4.20 pm]: As the Nationals WA Treasury and finance spokesperson, I would like to make a few comments on the Supply Bill 2020, and endeavour to value-add to the comments of the Leader of the National Party and both the Leader of the Opposition and the shadow Treasurer.

I have been in this Parliament now for 15 years, and I do not think I have ever come across anything quite like this. The state has certainly been through some challenges, but the declaration of a state of emergency is unprecedented. It might never happen again in the lifetime of this Parliament. These are very unique circumstances that we are all trying to respond to in a smart, considered and strategic way.

The government of the day needs to be able to lead, and rightly so. The government of the day also needs to have all the necessary levers in its hand to enable it to make decisions to spend where it thinks that is appropriate in order to respond to the issues that it faces. The challenge for the opposition is that it certainly does not have all the knowledge that the government has. The government has behind it all the agencies that are able to provide it with timely information on the issues, risks, challenges and hotspots and is able to use that information to respond. The Government also has engagement with the federal government. Yes, the National Party has a certain amount of engagement through our federal National Party colleagues, and the Leader of the National Party is in regular contact with the Deputy Prime Minister, but the government has strong connections with federal government decisions, and, indeed, the decisions of other state governments, and it benefits from that information in being able to lead and respond. As the Leader of the National Party highlighted, correct and timely information is critical. Correct and timely information is everything in being able to respond appropriately to this issue. The government of the day needs to make decisions that serve the Western Australian community the best, and the government of the day will rise and fall on those decisions. It is incumbent upon us to support the government in having the necessary levers to make decisions as it sees fit.

It is interesting that a lot of perspectives have been talked about. The most immediately obvious is the health perspective, and the very vulnerable people in our community and in regional Western Australia who may not have the services that we have in metropolitan Perth. The health aspects are critical. As we move forward, the economic aspects also grow. The opposition has talked about the business challenges and about how businesses that are here today might not be here tomorrow because of the issues that we face. Social considerations are also increasingly emerging. It is sad that people are moving to a position in which they are driven by self-interest rather than the greater community interest. We have certainly seen some very selfish acts. Those sorts of behaviours are becoming an issue that the government needs to respond to. Those are all different perspectives, or filters, I guess, through which we can look at this issue.

The government is asking the house to pass this Supply Bill. As the Leader of the National Party has highlighted, that will not be impeded by the National Party. The Supply Bill needs to be passed in case the appropriation bills are not passed before the end of the financial year. We understand that the bill will sit there and not be given royal assent unless it is actually needed.

I want to park for a second the view that we are dealing with a special Supply Bill. I have been through 15 budget processes in this house. The normal process is that we are presented with a set of budget papers. I have brought with me budget paper No 3, the *Economic and Fiscal Outlook* for the 2019–20 budget. When the Treasurer and the government of the day lay out the government's agenda, we are given all the budget papers that state the various settings and issues as they emerge, and also, as was highlighted by the shadow Treasurer, the state of play at a particular point in time. Through the budget estimates process, members can ask questions about how international markets are affecting the Western Australian budget. The government has now, on very short notice, asked the house to support the Supply Bill. The Supply Bill has been introduced in special circumstances. I understand that, and I reiterate that the bill will have our support. Embedded in that are the decisions around stimuli that have been announced previously and in the last few days, which will hopefully provide support for the challenges in our

Mr David Templeman; In; Mr Zak Kirkup; Ms Mia Davies; Acting Speaker; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mrs Liza Harvey;  
Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Terry Redman

---

economy. As the Premier said today, there is more to come. Clearly, the government will be making various decisions. Indeed, the Premier referred to the fact that the government will need reserve capacity in the budget to enable it to respond and provide stimulus in future decisions that are made.

Significant to that will be the state of play with the net operating balance and the state's balance sheet. Government has a role to ensure that the decisions it makes fit the financial circumstances in which it finds itself at a point in time. Oppositions also have a role. Oppositions need to be effective in holding the government to account. I come back to the point I wanted to make when I said I want to park the Supply Bill. The difference is that the Supply Bill, which is effectively an appropriation bill, is going through Parliament, but we have not been given any visibility about where the state's finances are now. The last read-out or snapshot of the state's finances was effectively the midyear review. That was all pre-COVID-19. The government is now asking Parliament to support a \$16 billion bill, without giving the opposition any visibility about where the state's finances are now. I therefore ask the Treasurer to give serious consideration to tabling a couple of key pieces of information. The first is the budget aggregates. Page 4 of the *Economic and Fiscal Review* outlines the key budget aggregates. These are basically a snapshot in time. I know that the Expenditure Review Committee —

**Mr W.R. Marmion** interjected.

**Mr D.T. REDMAN:** That is both now and for the forward estimates. It is whenever there are ERC meetings. I am the only person in the room, along with the member for Nedlands, who knows that when we were in government, every time we had an EERC meeting, we were given an update of the budget, where things were at, and what was changing in terms of the net operating balance and the state's balance sheet, and we were presented with a set of aggregates. I am asking the Treasurer to table that information and what the ERC has visibility on when it makes decisions. For the benefit of the house, the government calls the subcommittee of cabinet that drafts the budget the ERC. Our government called it the Economic and Expenditure Reform Committee, or EERC.

**Mr W.R. Marmion:** That would be very good, because it would give context to this particular Supply Bill.

**Mr D.T. REDMAN:** Yes. It is an issue of special circumstances, and an issue of transparency. To that end, I agree with the shadow Treasurer that this is about transparency. If the government is looking for and chasing opposition support, it should give the opposition the information that it is requesting so that the opposition can do its job, for what is effectively a \$16 billion bill.

**Mr B.S. Wyatt:** Are you asking me to table that now?

**Mr D.T. REDMAN:** I am suggesting now. The house is being asked to make a decision to support a \$16 billion bill, the expenditure of which will be at the discretion of the government. The house is being asked to give authority to the government today, if this bill goes through. That is what we will be voting on. We will be giving that authority to government. At that point in time, we need to have an understanding of where the state's finances are at. We are effectively authorising something without having visibility of the state's finances post-COVID-19.

**Mr W.R. Marmion** interjected.

**Mr D.T. REDMAN:** Yes. Every time we had an EERC meeting, we would get an update on the budget aggregates, plus other information that was significant to the budget and had a tangible impact on the decisions that we made. It is also important to note that page 11 of the *Economic and Fiscal Review* outlines the economic forecasts. That refers to the settings in and around household consumption, dwelling investment and business investment, which are all parameters of the changes in our economy that will influence the state budget.

**Mr B.S. Wyatt:** That's called a moving feast, let me tell you.

**Mr D.T. REDMAN:** I am sure it is a moving feast, but it is very important, because it has a tangible impact on the decisions the government makes. I would have thought that if the government wants the opposition to support a \$16 billion bill, it should provide some visibility on that.

The other important issue is general government revenues. General government revenues impact things such as royalty income and commonwealth grants—that is, the revenue side of the budget for the general government sector, which will be a moving feast. Again, we are trusting the Treasurer's decision to ask us to support this pretty significant bill on the back of not understanding the information that the government is getting about things as basic as royalty income and revenue from public corporations, which I am sure will be impacted by the government's decisions, and indeed, COVID-19 circumstances. The other issue is the statement of risks. When the Treasurer was in opposition, he went to the *Economic and Fiscal Outlook*, and the first page he read was the statement of risks, which shows what could change and have a tangible impact on the state of the budget. Those are four pieces of information that, in the interests of transparency, are reasonable for the government to table, so that the opposition and indeed the public can see the state of play. The government brags about the budget settings every day, so let us look at the state of play and the context that the government has for making its stimulus decisions. Those are

Mr David Templeman; In; Mr Zak Kirkup; Ms Mia Davies; Acting Speaker; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mrs Liza Harvey;  
Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Terry Redman

---

important, and there are more to come, so that is a factor in play. We are supporting a pretty substantial bill, and the only information we have is pre-COVID-19. We do not have updated information to properly scrutinise the government's decisions. I am not highlighting this to be political, but this is about transparency in a very unique set of circumstances that we find ourselves in. I know that information is available to government because the Treasurer would be regularly having those meetings now, and I think that it would not be hard to make that information available.

This bill is different from the Supply Bill 2017. In the information we received about this supply bill, there was reference to the Supply Bill 2017. There was a government changeover then. At that time, all the information was known to the opposition of the day. There was a need to have a budget in August, or whenever the budget came out that particular year. That is quite a different set of circumstances from what we find ourselves in now. I will be disappointed if the government uses that as an excuse for saying, "Well, to be consistent with that, we are going to keep this to ourselves." I think that would be wrong. It is also important that no matter what happens—we may well pass the budget, in which case that is nice and we will still have Parliament operating—if this bill needs to be enacted, we will have to come back into Parliament at some stage before the year is out. If the Treasurer has reason to trigger this supply bill, we would have to come back to Parliament before the end of the year, because this effectively institutes supply until the end of December.

**Mr B.S. Wyatt:** The science behind the number that is being authorised is simply 50 per cent of the previous year's appropriation. If that appropriation ran out before the end of December, the member is quite correct. If it does not run out, then we have until 30 June 2021—we are authorised to spend that out until then, but it is really only based on half of the previous year's. Will it last through to December, bearing in mind the spending profile that we are probably looking at? Probably not. The member is right; we will probably have to come back to Parliament.

**Mr D.T. REDMAN:** There is every likelihood that we will come back at some point in time; that is a possibility. We have had some information from the upper house suggesting that the government has no intention of shutting down Parliament, but anything is possible, because decisions change today, tomorrow and the next day.

**Mr B.S. Wyatt:** I don't want to have to use this.

**Mr D.T. REDMAN:** Of course.

**Mr B.S. Wyatt:** I would prefer budget day on 14 May, and we then move on.

**Mr D.T. REDMAN:** The way decisions and information has happened over the last couple of weeks, we could be having a very different conversation on Thursday, and it may well even be the last chance for us to ask questions. We have to work in that sort of environment; that is the nature of what we are dealing with.

I have a couple of questions. What is the status of the bill? This is a bill that will go through two houses this week. It will sit there and not hit royal assent. Assuming we pass the budget in May under the normal budget processes—the Treasurer said 14 May—what will the status of this bill be? Will this bill continue to sit there?

**Mr B.S. Wyatt:** If the budget is passed as per normal?

**Mr D.T. REDMAN:** Yes.

**Mr B.S. Wyatt:** That will take that over. I'm saying this on the fly, but I suspect the budget legislation will deal with that. It will override this bill.

**Mr D.T. REDMAN:** I am assuming the Treasurer will still have a live bill sitting there.

**Mr B.S. Wyatt:** Yes, it will be dealt with in the actual budget. That's how we'll deal with it.

**Mr D.T. REDMAN:** The actual budget will have reference to that?

**Mr B.S. Wyatt:** I'll have to get some advice from State Solicitor's Office on that, but that will be effectively superseded and overtaken. Would I have another \$13 billion on top of the budget, if that's what the member is worried about? No, I won't!

**Mr D.T. REDMAN:** I am just getting some clarity, Treasurer. The second question is that under the Financial Management Act, the government has two months' grace, so this bill is simply for 50 per cent of the appropriation and effectively covers six months. Is it on top of the government's grace period?

**Mr B.S. Wyatt:** It is my understanding that it is on top of the grace period. Effectively, we end up with eight months, if you like.

**Mr D.T. REDMAN:** From 1 September onwards?

**Mr B.S. Wyatt:** Yes, that is my understanding. No, I am getting advice that it is the other way. It is only six months, so it must deal with that FMA authorisation.

Mr David Templeman; In; Mr Zak Kirkup; Ms Mia Davies; Acting Speaker; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mrs Liza Harvey;  
Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Terry Redman

---

**Mr D.T. REDMAN:** The authorisation is just a provision that the government may not use.

**Mr B.S. Wyatt:** Correct, and this takes that.

**Mr D.T. REDMAN:** This bill takes that period; therefore, part of the bill says or makes reference to the commencement, the rest of the act, on a day fixed by proclamation. Why have we not just written in there, “The rest of the act, starting 1 September”?

**Mr B.S. Wyatt:** Because it would require me to use the two months extra under the FMA.

**Mr D.T. REDMAN:** Okay, the Treasurer’s last answer probably answered that.

**Mr B.S. Wyatt:** Yes.

**Mr D.T. REDMAN:** We have hopefully had a number of those issues answered. I want the Treasurer to seriously consider whether in the interest of transparency he will now make available key, high-level information that gives the opposition some visibility of the financial context on which the Treasurer is making decisions. I am not talking down the track because, effectively, the Treasurer is asking Parliament to support a special bill for special circumstances. I understand he will not roll down to the expenses side of the ledger.

[Member’s time extended.]

**Mr D.T. REDMAN:** There has been a lot of commentary about small business, so I will not add to that. The issue of responding to remote communities—I will wait until the Treasurer finishes his commentary.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr T.J. Healy):** Member, you may want to continue on other aspects.

**Mr D.T. REDMAN:** I want to make sure the Treasurer does not miss this.

**Mr B.S. Wyatt:** Sorry, member.

**Mr D.T. REDMAN:** I am the Aboriginal affairs spokesperson for our party. I have only had a little commentary and I do not get that many questions, but the issue of remote communities and the risks that sit around that is very challenging. The Treasurer may choose to not make comments about it here, but those sort of vulnerable groups are at a very high risk for obvious reasons. The aged-care sector has one of the biggest challenges in staffing, as mentioned by the Leader of the Nationals WA. Are there strategies for managing those vulnerable groups? There was a terrible example in the eastern states where there was a COVID-19 case at an aged-care facility and the next day no staff showed up. That is a risk that needs to be managed. I took time to go into the Manjimup pharmacy, and it had been cleaned out. People are getting six months’ worth of scripts and the bulk goods part of the pharmacy was cleaned out. The Leader of the National Party highlighted a bunch of questions that sit outside the immediate health risk issue, such as a one-stop phone-in line for Western Australia. In the unique circumstances we find ourselves in, particularly regionally, that would be absolutely valuable. Certainly, the call from the Leader of the National Party is appropriate.

I will not talk much more other than to say that this is an important bill. It will certainly have the support of the National Party, as the Leader of the National Party highlighted, but I ask the Treasurer to consider the transparency issue around those key numbers that give us context of the decisions that the government is making, given that if this is triggered we will not have the benefit of a budget estimates process in order to interrogate those numbers and the context of decisions that government makes.

**MR B.S. WYATT (Victoria Park — Treasurer) [4.39 pm]** — in reply: I rise to respond to a range of issues that were raised by members in their contributions. I thank all members for their support of the Supply Bill 2020. As all members have said, it is not unknown to have supply bills but they are usually linked with an election year and a delayed budget. This is most certainly an unusual circumstance as we face a once-in-a-lifetime event. There is no doubt about that.

I want to make a couple of points before I deal with specific questions and comments of members. A couple of things are going on. Clearly, at the moment we are primarily concerned with the health response to coronavirus—COVID-19. I want to make it crystal clear that there will be no resourcing issues to that health response. Health will get what Health needs to respond as coronavirus continues to emerge in our community. On the other side, of course, is the economic impact. Even if COVID-19 had not made it to Australian shores, the impact on Australia would still have been dramatic because we are part of a global economy. I think we are going to see a global impact of the coronavirus. I note that the Leader of the Opposition said that she does not want this issue to become an economic and jobs challenge. It will and it is. Mathias Cormann said today —

Indeed businesses will close and Australians will lose their jobs.

There are levers that the state government can pull to limit that. There are bigger levers that Mathias and the commonwealth government can pull that will limit that. But the reality is—Senator Cormann is quite correct—that

Mr David Templeman; In; Mr Zak Kirkup; Ms Mia Davies; Acting Speaker; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mrs Liza Harvey;  
Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Terry Redman

---

businesses will close and people will lose their jobs. This is quite unlike the global financial crisis when there was a structural issue in the global economy that we could see—eventually, once it emerged—and react to. This is quite different because we are also dealing with human psychology and fear.

I take the point that the member for Bateman made that it is important not just for the government to have coherent, clear and consistent messages but it is actually important for all of us—every single one of us. I get that our responsibility as a government is to make sure that we are all armed with that information. We all have that responsibility. Anyone can get on Twitter. Apparently, everybody is a doctor on Twitter and everybody has a view and they are 100 per cent correct. But that is causing—I think this issue came up in question time—a lot of that confusion. The problem is that there is too much information and no-one is certain which information is correct and which is not. We are seeing all sorts of different official information from different governments. That is because this thing is rolling out so quickly that governments around the globe are trying to catch up with it. Some governments have failed terribly. I want to make those two points up front.

As I said during question time, we will continue our efforts to respond to the economic impacts around jobs. The member for Bateman made the point that there are 150 000 unlisted sole traders. Are we able to support every single one of them? I suspect not. I suspect that they will get the support from the commonwealth government's \$750 paid into bank accounts. That will help them. Freezing of fees and charges will help them. Will they get cash grants from the commonwealth government and the state government? I suspect that not every single one will. We are responding in whatever way we can. The point I want to emphasise and the point I made at question time is that I do not get insight into all those measures. The commonwealth does but I do not. For those who pay payroll tax, I certainly do get insight, but if they do not, it is a much more difficult task. We are committed to try to find something to support those other small and medium-sized enterprises. Those cafes, restaurants and small businesses attached to events, of which there are many, which disappeared and are not likely to appear again this side of winter, will face dramatic impacts.

I want to emphasise the point that we all have this responsibility around our language. I want to deal with a couple of the disappointing comments made by the Leader of the Opposition because some of the points that she made were wrong. She quoted a speech I made on 11 March. She said that I said there would be no stimulus. I asked her to quote me and she would not. I want to get on the record what I said on 11 March. I am quoting from *Hansard*. I said —

We will, as the Premier has said, continue to work with the commonwealth government. We will roll out the stimulus measures we have already announced and we will have more to say in the very near future.

I did not say that there would be no stimulus. I said that we were working on a stimulus package, there has been some and there will be more. The Leader of the Opposition has to be careful with her language sometimes because she says things that come into her head without any particular clarity about whether they are true. I found another point she made quite interesting. She said that apparently the government should have been doing all this since 30 December 2019. That is what she said. She referred to all the things that the government started doing, all of which were national government responsibilities. I cannot screen airports and I cannot close borders. The Premier cannot; the state government cannot. If the Leader of the Opposition has concerns, she should get in touch with Mathias and the Prime Minister. I am sure that they will be keen to hear what she has to say. Not only was she so concerned that things had not happened in January and February, but she also came to Parliament in February and did not ask a single question about the coronavirus during the first two weeks of sittings—not a single question. In fact, the very first media statement from the Leader of the Opposition that mentioned coronavirus was dated 10 March. I am not going to critique the Leader of the Opposition for not dealing with this issue because the reality is that this thing has been evolving. The disappointment I have is that we are in an environment in which we need to understand what is occurring. That is why the commonwealth government is continuing to react—because it is evolving. No-one foresaw in December what was going to become of the coronavirus. The Leader of the Opposition did not, and that is why she did not ask any questions. There was no matter of public interest. There were no media statements.

**Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup:** We asked questions about this in February.

**Mr B.S. WYATT:** No, the opposition did not. There was not one during the first two weeks. The first time opposition members started asking questions about coronavirus was when the member for Bateman was critiquing the Premier for relying on coronavirus for negative economic impacts. I have the *Hansard* here. The member for Bateman accused the Premier of saying that we are using coronavirus as spin to justify decisions of the government. The member for Bateman said, “That’s your spin.”

**Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup** interjected.

**Mr B.S. WYATT:** I sat in silence and listened to this but I need to correct the record because some comments made were simply wrong. All I ask in this debate is that members mind their language. The Leader of the Nationals WA made the point that she and her colleagues have been careful with their language in public, and they have. They

Mr David Templeman; In; Mr Zak Kirkup; Ms Mia Davies; Acting Speaker; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mrs Liza Harvey;  
Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Terry Redman

---

are much more careful than senior leaders of the Parliamentary Liberal Party, and they should note that. I am not referring to the member for Bateman, funnily enough. Members opposite should be careful with their language. I think members of the National Party have been much more mature in how they have gone about dealing with this issue than the Leader of the Opposition.

There is one final point I want to make to the Leader of the Opposition. This highlights her personality. Did she get permission from John XIII College to come in here and read that letter out or from the family? I know she stopped when she was challenged. Did she get permission from the school to read it out?

**Mrs L.M. Harvey:** The parents wanted it.

**Mr B.S. WYATT:** So the Leader of the Opposition got permission from the parents to read that out in Parliament. Say yes or no please. Did the Leader of the Opposition get permission from the parents to read that out in Parliament?

**Mrs L.M. Harvey:** Yes.

**Mr B.S. WYATT:** Okay. One of the things we do not need are senior leaders in our community, like the Leader of the Opposition, coming into Parliament and acting in that way. The Department of Health will deal with that. The Leader of the Opposition said she had permission from the parents to come into the chamber and do that.

**Mr R.S. Love** interjected.

**Mr B.S. WYATT:** Correct. It is interesting that that is what the Leader of the Opposition did during the debate on the Supply Bill 2020. That was a good interjection, Deputy Leader of the National Party. That is quite correct.

I put that on the record because the only things that need to be dealt with specifically in rebuttal were raised by the Leader of the Opposition.

In response to a question asked by the Leader of the National Party about consultation, yes, of course. The consultation aspect was referred to in my second reading speech, not in the bill, of course. If it needs to be exercised, then of course the Leader of the National Party will also be consulted. I put that on the record. I should have put that in my speech. I apologise.

We heard about the one-stop shop, which is fair enough because, again, accurate information is difficult to get but, nonetheless, the Minister for Small Business made a point about a one-stop shop for businesses and that will continue to roll out and evolve as we get more information from both the commonwealth government, which is the bigger player, and our own Chief Medical Officer.

The member for Bateman asked whether the stimulus that we announced will be covered. This bill is a bit of a blunt instrument because, effectively, it is 50 per cent of the previous year's appropriation; that is the science of it. In 2013 and 2017, the supply bills were 40 per cent of the previous year's appropriation. This one is up to 50 per cent, just in case.

**Mr D.C. Nalder:** I know some of them are just changes in how you apply revenue and expenses within, but if you're going to spend something on it—make another announcement and spend—do you have the flexibility within how you utilise the \$13 billion?

**Mr B.S. WYATT:** Yes. As the member can see, it is a very small bill for such a large authorisation because it is simply a global.

**Mr D.C. Nalder:** I was just getting on the record that the flexibility is there.

**Mr B.S. WYATT:** Yes, it is a global amount. I think I am dealing with both the member for Bateman and the member for Warren–Blackwood about the transparency issue, both of whom made fair points, and I will make a couple of commitments about that in a tick. If the budget comes in on 14 May, this bill is redundant. If the budget comes in after 14 May—a couple of months later, I do not know—the budget will deal with the transparency issues because the money that has been effectively spent will be accounted for in the budget. Members will see the line items as they always do. Health will take most of it, as will Education. The budget will do that. If we are deep into the calendar year and the budget has not been delivered, will we provide updates to the Parliament.

**Mr D.T. Redman:** I suggested that you actually do it now because the government is asking us to give it full authorisation; I was suggesting now.

**Mr B.S. WYATT:** Okay. I will deal with both of those. Firstly, yes, I will provide updates as the money is being spent. Secondly, not at the moment because the budget process is still happening. I want to complete the budget process. If the budget process does not happen on 14 May, that will be the point at which we decide to provide those aggregates.

Mr David Templeman; In; Mr Zak Kirkup; Ms Mia Davies; Acting Speaker; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mrs Liza Harvey;  
Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Terry Redman

---

**Mr D.T. Redman:** Treasurer, the point I'm making is that you're seeking authorisation for a specific supply bill for a unique set of circumstances without giving the opposition the visibility of the parameters.

**Mr B.S. WYATT:** I get that. Currently, the budget cut-off is 14 April; that is effectively when the last decision can be made on what is included in the budget. I can provide the aggregates if the budget is not handed down.

**Mr D.T. Redman:** On 14 April?

**Mr B.S. WYATT:** No, if the budget does not appear on 14 May. I commit to do that. If the budget does not happen, I will do that. The other issue is around economic assumptions.

**Mr D.T. Redman:** If the budget doesn't happen or if you don't close it off by 14 April, you say you will commit to give the aggregates to us.

**Mr B.S. WYATT:** No, if the budget does not happen on 14 May. Currently, budget day is 14 May. If that does not happen, then I can provide those.

The other issue is assumptions about the economic data, GSP growth and all those. They are still being worked through. I give members this commitment: if the budget does not come down on 14 May, I will ensure that they get a briefing on those updates. Those are emerging issues. I will be honest with members; the budget might be redundant by the time my speech is completed given the way that this thing is evolving. It is dramatic how quickly it is having an impact. If the budget happens on 14 May, I will make sure that members get an update on the economics, because those economics, of course, will then flow through to what I expect around payroll tax et cetera. We still have not, for example—expect this to fall off a cliff—had updates about the GST. Watch the GST pool contract from what the federal government expects it to be.

**Mr D.T. Redman:** Yes, and getting some visibility on the revenue to the general government sector will be pretty important.

**Mr B.S. WYATT:** It will be very important. I expect that I will be writing that down due to the impact of the coronavirus.

**Mr D.C. Nalder:** What that was talking about was the revenue and what happens at budget time. But if we have to utilise this supply bill, come September, October and November, how will we know how we are tracking? Will we have early indications —

**Mr B.S. WYATT:** I expect that if we get to November, regardless, we will be back in here whether or not we are riddled with coronavirus because we will have to deal with this issue. Even though it extends through to December, it probably will not last.

**Mr D.C. Nalder:** No, it won't last. I am just trying to get a sense of how much information will be provided along the way.

**Mr B.S. WYATT:** I commit to provide a monthly report to Parliament on how it is tracking.

**Mr D.C. Nalder:** Perfect.

**Mr B.S. WYATT:** I note that what the member for Bateman said is quite correct. The announcement about freezing household fees and charges has some people thinking that there will be no fees and charges. That is, of course, not correct.

**Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup:** A lot of people think that.

**Mr B.S. WYATT:** I know. We all use the rhetoric of freezing fees and charges. It has been used by many members on the opposition side and many members on my side. I make this point: when prices are frozen in Coles and Woolies, people do not expect to go in and walk out with whatever item they want for free. It is certainly not wiping out bills; it is freezing them at the current unit rate as set in the 2019–20 budget.

The member for Warren–Blackwood raised a few issues, one of which was about remote communities. I will have a bit to say about that in the next couple of days. Funerals worry the hell out of me at the moment because people come from lots of different areas to attend a large funeral and that causes me great concern. We are working with Aboriginal communities and the Aboriginal leadership to try to discourage those in the current environment. We do not want people from vast areas to go to and return from a regional centre. Some of the large communities are starting to pass by-laws to close the gate, which is great. I encourage that. We are not allowing public servants to visit Aboriginal communities unless it is for essential service delivery. At one level, there is a certain kind of security because remote populations are similar to FIFO camps and can be controlled but, on another level, if COVID-19 spreads to a community, it becomes vulnerable because its people have high levels of poor health, respiratory health in particular. That would be quite dramatic.



Mr David Templeman; In; Mr Zak Kirkup; Ms Mia Davies; Acting Speaker; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mrs Liza Harvey;  
Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Terry Redman

---

By way of an aside, one of the issues that I raised with Josh Frydenberg was the flexibility of the 50-50 split of the health spend and whether it would include, for example, things such as relocating a community, transport and accommodation. It is included. The 50-50 split of the COVID-19 response between the state and the commonwealth is more flexible and broader than the national partnership for health, which is good. The commonwealth has been very cooperative. But having said that, I do not want to have to resort to dramatic actions to stop large funerals, but I will do so if people do not listen. We can do that through the public health officer now that a state of emergency has been declared. The likelihood that the coronavirus will go through a big part of regional WA is quite high but, as a few people have pointed out, currently there are no cases of coronavirus in regional WA.

Every state leader, Treasurer and health minister is worried about coronavirus spreading to the aged-care sector. It can spread to not only those who live in aged-care facilities but also those in the aged-care workforce, which is what happened in Sydney. The workforce did not turn up. That continues to be watched and managed.

Yesterday, the director general of Health made the point to me that there has been a run on some pharmaceuticals, and one of the things that I have had a few questions in my electorate office about is ventolin. Again, it is a bit like the problem with toilet paper, in that it is not necessarily something that we need to have a run on, but people are worried, and, accordingly, behaviour is changing that way. There are a couple of issues, and one issue is around purchasing. Some countries—the United States being one—have simply said that there will be no more exporting of pharmaceuticals because they are protecting their own populations, so we have to manage those issues. But in terms of what we actually need at the moment, as the health minister pointed out, we are managing that by making sure that we all have a national approach to those supplies.

Hopefully, I have answered the questions that were put to me by members tonight. I want to thank all members. I understand that this is unusual, and the request for transparency is perfectly reasonable. These are extraordinary times. Economic or fiscal shocks like the global financial crisis can be diagnosed easily and we can understand what needs to be done; this is different. As Mathias Cormann said, the reality is that businesses will close and people will lose their jobs regardless of how the state and commonwealth governments respond, but we intend to respond as strongly and effectively as we can to try to limit the impact of coronavirus at both the health level and certainly an economic and jobs level. I thank all members for their contribution to and support for the passage of this important legislation.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

#### *Third Reading*

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms L. Mettam):** I move that the bill be now read a third time.

**MR B.S. WYATT (Victoria Park — Treasurer)** [5.02 pm]: I do not have much to say, but I think I have to say that bit. I move —

That the bill be now read a third time.

**MRS L.M. HARVEY (Scarborough — Leader of the Opposition)** [5.02 pm]: I will make a few comments at this third reading stage of the Supply Bill 2020. I want to rebut some of the comments the Treasurer made in his reply to the second reading debate. In the second week of Parliament, in February, the opposition raised the issue of coronavirus in the context of a health response, and we had certainly been raising questions through the media about what action the government was taking. Our assertion, and we still make it, is that we felt that there should have been a more urgent response from the state government early on in the piece, when the health issue was known in China, to try to assess how Western Australia might manage the impact of that virus reaching our vulnerable population. Did we expect the government to have an economic response or a stimulus response back in January? No, we did not; but the health of our people should always come first. Given our strong trade relationship with China, the inevitability of the coronavirus reaching Australian shores should have been evident at the time. Most people with trade relationships in the resources sector and gas sector and who had close relationships with China were certainly acting very early on in the piece, around the end of last year, to ensure that they had arrangements in place for their employees, to manage the spread of the virus through their workforces. The opposition has been at pains to point out to the government that it did not have a similar response in train or, indeed, widely known, for the Western Australian community or the Western Australian health workers who would be required to deal with this virus when it inevitably reached our shores. We make that point, and we will continue to make that point, because we believe that the government has been flat-footed in responding to the health threat to our vulnerable community with the spread of COVID-19.

I think the economic impact on Western Australia was the Premier's first concern with the coronavirus, and he made mention of that during his Premier's Statement at the opening of Parliament. It was a short reference to the potential

Mr David Templeman; In; Mr Zak Kirkup; Ms Mia Davies; Acting Speaker; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mrs Liza Harvey;  
Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Terry Redman

---

for the coronavirus to have an economic impact on Western Australia, and it was more in the context of the iron ore price rather than anything else. Once again, we believe that there should have been a response about the health impact on Western Australia.

Another thing I want to put on the record is that, as members in here know, I have sisters who are nurses in the health system. At the moment, their grave concern is that they are in the process of trying to discharge patients who have been in hospital for several weeks and who they know will, on discharge, be unable to buy any kind of food products or, indeed, sanitary products to look after themselves when they get home. Therefore, I implore the government to have a look at whatever action it can take to try to manage the behaviour of panicked consumers, who are selfishly going out into different communities—small towns or wherever it might be—and hoarding all of these groceries. There is enough to go around. It is incumbent on the government to try to find a way to not only get the message out to these people who are causing this panic buying and are part of the panic-buying mentality, but also work with those major grocery retailers to ensure that restrictions can be put in place on the number of products that people can buy, so that vulnerable people in the community—for example, people being discharged from hospital, people with disabilities and elderly people—can get access to those groceries. I welcome the government opening up the retail trading hours between 7.00 am and 8.00 am for some retailers, specifically for seniors and people with disabilities. Those people just cannot compete if there is argy-bargy in the shopping centre aisles in trying to get essential needs and essential groceries. I think that was a very good move from the government.

The other issue that I will draw to members' attention—I think we need to contemplate this as a Parliament—is that as an opposition, we obviously want to be able to hold the government to account in this place, but I think we need to consider our actions as a collective with respect to the continuation of the sittings of Parliament during the present crisis. I am very wary of the fact that there are members here who are part of the vulnerable health group, and employees of this Parliament who are vulnerable people, who are undergoing chemotherapy or have recently had heart surgery. There are all sorts of members who have particular comorbidities that put them at risk should they contract this virus. This Parliament is not designed for social distancing. We cannot move our seats. The Hansard reporters sit less than a metre from each of the members on the front bench when we are talking. People like me, as a middle-aged female, may have the virus and not be symptomatic, as has been reported, and I may inadvertently put my co-workers at risk because this environment does not lend itself to social distancing and there is a complete inability on my part to control what I do not know. I do not know whether I have this virus, and I cannot be tested. Therefore, I think we need to contemplate that as a collective. As the first and foremost consideration, we need to take responsibility for the health and welfare of all our members and all the employees who support us at Parliament House, and that should always be the case for people in this place. As much as we love to spar politically across the chamber, each one of us would be deeply upset if any of our members managed to succumb to COVID-19, no matter who it was. We need to be thinking about this and contemplating whether the Petroleum Products Pricing Amendment Bill, Prisons Amendment Bill and Dog Amendment (Stop Puppy Farming) Bill are important enough for us to override the health concerns faced by vulnerable people who work in this place should COVID-19 be identified in even one of our members here. I urge the government to consider what I have said. I think the health and welfare of the people who work here should be paramount. Obviously, we support ensuring that the Supply Bill 2020 gets through both houses of Parliament as urgently as possible. But if there is no time-sensitive, utterly essential legislation such as that required to manage the coronavirus impact in our community, I question whether we should be sitting as a collective, or whether we should be setting an example to the community of where we should rank the health and welfare of every single one of the employees in this place, and extrapolate that out into workplaces in our community. With that, I conclude my remarks. I commend all members on their support for the Supply Bill 2020 in these times.

**MR D.T. REDMAN (Warren–Blackwood)** [5.10 pm]: Madam Acting Speaker (Ms L. Mettam), congratulations on your ascension to the role, standing in that position.

On the transparency issue that we raised, just so I have it on record, I want to clarify that it is the Treasurer's intention to provide monthly updates on some high-level assumptions, if you like, about the state of budget. If the budget is not delivered on 14 May, the Treasurer will provide, as I mentioned, figures on the budget aggregates, the assumptions part of the budget, the general government revenues and a statement of risk. Can I get clarity that those things will be provided if the budget is not delivered on 14 May? I assume that is what the Treasurer mentioned. Thank you, Madam Acting Speaker.

**MR B.S. WYATT (Victoria Park — Treasurer)** [5.11 pm] — in reply: Again, I thank members for their contributions on the Supply Bill 2020. I want to emphasise that the comments made by the Leader of the Opposition on the community, the shopping behaviour, the responses and the panic are quite correct, but I want to make this point to the Leader of the Opposition. It does not help when members come in here and read to the Parliament a letter from a school to the school community about a parent who has contracted coronavirus, without the agreement of that school.

**Mr W.R. Marmion:** It's in the media.

Mr David Templeman; In; Mr Zak Kirkup; Ms Mia Davies; Acting Speaker; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mrs Liza Harvey;  
Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Terry Redman

---

**Mr B.S. WYATT:** It is now, and guess how it got in the media, member for Nedlands! We need to think about how we moderate our language and what we say, because I think that is important. The reality, again, regardless of what the Leader of the Opposition says, is that she critiques the government, but her main problem with the reaction lies with the commonwealth government. The Leader of the Opposition stated that her main concern is that of people with coronavirus reaching our shores. Of course, the commonwealth government has responsibility for that. I suspect that it will continue to make decisions on that. When Parliament sat in the first two weeks of February, not one question on coronavirus was asked by the opposition. Not one matter of public interest or media statement was raised by the opposition. The first media statement from the opposition that even referenced COVID-19 or coronavirus was on 10 March. I want to make this point, but, again, I am only saying it because of the overly political second reading contribution of the Leader of the Opposition. I am actually not surprised by that, because this thing has been emerging. All governments around the globe have been reacting to this.

**Mr F.M. Logan:** They still are.

**Mr B.S. WYATT:** They still are. Some have reacted better than others. I will respond to the Member for Warren–Blackwood. Yes; I will go on the record, I guess. Firstly, if this bill needs to be proclaimed and the budget is delayed until deep in the calendar year, I will provide the Parliament with a monthly update on how the spend is going vis-a-vis the authorisation. Secondly, if the budget is delayed beyond 14 May, I will provide—it may not be on 14 May, but as soon as I can—an update of the economic assumptions that underpin the budget. One thing I did not deal with is a statement of risk, as referenced by the member in his second reading contribution. I would be happy to provide something along the lines of a statement of risk, which I suspect would be dominated by coronavirus in any event, and likely impacts on commodity prices, population growth, tourism numbers and all the things that I guess fairly obviously will fall out of that. I am happy to do that as well. It may not be on 14 May, which is budget day. If it does not happen on that day, it will be when we get a landing on it. Again, I thank all members for their support.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.