

PERTH MARKET (DISPOSAL) BILL 2015

Rescission of Motion — Motion

On motion by **Mr J.H.D. Day (Leader of the House)**, resolved —

That the motion that made the Perth Market (Disposal) Bill 2015 an order of the day for the next day's sitting and the subsequent vote on that motion be rescinded.

Third Reading

DR M.D. NAHAN (Riverton — Treasurer) [3.43 pm]: I move —

That the bill be now read a third time.

MS R. SAFFIOTI (West Swan) [3.43 pm]: I want to put on the record that the opposition really thought the agreement was to go to the City of Perth Bill—we were not trying to be mischievous. I did go looking for the Leader of the House, because when he is not here the whole place falls apart! We were leaderless for just five minutes and look what happened!

I want to outline that the opposition will not be supporting the Perth Market (Disposal) Bill 2015 at the third reading stage because the government did not pick up our key amendment, which was to guarantee the future of the markets for more than 20 years. We wanted the future of the markets at the Perth market site in Canning Vale to be guaranteed for 50 years, but that was not endorsed by the government. We are not going to be supporting this bill because we wanted more security and a stronger future for growers in Western Australia.

I want to go through some of the issues that we went through during the consideration in detail stage. Maybe the next time the government lifts the definition of “produce” from other legislation, it should have a closer look at what is included in that definition. The definition included fruit and vegetables and cut flowers. I think only frozen fish was a problem, and the Treasurer picked up that issue. Mushrooms could probably have been dealt with better in this legislation. There probably could have been a paragraph (d) in the definition of “produce” that detailed any other product that could be prescribed through regulations or maybe through the market rules. It was a bit clumsy that we were debating what the Perth Market Authority could sell right at the death knell. Again, maybe the bill could have been a bit cleaner in picking up exactly what the Perth Market Authority can and cannot sell.

Another key point is that I am very disappointed that we are debating this legislation when the process for sale is well underway. From my perspective, the sale process appears 80 per cent complete. I do think it would have been wiser and more appropriate to bring the legislation into the Parliament earlier and to actually have had some good public debate on this process. I suppose it is quite indicative of where this government is at because the Treasurer brought the legislation into this place as the minister responsible for asset sales. I do think the horticultural aspect has been missed in the policy discussion. I have not seen the Minister for Agriculture and Food in the debate whatsoever, which shows that this has always been seen as a land sale and not enough consideration has been given to what the land does—that is, provide the wholesale marketplace for Perth and the metropolitan area. I really want to point out that I do not think that industry has been consulted enough. I know it is a complex issue. Some parts of the industry—not all, and in fact not the majority—are tied up in an industry bid so it complicates the matter, but I think it goes to the point that we are debating this legislation while the sale process is underway. The fact that some industry participants cannot participate in the policy debate because they are tied up with a bid is a product of the fact that the legislation was not passed beforehand. The failure in not getting the legislation ready before the bids were proceeded with has impacted on the ability to consult with all parts of industry. Of course, there are other parts of the industry that have not been involved in the bid whatsoever and have not been consulted. Again, there are different representative groups. If the government did a little work, it could find them. Those groups are willing to talk to the government. They could have been consulted a lot earlier—or consulted full stop. I believe most of them would have been pretty much against privatisation, but if more safeguards had been put in the bill and more consideration given to them, they might have felt more comfortable with it. In particular, if the government could guarantee the site for more than 20 years, that would be very important. That is another key point—the 50 years versus 20 years issue.

As I have said, the opposition truly believes that the sale in this way will not achieve the policy objectives of assisting growers, keeping prices down for customers and protecting taxpayers in the future. They are the three policy objectives that I tried to overlay in our analysis of this bill. As I said, we do not believe that this bill does anything to protect or assist growers in WA—it actually does the reverse. The bill also does not assist consumers and it jeopardises taxpayers in the future. I will go through those points. As I said, if Labor does win in 2017, one thing I would like to do is an analysis of some of the expenditure of public moneys in the

Mr John Day; Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Rita Saffioti; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Mark McGowan; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Mick Murray

agriculture portfolio. I think that when we look at it there will have been zero spent on horticultural or agricultural areas in some parts of Western Australia. If we look at the hills in places like Karragullen, Pickering Brook and Roleystone, there will have been zero money spent by the state government on assisting orchardists in those areas. If we look at the Swan Valley, there will have been zero dollars spent on assisting grapegrowers there to compete with foreign imports, to deal with changes in chemical usage for combating fruit fly, and to contend with the pressures of urbanisation and transport issues. They are also facing exorbitant increases in some rates and taxes, particularly land tax. If we look at other parts of Western Australia such as the vegetable growing districts in Wanneroo, the region around Gingin and regions in the south west, we will see that the government has not done anything to assist established growers. I think there is a view that they are okay; they have been there for generations, so they will do okay. But then there have been some absurd programs at great cost; I do not know what they would add up to.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr P. Abetz): Member, I remind you that this is a third reading debate, so you need to restrict yourself to focus on what is in the bill.

Point of Order

Dr A.D. BUTI: It is my understanding that in a third reading debate members can cover anything that was mentioned in the second reading debate or in consideration in detail. These points were brought up then so I cannot see why they cannot now be brought up again.

The ACTING SPEAKER: That is not correct. You can bring up only what was brought up in consideration in detail, not make a wide-ranging speech.

Dr A.D. BUTI: Mr Acting Speaker, if you go back to *Hansard*, I am 100 per cent confident you will see that what the member for West Swan is saying was brought up during consideration in detail.

The ACTING SPEAKER: I will not allow wide-ranging topics because the member needs to stick to the third reading focus. I just advise the member to wrap it up.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: We have been in consideration in detail since Tuesday night; we have had a long consideration in detail and I would have raised all these issues, and I did. I do not intend to continue for 30 minutes, but I want to recap the key policy reasons for why the opposition is objecting to the bill at the third reading stage. We did not call for a division on the second reading because we wanted to see how the government would treat our amendments. Those amendments were not accepted by the government, so now we are outlining why we oppose this bill. This is the time for me to outline the opposition's case for opposing the bill, primarily because the government did not accept our amendments.

Debate Resumed

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: This is another case in which the government, through this legislation, is not doing anything to assist growers in Western Australia and is in fact hindering and exposing them to changes of ownership of the markets, increasing costs over time, and increasing insecurity over the future of the market. From a grower's perspective, the opposition thinks this legislation fails the test.

With regard to Western Australian consumers, there are some transitional provisions. We went through the two-year provisions relating to the rules of sale. There are some issues to do with land tax that will be transitioned over five years, and there is a mechanism to pass back some energy savings through energy being bought at the contestable wholesale rate and sold at the regulated retail rate in the centre. But I believe the threat of increased rents and how they are passed on to growers will impact on the viability of growers and on fruit and vegetable prices in Western Australia.

The other point we tried to raise relates to the weekend markets. We found out some interesting history about the Sunday markets, but I want to start with the Saturday markets, which are the clearance markets. The Sunday market is more of a general market, but those weekend markets, unlike the weekday wholesale operations, are where the public can have access to produce. We believe we should give some security to the wider community on that issue. We moved an amendment very early on to try to define "weekend markets", and if that had been accepted we were then going to move an amendment to allow the community access to the site. That was not intended to be prescriptive; we were not going to force anyone anywhere. We just wanted to ensure that we did not shut the community out from the markets on the weekend. Unfortunately, the initial amendment we put forward was not accepted so we were unable to move our consequential amendment later on. It is an issue that I know my colleague Hon Sue Ellery is very passionate about and that many other members who visit the markets on the weekend are also very keen to see.

Of course there has been a growth in farmers' markets throughout the suburbs as more people want the market experience and like the idea of buying produce straight from the farmer. That is not always the case; "farmers'

Mr John Day; Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Rita Saffioti; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Mark McGowan; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Mick Murray

markets” is probably a loose term used in application to markets, but it is something that people are becoming more aware of—the idea of fresh fruit and vegetables. I did not touch on this issue very much, although I raised it during consideration in detail, but the whole issue of fresh fruit and vegetables is very important to the health and wellbeing of our community. From a general policy perspective, we should be doing whatever we can to encourage more people to have access to fresh fruit and vegetables at a competitive price. Again, I do not believe that this legislation will have that effect.

I talked about the industry and growers, and about the wider community and consumers, and my third point was about taxpayers in general. Interestingly, we heard during the second reading debate and in consideration in detail that the government is selling the asset but will keep the key liability, which is the Western Australian Treasury Corporation debt—about \$40.5 million. In future, when we see the headline figure of the sale proceeds, we will have to immediately deduct the debt the state will continue to have. That \$40 million WATC debt will be held onto by the taxpayers, who will have to pay it off. As I understand it, the WATC debt appears in the PMA’s annual report, and only some of it is short-term. A lot of it is profiled over five years, so the revenue the government receives through the sale will, I suspect, be used to pay off general debt. I do not think it can go in and grab the PMA debt and pay it off. It is going to be similar to the Westrail Freight deal in which we sold the asset but the government took on the debt, or restructured Westrail Freight at the time, to make sure that a lot of the government debt was taken into the government sector, and the government was left with a debt that was, as the member for Cannington outlined, greater than the asset price we actually sold it for. As soon as the headline rate appears, we are going to have to immediately take off the \$40 million of WATC debt. Of course, this transaction does not incur stamp duty. One of the clauses in this legislation exempts the buyer from having to pay stamp duty, and we need to acknowledge that when we look at the calculations of any proceeds from the sale of the market.

I do not have any more to say; I think I have outlined in sufficient detail and a sufficient number of times that this is yet again a policy issue that has been poorly handled by the government. I hope the legislation comes under more scrutiny in the other house. I hope the upper house Committee of the Whole has a look at the 50-year provision; I think that is something the government should incorporate in the legislation. As I said, during the briefing with Treasury officials a number of weeks ago I asked, “Why 20?” and they said, “Look, it’s just a number”. There is not a lot of science in that number; therefore, there is not a lot of defence of that number. A 50-year guarantee is a much sounder position. Every grower group I have talked to supports it. I have not talked directly to any of the bidders, because I thought that probably was not appropriate, given that I have moved a 50-year amendment. The 50-year amendment should be considered in the upper house. It will give the growers and the industry more satisfaction and probably peace with the prospects. Otherwise, this is simply a land banking opportunity that an investor will buy into to bowl over in 20 years’ time.

The state opposition has a very clear policy on privatisation. We do not support it. In examining the Perth Market (Disposal) Bill we wanted to see how we could analyse this from a number of perspectives. The reality is that we do not believe there are enough safeguards in this bill for us to change our policy on this occasion. I have given the policy reasons, which are pretty sound. I acknowledge that this was not a controversial privatisation. This is not the Fremantle port or the TAB. One of the reasons it is not that controversial is that many on the Liberal back bench do not actually understand what is happening here, unlike the issue of the TAB, on which the members for South Perth, Belmont and Murray–Wellington have been very active. On this issue, members who should represent growers in the industry, such as the members for Darling Range and Swan Hills, have not got across this bill in enough detail to bring their views into this place. That is a pity, because they should have sought the views of the constituents that they purport to represent and they have not done so. I am not saying that we have consulted with everybody, but we have done some consultation with a number of grower groups. Our historical knowledge of the industry makes us believe that we should not support this bill because it does not give long-term guarantees to our local vegetable and fruit industry.

MR B.S. WYATT (Victoria Park) [4.03 pm]: I rise to make a few brief statements on the third reading of the Perth Market (Disposal) Bill 2015. I begin by thanking the member for West Swan for her carriage of this matter on behalf of the opposition. Ordinarily, I would have thought this bill would be handled by the Minister for Agriculture and Food, but I understand the Treasurer has the responsibility for the disposal of assets, which means that ordinarily I would have been dealing with it on this side, but I was away for a spell. I thank the member for West Swan for taking this on and also for carrying out the consultation on behalf of the opposition.

I want the Treasurer to confirm something by way of interjection. I should have raised this during consideration in detail. I think the minister said that the 25 full-time equivalents within the Perth Market Authority are all employed by the Department of Agriculture and Food.

Dr M.D. Nahan: Do you want me to answer?

Mr John Day; Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Rita Saffioti; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Mark McGowan; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Mick Murray

Mr B.S. WYATT: Yes, I do.

Dr M.D. Nahan: There are 25 FTEs; there are more employees. The context was what would happen if they stayed with the state, and chose not to go out. My understanding and advice was that those FTEs would go to the Department of Agriculture and Food, as the PMA is under the Minister for Agriculture and Food.

Mr B.S. WYATT: That is the clarification I was after, which is why it is curious that we have not had a contribution from the Minister for Agriculture and Food on this matter. My understanding, confirmed by the Treasurer, is that the Minister for Agriculture and Food has responsibility for the PMA, so I would have expected a contribution from the Minister for Agriculture and Food, who is silent on the passage of this bill, which is curious. It is also, as the member for West Swan pointed out, disappointing, because ultimately, although there will be an implication for Treasury in a small impact on the net debt, using the prism by which the opposition approaches this matter—that is, the impact on consumers, growers and taxpayers—we would have liked to have heard from the Minister for Agriculture and Food. He is the person who is really responsible for the Perth Market Authority. This highlights the point that has been made by a number of opposition members, although refuted by the government, that this is emerging as a land development play. That is confirmed by the fact that four of the five shortlisted bidders are clearly in the space of the value of that land at the end of 20 years.

Consideration in detail was interesting, in particular the fact that this bill appears to be a template. There are a range of clauses in the bill—soon-to-be sections—that do not really apply to the disposal of the Perth Market Authority. They are simply there by way of reference, I assume—the Treasurer made this point—for when future sales come on, including the sale of Fremantle port, which I daresay will be a more complicated document and will require regulations. Although this bill has provision for regulations, as the Treasurer pointed out, no regulations are expected to be required for the transition of the Perth Market Authority from public to private ownership. I found consideration in detail to be a useful opportunity for the opposition to make its position known.

The member for West Swan outlined the desire of the opposition to increase the certainty for growers, consumers and taxpayers by amending clauses 15 and 16 to ensure that the site was used as a public market, not for 20 years, but for 50 years. I am not going to go through it all again, but we have outlined our concern that this may very well be a replica of the sale of the grain freight rail network, which at the time was replete with commitments to the long-term viability of the rail lines, in particular the tier 3 lines. They are now effectively rotting for lack of investment. It worries the opposition that by not having a 50-year commitment, we are not thereby guaranteeing the long-term future use of the public market. We were disappointed that the government did not agree with that amendment, and accordingly we will oppose at third reading the passage of this legislation.

The opposition also sought to move an amendment to protect the weekend retail markets. The weekend retail markets are held on both Saturdays and Sundays. We sought to define “weekend retail markets” in clause 4, and then to add new clause 40A, guaranteeing protection of the operation of the weekend retail markets. The opposition was defeated in the definition amendment, which made it basically impossible to then introduce the later new clause. Again it is disappointing that the government would not seek to protect the operation of those markets for consumers. I noted the argument by the Treasurer that that space could be utilised, and binding the purchaser to a retail market would inhibit the use of the space in the future. However, the amendment did not stipulate a place or a time, it simply stipulated a requirement that could quite easily be accommodated by the future owner of the Perth market and its assets.

I daresay the sale will be an interesting process. The minister committed to reporting to Parliament on the contract in a ministerial statement explaining how it works and whether transitional arrangements are required whereby the state sets up a corporate structure to own assets before they are then transferred to the private sector. It will be interesting to see how that plays out. As the member for West Swan pointed out, it is interesting and somewhat concerning that we are debating this bill in this chamber on 12 November, and the minister hopes to take the recommendation of the buyer to cabinet on 18 December. That is not a long time, and the bill still has to make its way through the upper house. Anything can happen in the upper house to delay the passage of this legislation, which may therefore delay the decision to be made on 18 December and in turn delay the plan of the Treasurer to have the Perth Market Authority sold by the end of January and the revenue in his books for 2016–17.

Ultimately, as the member for West Swan outlined, as we debate the legislation at the same time the sale process is underway, the capacity for members of Parliament to be involved in the consultation has been eliminated. It is a curious and inadequate way to go about managing the sale of this asset. The Western Australian Treasury Corporation debt of \$40 million that effectively sits with the Perth Market Authority will be retained by the taxpayer. This echoes times gone by with Westrail and will eliminate, if you like, the return to the taxpayer.

Mr John Day; Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Rita Saffioti; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Mark McGowan; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Mick Murray

The final point I want to make is to thank VegetablesWA. Although I did not meet with its representatives, the member for West Swan did and she has had a number of discussions with them. The information that they provided to the opposition was useful and, despite the comments made by the Treasurer on day one of the debate back on Tuesday that the majority of growers support this sale, it is clear that that is not the case, or at least the government does not actually have that knowledge to make that statement—that much is clear.

Mr R.S. Love: Some of them want to buy it.

Mr B.S. WYATT: I will be interested in the member's contribution when he talks about that. What is clear from the feedback received by the opposition is that there is great concern amongst growers and there is no information from government to say that the majority of growers support the sale. I am surprised that the National Party is backing that in, hence my comments earlier about the Minister for Agriculture and Food and my comments in the second reading debate about my disappointment that the National Party has not made any contribution to the debate on the sale of this asset. Perhaps its members will do so in the upper house; I do not know. Maybe they will roar in the upper house as opposed to being silent in the lower house; we will see.

VegetablesWA made a number of points in its information sheet about its concerns about not just the consultation, but also how it would have liked to see the public market used for 50 years and a range of other concerns that the opposition certainly tried to have addressed during consideration in detail. Issues were raised during the second reading debate and emphasised again by the member for West Swan just a moment ago during the third reading debate.

The stamp duty exemption is very interesting to note. It is a very generous offer to the purchaser of this asset who will be effectively exempt from paying any state tax, fee or charge for which it may be liable. Of course, within five years those growers will be liable for whatever amount of land tax is assessed subject to whoever the buyer is and the value of that land. Ultimately, some more challenges will come forward for those growers.

As the member for West Swan pointed out, the opposition will be voting against the third reading of this bill not because we want to defeat the bill, but because the protections sought by the opposition to protect those three important groups—the consumers, the growers and the taxpayers of Western Australia—were not met by the government, and those proposals from the opposition were reasonable. I am almost certain that should I live a full and long life, I will be watching a large residential development take place on the current site of the Perth Market Authority—I am almost certain of it.

Ms R. Saffioti: It will be called “Market Lakes”.

Mr B.S. WYATT: Yes, “Market Lakes” with a big wall around it. I am almost certain that that will be the case. Perhaps the member for South Perth will be living there.

Mr P. Papalia: After retirement.

Mr B.S. WYATT: No, there are plenty of years left in the member for South Perth. If I live as long as the member for South Perth has lived, it is fairly clear that I will see a large residential development take place on the site that is currently owned by the Perth Market Authority. That is what the opposition has been trying to prevent to ensure that growers, consumers, taxpayers and Parliament will not have to revisit this issue 21 years from now when all the good reasons will be given by the owner for why the market authority can no longer operate from that location.

Ms R. Saffioti: Matilda Wyatt and Grace Fraser will be there.

Mr B.S. WYATT: Matilda Wyatt will be selling fruit there. Future members of Parliament and taxpayers will not then have to buy another site for another market. As I said, when Richard Court sold the grain freight network and made all those guarantees, who would have thought that we would be in this situation? Those farmers would not have thought, “The tier 3 rail is rotting away. We can't get any support from the Nationals or the Liberal Party. What do we do about it? We got all these guarantees and look at what's happened.” That is what we have sought to guard against. I hope that we hear from the National Party in the upper house. I am interested in its members' views. I hope that we get to hear an official position from the Minister for Agriculture and Food and I hope that the upper house can perhaps bring some sense to the government that we have not been able to bring in here. I think there was a brief flicker of rational response from the Treasurer when he understood the argument raised by the member for West Swan about salted fish. It was an important amendment that the Treasurer understood. He understood that the definition of “produce” in clause 3 is weak and absent. Sometimes the government can be encouraged, usually gently, to making an amendment to its own legislation. I congratulate the member for West Swan for that but I hope the more substantial amendments on the protection for consumers, growers and taxpayers will come to fruition in the upper house.

DR A.D. BUTI (Armadale) [4.16 pm]: I will commence my remarks on the third reading of the Perth Market (Disposal) Bill with the issue of certainty. One of the principles of the legal system is that we ensure certainty in a system so that people's behaviour can be guided by a legal process. The problem here is that the government's refusal to accept the opposition's amendment to increase the 20-year provision to, say, 50 years is creating a great deal of uncertainty in the fruit and vegetable growers industry. As I mentioned in my speech on the second reading, which was also mentioned by the member for West Swan and others in consideration in detail, we are facing in some respects a crisis in the local supply of fresh fruit and vegetables. The member for South Perth, who enjoys his Sunday drives into the hills, would attest that there has been a reduction in the number of orchards still operating in the hills region. Part of that is because of the issue of free trade, and with the reduction in tariffs et cetera we are now competing in a global market. Many of these growers cannot justify working day in, day out to produce fruit and vegetables because the price that they need to charge is not competitive in the international market. As we know, we can receive fruit and vegetables from all over the world now, and it is much harder in Australia when one considers the imposts through utilities and labour costs et cetera vis-a-vis some of the overseas markets. One has to wonder why the government has refused to accept the member for West Swan's amendment to increase the 20 years to, say, 50 years. The Treasurer has refused to accept that amendment because he knows that if he increases that restriction from 20 to 50 years, the attractiveness to the market of this sale will be reduced.

This is all about a land grab; it is all about the fire sale of an asset that the government owns in order to help reduce the debt that has accrued under this government—led by the Premier, the member for Cottesloe—over the last seven years. That is what it is about. It has nothing to do with improving the supply or the business exchange of fresh produce in Western Australia; it has nothing at all to do with that. It has all to do with trying to obtain much-needed funds to reduce the debt that has accrued under this government. If that was not the issue, what is the business case justification for not agreeing to the opposition's amendment to increase that stipulation from 20 to 50 years? The business case justification for not increasing it is the attractiveness to potential buyers because, of course, if it is only locked up for 20 years, buyers know they will have freedom after 20 years to dispose of the land for other purposes. As the member for Victoria Park stated, as night follows day and as the sun rises every morning, we can be assured that there will eventually be a residential development or other use on this land that is more profitable than a city market. That is what this is all about.

I am not sure whether the Treasurer is aware—although he does have a rural background, so he may be aware to some extent—of the labour that goes into producing fresh fruit and vegetables. It is a phenomenal amount of work, day in day out. As the member for West Swan mentioned, many growers—most of the growers that she has spoken to and that some of us have also spoken to—do not support this move by the government. Yes, there may be a consortium of growers who are bidding for this asset sale, but I can assure members that many, many are not in favour of it. I will give a personal example of the amount of labour that goes into producing fruit and vegetables. Back when I had just finished my tertiary entrance exams, many, many moons ago, I was looking forward to spending a summer relaxing at the beach and watching the cricket on TV. My father had decided—which was always his ambition—to have a go at being a market grower. He had a day job, which at that time was assisting with the building of the Wungong Dam in Bedforddale. He rented a plot of land in Maddington, near the Canning River and he planted rows and rows of tomatoes. The previous year, people received quite a substantial price for tomatoes at the market, so my father thought he would give it a go. He would finish his day job as a labourer and then rush off to attend to his tomatoes. Then the guilt got to me and I asked him whether he wanted some assistance. Unfortunately, he said yes.

That meant, for the next three months, rather than enjoying a life on the beach or in front of the TV to watch the five test series against England, I was getting up at 4.30 am—I think I said the other day I was getting up at 4.30 am, but I thought about it and it could not have been then. We rose at about 3.30 because we were at Maddington, which only took about 15 minutes from where we were living, just after 4 am. We woke up about 3.30, had a quick coffee, and were at the plot of land just after 4 am because I distinctly remember picking tomatoes in the dark. It was not a great experience because we would be trying to grab the tomatoes, and we would often come across squashed tomatoes or bugs et cetera—we could not see—that would crawl up our arms. It took about four hours of backbreaking work to pick all the tomatoes. Then we had to transport them into the back of the ute and drive them back to our place. Then we put all the tomatoes onto a table in the garage and went to have a bite to eat. Then we went back to sort them out into what we thought would be acceptable by the market. That would take about another three hours. We would have been up about 3.30 am, commenced work just after 4.00 am and had, at the most, about an hour's break throughout the day. We would finish at about 3.30 or 4.00 pm.

As I mentioned the other day, we would then drive down to Lori's Transport Services in Kelmscott. They then took the tomatoes to the markets in Wellington Street. We were doing that four or five days a week. We knew that there was a market—a place that would take the tomatoes—and that they would then go into the normal

Mr John Day; Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Rita Saffioti; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Mark McGowan; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Mick Murray

purchase situation at the Wellington Street markets. From Kelmscott to the Wellington Street market was a reasonable distance. Of course, the Canning Vale markets are much more attractive to growers—not all growers, but to people out in the Roleystone–Karragullen area—because they do not have to fight their way through the Perth traffic. They can just take arterial routes: South Street, Armadale Road, Tonkin Highway et cetera. That market is very attractive to growers.

I am really concerned about what will happen at the end of the 20-year period. The Treasurer said that it will be very difficult to put a residential development there. However, as we know, planning schemes change all the time. Before I came into Parliament, I served a period as a member of the Armadale Redevelopment Authority. Planning schemes change all the time. Often, the whole idea of a planning authority is to change the planning scheme to ensure that it allows flexibility with respect to planning and development. Economics is very, very important, obviously, when we are dealing with land. If the investors or the owners of this market believe that they will get a much greater return from another use, what will prohibit them from doing so? Then what happens? Either there has to be another commercial enterprise to establish another market, and/or the government will have to come back into play because if the government does not come back into play if there is an absence of private investment, we will have a major food security problem. We would be relying on produce that will not be overly fresh if it has to come from interstate or overseas, rather than having locally produced fruit and vegetables. That is paramount to any thriving metropolis.

The next bill I think we are going to discuss is the City of Perth Bill 2015. The argument being made by the government is that it is necessary for this thriving metropolis. It is no good having a thriving metropolis if there is nowhere people can go to reliably purchase fresh fruit and vegetables. Every city in Australia is in a reasonably located proximity to a market where there is the ability for growers to deposit their fruit and vegetables and for buyers, of course, to purchase that produce. I am really concerned that the Treasurer did not agree to what I thought was a sensible amendment by the opposition to that 20-year limit. As the member for West Swan mentioned, the briefing that she received from officials from Treasury stated that that was an arbitrary figure. Maybe that is not the case; and, if so, I would be interested for the Treasurer to inform the Parliament why 20 years seems to be the magical time period. If it is not a magical time period, surely the 50 years that was proposed by the member for West Swan would have added some certainty to the situation, which would have been better for the growers. As I say, every year, we have fewer and fewer growers. That is a real danger to the food security of our city and to the state of Western Australia. The Treasurer did not accept our amendment, but one would hope that when this bill moves to the other place, it will be debated and the merits of the opposition's amendment will be considered.

MR M. MCGOWAN (Rockingham — Leader of the Opposition) [4.30 pm]: The opposition's position on the Perth Market (Disposal) Bill 2015 has hinged on the clause that relates to the length of time for which the Perth Market facility must remain a market for fresh food and vegetables. I understand that the government is in a difficult financial situation and is looking for ways in which it can get some money to assist with that situation. There are indications that the Market City facility will fetch between \$150 million and \$200 million. That equates to around two-and-a-half months of the annual interest bill that is currently confronting Western Australia. Therefore, the government will be able to arrest the interest bill for a couple of months. However, the consequence of selling the Perth Market facility with the requirement that it remain a market for only 20 years I think is quite dire. Therefore, the opposition's position on whether we would support the sale hinged on whether the government would agree to the Market City facility remaining in place for a period of 50 years. I think that was quite a modest request, to be honest. The Perth Market Authority was established in 1989 on that site. The site comprises 51 hectares of land, 12 hectares of which is currently unused, and it is only 16 kilometres from the central business district of Perth.

Therefore, we have three important facts to consider. The first is that the buildings and facilities on the site are relatively modern. They are 26 years old. A lot of cost has gone into the capital construction of those facilities. As I understand it, a lot of that cost has been borne by the state over that period of time. Therefore, it is a state asset, available to be sold. The second point is that the site is 16 kilometres from the CBD. These days, 16 kilometres is virtually inner-city. Thirdly, it is a large amount of land. It is attractive for land developers to get 51 hectares of land in close proximity to the city. The land is extraordinarily attractive for residential purposes. As we have been saying over the last few days, what is the appeal of this piece of land? The appeal is to a developer. Of course a developer would want to buy this land. The government can say that this land will not be used for residential purposes. The potential bidders for this land are very effective and powerful operators. Of course the value of this land is in redevelopment. It is not in the Perth Market facility.

There is a 20-year requirement that Market City be operated as a market. That 20 years will go in the blink of an eye. It is the equivalent, in reverse, of 1995. I remember 1995 very well. It was not that long ago. It will go very quickly. If in 18 years the Market City facility is closed and bowled over, development is approved, and

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Thursday, 12 November 2015]

p8198c-8210a

Mr John Day; Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Rita Saffioti; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Mark McGowan; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Mick Murray

construction starts on the twentieth anniversary of the royal assent to this bill, what will happen? The state will then be required to find another site and build another market for the growers, restaurateurs and supermarkets of Western Australia. That is what we predict will happen. It is a pretty easy prediction to make, because all the indicators are there.

If the government's view is that this site will never be redeveloped and will never be used for any purpose other than a market, it would agree to the amendment for a 50-year extension—or even a 99-year extension. We put that amendment to the government and it refused to accept it. That says to us that the government's view is that there is value in a 20-year term. That must be the government's view; otherwise, it would have no reason for not agreeing to this amendment—in fact, it would have no reason for not putting in a 50-year requirement in the first place. This is a mistake. It is a mistake to sell the Perth Market facility on the terms on which the government is proposing to sell it, and in 20 years' time the taxpayers of Western Australia will pay for it.

I googled the site and had a look at it from the air. Members should google it and look at what is across the road. Across the road from this site there is residential development. I have not followed this debate carefully, but I heard the line the other night that this site is nowhere near any residential development. That is wrong. It is across the road from residential development. It is close to a rail line. However, from my experience, being close to a rail line only increases the value; it does not reduce it. This site is close to a rail line, it has a residential area across the road, it is 16 kilometres from the city and it comprises 51 hectares of land. What do we think this land will be used for? In 20 years' time, this land will be used for residential. The government is willing to accept that. In 20 years' time, where will I be? I will be older. In 20 years' time, we will be able to say to the government, "We told you so." However, that will not give much comfort to the then state government, which will be saddled with this big bill and this big problem that this government is saddling it with. I think 50 years is a reasonable proposition, and 99 years is even more reasonable. However, the government will not accept 50 years, so there is little prospect that it will accept 99 years.

I am disappointed in the country Liberals for failing to stand up for growers. I am disappointed in the National Party for failing to stand up for growers. I am disappointed in the city Liberals for failing to stand up for shopkeepers and restaurateurs and all the people who rely on the Perth Market. I am disappointed in all of them for failing to stand up for the interests of the taxpayers 20 years from now. This responsibility will be saddled upon a future state government. If it is not saddled upon a future state government, who is going to build the new markets? In 20 years' time, the pressures on Perth for land will be much greater than they are now. Where is anyone going to find another site like this? There is not one. Any site that they will be able to find will be further out and more difficult to access, and the costs will be enormous. The government could sell the 12 hectares that abuts this 51-hectare site and is undeveloped. The government would secure some money from that sale. The government could sell that site for development, frankly. The government could sell the remaining portion of the site with a 50-year, 80-year or 99-year requirement. If the government did that, it certainly would receive less money. However, it would not be saddling future generations with a significant problem. All this bill will do is help the government pay off about three months of the interest bill that the government has accrued with the \$24 billion debt that it has saddled upon the state. The government will be meeting a few months of its interest bill, and, on top of that, it will be saddling a future generation with a bill that will amount in today's terms to hundreds of millions of dollars but in 20 years' time will amount to probably billions of dollars. That is a pretty poor public policy outcome from my point of view.

The government could have avoided that. We were not bloody-minded. We did not say that we would vote against the bill. We did not say, "No way; never." All we wanted to do was retain the facility as a market for the long-term. All we are saying is that this facility needs to be retained as a market. The government has let down growers, restaurateurs, shopkeepers, industry, future generations, the future taxpayers of Western Australia and a future state government, all for this very, very short term outcome.

MRS M.H. ROBERTS (Midland) [4.40 pm]: Before the passing of the Perth Market (Disposal) Bill 2015, I too want to put on record my opposition to the bill and what is occurring here today. In forcing through this bill, the government will be doing a disservice to the whole community of Western Australia. This bill epitomises the total financial mismanagement of the Barnett government over the past seven years or so. We have seen state debt grow from just \$3.6 billion in 2008 to well beyond \$25 billion now. It is an unprecedented rate of increase for state debt. This Premier has a record of not caring about debt. He did it as education minister; he just overspent. This Premier believes that the economy goes up and down, that somehow in the future it will go up and not be a problem, and that somehow, magically, the bills will get paid. In recent times, though, the economy has not gone from strength to strength. Only today, very concerning unemployment figures came out. The government has tried to rationalise away those figures, but they cannot be rationalised away for the people in this state who do not have a job. The unemployment rate in Western Australia is at its highest for the past 13 years. The Premier has been gambling with the money of the taxpayers of this state; he has gambled and lost. He was

Mr John Day; Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Rita Saffioti; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Mark McGowan; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Mick Murray

hoping that he would somehow gain some windfall and would be able to pay off his debt. That has not happened. He also hoped that somehow, magically, he could get a better share of the goods and services tax than was provided for in the deal that he and Richard Court signed up for all those years ago when they agreed to the formula for the GST. That has not happened either.

The Premier is now selling off state assets to pay for his debt addiction—his spending addiction. I am not saying that any of the projects that are being undertaken in the state are not beneficial. I am saying that sometimes you have got to cut your cloth to measure; sometimes, we cannot have everything we want all at once. The Premier is so keen to leave a huge legacy that he has just been spending, spending and spending the public's money. We have not seen that money spent on key service areas such as police, but it is not my choice to dwell on that today. What we are seeing, though, is a Premier who has just continued to spend money—spend, spend, spend. As a result, he has to sell off our public assets. What disappoints me is that in this house we have not heard as much as a squeak from members of the National Party about selling off an asset such as the Perth Market Authority; nor have we heard much from country Liberal members about selling off an asset such as the Perth Market Authority; and nor have we heard much from those members representing the urban fringe in electorates such as mine and those further out around the periphery of the metropolitan area where there are very many growers. It is interesting to note that quite rightly a lot of concern has been expressed about the selling of the TAB and that particular asset. I put to members that it is because a lot of blokes in this place like to have a bet and like to have a punt. They go to the races, the trots or the dogs and they know a bit about the industry and they have some mates in that industry. However, if we had more women members in here and if the Liberal Party had more women in Parliament, we might have got a little more out of the government when it came to the safety and security and cleanliness and greenness of our food. I want to see Western Australia into the future support its growers and our local industry. I do not want to be importing grapes, oranges, vegetables or whatever from different parts of the world. We should be fairly much self-sufficient when it comes to growing our food and produce in this state for a variety of reasons, such as energy and transportation costs.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr I.M. Britza): Excuse me, member. The conversations in the chamber are definitely getting louder. If members want to continue them, they should go outside. Thank you.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: There is a growing concern worldwide about the safety and security of our food and of natural food products. People understand more and more about the value of eating natural food products. The only way that we will provide that in Western Australia is if we provide a fair market for our growers. That is why the Perth markets were originally established around the turn of the last century, around the 1900s. I well remember because people in my grandfather's family were involved in those Perth markets that ran between Roe and Wellington Streets. When I was a child I remember going to those markets and seeing the produce being sold there. I have been to the equivalent markets in other states and seen what those states have done.

I will not give a long speech tonight; I simply want to put on record that this bill is wrong on so many levels. It is wrong because this government is selling off what I regard as a major asset of our state. It is wrong because the best way of ensuring that our growers get a fair go is for the Perth markets to continue. Under this bill we have no guarantee of there being any continuity beyond the next 20 years. The current Premier will be long gone. What will happen in 20 years when we have no markets here? What will we do for the growers of this state then? My view is that that will be a major and significant issue and cost to this state. We will have to make a choice about whether we still want to support the growing of fresh produce in this state and support the people growing it. The problem is it will be just like the third-tier rail, in that it will be much harder to unscramble the egg 20 years later. Once the government has sold off the rail lines and privatised things, re-establishing them and buying them back and re-entering the market will be very, very expensive. Plenty of people will tell the government it will be cost-prohibitive to do that. Some future government will be put in the position of having to decide whether it wants to engage in monumental expenditure to re-establish the equivalent of the Perth Market Authority to provide growers a place to trade their goods fair and reasonable way.

I also want to know that this states' produce will be available for our own population. The government's main interest is a type of free-ranging, free-enterprise approach, in which I do not think it would matter squat to its members if our best produce was exported right around the world. Although it is great to see our growers doing well and see those exports happen, the primary obligation we have is to the people of our own state and our own community to ensure that they have access to fresh and good produce at a reasonable price. It just smacks of desperation and political expediency to see what is happening here today. It is somewhat ironic that a state government that maintains the Potato Marketing Corporation to protect potato growers is now absolutely deserting the growers of all other produce in this state.

MR M.P. MURRAY (Collie-Preston) [4.49 pm]: Like the member for Midland, I will be very brief in my comments on the Perth Market (Disposal) Bill 2015. Firstly, I must thank the members for West Swan and Victoria Park for their carriage of and helpful contributions to this bill; they were very good. They certainly tried

Mr John Day; Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Rita Saffioti; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Mark McGowan; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Mick Murray

to convince the government that it is totally wrong. Not only that, but they had a major breakthrough with an amendment that will now allow dried fish to be sold at the market. That is a major, major issue!

On a more serious note, I am very disappointed that the government has not listened to the people and, again, because of its arrogant governing style, the people are the ones who will miss out. They will miss out because the length of the lease they have to worry about is not 20 years; it is 15 years. At the 15-year mark, the purchaser can put forward proposals about what it wants to do at the 20-year mark. That means that the purchaser could change or not fulfil its obligations at the 15-year mark. That is something that has been lost along the way in this debate, but is something that we must take notice of. No doubt those land developers are licking their lips at the prospect—15 years is a very, very short time. If the market shuts down in 15 years—I say “if”—who will pick up the bill for the next market? If one thinks about how much land there is at the market, about 110 acres or 112 acres—51 hectares—how far out of the Perth central district will we have to go? Will it go south or will it go north? At the moment the market is essentially centrally located, but where will the next market be? There will be losers—the market cannot just stay where it is in that area. If a new market is north, the southern growers will miss out. If it goes south, the northern growers will miss out. It will put costs on to produce, which will put them at a disadvantage.

At the 15-year mark, when the new owners start to say that in the future they will do this and this, I see that there will be maintenance problems, because an owner will not put money into a market if they are going to change the whole aspect of the market. There is no doubt that extra costs will be put on. The 18 per cent of turnover average that has been there for many years is quite reasonable, and I think it is a very good return for any market, but I will have a shilling each way and say that in time costs will go above 18 per cent when the market is privatised, because shareholders will want their bit. We know exactly what will happen at the 15-year mark, the owners will not reinvest to maintain the standards that I believe should be kept at any market. That is a problem I see. The Treasurer is not worried about growers; the Treasurer is worried about his bottom line. The Treasurer has contributed to ruining Western Australia along the way, and I think he might even have some aspirations to be the Premier. I hope it happens before the next election, because that will make it quite easy for us to go forward.

Dr A.D. Buti: Member for Collie–Preston, I think he might be Deputy Premier. Surely they are not going for —

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr I.M. Britza): Thank you, members.

Mr M.P. MURRAY: Okay, we will put him a rung lower.

It is disappointing that the government could not see its way forward to move what I believe is a quite simple amendment to take it out to the 50-year mark, which gives security in any business. When the government loses contact with the people who want to use the facility, I wonder where it is headed as a government.

Along with that, there is the National Party’s reluctance to engage in this debate. It has been very reluctant. I wonder whether the Leader of the National Party has spoken to any growers in his electorate. If he has, why did he not bring those opinions to the Parliament, so that when we were voting on clauses during the consideration in detail phase, we could have understood the opinions of people in his electorate? He has not done much at all; he has sat there mute.

Mr D.T. Redman: Another minister had carriage of it through Parliament.

Mr M.P. MURRAY: The Leader of the National Party sat there mute; it is his electorate. As I said today, National Party members are the pussies of the bush on following through and they still have to kowtow to the Liberal government and they have no say in the cabinet whatsoever. In fact, we are still watching very closely to see —

Mr D.T. Redman interjected.

Mr M.P. MURRAY: We will see; time will tell.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Thank you, members.

Mr M.P. MURRAY: We certainly have a view of what we want to see in country areas, and how we will help people such as growers in the south west. We will not just push them out and ignore their requests—I have had requests from some of those people—to hopefully help them, not hinder them as the National Party has done. It is so annoying that National Party members masquerade as helpers in the bush, but when it comes to the real issues, they are not there. Certainly, National Party members should hang their heads in shame over this issue.

I have been very surprised by the interest in this issue in the south west. The press ring me regularly, and people ring in to ask me to do everything that I can to lengthen that period of time. They understand that we had no chance in the world to stop the government from selling off the market, none whatsoever, but if it is to be sold off, they wish that they could have the 50-year period.

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Thursday, 12 November 2015]

p8198c-8210a

Mr John Day; Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Rita Saffioti; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Mark McGowan; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Mick Murray

I see that the member for Murray–Wellington is in the chamber. He also contributed absolutely next to nothing—he just sat in the house and had a snooze—on behalf of the Myalup growers and others in that very, very productive area. I am glad to hear the member for Murray–Wellington say something, even if it is only through interjection. Even then, he is not in his right seat. It is a shame that some of these members, two in particular, have not looked after their local growers and their constituents and failed to engage in the process of Parliament to look after their constituents down that way. In time, I will see what happens. Some government members think that they have really safe seats but they should never forget, and I never forget, that I came into this house on a 9.7 per cent swing. I have never forgotten that, and I work it to death.

Dr M.D. Nahan: To you?

Mr M.P. MURRAY: Yes, 9.7 per cent, and that is because I listen and I work. I have never just sat in here on my rear end and got bigger and had to get a new suit every six months because the other ones do not fit—I have not got that way. I will not point out anyone in particular, but we know that he is quite large these days. Certainly, when members ignore their constituents, they have to put up with it at the next election. Believe me, this issue of the sale of the markets is certainly one of those issues that will be regurgitated at the next election to those members' peril.

DR M.D. NAHAN (Riverton — Treasurer) [4.58 pm] — in reply: I will finish off this debate. I thank members who have been involved with the issue, generally in good spirits. We differ on issues from members opposite on a number of fronts. Members opposite voiced support for the horticulture industry and we, of course, support it strongly. Indeed, this legislation is consistent with that. When we talk to horticulturalists, what is it that they say that they need? They need markets, land and water—they need a lot of things—but they also need an effective distribution chain, investment in storage and other assets, and innovation. They also want us to improve the markets—talk to them—and that is what this bill will do. For a long time, the Perth Market Authority has complained that it needs more investment; however, the state, whichever party was in power, decided to put money into schools, general government and other assets, not the facilities at that market—it has been starved of investment. Under the previous Minister for Agriculture and Food, we made a substantial investment in cold storage at the facility—I remember going to open it—and it was filled immediately. We also expanded more—some 12 hectares for expansion. The market needs substantial investment.

The board of the Perth Market Authority has been arguing for some time that it needs \$250 million in additional capital investment. Because of our tardiness in investing in the facility there has been a raft of private investment in storage facilities around the area, with more going up. At the same time, because of the receptiveness of the market, a whole range of the major horticulturalists have skipped the market altogether—they have dealt directly with private wholesalers or retailers. The total throughput of the market, in weight at least, has not grown; it covers about 40 per cent by volume of the fruit and vegies sold in the market. It has lacked innovation. What we are doing here is transferring the asset. Yes, we are recouping a return for the state's long investment in the asset—and there has been substantial investment in it—and transferring the asset to a body that is committed to running it as a market, shows expertise and is committed to investing new capital in the market to increase the distribution and the facilities associated with it. That is what growers want, that is what growers need and that is what this bill helps to do.

The question is how long we should mandate that the site be used as a market. We put in 20 years and the opposition argued for 50 years. There was not a lot of science behind the suggestion to make it 50 years except that it was much longer than 20 years. The problem with going beyond 20 years is that we do not know what the market will look like. It might be like share transactions, where it is all done electronically and is not done in the same room, or it might be like wool, where the physical volume is not traded on the floor anymore and there are just a few samples and microns of wool. We can easily see that, with technological changes, there will not be physical volumes of fruit, and not just in 20 years' time but in 10 years. Members opposite wanted to lock it in to existing technology. Members opposite have a problem with technology. They are against GM, they are against fracking—they are against a whole range of technological change, and this is just another example of that.

A government member interjected.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: They are luddites. They are afraid of the future. We were criticised for not talking with our constituents, including by the member for Collie–Preston. He represents a very large proportion of the growers in this state. He should ask them; they want it. He should ask them how to fix it and they will say, “Sell it. Make sure there are investments in it and make sure you get an innovator on it.”

An opposition member interjected.

Mr John Day; Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Rita Saffioti; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Mark McGowan; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Mick Murray

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr I.M. Britza): Member for Collie–Preston, I am calling you; that is the second time you have spoken from a seat that is not yours. I am doing that out of protocol. If you want to speak, you go back to your seat.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: We have gone through a process that sought a wide range of bidders.

Ms R. Saffioti interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Thank you, member for West Swan.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: We got 15 and we have selected five. They are now in a process that will be finished under the bill. The priority is to ensure that they are committed to understanding —

Ms R. Saffioti interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for West Swan, I call you for the second time.

A government member interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: No, but I can see it coming, member for Murray–Wellington. If you want to say something, get back to your seat, member.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: We have gone through a selection process that is getting people who are willing, able and expert in running a market and who will invest in the market and run it more innovatively. That is what we need. That is what the horticulturalists need. We have huge potential in this state, but we have to have the distribution chain and the storage facilities that are suitable for them. This bill helps that. We could, of course, have taken the position of members opposite and just worry about the future rather than grasp it.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members!

Dr M.D. NAHAN: We could stop investment in the horticulture industry in terms of warehousing facilities. We could stop and prevent further investment in the facility, but we are not going to do that. We owed it to the horticulture industry to ensure that it has the best facilities and the best innovation in its distribution chain as possible, and that is what we are doing. One of the major claims, and it does not have much basis, has been that all the bidders are nothing but speculative housing investors. Canning Vale is an industrial zone.

Ms R. Saffioti: No, it's not.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Theoretically.

Ms R. Saffioti: There is housing across the road.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Yes, it is an industrial zone up to a certain boundary, and across the boundary there is housing, but in the industrial zone there is no housing. It was located there in the 1980s because it is an industrial zone, and it will not be converted into a residential property within 20 years, unless perhaps that is something the Labor Party might do; I am not sure, but I can assure members that the Liberal–National government will not. It will remain a market for 20 years or longer and we have put that in place. Yes, the bidders—including the Chamber of Commerce and Industry of Western Australia and the other bidders—have a range of investments, but most of them have substantial investments in shopping centres that are nothing more than markets.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr I.M. Britza): Members!

Dr M.D. NAHAN: I will let members know that there is already a shopping centre there; there is a fish shop.

Ms R. Saffioti interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for West Swan!

Dr M.D. NAHAN: I found very odd some of the contorted arguments that someone would pay a substantial amount of money and commit to further investment in a market, only to rip it up in 20 years' time; that will not happen.

This is a bill to transfer the Perth Market Authority to private hands, and the belief is that it is best run by the private sector; it will invest more money and induce innovation in the facility and improve the distribution chain for horticulture in this state. It is a good move and it should have been done some time ago. In terms of innovation in agriculture, it also shows that we have to leave this up to the Liberal–National government because the Labor Party cannot and will not do it. I commend the bill to the house.

Division

Extract from *Hansard*
[ASSEMBLY — Thursday, 12 November 2015]
p8198c-8210a

Mr John Day; Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Rita Saffioti; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Mark McGowan; Mrs
Michelle Roberts; Mr Mick Murray

Question put and a division taken with the following result —

Ayes (32)

Mr P. Abetz	Mr J.H.D. Day	Mr A.P. Jacob	Mr N.W. Morton
Mr F.A. Alban	Ms W.M. Duncan	Dr G.G. Jacobs	Dr M.D. Nahan
Mr C.J. Barnett	Ms E. Evangel	Mr S.K. L'Estrange	Mr J. Norberger
Mr I.C. Blayney	Mr J.M. Francis	Mr R.S. Love	Mr D.T. Redman
Mr I.M. Britza	Mrs G.J. Godfrey	Mr W.R. Marmion	Mr A.J. Simpson
Mr G.M. Castrilli	Dr K.D. Hames	Ms L. Mettam	Mr M.H. Taylor
Mr M.J. Cowper	Ms L.M. Harvey	Mr P.T. Miles	Mr T.K. Waldron
Ms M.J. Davies	Mr C.D. Hatton	Ms A.R. Mitchell	Mr A. Krsticevic (<i>Teller</i>)

Noes (16)

Ms L.L. Baker	Ms J.M. Freeman	Mr M.P. Murray	Ms R. Saffioti
Dr A.D. Buti	Mr F.M. Logan	Mr P. Papalia	Mr C.J. Tallentire
Mr R.H. Cook	Mr M. McGowan	Mr J.R. Quigley	Mr B.S. Wyatt
Ms J. Farrer	Ms S.F. McGurk	Mrs M.H. Roberts	Mr D.A. Templeman (<i>Teller</i>)

Pairs

Mr V.A. Catania	Mr P.C. Tinley
Mr J.E. McGrath	Mr D.J. Kelly
Mr B.J. Grylls	Mr P.B. Watson
Mr R.F. Johnson	Ms M.M. Quirk

Question thus passed.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.