

Mr Mick Murray; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr David Templeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Ms Rita Saffioti;
Dr Tony Buti; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr John Day; Acting Speaker; Mr Dave Kelly; Mr Bill
Johnston; Dr Kim Hames; Deputy Speaker; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Nathan Morton; Ms Eleni
Evangel; Mr Chris Hatton

PREMIER'S STATEMENT

Consideration

Resumed from 18 February on the following question —

That the Premier's Statement be noted.

MR M.P. MURRAY (Collie–Preston) [9.16 am]: I rise today to reply to the Premier's Statement. What a week we have had! We have had the week of *The Giants*, when we saw a giant girl walk through the city and a giant diver follow her. That was very entertaining, and it gave many people a moment when they could become kids again and forget the problems of the day. But it was back to work on Monday, and back to Parliament on Tuesday, only to be met by another giant. However, this giant is not going anywhere. This giant is the giant budget blowout that this government has presided over. That budget blowout is a giant by any measure, and it is growing. There is another giant following that giant—very similar to what happened in the city with *The Giants*—and that is state debt. This is the biggest giant state debt that we have had in the history of our Parliament. That is a disgraceful exhibition by this government. This government has made no attempt whatsoever to rein in spending. That will impact on our future and the future of our children for many, many years to come. It will stifle the building of housing for the poor, the disabled and the unfortunate. It will stifle the building of schools. It will also stifle something that is very dear to my heart—the help that disabled children in schools need but are not getting. That is all because of poor management by this government.

As we saw with *The Giants*, puppets need to have a puppetmaster. We know who the puppetmaster is in this state. It is the Premier. However, the Premier's strings as the puppetmaster are wearing very, very thin. In fact, from what I am hearing from within his party room, there is a chance that the Premier's strings will break. If the Premier's strings were to break, we might see some changes in attitude and in the way forward for this state. It would probably be to our benefit if those strings were to break and we had a new Premier, because this Premier does not seem to understand the logistics of living in country towns and living on the outskirts of the city. This government has only one focus, and that is the city. Yesterday, the member for Pilbara pointed out loudly and clearly some of the mistakes that this government has made. It is not often that I agree with the National Party. But that was a very good speech by the member for Pilbara and he put the issues very well, not only royalties, but also what happens in country towns when we do not look after them, and when we have a bit of a boom and all we look at is the returns in the short term and not the long term. The returns often come very quickly, and they can diminish just as quickly when the ore price changes, yet the companies that are pulling the strings do not lose their profit margins. There is something very wrong about that.

In my area, instead of fly in, fly out, we have drive in, drive out, whereby people, after a 42-hour week and a 12-hour night shift, will drive all the way back to Geraldton. That is appalling. Companies that require their employees to do that should be pulled into gear. I heard the Premier say that in Onslow, an extra 15 minutes was the difference between having a good workplace and having a bad workplace. That was when he would not allow the employees to live in the town but rather allowed the company to build an accommodation village close to the site. There is no control over these people who drive extraordinary distances after night shift to get back to their city. Geraldton is probably another eight hours from Collie after someone has finished a 12-hour night shift. WorkSafe, the government and others should be involved in addressing that issue. Other anecdotal reports indicate that people live in caravans in the bush without facilities and go home on the weekend because the job is very good. There is no argument about that. In the meantime, the people of Collie and the workers in that area cannot get a job. It is no different from Port Hedland. The companies somehow think that the people outside the region where the mine is are better workers. I can tell members that that is not the case. In the coal industry, third and fourth-generation coalminers live and breathe it. Ten minutes do not go by without there being mention of how much coal has been shifted here and how much dirt is there and the safety issues with the job.

People have come in my electorate office door and said that they cannot get a job. When I asked Premier Coal recently at a meeting—it was probably one of the worst meetings I have had with a mining company in my 14 years in this place—the company refused to answer. The only reason it came in the door was to address the criticism I had made about not meeting. The company would not answer one question. When I asked whether it determined where its workers come from through their postcodes, I was told that it did, but when I asked whether I could have that information, I was told no. I have evidence that shows that 30 of the last 50 workers put on at that mine were from out of town. Why should the people of Collie put up with the dust, the noise and the extra trucks that travel through their town if there are no jobs? Why should grandmothers not complain if their grandchildren cannot get a job? It has come around, and it will come around again.

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Thursday, 19 February 2015]

p421b-457a

Mr Mick Murray; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr David Templeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Ms Rita Saffioti; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr John Day; Acting Speaker; Mr Dave Kelly; Mr Bill Johnston; Dr Kim Hames; Deputy Speaker; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Nathan Morton; Ms Eleni Evangel; Mr Chris Hatton

The environmental issues in the area are not addressed at times, but it is pretty good in the main. I have brought this matter forward in this house on every occasion I have been able to do so to make sure that the company abides by every rule if it is not going to employ local people. I am not saying that it should be allowed to break the rules, but it should at least abide by the existing ones. There is outstanding rehabilitation work worth \$20 million to be done in the mining industry down there. That should be addressed immediately. A few comments have been made by my boss in the house about the dust in my backyard every day—not once, but every day—yet the company says that it is not its dust. People who drive to Darkan along the Coalfields highway have to have their lights on because of the dust coming out of the mine, yet the company denies it. I have had photos taken that show that that is the case, yet the company denies it. It is about time these companies put their hands in their pockets and started to think about the communities. It has been said that Collie has been overloaded and looked after by the mining industry, but I do not see any gold-paved streets in Collie. In fact, we have the broken promise of trying to lift it up through SuperTowns. Mr Speaker, you can understand the frustrations of the community when local people cannot get a job. It is no different from what the member for Pilbara has put forward about fly in, fly out workers from Perth getting a job in Port Hedland. It is disgraceful.

I have already mentioned the second part about the safety issues and people driving long distances.

I was amused to say the least by the comments of the member for Murray–Wellington about him becoming involved in the coal industry when people from his area started to work in the industry. He said yesterday that about 100 people were working in the coal industry and then, all of a sudden, he had an interest. Did he have an interest before that? No, not at all. But once people started to travel to work from his area, which is about 40 minutes away, then he had an interest. It disappoints me greatly to see that he opposed the geosequestration plan which the state government has worked through and which I am proud to say came out of the Coal Futures Group, of which I was chair. It is a plan that could create thousands of jobs in a clean, green industry, yet a member of the Liberal Party opposed it. For what reasons, I am not quite sure, and he is not in the chamber to say anything about it. While that research is going on, we have a chance to change the image of the coal industry. We have a chance to help companies such as Alcoa and Worsley Alumina Pty Ltd and other big companies that are putting out much CO₂ into the atmosphere to collect that CO₂ and put it back where it came from—that is, back into the earth—as a fluid. Many people think it goes back in as a gas, but under pressure, CO₂ turns into a fluid, and that is driven about three kilometres into the earth's surface and then percolates with the salt water to become a carbon calcinate, which is a limestone-type rock. It will not come out if there is an earthquake, but if the earthquake gets down three kilometres, we may as well kiss our bums goodbye anyway!

I see the Liberal side of government picking and choosing and not taking a strategic line. That is where I think it is falling down and that is why we have the blowout in debt.

There are also issues with our schools. On the last day of school, Collie Senior High School was notified that it would lose \$400 000. The budget had been set and people were notified about who was going to work where and then bang—\$400 000 was taken out of the budget. That is disgraceful. It is poor management. I understand we have to rein in at times, but why was Collie picked out? We know that the school has been struggling for facilities. It has a new arts centre, which is great and is very well looked after and utilised. I went to a play there not long ago. It is a very good facility. However, taking \$400 000 from that school means that there must be compromise within the school budget and on the processes that have been laid out for the year. Of course, the headmaster was not allowed to talk to me; it had to come through the back door because this government is not open and honest. This is the problem. If people understand what the government is doing, it has a chance, but under this Premier, the secretive little Pol Pot, we have really big problems in understanding where the government is going. I think that will be to its detriment, which it will find out at the next election.

An amount of \$300 000 has been removed from Dalyellup College. Again, Dalyellup is one of the biggest growth areas in the state; if people do not go there for a month, they cannot find their way around again. At the last citizenship ceremony, 42 new residents from that area were naturalised. That is a big number in a country area when we consider that, generally, there are only about four or five over the year. There was a mix and match at the ceremony, with quite a strong leaning towards South African people. They all had young children who they wish to go to those schools, but the budgets have been cut, so how will those children be accommodated? I am not quite sure. I can tell members that people down there are not very happy.

While I am on the issue of schools, something else that has been brought to my attention that just about makes me want to cry is that kids with learning and other disabilities have had their times cut. In one case, a young fellow has had his time cut to 10 hours a week, or two hours a day. That is nowhere near enough for that kid, who has autism, to be taught properly so that he can function later in life. It puts pressure on the family and on the schoolteacher, who is trying to teach a normal class but they have this kid with autism, who is a runner and

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Thursday, 19 February 2015]

p421b-457a

Mr Mick Murray; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr David Templeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Ms Rita Saffioti; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr John Day; Acting Speaker; Mr Dave Kelly; Mr Bill Johnston; Dr Kim Hames; Deputy Speaker; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Nathan Morton; Ms Eleni Evangel; Mr Chris Hatton

will take off out the door if it is open. That is only one example. A dear little girl at Amaroo Primary School—she is a great friend of mine but I will not mention her name—has also had her hours cut. She has progressed so far in such a short time and now that help has been taken away. It is absolutely appalling to see that this girl, who is coming into year 6, now will not have the help she needs to get on with life. We should not forget that the cost does not go away; that cost is just delayed. If they are not able to live independently in the future, there is a cost. If they need extra services when they become adults, there is a cost, because we did not train these people on the way through. Members should now understand why I talk about the puppetmaster and his fraying strings.

I will probably need five hours to raise all the matters I want to go through, but one matter I want to mention is the Wellington Dam fiasco in Collie. Without any consultation, and after not listening to the local community, the minister at the time, Mr Buswell, allowed waterskiing on Wellington Dam. What he did not take into account was that local people wanted the amenity of a quiet place to camp, a place to go and really wind down, not a place where V8 boats motor around the middle of the dam water. Over and above that matter, the main issue at the moment, other than ski boats not staying in the skiing area, is that for many years local people bought small dinghies and put electric motors on them so that they would not pollute the water and cause noise and disruption to other people. Officers from the Department of Transport and harbour and lights booked people for using their 12-foot dinghies with electric motors to fish and sightsee around the backwaters. What a disgrace! At the same time, a 351-cubic-inch Chevy rips up the middle of the dam, keeping everyone awake in the wee hours of the morning with boom boxes while they drive around the dam, yet people have been booked for having a small electric motor that can at most do five knots so that they can do a bit of fishing and sightseeing. It is absolutely ludicrous! Most of them get blown out of the water anyway by jet skis that come past at about 50 knots and are not supposed to be on the water anyway. Members can see the problem: this government does not listen. A petition was presented to this house and Facebook was covered in complaints about the matter. From memory, the petition had 5 000 signatures and was asking this house to not allow those large boats on the dam, yet the government did not listen. I really think Collie is being punished for being a Labor town. Anything that the Premier considers is Labor is seen as no good and he will punish it. Let us remember that those people can punish at the next election, and will do so; there is no doubt about that.

Only a fortnight ago the Premier snuck into town. He came in under the radar, crawled up the hill, had a look at the workings of the new Coalfields highway and met with only the shire president and the chief executive officer. He did not meet with the council. No, he would not do that because there might be a Labor person on the council! They might talk! He came into town and spoke to no-one. The earliest notice I got was about an hour before he came. In he came under the radar. What the Premier did not know—this is the difference between us and the government—is that the day before the shadow Minister for Mines and Petroleum was down there, and he met with everyone. That is the difference: he did not sneak into town. He met with the shire, the shire councillors, the two mining companies and the CEO of the local Chamber of Commerce and Industry. He met with a list of people that is so long I cannot remember them all. Yet the Premier came—zip, under the radar—with no press release; he had no meeting with the press at all. Our generous shadow minister met with the press and had coffee with the locals. I do not know what the Premier thinks. I think he might be scared of meeting Collie people. The tough little Pol Pot came through but was not game to stand up in public. That is the problem. That is how I explain when people ask what is the difference between a Labor and a Liberal government. We are open.

[Member's time extended.]

Mr M.P. MURRAY: That is how I explain the difference between a government that is open and honest and willing to tell people what the future will hold and one that has no idea.

Now I have an extension of time, I will turn to the Treasurer. He has a bit of an accent that does not go down too well in Collie; we are a bit isolated down there. He came out and said, "Kick the mining company out of town. Kick Lanco out of town. They're no good." Have members ever heard a Treasurer say anything so ridiculous? He told an \$800 million company to get out of town! The Premier has talked about an emerging Indian economy, yet an Indian company has been told to get out of town—"We do not want you in Western Australia"—by our Treasurer. Did he have any people to take over from that company? Did he have any plan how we will mine coal in the future? Did he have any plan about the 300 jobs that would be lost if that company left? He had none whatsoever. That shows the nastiness of the Premier, and the Treasurer followed suit. The Treasurer has no idea about the impact of his statements if that company were to say, "Righto, stick it! I'm off. You can have the lot for free." There would be no-one to work it and no company to take over and 300 people without incomes would be sitting on their bums in a small country town. Think about the implications of that! The Treasurer should come into the house and apologise to the people of Collie for his loud-mouth, off-the-cuff remarks that have

Mr Mick Murray; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr David Templeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Ms Rita Saffioti; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr John Day; Acting Speaker; Mr Dave Kelly; Mr Bill Johnston; Dr Kim Hames; Deputy Speaker; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Nathan Morton; Ms Eleni Evangel; Mr Chris Hatton

done immeasurable damage to Indian companies that are thinking of investing in Western Australia. He has insulted not only those Indian companies, but also the people of Collie.

Members should remember one thing: while people are working, they are getting paid. Yes, sometimes it is a day or two late, but there is truth in the old saying, “Better to have a late pay than no pay at all”, which is also like the saying that a second-class ride is better than a first-class walk. That is the same issue here. Another person, the member for Murray–Wellington, who is walking around the chamber, has made similar comments.

Mr J.E. McGrath: He’ll come over to your side!

Mr M.P. MURRAY: He might be able to front me up here!

The member for Murray–Wellington similarly has said that companies should get out of the town and that no-one should deal with them. Did he have any secondary answers about what we should do and how we should fix the problem? No. It is easy to shoot from the hip, but it does not help the town of Collie and its confidence; it does not help Indian investors or investors of any sort in the future if that is the respect paid by the government to a company worth \$800 million.

Mr M.J. Cowper interjected.

Mr M.P. MURRAY: I knew the member for Murray–Wellington would have to bite.

Mr M.J. Cowper interjected.

Mr M.P. MURRAY: Is the member for Murray–Wellington going to retract his statement?

The SPEAKER: Members!

Mr M.P. MURRAY: Mr Speaker, I do not need protection from that person because he is a bit shallow on thought and a bit loud of mouth. We do not have to worry about that.

I will move on because I am also worried about who is running the state. I turn to Hospitality WA and the review of the Liquor Control Act, which has been coming, coming and coming! It was going to be done before last Christmas, it was going to be done in June and now it is being talked about again. The member for Vasse has raised the matter again and has said how good it is. The only change in recent years has been under a Labor government, and that related to small bars. That was done. Another issue that was raised very strongly was when Country Labor (WA) members looked after their local hotels by arguing that the multinational bottle shops should not open on Sundays so that pubs would get trade to help them through the times of slim pickings. I picked up the Australian Hotel Association’s magazine and saw this headline about a review: “AHA Delivers on Liquor Control Act”. Who is running the government? Is it Bradley Woods, the AHA or the minister? What will happen is all outlined in this publication. Do not come Monday; do not come Tuesday; it is all done. Bradley has done it! Do not worry. I agree with many things in that magazine, but I am asking: where are the ministers on these issues, what are they doing and why has it taken the AHA to lead the pack? It is the minister’s job to do that, not the Australian Hotel Association’s job. Debate was a bit tough down here, so the government shifted the portfolio to the upper house because it is a bit easier up there and issues are not debated as robustly as in this place. I do not think the government can handle robust debate. The portfolio shift to the upper house meant that the TAB debate was also moved. We have had good strong debate here about the TAB, but it must have been too strong because it was shifted to the upper house where the scrutiny is not quite as strong; it is supposed to be the house of review. What is happening to the TAB? I do not know. Does the industry know? Maybe one or two of the codes know, but not the broader industry. It is the most asked question when I go to the races or any function that horse trainers attend. The gossip line one week is that the TAB’s privatisation has been put back indefinitely, another week that it will be the end of the year, and then that it will be just before the next election. I hope that is the case, because I know the feeling of punters, trainers and owners about the privatisation of the TAB. The government should bring it on as an election issue and the opposition will take it on. We will tell the public what we are going to do. It will benefit the industry and not shareholders who do not live in this state, with the majority of shareholders overseas. Our policy will benefit this state alone, which may see some major investment coming back to the racing industry.

It is good to see the member for Belmont putting a saddle on and taking off out the door. The lead rope was not long enough; the member has come back! I was happy to see that at times the member for Belmont has stood up in debate on the TAB and I hope she is strong enough in her party room to make sure that the TAB is not sold. I will give a very quick account of a trip to the Melbourne Cup in November last year, where I met a gentleman; I had never met him before. He told me how he invested in horses and that he had just sold one for \$1.3 million. I moved a bit closer, in case something rubbed off on me! He said he was getting out of the industry. We spoke

Mr Mick Murray; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr David Templeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Ms Rita Saffioti;
Dr Tony Buti; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr John Day; Acting Speaker; Mr Dave Kelly; Mr Bill
Johnston; Dr Kim Hames; Deputy Speaker; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Nathan Morton; Ms Eleni
Evangel; Mr Chris Hatton

for another hour about the industry. He said there were only two places in the world he would invest in the industry, one was Western Australia and the other Sweden, because they have a state-run local industry authority. That says it all. A person who is trading horses at a million dollars a pop—it was not Mr McGrath from South Perth whose trades tend to be a bit lower than that—said that WA had the best industry control in the world. In addition to that, recently the president of the Victorian Racing Club—the member for South Perth might correct me on that—said that if he could do one thing, he would buy back its TAB. We know that Jeff Kennett reckoned that sale was the biggest mistake he had made and that he would like to buy it back, if he had the authority and the money. When we look at it from that point of view, this government has got to go with the punters and not leave them behind and say, “No, we need the money because we have blown our budget.” This is our giant budget and our giant deficit, which happened in the week of *The Giants*. We have had all sorts of giants! We have seen *The Giants* plodding down the street. I did look for a figure behind *The Giants* saying, “I am the giant of Western Australia”, but the Premier was not there—apparently he was up in the crowd somewhere.

The other thing, which I would call pork-barrelling, which the National Party is very good at, relates to the Nationals’ Growing our South initiative. I am quite happy that we have got some money down our way, but the Nationals did not address the major centres of Bunbury, Mandurah and Harvey. Its publicity blurb for Growing our South included Northam townsite grain improvements. How long has Northam been in the south? It also included a town north of Perth—not Quinns Rocks but another town up north. Members will have to bear with me—here it is, among all the papers I have with me. Growing our South refers to Jurien Bay sewerage! No wonder members opposite cannot govern, they have the state upside down! South is that way and north is the other way, but here Jurien Bay is part of the southern growth initiative. I would hate to go fishing with that mob, I would never get back—their compass is wrong! I will move on because I only have a minute left.

On a more serious note, I am very concerned about the Bunge proposal to put another 160 trucks a day on the road through Collie in peak season.

Mr I.C. Blayney: Mr Speaker.

Mr M.P. MURRAY: I have one minute to go. If the member wants to interfere now, he should worry when it is his turn!

The Coalfields highway cannot accommodate an additional 160 trucks. Great work has been done on the roads west of Collie, but there is not enough room to put another 160 trucks on them. That is occurring because Bunge will not put larger storage bins there, which would modify the impact in harvest time and the trucks could then be spread out and not be on the highway at the same time.

MR I.C. BLAYNEY (Geraldton) [9.45 am]: Members would have noted that I presented a petition this morning asking for new classrooms for Wandina Primary School. The fact that this school’s enrolment numbers are roughly double what had been expected tells us the Western Australian population has a lot of faith in the reforms this government has brought into the education system. It is definitive evidence that parents are moving back to the state system. It is a good thing to have an education funding system that treats all schools equally. Similar schools across the state should receive the same funding, not some kind of funding mishmash.

I am delighted to report that the integration of year 7 students into the local high school has worked well in Geraldton. I was part of the committee that had been overseeing this for the last 18 months. We have 10 feeder primary schools. As part of this process, we developed an information base so that all the information for year 6 and 7 students going into high school, with all their various needs and resources, was shifted with them straight into the high schools, so that the teachers who had those students in their classes were able to look up the records carried over from the primary schools. That was a fantastic innovation. All Geraldton’s incoming year 7 and year 8 students spent a week late last year at the John Willcock College campus, and year 9 students were shifted to the Geraldton Secondary College. Of course, having two campuses in Geraldton causes all kinds of problems. Bringing year 7 students onto the John Willcock College campus has led to a 50 per cent increase in student numbers, with two-thirds of the students new to the school. I spent the morning at the school’s first assembly and I was impressed at how well it ran, and from what I could see every student was wearing the new school uniform, which is quite an achievement. I thank all the staff for their cooperation, in particular, Julie Campbell, principal of John Willcock College, and Garry Simmonds, principal of Geraldton Senior College; they have done a wonderful job this year.

Mr Mick Murray; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr David Templeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Ms Rita Saffioti; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr John Day; Acting Speaker; Mr Dave Kelly; Mr Bill Johnston; Dr Kim Hames; Deputy Speaker; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Nathan Morton; Ms Eleni Evangel; Mr Chris Hatton

In other education developments in Geraldton, the government has built a new kindergarten at Beachlands Primary School and is building a child and parent centre at Rangeway Primary School, a new library at Allendale Primary School and it has replaced the administration building at Wagrakine Primary School, which unfortunately burnt down. I am on the board of Rangeway Primary School, my old school, which last year won the state award for Aboriginal education. That was a wonderful achievement. Once again, Rangeway is a school that has an incredibly dedicated team of people who work very hard.

I am delighted to report the situation at the Geraldton Residential College appears to be resolved and the college is now on track to service all the secondary school students in Geraldton who require residential accommodation following the closure of the Nagle Catholic College's boarding facilities.

The Geraldton Universities Centre is for the first time celebrating an intake of over 200 students. Courses are offered from the University of Southern Queensland, Central Queensland University and Charles Sturt University. Members will note that they are all east coast regional universities. The experience of GUC is that regional universities on the east coast are much more interested in other regional areas and much more user-friendly. We are very lucky to have had the opportunity to switch to those courses over the last couple of years.

It is a great thing to be able to study locally. A person can keep their job, their house and their networks, and their children do not have to change schools. We do not lose those people from the community and it gives middle-aged people the opportunity to upskill.

Another useful development in Geraldton was the opening of the new bridge across the Greenough River at South Greenough. The Minister for Transport, Hon Dean Nalder, opened that bridge just before the end of last year. It is the same old story: we finished that bridge ahead of time and ahead of budget. It is a very useful safety improvement for that stretch of Brand Highway.

Although our local economy is starting to feel the impact of low resource prices, I am pleased to say that Top Iron, a new iron ore miner from China, is going against the trend. I congratulate everybody involved in Top Iron and in bringing this new miner to market. I am also very pleased to see that most of its product will be carted by rail. The impact of the slowdown has been felt right across the regions. We are lucky that our local economy is reasonably diversified, but the slowdown is still having a big impact. In the long term, companies may substitute maintenance for replacement, and that will be a good thing for a service centre such as Geraldton.

Karara Mining Ltd's magnetite mine is Western Australia's first magnetite mine in the member for Moore's electorate, and it continues to approach its nameplate capacity for stage 1 of producing eight million tonnes per annum. I am very proud of this midwest mine and what it has achieved and I hope to see it outlive me. It should last for at least 100 years. Another interesting mine that I visited last year was Windimurra, a vanadium mine in the member for North West Central's electorate.

Mr W.J. Johnston: It has a great gas pipeline.

Mr I.C. BLAYNEY: Yes, it is very good. If the member has not been there, he should have a look when it is up and running again. Unfortunately, on the day I was there, the beneficiation plant caught on fire. I have been following the repairs with interest and it appears that the company is on track to reopen the mine soon. I was told that there were no hard feelings and that I was welcome to visit again when the mine is up and running! I was a bit surprised by that. It is not like that on ships when if there is a disaster, a person is not welcome back—miners are more forgiving! Murphy Oil Corporation is also drilling three wells between Dongara and the Abrolhos Islands, and its expenditure is in the region of \$80 million. I wish Murphy Oil well. As yet, I have had no community concerns raised about this project, which tells me that Murphy Oil has done its homework. I recently met with people from Ramelius Resources to discuss the gold royalty. Their concerns seem to have some basis and I wonder aloud whether it will be possible that if the rate is increased, the actual amount of revenue to government might drop overall because of the impact on the gold sector. The number of people employed in that industry has declined a little, but it still employs some 21 000 people, so gold is not a forgotten industry in Western Australia.

In the field of agriculture last year, what started out as a very promising year in the midwest faded towards the end and became a very average one. That tends to bring home what is clear in farming; that is, there is always safety in diversification, and costs and debt levels are crucial in tight years.

Last year I hosted the United States Consul General in Perth, Cynthia Griffin, on a visit to Geraldton for three days, which I thoroughly enjoyed. For a day last week in Geraldton, I joined the German ambassador to Australia, Dr Christoph Müller, the Honorary Consul of the Federal Republic of Germany in Western Australia,

Mr Mick Murray; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr David Templeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Ms Rita Saffioti;
Dr Tony Buti; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr John Day; Acting Speaker; Mr Dave Kelly; Mr Bill
Johnston; Dr Kim Hames; Deputy Speaker; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Nathan Morton; Ms Eleni
Evangel; Mr Chris Hatton

Torsten Ketelsen, and 10 members from the Committee for Economics and Energy of the German federal lower house, the Bundestag.

Mr W.J. Johnston: Is the member ready for a return visit?

Mr I.C. BLAYNEY: They invited me. Both the US Consul and the German ambassador joined the Mayor of Geraldton to lay a wreath at the HMAS *Sydney II* memorial at Mt Scott, and I would like to thank the Sydney volunteer guides for their time, and the piper Lucy Hosking for attending and playing at the wreath laying.

We frequently come across commentary about reform, especially from Canberra. It has never been easy, and for areas in which I have been involved so far here, in serious reform there is always a fear of the unknown. The first serious reform that we started when we came to government was under the guidance of Hon Norman Moore to shift our rock lobster fishery away from the “race to fish” to a quota system. This created a lot of fear in my community, but now that we have come out the other side, we can say it was worthwhile. The fishery is now very sustainable and the fishermen are making money again. The price of pots is now up to about \$57 000 a pot. It dropped to as low as \$6 000 a pot when we came into government, so some fishermen must be making money now.

The other reform I have been involved with has been the move of year 7s to high school. That raised a lot of questions and concerns in the local community. However, once again we are through that process and we can see that it is a worthwhile move. Putting this in place with a national curriculum is very beneficial for families who move between states. I was surprised at how many students there were in my electorate last year in year 7 who had recently moved across from other states.

At a federal level, the Hawke–Keating time is frequently quoted as a period of worthwhile reform. What is less frequently quoted, of course, is that their reforms were usually supported by the John Howard–led opposition. The last serious reform was the introduction of the goods and services tax, which cost the Howard government quite a few seats, opposed as it was by the opposition. Basically, we can reform, or sooner or later the markets will do it for us. We could still have had a car industry in Australia for the long term if people had been prepared to put everything on the table and become more efficient. The alternative was to sit on our hands and say that the industry is to close, costing tens of thousands of jobs. In the minds of some, this is apparently a better outcome. The need for Toyota to have to go to court to have the right to directly engage with its workforce was frankly bizarre.

I applaud the government of South Australia for announcing a wideranging royal commission into a new industry to be built around the uranium industry. The commission is looking right into it—seemingly everything is on the table. I expect that the South Australian government can do this, no doubt, because the Liberal opposition will support it.

Finally, I would like to talk a little about China and where it is going. China has gone through two phases since 1949. The first three decades consisted of political turmoil and instability, including the Great Leap Forward and the Chinese Cultural Revolution under Chairman Mao. Next came the rise of the economic reformers under Deng Xiaoping and rapid economic change for three decades, which is actually the greatest economic transformation in history in terms of the number of people lifted out of poverty and by many other measures. Of course, it was marked by comments from Deng along the lines of, “To get rich is glorious”, and, “It does not matter if the cat is black or white, so long as it catches mice.” We are all still trying to work out what the Chinese mean when they say they have “Communism with Chinese characteristics”. It is now being said that a new phase is starting. The leadership in Beijing is talking about a new normal. Its leader, Xi Jinping, has talked about the Chinese dream. I suspect that this does not really equate to the American dream of the 1950s, which was for a Chevy in every driveway. In terms of purchasing power, the Chinese economy is now the largest in the world. In actual nominal terms, its size will pass the US economy somewhere between 2018 and 2020. It is clear that changes are happening. Consumption growth in China is nine per cent with growth in services the next big area of growth. This is growth that is domestically focused. Other areas for change include tightening the rule of law; more independent courts; a reform of the hukou system, which determines where people can live; relaxation of the one-child policy; and a gradual tightening of environmental standards. There is no doubt that the change in commodity prices that we are now experiencing is due partly, or mostly, to the change in direction of the Chinese economy. Just as the Chinese economy is now heading towards what it calls the “new normal”, does this mean current mineral and oil and gas prices for Australia have become the new normal? If so, life for Australians is going to become quite a lot harder in the next few years. Of course, we will not be alone in this. China is now the largest trading partner for some 140 countries in the world, out of about 180. Another issue regarding China is the change under this leadership of becoming more assertive in the region, which is seen in the dispute

Mr Mick Murray; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr David Templeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Ms Rita Saffioti;
Dr Tony Buti; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr John Day; Acting Speaker; Mr Dave Kelly; Mr Bill
Johnston; Dr Kim Hames; Deputy Speaker; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Nathan Morton; Ms Eleni
Evangel; Mr Chris Hatton

between China and Japan over the Diaoyu—Senkaku Islands and in the South China Sea. Once again, this is something that we have to learn to live with. To quote the old Chinese curse: we live in interesting times, but I also think that our government is up to it.

MR B.S. WYATT (Victoria Park) [9.59 am]: I rise to comment on the Premier's Statement. On Tuesday afternoon in a short contribution to the amendment to the Premier's Statement moved by the opposition, I commented on some initial reflections. However, this morning I want to make a number of comments on three main areas about the state's finances, specifically the finances for health and the looming budget crisis that every state in Australia faces, and I will also comment on Aboriginal affairs in a number of different areas.

The point I made on Tuesday was that the Premier's Statement—I go back and read them all before the next one is made—seemed to me nothing more than cobbled together media statements from 2014. Then at the end he said, "And I am interested in jobs; I want to go to India. I want to do this and that—science. Science." Despite cutting the hell out of science over the last six years, he mentioned science; it was tacked onto the end of his speech. It was a strange speech. For the first time in seven Premier's Statements, the Premier mentioned remote Aboriginal communities. I want to come back to that a little later in my speech, but I note early on that for the first time in seven Premier's Statements, remote Aboriginal communities got a mention.

It was, indeed, interesting. This is the first week we have been back together, friends, since the midyear review was tabled in late December 2014. I think the midyear review is the final confirmation that the Liberal Party cannot manage the finances of the state. If members look at the last 20 years, the Liberal Party has been a shocking financial manager. The review also shows, along with the Treasurer's response, that no-one, except maybe the member for Hillarys, seems to accept that there has been poor financial management. No-one seems to accept that there is a problem with a \$1.3 billion deficit—the first in 15 years since the Liberals were last in power. No-one seems to accept that there is a problem with the debt. The Treasurer, the member for Riverton, who spent a career writing about, thinking about and analysing the evils of government revenue sources and critiquing government for relying on land tax and stamp duties, who has now twice increased land tax, gets up every day to defend it, "There is no problem. There is nothing to see here!" He has walked away from everything he has ever written. His transition from commentator to Treasurer is now complete that he is the government's chief information officer. He is like "Baghdad Bob" wheeling out, "The Americans aren't here! We're going to destroy the Americans with bullets and shoes!" as the laser-guided missiles are painted firmly on his head. Standard and Poor's indicate a lack of political will, and up pops "Baghdad Bob" from the Riverton province saying, "Nothing to see here. The finances are fine." The AAA credit rating is gone but the Treasurer says, "It is all okay; we have strong financial management!" Debt is now nearly at \$31 billion when the Premier said it would not get beyond \$20 billion. Up jumps "Baghdad Bob" and says, "It is all good stuff; there is no problem with debt." There is a \$1.3 billion deficit yet the government says, "It is okay. We are spending on good things." We all became familiar with the man familiar with these grandiose and grossly unrealistic comments. I think the Treasurer needs to work out what his role is: is he the chief information officer or is he the Treasurer? Does he hold in his hands the smouldering ruins of the Liberal party's fiscal credibility?

Members opposite will all have to work this out at some point. The Premier does not care. Hon Norman Moore made that clear last year. John Langoulant has previously made that clear in his role as Under Treasurer. The Premier does not care, but members opposite should care because the lack of consistency from the Premier is just breathtaking. I quote the Premier extensively. Remember that the Premier likes to think his parliamentary career started the day he walks in here each day. I want to remind members of a little statement that reads like Fringe World Festival script when members know who is saying it. This was a matter of public interest moved by the member for Cottesloe when he was Leader of the Opposition in 2002. This is what he said about the then Labor government —

It has had a full fiscal year in government, yet it continues to blame every financial difficulty it faces on either the Commonwealth Government or the previous coalition Government. Surely time has moved on and surely this Premier and this Treasurer should start to accept responsibility for the financial affairs of the State of Western Australia.

All I heard the Premier say on Tuesday was "GST", "GST", "GST", "GST". Not one element of responsibility was taken for the position we now find ourselves in—record debt and deficit—by the member for Cottesloe, who was applauded by the Liberal Party members behind him. The now Premier, as Leader of the Opposition, went on to say in 2002 —

Mr Mick Murray; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr David Templeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Ms Rita Saffioti;
Dr Tony Buti; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr John Day; Acting Speaker; Mr Dave Kelly; Mr Bill
Johnston; Dr Kim Hames; Deputy Speaker; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Nathan Morton; Ms Eleni
Evangel; Mr Chris Hatton

I want to talk about the tests of the credibility of the budget itself. There are two ultimate tests: first, the deficit or surplus position and, secondly, and most importantly, the longer term implication of what will happen to the level of indebtedness as a State and as a people of Western Australia.

That is what the member for Cottesloe said when he sat in the Leader of the Opposition's seat. As soon as he got his hands on the levers of power, it all burst asunder. Now we do not know what will happen with the debt position. It was going to be capped at \$20 billion. I have said this before: when the Premier said he wants to cap net debt at \$20 billion, when members look at that budget year in the forward estimates, and what actually happened with revenue, the Premier received an extra \$6 billion in unbudgeted revenue. Revenue has not been the issue. We then had Christian Porter's budget that he tabled then quit. He said that net debt will peak in 2014–15, this year, before commencing its decline. It was going to peak this year at \$23 billion before commencing its decline. This year —

Mr P. Papalia: It ain't doing that.

Mr B.S. WYATT: It ain't doing that. The whole time we have “Baghdad Bob” from the Riverton province popping up saying, “It is all okay. Nothing to see here. Finances are fine. The Americans are not coming!” I do not know what the narrative is of the members of the government; I do not know what you stand for any more—I do not. I hear the Premier's statements, I hear the chief information officer from Riverton talk about things that simply do not reflect the reality. The Treasurer said earlier this week that no-one could have picked the fall in iron ore and oil prices. I will give him one bit of wiggle room: perhaps nobody could have seen the extent of the fall and the speed of the fall. But everybody knew it was going to fall—everybody. The problem we have is that we have had a Premier and seven Treasurers who have assumed that the record revenue was here to stay and spent accordingly.

Mr W.J. Johnston: “It wasn't a boom”, the Premier said.

Mr B.S. WYATT: “It wasn't a boom”, the Premier said. In his mind, it was here to stay, despite everybody knowing it was going to decline.

Mr P. Papalia: He thought it was here forever.

Mr B.S. WYATT: He thought it was here forever. Just like John Howard spent the boom in the income tax cuts, the Premier has spent the boom revenue. The Treasurer says, “We did not know what it was going to be”, but the reason we talk about large surpluses is so there is some flexibility. When the government got itself in the position when the 2014–15 budget was released, all the government needed was a four cent drop per tonne in iron ore to wipe out the surplus. Members all knew there was going to be a drop but the government did not prepare for it. Even just as recently as yesterday in *The Australian Financial Review*, Jennifer Hewett, an astute national commentator, made the following point on page 2 —

The immediate problem for Colin Barnett is that while he might have disliked boom-time terminology, he certainly liked spending the money as if the extraordinary amount flooding in would never end. That's how the state lost its AAA rating back in 2013 after Standard & Poor's noted the government's “limited political will” would probably lead to slippage in its “fiscal action plan”.

In response, “Baghdad Bob” jumped up and said, “It's all okay; we're now getting spending under control, if you take away all the expensive bits. It's all under control!” Do members know what? That horse has bolted. It is like when the Premier stands up and says, “It's okay with China, because weaker economic growth is off a bigger base, therefore it's all okay.” Well, that is the problem the government has: it has a big base of spending that is growing and growing, and it is out of control. I cannot see how the government can do it. It might get a year here or there, but this horse has bolted, and the government's problem is that it now has shocking deficits and is reliant on the lag effect of the GST to bail it out. As Jennifer Hewett wrote in yesterday's *The Australian Financial Review*, the Premier liked to spend, and that was applauded by all government members, except the member for Hillarys, who is now very vocal in his critique. They all accepted that. I do not know what the policy spine of the Barnett government is. What does it stick to? What defines it? I do not know. At some point or other it is going to have to work that out, because those cobbled-together media releases from last year that passed as a Premier's Statement will not cut the mustard going forward.

Nine months ago, in May 2014, the government cut payroll tax. Then, in the midyear review, it increased it again. What is going on with the consistent financial plan? What is going on? The Treasurer spent 30 years writing about the evils of land tax, and has now ratcheted it up twice in 18 months. I do not know what the government's fiscal plan is, and that is why Standard and Poor's and Moody's critique it so strongly. Nothing is sacred; the government has stuck to nothing in the finances, whether it is debt levels, the spending profile or the

Mr Mick Murray; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr David Templeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Ms Rita Saffioti;
Dr Tony Buti; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr John Day; Acting Speaker; Mr Dave Kelly; Mr Bill
Johnston; Dr Kim Hames; Deputy Speaker; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Nathan Morton; Ms Eleni
Evangel; Mr Chris Hatton

wages policy. It has not stuck to anything, and that is the problem the government faces. Until it can prove that it can stick to something, it is not going to regain the AAA credit rating. AAA is a long way from returning.

I now want to make some comments about the health budget. There is a big problem emerging. Regardless of who wins the state election in 2017, there is a big problem emerging. For those who follow the budget, a particularly interesting part is the statement of risks. It is always the place where the sins are buried, deep within budget paper No 3. It has all the risks. In the 2014–15 budget, it was probably relevant only for a week or two. The more interesting ones are the midyear reviews; the budget is not actually enormously relevant. One of the factors that was included in the government’s spending profile was the assumption that it was going to get its hospital spending to the national average cost by 2017–18. That is built in. I quote from page 130 of budget paper No 3 —

To facilitate reduced cost growth and deliver a more sustainable expenditure base for hospital services, the forward estimates are predicated on transitioning the cost per unit of activity (i.e. the State Price) to the national average cost by 2017–18.

From 1 July 2014, in line with the NHRA, the Commonwealth will pay for 45% of the efficient growth in activity each year from 2014–15 to 2016–17 (and 50% of the efficient growth in activity from 2017–18) ...

That is important because that is part of the agreement that we as a state had with the former federal government around what happens post-2017–18. What we saw in Joe Hockey’s budget—which I do not think has been passed yet; I do not think he is actually going to get a chance to pass the budget, but we will see in due course—was the federal Treasurer walking away from that agreement. That will have some impacts between now and 2017–18, but the real budget buster will be from 2017 on.

Perhaps the best work being done in public policy in Australia outside government is, I believe, by the Grattan Institute. In Western Australia, most of our think tanks have become lobby groups or interest groups; they do not actually produce thoughtful, analytical work. That is being done in the eastern states, which is a shame. I think the Grattan Institute is doing the best work; whether members agree with it or not, it is certainly doing the best work in the country, in my view. In its report titled “Controlling costly care: a billion-dollar hospital opportunity” of March 2014—released before the budget and before Joe Hockey tore this agreement up—the Grattan Institute worked through the whole national partnership deal and the importance of activity-based funding to effectively try to create an efficient hospital system. The range of costs of hospitals in Western Australia is quite diverse from one end to the other; we have expensive hospitals and ones that are not too bad. Victoria is leading the way because it got onto activity-based funding very early.

Then Hockey walked away from the post-2017 arrangements, and that has the potential to cost tens of billions of dollars for state governments around the country. I do not expect whoever is leader of the Liberal government in Canberra to move on that issue, and I do not expect that, because of the revenue problems that the federal government is having, there will be much movement either way. That means that at some point we are going to have to have this conversation. I know that the Premier always says that he does not believe in forward estimates, only in the budget year.

[Member’s time extended.]

Mr B.S. WYATT: Therefore, a problem emerges. I want to read from a document put out by PricewaterhouseCoopers titled “Australian Federal Budget 2014”, which looks at this issue. It states, on page 3 —

... the other major change is future abandonment of growth funding based upon the volume of activity within hospitals, based upon an agreed efficient price. This change is in the order of tens of billions of dollars over the next ten years.

Whilst this change may have a positive implication for the federal budget, it seems to reduce the “strong financial incentive to ensure that people are treated through less expensive primary care services” identified by the Prime Minister at the time of the previous reform agreement. The Commonwealth and the States previously shared a financial burden for increased volume care, which could potentially be reduced (or not occur), with highly effective and coordinated primary care and aged care services. This budget’s change removes this link for the Commonwealth but not the States and Territories. The change also potentially undermines the significant work done to establish and monitor the National Efficient Price, and raises the question as to whether there is a need for Activity Based Funding at all. Yet Activity Based Funding is driving a focus upon real waste in our health care system, casting a spotlight

Mr Mick Murray; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr David Templeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Ms Rita Saffioti;
Dr Tony Buti; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr John Day; Acting Speaker; Mr Dave Kelly; Mr Bill
Johnston; Dr Kim Hames; Deputy Speaker; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Nathan Morton; Ms Eleni
Evangel; Mr Chris Hatton

on what factors contribute to additional cost, and is a demonstrable step towards a system that better links patient health outcomes to funding. Exactly what the future holds for efficient hospital funding remains unclear.

Subsequent to that, appearing before the Senate Select Committee on Health, the Grattan Institute made a submission in September 2014 stating that the federal government needed to abandon that particular part of its budget. At every level that is a shocking decision in terms of an efficient health system and driving waste out of the health system, and it will create a massive hole post-2017 that this Parliament is going to have to address; it will mean billions of dollars for Western Australia over 10 years.

I raise this issue now because I am begging my Liberal Party friends: when the Premier says not to worry about the forward estimates, they have to recognise that they have a looming problem; we all have a looming problem. The government needs to start thinking about this now.

In my final 10 minutes I would like to make some comments around Aboriginal affairs, and to make three particular points, one being the closure of remote communities announced by the Premier late last year; secondly, some proposals or ideas I have about Aboriginal affairs; and thirdly, constitutional recognition. As I said at the time during debate on that legislation, I am particularly disappointed with the Premier's position on constitutional recognition, but it has now been referred to a committee on which I sit, and I do not intend to make any further comments on that part until the committee reports.

For the first time in seven Premier's Statements, the Premier on Tuesday mentioned remote Aboriginal communities; he had never mentioned them before. He had never expressed particular concern about them until there was a budget issue. There is a sense of irony in that remote Aboriginal communities, many of which are located very close to the wealth being produced for Western Australia and Australia, are now being told, "You must move away because we can no longer afford to service you." The Premier said that at a conference in Perth just before the wet season descended upon the Kimberley and it created angst and fear across the Kimberley. The Premier made that announcement in an arrogant way that was contemptuous of the history of why the communities are there. He singled out two communities. One was the large community of Balgo—"Balgo, It's got to go!" I went to go Balgo about two weeks after the announcement—unlike the Premier—with the member for Kimberley, and there is real fear there. There is a lack of understanding of why Balgo is there and who makes up the Balgo community. Are these people suddenly going to move to Halls Creek? No; history shows that would be chaos.

The Premier said on radio that we have to close down the communities because there is a community out there costing \$85 000 a person. The next day I asked the Premier, "Which community is that?" He said that he would not tell me which community it is, so I put in a question on notice, and I got the answer yesterday. The Premier was referring to the Oombulgurri community. Members, the government closed Oombulgurri in 2011. The Premier has the audacity to come in here and to go on radio and say that these communities must be closed because there is one community, which is already closed, costing \$85 000 a person. What an outrageous slur by the Premier. He will go to any length to justify some of the ridiculous things he says. It is always easy to beat up on remote communities—they are easy targets—and say that at a cost of \$85 000 a person it is terrible. The Premier has already closed that community and, as the member for Kimberley will tell members, that has been a roaring success, because many members of that community are now living in the marshes around Wyndham! That has been managed really well! When Warmun was flooded and the community was destroyed, many people went to Kununurra. The government could not act fast enough to rebuild Warmun to get those people out of Kununurra. It is despicable behaviour by the Premier to use a community that he has already closed and to point to Aboriginal people and say, "See, you have failed. I now have to come in and fix you up." It is a fundamental misunderstanding about those communities. I am talking about the Kimberley in particular because 90 per cent of those remote communities are in the Kimberley; it is very much a Kimberley issue.

Members should search the ABC website and they will find this information. I want to talk about Broome for a minute. Between 2002 and mid-2008 there were no murders in Broome. Since that time, there have been 10 murders. Going through the names of either the person charged with or the victim of those murders, one can see that they are not from Broome. They are people from Bidiyadanga, Derby, the goldfields, Kiwirrkurra and Balgo who were visiting Broome for various reasons. Right now, behind the Anglican church—anyone who has been to Broome knows the Anglican church—there are three families camping. Two families do not drink, but one does, and they all have kids. They are all there because they have family members getting dialysis. We are now talking about moving more people. If the government closes Balgo, more people will end up in Broome. Members may think that Broome is a long way from Balgo, but that is what will happen. Last year the Shire of Broome made the point—I read it in its minutes—that if one were to assume that just 10 per cent of the 2 500

Mr Mick Murray; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr David Templeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Ms Rita Saffioti;
Dr Tony Buti; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr John Day; Acting Speaker; Mr Dave Kelly; Mr Bill
Johnston; Dr Kim Hames; Deputy Speaker; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Nathan Morton; Ms Eleni
Evangel; Mr Chris Hatton

people who live on the Dampier Peninsula where to move to Broome, that would be 250 people. Has anybody actually had a rational thought about what this means? I am not saying that those remote communities are paradises, but to stand in Perth before the wet season and tell Aboriginal communities that they have failed and to use the example of a community that was closed four years ago is an outrageous performance by the Premier.

I will continue to pursue this issue, as I will continue to pursue the heritage proposals, because the heritage proposals government members have made are bad proposals. The government has introduced the bill; it is before the house. I ask government members to read it. Everyone agrees that the act needs to be amended, but the government has caused a fundamental rift between the government and every Aboriginal group in Western Australia. Find me one group that supports the proposed heritage changes. We will have that debate in due course, and I look forward to that.

Late last year, at the University of Western Australia, I said that we now need to correct the architecture that is Aboriginal affairs in Western Australia. The legislation is old; it is from before I was born and before native title was introduced. As Neville Bonner told Richard Court, the land vested under the Aboriginal Lands Trust should be divested and given back within five years. I think we need, and it is not beyond the wit of government, to divest that land back to Aboriginal people within two terms of government—within eight years. Ten per cent of the state is held in a trust on which 10 000 people live. It is time to look at that properly. Think about the stimulating effect that would be created by divesting 10 per cent of the state's land mass, including the stations and the freehold land, back to Aboriginal people. It would be huge. It is time that the Aboriginal Affairs Planning Authority Act not just be reviewed, which was my and the Labor Party's position before the last election, but for it to go. It is time for the Department of Aboriginal Affairs to be replaced. The department has frustrated people for a long time. The department is betwixt and between; Aboriginal people want an advocate but the department is not an advocate for Aboriginal people. I do not say that in a nasty and critical way, but the department is there to represent the position of the government of the day. I intend to take this idea to Aboriginal people for their views. We need to replace the Department of Aboriginal Affairs with two things. We need an advocate for Indigenous affairs modelled on the Commissioner for Children and Young People that reports to Parliament, not the minister, advocates for Aboriginal people and researches key issues. And, of course, government needs within it the machinery of a policy agency. We need to create an agency within the Department of the Premier and Cabinet to drive policy for government and hold other government agencies and departments to account for the services that they should be delivering to Aboriginal people. If we do that, I think we will get a better response. The architecture for Aboriginal affairs in Western Australia is old and decrepit, and it is time that it was updated. The department might then be a position to represent Aboriginal people and we will no longer get ridiculous statements such as, "We told you to go find other funding", on the closure, or defunding, of the Kimberley Interpreting Service. Aboriginal people's aspirations supported the continuation of that service, but the department did not represent it. Frankly, that is because it cannot do that; that is the reality. They are some proposals that I intend to take to Aboriginal people for discussion. I do not intend to do what the Premier does and announce the policy in Perth; he still has not consulted.

The state's deteriorating financial circumstances mean there are many things to deal with because the government has not protected the sustainability of the finances or allowed the flexibility to allow for emerging trends and changes of community aspirations. That is the Liberal government's legacy. Ultimately, whoever is elected in 2017 will have to deal with some significant budgetary and service delivery issues.

MR D.A. TEMPLEMAN (Mandurah) [10.29 am]: I am very, very keen to make a contribution to today's debate on the Premier's Statement. I think, as numerous members have mentioned, the Premier's Statement was a very, very shallow statement here in this place on Tuesday. There are a number of issues that I need to raise —

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms J.M. Freeman): Member for Mandurah, would you like to sit down for a moment. Member for Carine, do not question the Acting Speaker's call; do not question the Acting Speaker. Thank you.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: It is important that I put on record a number of issues that are currently of concern to the people of Mandurah and the Peel region in general. I will start this morning with the issue of health in the Peel. I need to highlight my increasing concern about where we are going with the provision of health services in the Peel, how that relates to the state's overall hierarchical system of health delivery through the clinical health services structure, and of course the processes of health delivery in the state as highlighted under the Reid report, which goes back a number of years now.

One of the things that has always concerned me about the Reid report is where general services in the Peel are delivered and where Peel Health Campus features and factors into that hierarchical structure. I want to highlight

Mr Mick Murray; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr David Templeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Ms Rita Saffioti;
Dr Tony Buti; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr John Day; Acting Speaker; Mr Dave Kelly; Mr Bill
Johnston; Dr Kim Hames; Deputy Speaker; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Nathan Morton; Ms Eleni
Evangel; Mr Chris Hatton

today two examples of constituents or Peel region people. I think their plights highlight the fact that the Peel region still falls between the gaps because of not only its close proximity to Perth, but also the various factors that impact on people's access to the services they need. The first is from a resident of North Yunderup, Mrs Catherine Jackson. She contacted me early this year because, unfortunately, Mrs Jackson was diagnosed with breast cancer in September 2014. After diagnosis, Mrs Jackson travelled to Royal Perth Hospital for treatment and has been undergoing six months of chemotherapy, which will be followed by six weeks of radiotherapy. She wrote —

My chemotherapy can be done here at Peel Health campus, however, my radiotherapy, which is five days a week for six weeks, can only be done at Royal Perth, Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital or in Bunbury. There is nothing in between. I also have to work through all this treatment. I am the sole wage earner and on an education Assistants wage. I have no choice other than to travel by train every day to Perth which is going to be a huge cost and it is possible that I will have to take a lot of time off work.

I, along with many other people who suffer from cancer, are in the same boat in this region. Having to travel so far for treatment that takes only a few minutes is ridiculous. I was hoping with your knowledge and connections you may be able to do something about getting a radiotherapy clinic down here at Peel Health or even at Rockingham?

Mrs Jackson is, like many who are given that unfortunate diagnosis of cancer, currently required to travel to Perth for the radiotherapy treatments. I am not critical of those treatments in Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital—now, of course, they will be delivered at Fiona Stanley—but to simply say to someone who lives in the region of Peel, like Mrs Jackson, “Oh well, just get on the train or just drive up to Perth”, is simple in words, but it is, in reality, a very taxing problem, emotionally and financially, for them and their families. When I asked the Minister for Health to respond, as I did after receiving Mrs Jackson's letter, he talked about the new state-of-the-art Fiona Stanley Hospital and said that it will deliver those services. But when does the point come that we actually ask: why are we not planning for these important services, given the demographics of the region of Peel with its high population of people over 50 years of age—which will continue to grow—given the implications of the congestion that people face when driving to Perth and given the fact that sick people cannot simply jump on the train? When someone is sick, it is not as simple as just jumping on the train. That seems to be the answer we keep getting back from the health minister and even from the Health bureaucracy.

Mrs Jackson and many, many others ask a legitimate question: when do we start to plan for services such as radiotherapy and others in the Peel region? I am very impressed with Dr Margaret Sturdy, who is now the chief executive officer of Peel Health Campus. I must say that since Ramsay Health Care took over there is such a positive view of the hospital, which was not necessarily the case with the previous contracted service provider. In my view, in Peel, and in Mandurah as the major population centre, we need to ask: what services need to be provided in the future to address the local needs of local people? We must not just have this bureaucratic response of, “Just go to Perth. We'll send you to Fiona Stanley or Royal Perth or Sir Charles Gairdner”, as the first option. We need local services in Mandurah at Peel Health Campus; we need to have a plan. My view very strongly is that I do not believe we have a real, coordinated and focused plan now and into the future for the delivery of health services in Peel. When we see that Peel Health Campus has more than 45 000 attendees to the emergency department—that is only one example of the growth demand—we need to ask that question. The community of Mandurah needs to ask the question, and demand from government of whatever persuasion to be absolutely given due consideration of our health needs into the future.

I want to highlight another example; I asked the permission of Mr Michael More, who lives in South Yunderup. Michael More is in fact the father-in-law of the Minister for Seniors and Volunteering; Local Government, and a paid-up member of the Liberal Party, as he said in his letter to Dr Kim Hames earlier this year. Mr More has a very legitimate case. His wife has dementia and he is her full-time carer, and he is trying to care for his wife at home. His wife needed urgent dental attention, but because of her circumstances she cannot simply be transported to the dental care, so she needs the dental care to come to her. I will quote from Mr More's letter in which he highlighted what appears on the health department's own website in terms of dental health. The letter reads —

“Dental Health Services provides a range of Public Health Services ACROSS WESTERN AUSTRALIA” and this includes Domiciliary Care for non-ambulatory persons. In fact it transpires that the service only provides this service within a 50km distance from Perth central advised as from Yanchep in the North to Waikiki in the South ...

With due respect, clearly this situation is quite absurd and at least another unit is required for this service to be available for the large SENIOR populations further South and beyond, but surely to

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Thursday, 19 February 2015]

p421b-457a

Mr Mick Murray; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr David Templeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Ms Rita Saffioti; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr John Day; Acting Speaker; Mr Dave Kelly; Mr Bill Johnston; Dr Kim Hames; Deputy Speaker; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Nathan Morton; Ms Eleni Evangel; Mr Chris Hatton

include the Peel Region, Bunbury, Busselton etc. ONLY GOVERNMENT ACTION can rectify this matter even though it is recognized that funding is always a problem ...

Mr More raises a very important point. There are many, many people in my region who are over 60 years of age, and of course we know that at that age cohort, dementia, or the onset of Alzheimer's, is a real issue. The statistics show that in Western Australia and in Australia generally it will be a massive issue in the future because of our Australian population demographic. Again, when do we start to ask of government—in fact, when do we demand—that services such as domiciliary care be provided to people outside the metropolitan area who need them? The wife of Mr More, thank goodness—I do not know whether it was his political connections—was visited by the unit, which is great. Mr More is a very articulate man and obviously was very, very clear about what he needed. But what about those members of the Peel community who are not as politically astute or able to bang the desk, as he did? What about those people? That is another example of where our health system in the Peel needs to come of age and deliver for its growing needs.

In his response to me, the Minister for Health said that Fiona Stanley Hospital seems to be the answer to all. It is not the answer to all. People such as Catherine Jackson, on low incomes and because of their very sad diagnosis, have to travel to and from Perth five days a week. As Mrs Jackson said, it is only for a short period of treatment but basically it wipes the whole day out. If she wants to continue to try to draw an income for her family, it is extremely difficult. I want that addressed. I want it to be part of the debate in terms of health in the Peel.

Some people will say: what about the patient assisted travel scheme? The problem for PATS in Mandurah is that some people get it; some people do not. PATS is delivered in a patchy form to many people. People in Mandurah are not eligible for a Country Age Pension Fuel Card, even though Mandurah is a regional centre. By law, we are determined to be non-metropolitan. Since the Liberal Party came into power with the National Party, country pensioners in Mandurah are not determined eligible for the Country Age Pension Fuel Card. Even if they had the option to assist in getting a friend, a family member or whoever to help them up to Perth for appointments, it is still very difficult. PATS also needs to be looked at carefully. At the moment it is very patchy in its service delivery to people in the Peel. Remember that these people are older. Every single weekday our buses are packed with sick people travelling to various hospitals in Perth for treatment, whether it be radiotherapy or specialist appointments. They join that growing, congested throng of traffic travelling north from the southern region that is known as the Peel. We have to ask: Is this the best delivery of service? Why can these services not be delivered locally? I am not going to accept the bureaucratic responses that I get from the Minister for Health, nor from the hierarchy in the health department.

I now want to mention the policing model. The Minister for Police announced with great fanfare last year, along with the Commissioner of Police, the new policing model involving local policing teams, frontline services et cetera. I have to report that although I opposed this, I will not stand by and simply not promote how things are done now locally. I have to tell members that I am warning the Minister for Police that a number of people have come to me about this. People have started to ring the phone numbers of the local policing teams published on the WA police service website. They tell me they make the phone call but they do not get anyone on the end of the phone. They leave a message, as they are told to do, but they are not getting a returned call. Tom Murnane from Greenfields visited me in my office last week. He said, "This is what has happened. I wanted to report some suspicious behaviour along Teranca Road in Greenfields." I said, "We'll sit down here and ring the number now." We rang the number from my office. There was no response, so we left a message. I said, "Tom, if you don't get a response by today or later this afternoon, ring it again." He rang the number again, and his mate from down the road rang the number as well. Have they received a response to this date? No, they have not! The Minister for Police might champion this big, new, wonderful local policing thing, but the evidence is starting to build that they ain't answering the phone. The minister better start getting onto Karl, the commissioner, to say, "Listen, mate, feedback is starting." It is all very well to say this is a wonderful new local policing team matter but they ain't answering the phone! I am going to promote the phone numbers to every single constituent in Mandurah. I will tell them, "Use these numbers because the police minister is telling you this will be the answer to crime problems in the suburbs." If we start getting an avalanche—I think it will be an avalanche—of people saying, "But I've done that, David, and they ain't responding", you better watch out, mate, because the plan might fall down on its face.

There was a recent advertisement for submissions to the Peel region blueprint—a very important document. This is the plan for the region. Attached to it is the plan for the future of how royalties for regions will be spent. It ain't looking good, because only last week the Minister for Regional Development, as part of the new southern regions initiative, announced \$20-odd million as part of that \$600 million initiative. We know that the minister

Mr Mick Murray; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr David Templeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Ms Rita Saffioti;
Dr Tony Buti; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr John Day; Acting Speaker; Mr Dave Kelly; Mr Bill
Johnston; Dr Kim Hames; Deputy Speaker; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Nathan Morton; Ms Eleni
Evangel; Mr Chris Hatton

realises that the Peel and the south west were horribly underfunded in the last six years of the royalties for regions program.

[Member's time extended.]

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: I would have expected cities like Mandurah and Bunbury and towns like Waroona, Busselton and Harvey to have featured very prominently in that announcement. Again, no. The Minister for Regional Development has failed to realise that the very regions that require over and above funding from royalties for regions have dipped out once again. It plays into the argument that although one of the key criteria for the royalties for regions program is where the populations in the regions are growing, the minister has forgotten that the biggest growth in population continues to be in the Peel and south west regions.

Mr V.A. Catania interjected.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: What is the member's problem?

Mr V.A. Catania: Are you saying that royalties for regions needs to go to major centres?

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: No. I am saying that one of the criteria for royalties for regions that has not been part of the current National Party thinking is for regions that have the greatest populations. When we look at the spend over the past six years, those regions received the least royalties for regions funding. In the case of the Peel region, it has consistently received the least funding every single year but it is the second highest region population-wise. In fact, by 2031 it is expected to have a population equal to the south west region of Western Australia. That is the problem—population has not been included in it.

Mr V.A. Catania interjected.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: The member can get up and have his say in a minute. Get off the trolley, sunshine, because I'm on a roll here!

In terms of the blueprint, I have put a number of projects in my submission. I want to highlight those. I have mentioned the need for an overall health assessment.

Mr B.J. Grylls interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms J.M. Freeman): Member for Pilbara, you moved back to your seat so that you could interject. On that basis, I probably should call you but I will warn you at this point.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: In my submission to the blueprint I highlighted the need to have a major investment from royalties for regions in our public transport infrastructure. I also highlighted the need for a focus on the Mandurah foreshore redevelopment. That should be funded out of royalties for regions. It is a key, iconic element of Mandurah as a city. It is a project that will not only enhance the CBD but also improve and increase tourism opportunities and the potential of Mandurah as the major population centre in the Peel. The Shire of Murray has requested funding for projects. The Nambeelup industrial park is an important project that is focused on economic development and job creation. Those are some of the projects that need to be highlighted.

I understand that the member for Pilbara in his interjections said, "Get Peel out of the regions." It is an interesting comment from the member for Pilbara to say that he wants Peel out of the regions. If that is what he said, I will tell him what: I will fight tooth and nail to prevent that from happening. Quite frankly, the City of Mandurah, the Shires of Murray, Boddington and Waroona and now, thankfully, because the government's local government process has collapsed, the Shire of Serpentine–Jarrahdale will remain in their entirety in the Peel. If the member for Pilbara is advocating that the shires in the Peel should disappear into the metropolitan area, I am glad he has said that because I am going to tell them. I will tell them that the National Party policy now is to excise the Peel region from the regions of Western Australia and put it into the metropolitan area. I am going to go and tell them that that is what the member for Pilbara said. I will tell him what: he can forget about having his eyes on the Murray–Wellington electorate. I know he has his eyes on it, but he will lose it now if he advocates that sort of thing. There is a very strong sense of regional identity that emits from Mandurah through to the Shires of Murray, Boddington, Waroona and Serpentine–Jarrahdale. I am glad the member for Pilbara said, "Put Peel in the city" in his interjection.

Mr B.J. Grylls interjected.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: That is what he said. I can see the *Mandurah Mail's* front page coming up. Thank you, sunshine! He has given it to me. Thank you, sunshine! He has given me the front page of the *Mandurah Mail* again. He has gone and given it to me in one stupid comment that he threw out of the side of his

Mr Mick Murray; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr David Templeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Ms Rita Saffioti; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr John Day; Acting Speaker; Mr Dave Kelly; Mr Bill Johnston; Dr Kim Hames; Deputy Speaker; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Nathan Morton; Ms Eleni Evangel; Mr Chris Hatton

mouth—when he was sitting in the wrong seat anyway! Now he has given me the front page. I will continue because I want to move on, but I will tell him what: I love it, I love it; I love what he said.

I want to finish with the Minister for Transport. What a horror six months for him! His performance in question time yesterday was one of the worst performances I have ever seen and a demonstration of how poorly across his portfolio he is. He did not even know the full details of the late-night train debacle—another debacle!—that he foisted on us. I reckon he will backtrack 100 miles from it. He just needs to find the right way of doing it. But I want to tell him about the implications for a place like Mandurah.

Mandurah has a lot of young people, and also people who are not so young, who travel to Perth on Friday and Saturday nights to attend events and concerts at Perth Arena and entertainment venues. A lot of young people enjoy travelling to Perth to go to nightclubs and have experiences in Northbridge and the like. One of the things they had up to this moment was a good opportunity to get home on the late-night trains on Friday and Saturday nights. People going to concerts at night in Perth that finish around 11 or half past 11 might stay back and have a drink or go out to a club afterwards. Now, with the Minister for Transport's decision to lop off the late-night trains, that option for a young person from Mandurah—or young women or young fellows—who has gone to Perth to have a good time will be severed by the minister. Why is that? For a start, it is because the minister got his figures wrong. The figures he responded to were wrong, and he was proved wrong yesterday in question time. Also, the decision was totally ill thought out. The fact of the matter, as we know, is that hundreds of people travel on those late-night trains. People also know that the trains are there for them to get home safely if they happen to be in Perth during weekend nights. That is important for people in Mandurah; in fact it is crucial for people in the outer areas of the metropolitan transport system. The minister has therefore made a big boo-boo there—in fact, a number of them—adding to the long list he has made. I hope that he turns around that decision, because I will tell him what: if he does not, he will be very severely chastised by not only the voting public, but also a lot of young people who seek to use that transport option.

I need to highlight to the Minister for Transport the ridiculous decision by him and his department to sever transport services to the people of Madora Bay. The people of Madora Bay fought long and hard to get a bus service to go through to the locality of old Madora Bay, as it is known. Because the developer, Mr Perry, is finishing a section of the new Madora Bay development, which is south of old Madora Bay, the connecting road for the bus service that goes through to that locality is to be closed for six to eight weeks or maybe longer. Overnight the Public Transport Authority put up some signs at some of the bus stops along the Challenger Road access stating that the service would terminate on 18 January and would be closed for six months. That is all the PTA did. It believes that it consulted with the City of Mandurah about an alternative route. The City of Mandurah gave the PTA an alternative route. There is an alternative route through the new development of Madora Bay. The minister believed his department, rather than thinking for himself, and now the people of old Madora Bay remain with no service for up to a minimum of seven weeks, and possibly more than three months or even six months, as the PTA originally said. That is outrageous! I have said that there are two options. One is through the alternative route that was suggested by the developer, Mr Perry, and the City of Mandurah, which the department says is not appropriate; the other is to continue to service the people of Madora Bay by taking the bus back out on Lord Hobart Drive and onto Mandurah Road and back into Madora Bay for the six weeks, seven weeks or three months, or however long Challenger Road needs to be closed. Why can the minister not come up with a simple solution like that, rather than listen to his bureaucrats at the PTA who simply say that it cannot be done? Those people in Madora Bay—the elderly people who rely on that bus service, for example—now have no option. There ain't no option! The minister has given them none. He has taken away their service. It is outrageous and inappropriate. The minister needs to fix it, and I am demanding here today in Parliament that he fix it now.

I want to finish on local government. Yesterday, very briefly, we had a chance to mention local government, and I am now getting emails from people in the local government sector who are outraged at the way they feel they have been attacked by the Minister for Local Government and the Premier for the service that they have given to local councils throughout the state. The Premier needs to fix this, because I will tell him what: his standing in the local government sector now is zero, and his minister's is less than zero. The Premier had better fix it because now I am getting emails from people saying that they have been listening to the stuff that the Premier, his minister and the Treasurer have been saying about them. It is ridiculous! The Premier has got to fix it because these people do not trust him at all. I therefore would like to conclude my contribution today by moving the following amendment to the question before the house.

Amendment to Question

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: I move —

Mr Mick Murray; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr David Templeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Ms Rita Saffioti;
Dr Tony Buti; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr John Day; Acting Speaker; Mr Dave Kelly; Mr Bill
Johnston; Dr Kim Hames; Deputy Speaker; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Nathan Morton; Ms Eleni
Evangel; Mr Chris Hatton

That the following words be added after “noted” —

and that this house express a lack of confidence in the Minister for Transport for his numerous
conflict-of-interest failures and misleading the Parliament and public on late-night trains.

MR M. MCGOWAN (Rockingham — Leader of the Opposition) [10.59 am]: To move a motion of no confidence in a minister is not a matter that is done lightly. However, I believe that the events of the past three months deserve a proper answer from the Minister for Transport to this Parliament about the mistakes and failures that he has made, both in the conduct of his personal financial affairs and in their interaction with his public duties; and also about the failures he has made in his portfolio responsibilities and the misleading of Parliament and the people of Western Australia in his portfolio duties. I will say this about this minister: I would have thought that after three months’ preparation and a week since the outrageous cancellation of train services, he would have come into Parliament yesterday and actually known something about it and been able to answer questions from the opposition.

That is the third failing—that we have a minister who drifts along dreamily in this world, thinking, “All those nice people in the opposition will not ask me a tough question today, will they? Oh, no. That would not possibly happen here in the Parliament, would it?” That is the nature of this minister. He is a nice enough fellow, but he just does not get it.

I want to talk about the minister’s portfolio responsibilities first, because this is serious. This minister has misled the Parliament on the provision of late-night train services. People might say that is unimportant; these are only minor train services. But these train services matter to thousands of people, particularly in the outer suburbs, where I live. They might not matter as much to people who live in the leafy inner suburbs, but to the people in the outer suburbs, they matter greatly, because they are a way of preventing people from being killed on the roads late at night. So, it is an important matter.

Yesterday in the Parliament, we asked this minister about the provision of late-night train services. The minister used as one of his grounds for cancelling these services the fact that they are free. The minister said, “They are free, and that is one of the reasons we got rid of them.”

Mr D.C. Nalder: That is not correct.

Mr M. McGOWAN: No, they are not free. When I pointed out to the minister yesterday that they are not free, the minister did not know. Yesterday in question time at two o’clock, the minister answered that these late-night train services—the 1.00 am service and the 1.15 am service—are free. What compounded that error yesterday is that on 17 February, the day before, the minister again said that these services are free. The minister misled the Parliament. These train services are clearly not free. I have it here in black and white. However, the minister has not come into this place and done what is required, which is to correct the record.

I know that those train services are not free, for two reasons. The first is that it is on the website of the Public Transport Authority. The second is that I caught the train last Saturday night. I bought a ticket. As I went through the turnstile with my ticket at 1.00 am, I said to the security guard, “I don’t need this ticket, do I?”, and she said to me, “No. You need it for the 1.00 am service. It’s the 2.00 am service that is free.” So, I have two pieces of evidence—the minister’s own website, and my own personal experience. I would add that I also have the feedback on Facebook, which has provided me with further confirmation, with all of the people saying the minister does not even know the facts. The minister’s agency apparently does not know the facts either.

I will give the minister a bit of personal advice. If I were the minister, I would have gone out and caught the train. I would not have been so lazy as to not go and examine an issue of extreme public moment that is important to many people and that falls within the minister’s portfolio responsibilities. That is what I would have done if I were the minister. Despite all my responsibilities—not just one portfolio, but Leader of the Opposition—I caught the trains for hours, both to and from the city. But the minister is too lazy to do that. The minister’s first offence was failing to correct the record. The minister’s second offence was misleading the public about the number of people who use these late-night train services. When the minister justified the closure of these services, he told the public of Western Australia that 80 people per train are using the service on the outward leg, and that number was too low to justify the continuation of that service. The reality is that we have found out, due to the diligence of Hon Ken Travers, that the minister is averaging both the outward leg and the return leg. The minister is including the return leg. Naturally, there is not a great likelihood that people will get on a train at 1.00 am in Mandurah to come into the city. Naturally, trains that come into the city at 1.00 am are not going to be very full. But the outgoing trains will have numerous people on them, with late-night workers, people who operate small businesses, and people who have been enjoying the nightlife, all trying to get out of

Mr Mick Murray; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr David Templeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Ms Rita Saffioti;
Dr Tony Buti; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr John Day; Acting Speaker; Mr Dave Kelly; Mr Bill
Johnston; Dr Kim Hames; Deputy Speaker; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Nathan Morton; Ms Eleni
Evangel; Mr Chris Hatton

the city and go home. But when the minister was asked about that directly, he said that that number of 80 passengers per train referred only to the outward leg. The minister misled the public on that, and that was his justification for the decision to close that late-night service. The minister misread the Parliament, and he misread the public —

Dr K.D. Hames: Misled.

Mr M. McGOWAN: Misread as well—he misled, and misread, the public on that issue. The minister committed the cardinal sin. He did not come into this Parliament and correct the record. I do not know whether that is because the minister’s confidence is shot. Maybe that is the reason. The first thing the minister should have done after question time yesterday was get to the bottom of it and stand up and correct the record. When the minister found out that he had misled the public about the number of people catching those late-night trains, he should have corrected the record. But the minister failed to do that, and that is the cardinal sin. Ministers can occasionally make a mistake, but failing to correct the record is not forgivable.

We then turn to the other matters concerning the minister’s conflicts of interest. I agree with the minister; I expect that that period in December was very tough for him. The minister promoted various stories that somehow it was to do with the Labor opposition. But it was nothing to do with us. I was as surprised as anyone when I opened the paper and read the stories. I had no knowledge whatsoever of those stories and where they had come from. If the minister is looking for the culprits who have outed him on these matters, he should look a bit closer to home. It has come from inside the tangled nest of vipers that apparently is now the parliamentary and extra-parliamentary Liberal Party, in which there is all this internecine hatred —

Dr K.D. Hames: That’s the pot calling the kettle black!

Mr M. McGOWAN: Minister, we are a happy bunch! Your mob have done it to themselves!

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr N.W. Morton): Members, I am not an appreciating the interjecting across the chamber, and I am sure Hansard is not either. The Leader of the Opposition has the call.

Mr J. Norberger interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Joondalup, I call you to order for the first time. I have just asked members not to interject across the clamber. The Leader of the Opposition has the call.

Mr P.B. Watson interjected.

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

Mr M. McGOWAN: The minister is out here saying he has been smeared. The minister should look closer to home rather than try to blame people on this side, and I think the minister actually knows that.

These conflict of interest issues were covered in some depth back in December, but this is the first opportunity we have had in the Parliament to hear an explanation from the minister. The Parliament is the place to which the minister is accountable. We cannot ask the minister questions about the conflict-of-interest issues, because they do not come within the minister’s portfolio—or at least not anymore, since the minister’s dismissal from the finance portfolio. But today is the minister’s opportunity to answer to the Parliament in relation to each one of those issues. I would expect, if the minister is a parliamentarian of any note, and if he holds out the aspiration of rising to high office in this Parliament, that he would be able to explain chapter and verse each of those issues. It is a tangled web, I must say. I have always adopted the policy that I will not own shares, because I do not want to get myself into any of those situations, so I do not own shares. But the minister adopted the policy that he would own shares, and in fact after he became a minister he acquired more of them, directly contrary to the advice of the ministerial code of conduct. The minister needs to stand up today and explain himself.

I want to take the house through a couple of things. Yesterday the Premier’s defence to these questions was true to form. He did not defend the minister. The Premier said that it was an error of judgement—that is his defence—and that there was no personal benefit. I beg to differ. The Premier’s defence was true to form. He referred to events of eight years ago that involved people such as John Bowler. Remember him? He was a member of the Liberal–National government. The Premier referred to events from eight years ago and did not address the issue of the moment. His second defence was: where is the evidence? I have exhibit A here, Premier. It is a report by the head of the Premier’s department and is signed by the head of that agency, the Department of the Premier and Cabinet. The head of the public sector is the Premier’s personally hand-picked investigator and hand-picked head of the agency; the Premier appointed him. Even he, despite his obvious closeness to the

Mr Mick Murray; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr David Templeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Ms Rita Saffioti; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr John Day; Acting Speaker; Mr Dave Kelly; Mr Bill Johnston; Dr Kim Hames; Deputy Speaker; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Nathan Morton; Ms Eleni Evangel; Mr Chris Hatton

Premier, wrote a damning indictment of the Minister for Transport that was full of confirmed conflicts of interest in the personal financial matters of the Minister for Transport. They were not actions on behalf of someone else or on behalf of some lobbyist acting on behalf of somebody else; they were the personal financial interests of that minister in which there were conflicts with his public duty. That is the worst offence I have seen in this Parliament.

Mr C.J. Barnett: Rubbish!

Mr M. McGOWAN: It is! It is personal.

Mr C.J. Barnett interjected.

Mr M. McGOWAN: The last time I saw the mixing of someone's —
Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr N.W. Morton): Members, I have already asked you not to interject across the chamber. It is not fair to Hansard, which is trying to keep an accurate record. The Leader of the Opposition has the call. I would like to hear the Leader of the Opposition in silence.

Mr M. McGOWAN: The last time I saw the mixing of a person's own financial interest with their public duties was with Doug Shave, the Premier's good friend—the bloke I saw the Premier have a fight with down here.

Mr C.J. Barnett: What immature nonsense! You're just hopeless.

Mr M. McGOWAN: The Premier and he were chesting one another down here.

Mr C.J. Barnett: Try the truth for a change.

Mr M. McGOWAN: The Premier knows that is true.

Before I quote the report by the head of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, I will tell members that what has happened now is that the Premier has redefined the Ministerial Code of Conduct. What actually constitutes an offence has now been redefined. Despite the Ministerial Code of Conduct from 2008, which was renewed on April 2013, what constitutes an offence warranting dismissal is now redefined. According to the Premier's standard, it has to be a proven financial benefit. In other words, I expect that it means that a minister would have to go to court and be convicted before that minister can be dismissed from cabinet. Section 5 of the Ministerial Code of Conduct is very clear that what the Minister for Transport did infringed the code of conduct in the worst possible ways. The Ministerial Code of Conduct states —

Public duties must be carried out objectively and without consideration of personal or financial gain. Circumstances which could give rise to a serious conflict of interest are not necessarily restricted to those where an immediate advantage will be gained.

There it is. It also states that a member, on becoming a minister, is supposed to divest himself of shares within 60 days. The Minister for Transport did the opposite; he went and acquired them!

What did the head of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet have to say about these matters? Exhibit A is the report. When the Premier is looking for evidence, here it is. Here is the report that sets it out very clearly. I will read it to the Premier. I will refer to the meetings with the Chinese consul general first of all, which I must also add are very embarrassing for this state. What the minister did there was very embarrassing for this state.

Mr C.J. Barnett: Rubbish!

Mr M. McGOWAN: You know it, Premier. You can laugh all you like, Premier, but you know it.

Mr C.J. Barnett: Do you think the Chinese are embarrassed?

Mr M. McGOWAN: The Premier has not been down to the consulate lately and had the issues raised with him.

Mr C.J. Barnett: Have you? They don't even know who you are in China.

Mr M. McGOWAN: The Premier was not there.

I will turn to the report. This is in relation to the meeting with the Chinese consul general —

Mr Mick Murray; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr David Templeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Ms Rita Saffioti;
Dr Tony Buti; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr John Day; Acting Speaker; Mr Dave Kelly; Mr Bill
Johnston; Dr Kim Hames; Deputy Speaker; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Nathan Morton; Ms Eleni
Evangel; Mr Chris Hatton

The Minister has confirmed that the August meeting was originated by the Chinese Consul General who wished to reciprocate the June meeting and elaborate discussions on relations between Western Australia and China. The Minister advised the Consul General's Office was asked for the names of invitees with experience of Western Australia-China relations. ANZ suggested the two Directors General be invited while the Minister included Mr Ashworth.

Mr M. McGOWAN: That is the minister's business partner. It continues —

While hosted by the Consul General it is clear the suggested invitees did not originate from the Consul General's office. Ms Boska coordinated the Government invitee's attendance.

Despite earlier suggestions by the Minister that the meetings were private he has now confirmed the meetings were in his formal capacity as Minister but of an informal nature.

Despite the fact that the earlier part of the sentence states that it was about Western Australia and China relations and it involved two director generals, the minister is now saying that it was of an informal nature. The report goes on —

The Minister failed to identify a key concept underpinning the Ministerial Code of Conduct; that his actions as a Minister should always be, and be seen to be, directed towards the public interest and not any private interest, regardless of the nature of the private interest ...

The Minister also erred in including at the meeting his adviser Ms Boska who was also a shareholder in Metier Asia ... this was a breach of the Ministerial Code of Conduct.

There it is. It goes on. There are numerous other quotations I could add here, but it goes on and on about the relationship between the minister; Mr Ashworth, his business partner; his investment in Metier Asia; and the close relationship between the two Metier companies. The relationship between the minister and Mr Ashworth created further complications and increased risks of perceived and potential conflicts of interests that reinforced the need of the minister to divest himself of this interest. He took along to a meeting with the most senior Chinese official in the western part of this country a business partner with interests in China. What could be the purpose of that?

Mr C.J. Barnett: Tell us.

Mr M. McGOWAN: The minister should stand up and tell us. I am asking the Premier to explain. He has spoken to the minister about it—or is he not talking to him anymore?

Mr C.J. Barnett: If you have further information, tell us.

Mr M. McGOWAN: There it is!

Mr C.J. Barnett: Tell us.

Mr M. McGOWAN: You stand up and tell us.

Mr C.J. Barnett: Tell us.

Mr M. McGOWAN: I think it is highly inappropriate and deserving of dismissal.

Mr C.J. Barnett: You, who used your wife's mobile or whatever you did!

Mr M. McGOWAN: You are a disgrace.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members!

Mr M. McGOWAN: Do you want to bring in family, do you?

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members! The Acting Speaker is on his feet. Thank you.

Mr C.J. Barnett: Your example.

Mr M. McGOWAN: You're a dirt bag!

The ACTING SPEAKER: Premier and Leader of the Opposition—enough! There is just under two minutes left. The Leader of the Opposition has the call. There will be no extension of time for the member. There is now a minute and a half left, roughly.

Mr Mick Murray; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr David Templeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Ms Rita Saffioti; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr John Day; Acting Speaker; Mr Dave Kelly; Mr Bill Johnston; Dr Kim Hames; Deputy Speaker; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Nathan Morton; Ms Eleni Evangel; Mr Chris Hatton

Mr M. McGOWAN: I will not go into the other issue about Amcom—I am sure one of my colleagues will—but this report explains it in some detail and I think it is worth investigating. But I will say that there are no excuses for this. Labor in office, which the Premier will refer to, exercised standards. It took the former Minister for Transport and former Treasurer to rampage around a suburb in a car, bashing up people's cars, before he left. Our government exercised standards; this government does not, otherwise that minister would not be there.

MS R. SAFFIOTI (West Swan) [11.19 am]: I rise to speak to this amendment. What an incredible performance we saw yesterday from the Minister for Transport. He had an obligation to come into this place to explain the conflict of interest matter and why he cancelled the late-night trains and we heard nothing. Frankly, ministers in this government like the office but they do not like the accountability that comes with it. They feel offended and shocked when the opposition asks them to provide the reasons for their decisions. They are shocked to hear that the public believe that they should not conflict commercial with government interests. It is an incredible paradigm. These ministers enjoy the office, but they do not want any of the accountability that comes with it. This minister seemed absolutely flabbergasted and shocked when we asked whether he could justify a key decision to cancel the late-night trains.

Mr P. Abetz: And he did.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Thanks for that interjection.

Can the minister justify his dealings in relation to commercial matters since he has been a minister? I will go through them. Yesterday, the Premier asked us to show him the evidence. The evidence is in the report that the Premier commissioned and that the director general of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet undertook. It shows multiple breaches of the ministerial code. Yesterday, the Premier asked us to show him the evidence. The evidence is there in black and white; members opposite should read it. The report shows a number of breaches of the code, yet we have had no full explanation from the minister. Parliament has been sitting for a week and the minister has made no statement to explain himself, yet he was shocked and flabbergasted when we dared to raise the issue yesterday in this Parliament. It was an incredible performance. Let us go through Mr Conran's report.

On multiple occasions the minister did not act how a minister of this state should. He had a fund, yet he did not declare the interests of that fund. Between March and September, he sat around the cabinet table and the cabinet secretary did not know what interests he held. Members should think about that. He was a minister of the Crown sitting around the cabinet table and the cabinet secretary did not know of those interests. That is a clear breach of section 6 of the Ministerial Code of Conduct. In relation to the company Expedient, which has a shareholding in Fleet Network, again a potential conflict was found because of the ministerial responsibilities of the Minister for Transport. There was a potential conflict. The minister was asked to sell his shares but they were only recently sold—another breach of the code. I will touch on the minister's relationship with Mr Ariti. Mr Conran's report states —

... the relationship with Mr Ariti impacted on other areas of his responsibilities. Mr Ariti is also a senior executive with Amcom, an information technology ... company. This creates an actual conflict of interest with the Minister's responsibilities for government ICT matters ...

That is another actual conflict of interest. Let us go to Metier Asia, where this minister becomes elected —

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr N.W. Morton): Members!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: This is a minister who becomes elected and then undertakes to purchase —

Several members interjected.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: This report shows that the Premier's minister breached the Ministerial Code of Conduct on a number of occasions. Let us go to Metier Asia: basically, the minister bought into that company post when he became a minister. The code tells us that ministers have to divest their shares in companies. We have a minister who was actually buying shares and buying investments. I will now turn to the Chinese consul dinner, again, a clear breach and a clear confusion between the minister's commercial responsibility and his responsibility as a minister of the Crown—a clear breach. The minister failed to identify a key concept underpinning the code. That is what the report said, that he failed to understand a key responsibility of being a minister—a key responsibility. Then the last one: the minister stood yesterday and said, "I told everybody about the Weld Club meeting." He did it on 4 December. That was an absolutely incredible action. The minister met in the Weld Club with a Department of Finance officer and a business colleague to talk about information and communications

Mr Mick Murray; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr David Templeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Ms Rita Saffioti;
Dr Tony Buti; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr John Day; Acting Speaker; Mr Dave Kelly; Mr Bill
Johnston; Dr Kim Hames; Deputy Speaker; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Nathan Morton; Ms Eleni
Evangel; Mr Chris Hatton

technology. Again, that is a clear breach of the code and is something that only came out very late in the piece. The Premier asks: where is the evidence? The evidence is here. Frankly, the fact that Peter Conran was able to prepare such a damning report shows members how bad the situation was. What have we heard over the past week? There has been no explanation. Yesterday we dared to raise the matter that the head of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet prepared a report saying that the minister had breached the ministerial code on a number of occasions, and the minister came in with the most bizarre performance I have ever seen a minister give. It was most bizarre, trying to pretend that somehow the Labor Party is behind this report. It has nothing to do with the Labor Party and everything to do with the Liberal Party. Again and again in this place, if a member is Liberal, they can do anything. That is the standard. Liberal people are protected; Liberal people have feelings. Labor people do not have feelings. Our ministers did not have feelings. People on our side do not have feelings. Well, we do and we want to set the same standard that members opposite put to us onto them. This is a clear breach of the ministerial code.

Let us go back to yesterday and to the late-night train issue. Honestly, this minister could not have started the year in a worse situation. The minister cancelled late-night trains during the height of activity in the city centre. He could not have picked a worse time to announce the cancellation of late-night trains. He went out there with a stupid decision and sent out a representative from the department to justify it—the real minister, Mr Hynes, who seems to be out there all the time justifying these decisions. We then dared to ask the minister how he reached that decision: What were the numbers? What were the statistics? How did the minister reach that decision? As if we were not going to ask how the minister reached a massive public transport decision: “It’s because there are 80—an average of 80; we think there are 80.” We asked him how he got that figure, but he did not know. Ultimately, he is a minister of the Crown. He said to put the question on notice.

Mr P. Abetz interjected.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Honestly, he does not need the member’s help. If he needs the member’s help, he’s really in trouble!

Mr P. Abetz interjected.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Okay; you misled the Parliament, you misled the public. On Tuesday, you said that incoming trains were not included in the figures, and now you are saying they are. Let me go further if you want to say that: I will not say that you did not know; I will say you misled the public. That is more accurate. Thank you for picking me up! It is not that you did not know; you just misled the public—that is much better. You believe you can come in here and laugh at questions that we ask and you do not believe you have the responsibility that comes with the office. You get the office; you get the responsibility. It is as simple as that. People have paid the price decade after decade, government after government, for not understanding that. The fact that you guys are Liberal, so only if you really, really, really meant to defraud the public should there be consequences, then that is okay, does not wash with the public. You believe everyone has the same opinion of yourselves that you do. That is not the case. People think that you might do bad stuff, just like they might think we do bad stuff. They do not think that they are above the law, like you do. Again and again the government will make personal attacks on us; it can do whatever it does, but —

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr N.W. Morton): Members! Member for Butler! Member for West Swan, it is very hard to the Chair to protect you when you direct your comments across the chamber. Can members please desist from interjections. Again, it makes it very difficult for Hansard.

Mr D.C. Nalder: You said that I broke the law.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Minister!

Mr D.C. Nalder: You said that I’m above the law.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I did not; I said that the Liberals think they are above the law.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for West Swan, you have the call. Direct your comments through the Chair, please.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: As I said, the minister can stand and say whatever he wants, but this report was done by Peter Conran, head of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, and it says that there were breaches of the ministerial code, and we want a full explanation from the minister today.

Mr Mick Murray; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr David Templeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Ms Rita Saffioti;
Dr Tony Buti; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr John Day; Acting Speaker; Mr Dave Kelly; Mr Bill
Johnston; Dr Kim Hames; Deputy Speaker; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Nathan Morton; Ms Eleni
Evangel; Mr Chris Hatton

DR A.D. BUTI (Armadale) [11.31 am]: I rise to contribute to this debate. The Premier seeks to defend the Minister for Transport by trying to come up with some delineation between perceived conflict and actual conflict. If that is what he seeks to do, he will be rewriting the ministerial code of conduct and also rewriting the law of trust and trustees. Whether one is a minister or just a member of Parliament, the Premier's defence is inconsistent with what is required under the Members of Parliament (Financial Interests) Act 1992, which we as members of Parliament always have to comply with.

I want to take members through the Members of Parliament (Financial Interests) Act, because it relates to the \$400 000 shares in Metier Asia that the minister and his partner purchased. Under section 11 of that act, which is always in the form that we have to disclose annually, there is reference to interest in or positions within a corporation. Under section 11(1)(a), members must name all interests in any corporations. Under (1)(b) they must also disclose the nature of the interest, as prescribed under section 9 of the Corporations Act, and any securities as defined under section 92 of the Corporations Act. The definition of "interest" is prescribed under section 9 of the Corporations Act, which includes an interest in a management investment scheme.

Pursuant to section 92 of the Corporations Act "securities" means, inter alia, legal or equitable rights; interests in shares; and interests in registered managed investment schemes. In a trust situation, the trustee is the legal owner of trust property; that is the whole idea of having a trustee. Of course, I do not know the Minister for Transport's complete business arrangements, but it would appear from the information provided through various media outlets that the minister was, prima facie at least, required to disclose that \$400 000 in shares that he and his wife purchased, either as a trustee of the shares or as a beneficiary of the shares. Section 7 of the Members of Parliament (Financial Interests) Act talks about income source, which of course would include income from a trust; but even if section 7 disclosure is not required, under section 8 one must disclose that one is a settlor or trustee of a trust in which one has a beneficial interest.

Thus it would appear that the minister has a case to answer as to why, as a member of Parliament, he did not disclose the purchase of \$400 000 in shares, particularly pursuant to section 11 and possibly sections 7 and 8 of the Members of Parliament (Financial Interests) Act 1992. Even if he is saying that he purchased the shares as a trustee, it is difficult to see how he could not come under section 11 of the act. Further, if he is a beneficiary of the shares he purchased as a trustee, section 11 should apply.

The minister stated that he sought the advice of the Clerk of this house; of course, we do not know what information he provided to the Clerk. I think it is a bit unfair to hide behind the defence of the Clerk, because the Clerk is not in a position to go to the public with any of the advice he provides to any of us; that is precisely why we can go to the Clerk, confident that whatever we say to the Clerk will not be disclosed.

The minister might seek to argue that the shares were in a company or super fund and that therefore he did not have a personal obligation to disclose. However, the fact is that he was a trustee and that somewhere in that mix of financial arrangements, he was also a beneficiary—either personally or through a company of which he was a shareholder or major director. Thus it would seem very, very strange that he did not disclose these interests under the Members of Parliament (Financial Interests) Act 1992.

Then, of course, we come to the Ministerial Code of Conduct, where there is an even greater obligation because the minister is making decisions. Although, of course, one can always argue that there are various interpretations of various legal obligations, as a minister surely he had a duty to disclose any interests, even if they were an interest in a company or a super fund, because he was making ministerial decisions. It was not the company or the super fund that was making those decisions; it was him personally as a minister who was making those decisions.

In conclusion, I would just like to add something for all members. Given what has transpired and the defence by the Premier in this matter, it would not be surprising if some members were now confused about their disclosure requirements and obligations. There are questions that need to be answered, and I think we know the answers. If one is a trustee of a discretionary trust, is one obliged to disclose that under clause 3 of the pecuniary interest annual return? If one is a trustee of any form of incorporated trust, does this not also need to be disclosed under clause 6 of the annual return? If one is a trustee disposing of trust property in the form of shares, should this not also be disclosed under clause 10 of the annual return? If one is a trustee of trust property in the form of shares, should this not be disclosed under clauses 3 and 6 of the annual return? If one is a beneficiary of trust property in the form of shares, should this not be disclosed under clause 3 of the annual return? If one is a beneficiary of trust property in the form of shares that are disposed to provide income to the member, this needs to be disclosed under clause 2B of the annual return.

Mr Mick Murray; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr David Templeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Ms Rita Saffioti;
Dr Tony Buti; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr John Day; Acting Speaker; Mr Dave Kelly; Mr Bill
Johnston; Dr Kim Hames; Deputy Speaker; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Nathan Morton; Ms Eleni
Evangel; Mr Chris Hatton

Given those various obligations that we all have, it seems to be unforgivable for this minister to have not disclosed the various shares or equitable trustee interests that he held in his various business arrangements. On top of that, there were his obligations under the Corporations Act and the Ministerial Code of Conduct. It is unbelievable that the Premier, overnight and unilaterally, has decided that as long as there was not an actual conflict of interest—which is debatable in any case—the minister is okay.

Mr R.H. Cook: There was.

Dr A.D. BUTI: Of course there was, but even if he were to say that there had been no actual conflict of interest, there is still a perceived conflict of interest, and that is enough. The Premier has been in this Parliament long enough to know that a perceived conflict of interest is enough to pin a minister; he knows that to be the case. It is disingenuous for the Premier to come before this house or the media and state that because it is only a perceived conflict of interest, there is no need for the minister to resign as he has not breached the Ministerial Code of Conduct. The minister has not fulfilled his obligations as a trustee, his obligations as a member of Parliament and his obligations as a minister, and there are also serious questions under corporations law. Of course, he has breached at least one of those and probably more. It is incredible for the Premier to continue to state, as he did yesterday and the day before, that there is no actual conflict of interest, which of course is not the case. But even if there is only a perceived conflict of interest, the minister has still breached his ministerial obligations. He has breached his obligations as a member of Parliament. If any of us performed in that manner, we would have breached our obligations. Therefore, the minister stands condemned for his failure to disclose his various business interests, and the penalty should be even greater because he was a minister.

MR D.C. NALDER (Alfred Cove — Minister for Transport) [11.40 am]: I rise to talk about what has occurred and to provide some responses. Firstly, I will say that there is nothing new in the information that has come out today. It is old news and it has been discussed at length in the media and in various other places. I have explained fully to the Department of the Premier and Cabinet and to the Premier. I will touch on some of the points —

Mr J.R. Quigley interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr N.W. Morton): Member for Butler!

Mr D.C. NALDER: I will step through some of the allegations and repeat what I have said before. Interestingly, the first allegation, as the member for West Swan just raised, was about expediency and a conflict of interest with the Fleet Network shares. I advised and I put this information in front of the director general of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet three days before I became a minister. I explained the situation we had with that company, and that I was trying to dispose of those investments, but that it was difficult to do within the 60 days. In fact, I kept advising them of progress. As late as September, I received a letter from the director general of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet that I was meeting my obligations as far as he was concerned with the matter regarding Fleet Network. Additional to that, in conversations I also had with the director general, it was never felt that there was ever an actual conflict between Fleet Network and my role as Minister for Finance—no conflict whatsoever. Fleet Network is involved in novated leasing and State Fleet has nothing to do with that whatsoever. Because we were having difficulty trying to offload it, and we were concerned about the perception that may be inferred, my chief of staff came to me and suggested that perhaps we should transfer that to the Treasurer. I immediately said, “That’s a good idea; make it happen.” At that point, members of the opposition were coming out and saying that I should be sacked, yet the issue was fully disclosed and there was not a conflict.

On Monday, the front page of the paper said that I had failed to disclose my investments in Metier Asia. That day I pointed out to the journalist concerned that those investments were sitting inside my superannuation fund and my superannuation fund was disclosed in the parliamentary returns. It is not my responsibility to educate journalists on how to read an Australian Securities and Investments Commission register. If they had read the register, they would see that the register asks whether it is a beneficial interest, which is clearly marked “no”—there is no beneficial interest; it is a superannuation fund.

At that point, the Leader of the Opposition was out in the press and on Twitter saying, “If I were Premier, I would have sacked him by now.” One of the great replies someone made on the Leader of the Opposition’s Twitter account—I was keeping an eye on it—was that there is just one problem with that statement: “Member for Rockingham, you’re not the Premier.” This strikes at the heart of leadership and clearly contrasts the leadership style of the wannabe Premier with the existing Premier. I will explain why. There were allegations of conflict of interest regarding Fleet Network and allegations of failure to disclose that were not correct, and those corrections were provided to media outlets—yet the wannabe Premier said that if he had been Premier, he would

Mr Mick Murray; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr David Templeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Ms Rita Saffioti; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr John Day; Acting Speaker; Mr Dave Kelly; Mr Bill Johnston; Dr Kim Hames; Deputy Speaker; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Nathan Morton; Ms Eleni Evangel; Mr Chris Hatton

have sacked me by now. What message does that send to members sitting behind this wannabe Premier? “If allegations are made that are not true, you will be sacked.” There is a glaring inconsistency: all members know about the \$170 000 financial deal with a particular member—everybody knows about it. It has been found that there was no personal financial gain here —

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members! **Mr P. Papalia** interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Warnbro, I am on my feet, which means you will be silent. I call the member for Warnbro for the first time. The Minister for Transport has the call. As I instructed earlier when opposition members were on their feet, I will listen to the Minister for Transport in silence.

Mr D.C. NALDER: I talk about our existing Premier; he did not have the facts at hand, so what did he do? “I need to get the facts at hand before I make a decision.” That is what one expects from a leader. One does not expect to be executed on the spot when they do not have the facts at hand. The Leader of the Opposition states that he would have sacked me by now, yet he does not deal with people in his own chamber and his own house. The inconsistency stands out there for all to see.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members, you are still talking.

Mr D.C. NALDER: If the Leader of the Opposition wants to sit there and say that he would have sacked me by now if he were Premier, when there was no proof that there was an actual conflict of interest that I had failed to disclose —

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Albany! Member for Warnbro, I call you for the second time. Member for Albany, you are very close to your second call.

Mr D.C. NALDER: The Leader of the Opposition made these comments on the Monday after the news broke. He wanted me sacked on the spot, and he said that is what he would have done so if he were Premier. That is absolutely disgraceful, because he did not have the facts at hand!

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members!

Mr D.C. NALDER: Have I made mistakes? Yes, I have. Yes, I have. I acknowledge those mistakes, but there was no ill intent. As I have said before, the intent was genuine with what I was trying to do. I acknowledge what I have been found guilty of, and I apologise to members of this house for the distraction this has been from the good work the government is doing. I am very sorry about that. But let us be clear: what I did was create an environment in which it could be perceived that I may be doing something wrong. Because that perception was created, I was in breach of the Ministerial Code of Conduct—and I acknowledge that. I admit, as someone with a corporate background, I am used to being judged on the decisions that I actually make rather than the decisions that I might make. I acknowledge that I am learning and that I have made mistakes. I have spoken openly about this with the Premier. There was no ill intent in what I was attempting to do in any of the instances; there were two clear instances. As I said, after the first one was determined to be a breach of the Ministerial Code of Conduct, I went to the director general of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet and explained that on that basis there was another circumstance in which I believed that I was in breach as well. I declared that to him—and that is what I acknowledged yesterday.

There is nothing new in all of this; it has been explained. I did seek advice from the Clerk of the Parliaments. I am not trying to hide behind it. I got confused about which part of which category I was supposed to declare my superannuation in, and the advice that I received was that the last one was a catch-all clause—if you are not sure, put it in there. I made sure that the superannuation fund was declared. The other thing that I was told was that it is not an asset register. I was advised that I needed to ensure that the holding entities were all listed. So, because I had my super fund listed, I then added in Sunheat. There was no intention to mislead. I put in the other holding that my family trust had established. I had no intent to mislead.

Furthermore, I would not want anyone to go through the experience that I have had. I have asked my solicitors to engage in a full review of my disclosures to Parliament and to the director general to ensure that I have done everything correctly, because I am not a lawyer or a legal expert on these positions. I endeavoured to do everything openly, honestly and in good faith. Any argument or attempt to suggest otherwise is offensive. I am doing the best I can with what I have. I will continue to serve the people of my electorate of Alfred Cove in the

Mr Mick Murray; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr David Templeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Ms Rita Saffioti; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr John Day; Acting Speaker; Mr Dave Kelly; Mr Bill Johnston; Dr Kim Hames; Deputy Speaker; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Nathan Morton; Ms Eleni Evangel; Mr Chris Hatton

best manner possible. As a minister of the Crown I will endeavour to serve the people of Western Australia in the best way possible, as I committed to from the outset; there has been no change to that.

There were comments regarding the train. I was asked yesterday what the passenger numbers by train were on a monthly basis. In the past 24 hours I have received substantially more data from the Public Transport Authority; I have been waiting for it for some time. It is quite simple: the numbers are too low. Irrespective of how we look at it, how we cut it up and whether it is summer or winter, the numbers on those services are too low. I said to this chamber that the advice I had was that both services are free. The Leader of the Opposition stated that the 1.15 am service is not. It states on a press release from the Public Transport Authority and in a written note to me from the Public Transport Authority that both services are free. I have taken it on advice from the Public Transport Authority. I have followed it up, and I am unhappy with the situation because the advice from the PTA—it has apologised—about the 1.15 am train service was incorrect. Although the 1.15 am service is a paid service, the PTA does not enforce it and the majority of people are actually riding on there for free. I am unhappy with the explanation and I have asked the PTA to formalise the arrangement to make sure the services are free. They are not collecting the money and they are not enforcing anybody to see if they have paid, and a large percentage of people are not paying. I am not happy with that matter, and I have expressed that to the director general. That is what has occurred. I have not misled Parliament, because I based it on the advice that I had at hand.

With regard to the conflicts, I want to finish by saying that these issues and matters have been dealt with extensively. There is no further information to provide.

MR C.J. BARNETT (Cottesloe — Premier) [11.52 am]: This has been an interesting start to the parliamentary year. Normally an opposition—being in opposition is tough—does work on policy and comes back with new ideas. What we have seen in these three days of our first week of sitting has been base politics from those opposite and attacks on individuals that are personal and nasty.

Mr P. Papalia: On who?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: The opposition was attacking the minister just now. The member for Warnbro has been sending emails and messages around over the weekend, having a go at me.

Mr P. Papalia: What?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: Yes; go and read them.

Several members interjected.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: Go and read them.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members!

Mrs M.H. Roberts: What are you talking about?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: Go and read them.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Midland, I am on my feet. The Premier has the call; I will listen to the Premier in silence.

Mr P.B. Watson interjected.

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

Mr C.J. BARNETT: The member for Cannington attacked Minister Francis yesterday.

Mr W.J. Johnston: It wasn't a personal attack. I talked about what he did when he worked for Tony Abbott.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I am just pointing out that —

Mr W.J. Johnston: He leaked against the Liberal Party and was sacked by Tony Abbott. That is not a personal attack.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I am afraid it is.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members!

Mr C.J. BARNETT: The point I make is that after three or four months off over summer, the Labor Party has not done the real work of opposition. It has not done the work. On the first day, on Tuesday, the Leader of the Opposition did not respond to the Premier's Statement, which is fine. He got up and he launched a political

Mr Mick Murray; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr David Templeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Ms Rita Saffioti;
Dr Tony Buti; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr John Day; Acting Speaker; Mr Dave Kelly; Mr Bill
Johnston; Dr Kim Hames; Deputy Speaker; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Nathan Morton; Ms Eleni
Evangel; Mr Chris Hatton

attack that was sloppy, poorly researched, inconsistent and inaccurate. He talked about the decline in tourism, and then the Deputy Premier got up and quoted the figures that showed the exact opposite. The Leader of the Opposition had not even looked at the numbers. It was sloppy, ordinary and inappropriate.

Several members interjected.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: The opposition may laugh, but I tell members opposite what: go down this path and it is a race to the bottom. If the opposition thinks I am going to stand around and let it personally attack members on this side of the house, it is mistaken! I will name members, I will produce evidence and I will raise it publicly. The opposition can go for that race to the bottom if it wants to; it has consequences. What an inappropriate start to a parliamentary year.

Mr D.J. Kelly: You grub!

Mr C.J. BARNETT: Oh, charming! The member for Bassendean makes my point for me beautifully.

Withdrawal of Remark

Mr J.H.D. DAY: That is clearly unparliamentary; he should withdraw.

Mr P. Papalia interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr N.W. Morton): Member for Warnbro, you are on two calls already. Member for Bassendean, I ask you to withdraw that comment, please.

Mr D.J. KELLY: Yes, I withdraw that.

Debate Resumed

Mr C.J. BARNETT: Mr Speaker —

Mr P. Papalia: You got an email but I didn't —

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Warnbro, I will not warn you —

Mr C.J. BARNETT: The member is a bit touchy.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Premier!

Mr W.J. Johnston interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Cannington, I am on my feet. Member for Warnbro, you are on your last chance. You are already on two calls, so you are pushing it. Next time there will be a third call.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: When untrue slurs are put out against a member of Parliament and put onto social media, members can expect to be accountable.

Mr P. Papalia interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Warnbro, I call you for the third time.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: When members do that, they can expect to be held to account, and that will be the truth. I thought the member for Warnbro was a fairly decent person until the last couple of days; I have changed my mind.

Mr B.S. Wyatt: He won't sleep at night now!

Mr C.J. BARNETT: Is he accountable? I doubt it. I will move on.

It is reasonable for an opposition to raise some of the issues relating to the declarations and potential conflicts of interest of the Minister for Transport. That is a reasonable thing to do; it is proper parliamentary process. But the way it was done was not proper; it reflected a poor standard. It is a little rich for members on this side of the house to be lectured on propriety, honesty and integrity by not only the Labor Party, but also the Leader of the Labor Party. He could not have made a worse choice than the member he has chosen to represent the opposition on accountability. If he wishes to pursue that line, do not cringe when we remind more recent members of this house about some of the Leader of the Opposition's actions. He can choose to go down to the bottom if he wishes to, but we will follow him down, snapping at his heels.

I return to the matter of this amendment. The Minister for Transport has said that he has made errors of judgement; he is a new minister and, indeed, a new member of Parliament. He is a member of Parliament with an extensive and highly successful business background. He is also from a prominent Western Australian family that has family trusts and other arrangements. Goodness me, we have a high-calibre person in the Parliament!

Mr Mick Murray; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr David Templeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Ms Rita Saffioti; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr John Day; Acting Speaker; Mr Dave Kelly; Mr Bill Johnston; Dr Kim Hames; Deputy Speaker; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Nathan Morton; Ms Eleni Evangel; Mr Chris Hatton

I thought that was a pretty good idea. Yes, he has extensive interests, and, yes, maybe there were some shortcomings in disclosure. Was there any intent to profit from that or mislead? Not at all, in my judgement. Most of us who have been around for a while have probably got rid of any financial assets we had or any other interests; here is a new member with a significant commercial background and interests coming in and being promoted early in his career to a senior position. The meetings with the Chinese and some of the people invited along, and to the extent that there was involvement from his office, they were errors of judgement.

Mr P.B. Watson interjected.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: They were errors of judgement, member for Albany. I was not happy about that and I spoke to the minister about that, but —

Mr W.J. Johnston interjected.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I spoke to him as a Premier should to a minister, and we discussed it and I think the minister agreed that there was poor judgement; they were poor calls. Was there any intent to profit from that? No. Was there any intent to gain some privilege for a friend? No. The opposition cannot produce any evidence of improper motive because there was no improper motive, in my judgement. I am satisfied by the explanations given to me by the Minister for Transport.

On the issues of declaration, given the public debate about it and given the need to get to the truth of all matters, I did request appropriately that the head of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, Mr Peter Conran, would do a thorough review of all the declarations and the assets. It was complicated because the minister is a successful businessperson with a successful family who have lots of assets. That took some time and it was a very thorough review of declarations. I do not know that any other member of Parliament in the history of this Parliament —

Mr W.J. Johnston interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Cannington!

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I do not know that any other member of Parliament in the history of this Parliament has been subject to such a high level of scrutiny of financial assets and reporting. I cannot think of anyone who has been through that. The minister has complied. He has had to get accountants, I imagine, and lawyers to make sure he fully complied. He was advised to divest himself of some assets, not because there had actually been a conflict —

Mr W.J. Johnston interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Cannington!

Mr C.J. BARNETT: The minister was advised to divest himself of assets, given the portfolios he held. He was advised to do so not because he had found himself in a conflict situation, but, given his portfolios, it was likely that he would find himself in a situation in which there could be a conflict. Had that occurred, he would have declared that and left the room. That did not happen because an issue did not come up in which he actually had a conflict. But it was clear, particularly in the finance portfolio, that potential conflicts and maybe real conflicts could arise, so he was advised to divest himself of those assets. He has done so, to my knowledge. I think there is perhaps one in which the final conclusion of divesting is yet to happen, but he has acted totally and properly to divest himself of those assets, as he should have done. That is one of the prices of being not only a member of Parliament, but being a minister. Members often have to give up, at quite a substantial cost to the individual, assets and involvements. That is the price we all pay, but it probably is not widely recognised.

In the report, Mr Conran makes the point that there has been a breach of the ministerial code. He makes it quite clear. He made it clear that there was a breach of the code relating to perceived potential conflicts.

Mr W.J. Johnston: And actual.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Cannington!

Mr C.J. BARNETT: One has not occurred. One may have occurred, but one has not occurred.

Mr M. McGowan interjected.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I do not want to hear—I am going to talk about the Leader of the Opposition in a moment.

Ms M.M. Quirk: That's right—play the man!

Mr Mick Murray; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr David Templeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Ms Rita Saffioti;
Dr Tony Buti; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr John Day; Acting Speaker; Mr Dave Kelly; Mr Bill
Johnston; Dr Kim Hames; Deputy Speaker; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Nathan Morton; Ms Eleni
Evangel; Mr Chris Hatton

Mr C.J. BARNETT: “Play the man”, from the intellectual giant of the Parliament!

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members, I am on my feet. Member for Joondalup!

Mr C.J. BARNETT: “Play the man”, from a member of Parliament who led a committee who attacked someone with a mental health condition. That is the reality.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members!

Mr C.J. BARNETT: So, talk about standards —

Mrs M.H. Roberts interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr N.W. Morton): Member for Midland, I call you to order for the first time. I am trying to listen to the Premier in silence, member for Victoria Park. The amount of noise in the chamber is making it extremely difficult for Hansard to get an accurate recording.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: Throughout this debate members opposite continue to reflect to the public of Western Australia what their standards are.

The report by Mr Conran says that there has been a breach of the code relating to a potential or perceived conflict of interest. There was certainly a potential conflict of interest that would have arisen and become maybe an actual conflict. That is why he advised the minister to divest assets. Indeed, as a consequence of all this—blame me, if you like—the finance portfolio was shifted to another minister. In the debate today, the Leader of the Opposition could not help himself. The report by Mr Conran is quite clear: a breach of the ministerial code. The Leader of the Opposition described it as an offence—quite a different connotation.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members!

Mr C.J. BARNETT: The Labor Party also forgets the way in which a ministerial code operates. It is there for good reason. It will probably be amended following these issues; tightened up a little bit. The code is there in black and white.

Ms M.M. Quirk interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Girrawheen, I call you to order for the first time. Member for Cannington, if you wish to make a contribution, you can seek the call when the Premier has finished.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: The code is there. I think it is a good code. It has been modified before and it will probably be modified again to give absolute clarity on obligations of ministers, particularly in terms of disclosure.

If there is a breach of the code, does it follow that that minister is dismissed? No, it does not. That is the call of the Premier of the day, on the basis of the code and advice as to whether there has been a breach. The code does not say that if any of the provisions are breached, that minister should be dismissed. It does not say that at all. That is the call of the Premier of the day. When I make my call on something like that—maybe other Premiers make different calls—I look at the situation and I think of the circumstances, which in this case was a new minister and a fairly new member of Parliament with extensive family and other assets. I look, most importantly, at whether there was any intent to mislead, was there any intent to gain, was there any compromising of his role as a minister? To those questions, the answer is no.

Ms M.M. Quirk interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Girrawheen!

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I believe I have got it right. Understand what the code does: it sets down a set of rules for ministers on disclosure and other matters. It does not instruct a Premier as to how he or she should act. That is a judgement for the person who has that job at that time. I went to the extensive measures of having the head of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet go right through—it took a long time—the assets and all the events. Yes, there were some errors, some poor judgements and some aspects that could have been done better, but did that warrant dismissal? No, it did not; and it does not today. That is the difference, and that is what members opposite fail to understand. The minister has been through something in that area that probably other members have not. I do not see any improper motive —

Mr Mick Murray; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr David Templeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Ms Rita Saffioti; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr John Day; Acting Speaker; Mr Dave Kelly; Mr Bill Johnston; Dr Kim Hames; Deputy Speaker; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Nathan Morton; Ms Eleni Evangel; Mr Chris Hatton

Ms M.M. Quirk interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Girrawheen, I call you to order for the second time. Like the member for Cannington, if you wish to make a contribution, seek the call when the Premier has finished.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: Understand the process. Criticise me, if you like, for my judgement call—members can do that. I believe it is the right call; I believe it is the fair and proper thing to have done. I am tempted to say a bit more, but perhaps I will not. The audacity of Labor members to come in here and talk about ethics and morality and other things—the absolute audacity! I am going to say a couple of things—why not? Remember back some time ago—I have been around long enough, not in Parliament, to remember it—the disgrace of the Brian Burke-led government. It was not that long ago, the absolute disgrace of a government that was corrupt —

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Willagee, I call you to order for the first time. Minister for Environment, I call you to order for the first time. Member for Warnbro, you are on three calls.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: There are enough people around this town that do remember those days —

Mr F.M. Logan: This is desperate.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I do not think so; you did not come out too well. It was a long time ago. It was before I came into Parliament but I remember it very well.

Remember the Gallop-Carpenter government. I think both those Premiers were very reasonable people, but there was some naivety there. That government was compromised by the same people—lobbyists Burke and Grill. It was compromised. The former Labor government even put legislation through backwards to accommodate a client of Brian Burke's. It did that; it is well documented. Legislation that should have come to this house and then to the upper house went the other way. Ministers were meeting and providing confidential information on a regular basis to lobbyists.

Mr J.R. Quigley interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr N.W. Morton): Member for Butler, I call you to order for the first time.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I do not think that Premiers Gallop and Carpenter had any improper motives but they were let down by their ministers. The Labor Party, through Labor lobbyists, compromised that government. Alan Carpenter probably took the blame, but it did not start when Alan Carpenter became Premier. It went back well before that time. It may have come out more publicly but it did not start the day Alan Carpenter became Premier. That government was compromised. Five ministers were sacked from cabinet. I do not necessarily agree with all the decisions made. Four of them were sacked because of inquiries through the Corruption and Crime Commission. There were investigations one after another, not into public servants but into ministers. The now Leader of the Opposition, if anyone wants to read it, was right in there amongst it, dealing with Brian Burke, trying to collect dirt off Crichton-Browne. There is article after article about his grubby conduct in that government. I wish members opposite well, but do not come in here and lecture a government that behaves with integrity and honesty. I will circulate the articles to all their electorates. Read the articles about the improper conduct of members opposite. Do not come in here and try to lecture us. Do not try to do it, because if the Labor Party wants a race to the bottom, as I said, this government will follow it down.

Several members interjected.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: Members opposite do not understand cabinet because hardly any of them have ever been in a cabinet. They do not understand what the code actually means and what it implies to a serving Premier. They do not even understand that. This week has been grubby. The opposition has been personal, and it may well continue, but I tell members opposite: the people of Western Australia will reject that. If the member for Warnbro continues to send stuff like he did on social media, the people of Western Australia will see it for what it is.

MR W.J. JOHNSTON (Cannington) [12.13 pm]: As Mr Acting Speaker (Mr N.W. Morton) suggested, I have sought the call.

On 17 May 2007, we all remember the Premier's famous football speech. It is interesting that he went through and named some people—some of whom had done nothing wrong; some had done some things wrong. The Premier escapes from the chamber because he does not like to be held to account. There is only one person in this chamber who the Premier talked about. Of all those people that he talked about, there is only one person left in this chamber, and that is the member for North West Central. The Premier has no standards. If he reckons his

Mr Mick Murray; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr David Templeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Ms Rita Saffioti; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr John Day; Acting Speaker; Mr Dave Kelly; Mr Bill Johnston; Dr Kim Hames; Deputy Speaker; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Nathan Morton; Ms Eleni Evangel; Mr Chris Hatton

speech on 17 May 2007 was setting his standards, what is the member for North West Central doing sitting there providing him the numbers to form government? Tell us that, Premier. But he is too weak; he has run out of the chamber because he knows that somebody was going to hold him to account! He does not get the idea of accountability.

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, members!

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Butler and member for Forrestfield, when I am standing I would like to have silence. Thank you.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: The Premier promoted this man to parliamentary secretary. He has made him a member of his own government. That is his standard! No wonder the Premier sneaked out of the chamber. His work is to be held to account by this chamber, but when we are here to hold him to account, he runs away! This is a man who is never here for matters of public interest —

Point of Order

Dr K.D. HAMES: Deputy Speaker —

Mr J.R. Quigley interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Member for Butler, I call you for the second time.

Dr K.D. HAMES: On two occasions now the member, in his speech, has referred to the Premier as “escaping” from the chamber and trying to get away from accusations —

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, members! I would like to hear the point of order.

Dr K.D. HAMES: The standing order is about improper motive. He is reflecting on the motives behind the Premier leaving the chamber, which I can tell members opposite has absolutely nothing to do with his reason for leaving—which I know.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you. I will take that into account. It is not a point of order at this stage, but I think we need to watch what is being said.

Debate Resumed

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: The Premier does not get this: ministers get paid a quarter of a million dollars to be held to account. It is not a personal attack on Mr Nalder; it is asking the Minister for Transport to explain himself. The fact that he is too scared to explain himself, we now know what the problem is. I want to make it clear: I now feel very regretful about the sacking of the member for Eyre as a minister. He was sacked because he was not up to the job. All the Labor people agreed with that. Now the Minister for Transport is not up to the job and he is not prepared to comply with the Ministerial Code of Conduct. Why is it that the Premier sacks the member for Eyre —

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, members! The member for Cannington has the floor. I need to hear him and so does Hansard.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: Why is it that the Premier sacked the member for Eyre but does not sack the incompetent Minister for Transport? It is not fair on the member for Eyre that he goes to the back bench, but not this one! This one is doing nothing. It is not a personal attack on Mr Nalder. This is about his incapacity to do his job. He tells us that he did not know why the night train was cancelled. He said he did not have a plan, he did not have any of the details and he did not have any of the statistics, but he was still prepared to make the decision. The Labor Party said it would hold him to account for that.

Let me go through a few things: 80 passengers per train, five train lines, two nights a week, 52 weeks a year—41 600 passengers. If it was six trains, it would be 49 920 passengers. He could do it because he has halved the average—100 000 people are actually using the night trains. That is what he is not telling us. In fact it is probably double that because that is for only one train. There are probably 200 000 people using the trains, and he is going to close them. Make it clear: the Minister for Transport did not know that when he made the decision. He did not know the number of passengers using the train but he was still prepared to do it. That is not a personal attack on this man.

Mr Mick Murray; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr David Templeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Ms Rita Saffioti;
Dr Tony Buti; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr John Day; Acting Speaker; Mr Dave Kelly; Mr Bill
Johnston; Dr Kim Hames; Deputy Speaker; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Nathan Morton; Ms Eleni
Evangel; Mr Chris Hatton

Several members interjected.

Point of Order

Mr P.B. WATSON: I would like to hear what the member is saying. Members on this side have been called to order on a continuous basis, yet government members are interjecting all the time but nothing is happening.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Albany. I take your point. Member for Cannington, please continue. The chamber will listen in silence.

Debate Resumed

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: Let me make it clear: telling the Minister for Transport that when he makes a decision to cancel the late-night trains, without knowledge of any of the details about passenger numbers, and the fact that he comes into the Parliament for three days in a row and cannot tell us what happened, is not a personal attack. It is about the Minister for Transport's competence to continue to receive a ministerial salary. I quote from Mr Conran's report —

The Minister failed to identify a key concept underpinning the Ministerial Code of Conduct; that his actions as a Minister should always be, and be seen to be, directed towards the public interest and not any private interest, regardless of the nature of the private interest.

That is a damning finding.

I wish we had a minister with the same integrity as members from this side of the chamber. I will quote a former minister from this side of the chamber. On 13 October 2005, *Hansard* recorded Mr Bob Kucera —

... my personal integrity will not allow me to do anything other than admit that I was at fault ... I believe the only option available to me was to ask the Premier to accept my resignation as a minister of the Crown in Western Australia.

That is the difference between this side and that side. When a minister from this side works out that they have made a mistake, they fall on their sword. When a minister from this side of the chamber realises they have made a mistake, they resign. When a minister from this side of the chamber realises something has gone wrong, they are held responsible. That is what this Minister for Transport fails to understand. All that happened to him was he got his workload reduced. As all my constituents say, "I wish I got disciplined like that." That is all that happened to him. What a joke! What a deep embarrassment for the people of this state! No wonder this Premier is the most unpopular Premier in the history of Western Australia. No wonder this Premier is the equal most unpopular Premier in the history of any state in Newpoll. No wonder he got booed on Sunday at *The Giants*. That is the problem here; this is a man who has no standards.

Several members interjected.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: He has no standards. That is the difference. We accept our responsibilities to this chamber. We understand that if we get things wrong, we take responsibility for it. But again and again on the other side of the chamber there is no responsibility. Who can forget Allia Venue Management? Who can forget the underground power project in the Pilbara?

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, members! Order, member for Murray-Wellington!

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: Who can forget the feed-in tariff debacle? Who can forget Muja AB? All these failures of governments and not one minister has been held responsible. The problem in this state is the Premier. This is a man who has gone to the bottom. He cannot trip over the Ministerial Code of Conduct anymore. The Premier comes into Parliament and says that it is going to be tightened. No, it is not! It is going to be made irrelevant, and it is irrelevant no matter what its words are because the Premier will not enforce it. This minister breached the code of conduct. He said that in the chamber in his own defence. He said that he made a mistake. He said that he had no intent to mislead, but that is not the point. He did mislead. He said that there was no conflict of interest. Yes, that is the finding of the report by the hand-picked director general. Mr Conran found that he had a conflict of interest. It was not a potential or a maybe; it was a conflict of interest, and that is what it says in the report. The Premier says, "Give us the evidence." Has the Premier not read Mr Conran's report? Is that the problem? Is the problem that the Premier has not read the report? There can be no other conclusion. We cannot trip over the standards of this government, as they are so low. The Premier has the audaciousness to talk about his speech in 2007. Only one person is left out of that list in this chamber and he is a parliamentary secretary in this government. What a disgrace! This is a man who has no standards. He criticises me for holding the member for

Mr Mick Murray; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr David Templeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Ms Rita Saffioti;
Dr Tony Buti; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr John Day; Acting Speaker; Mr Dave Kelly; Mr Bill
Johnston; Dr Kim Hames; Deputy Speaker; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Nathan Morton; Ms Eleni
Evangel; Mr Chris Hatton

Jandakot to account. He calls it a personal attack when I read a section of a book. I will read it again for everybody. It states —

But it was people closer to home who were Abbott's pressing problems. First Oldfield. Then, in late September, Labor asked a question in the Senate about left-wing female government staffers flying from Canberra to Sydney for a meeting. It emerged that Joe Francis, one of Abbott's right-wing staffers, had provided the information to the opposition in the hope of damaging a left-wing Liberal politician. Abbott was appalled to learn that Francis had been hawking the information around in the parliamentary coffee shop, and sacked him.

That is not a personal attack. I am just making it clear what that minister did. That is not a personal attack; that is explaining to people what he has done. I do not understand it because the Premier puts out media releases telling people what he has done. He cuts a ribbon and puts out a media release. He gives a speech in Parliament and puts out a media release telling people what he did. All I am doing is pointing out what the member for Jandakot did, and I do not understand why that is a personal attack. It is not a personal attack. I have not personally attacked the Minister for Transport; I am saying that he is not up to the job. That is not personal; that is factual. That is the problem: there is no accountability. That is the fundamental problem in government in Western Australia. That is why we end up with all these problems. This is a Premier who has a long history like this.

I am reminded of a quote from Dr John Langoulant, who at the time of the 2005 election was the executive director of the Chamber of Commerce and Industry of Western Australia. He was talking about the canal proposal of the now Premier, and said —

This proposal continues the Coalition's range of promises that appear to ignore the state's capacity to fund them.

Now in government with \$30 billion of debt and a \$1.3 billion deficit, guess what? Dr Langoulant, you were right. The people of Western Australia are now suffering because of this Premier's incapacity to plan and his incapacity to do the job that he has been elected to do. We have a \$2 billion stadium and not a single minister can tell us how passengers are going to get to the stadium—not one person. I have asked questions for three years and I still cannot get an answer. Hon Ken Travers in the upper house asked a question and was told, "We're working on it." The government has already spent the \$2 billion and is working on it! This is a shambles of a government, and every Western Australian will suffer for probably a decade while we have to fix the mess that this government has created. That is the problem here. If the Premier does not get the idea of ministerial accountability, he can continue to come back into this place and we can enjoy his little sojourns in here where he attacks the member for Warnbro because he did a tweet! It is called a tweet, Premier. It is actually a public document. Go to twitter.com and search for "@papsMLA".

Mr B.J. Grylls: This is your policy work!

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: That is your policy work! The Premier could not even manage that. The Premier could not even manage Google. That is the problem we have.

Mr P. Papalia interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Warnbro, you are on three calls.

Ms R. Saffioti: How about him? Who is he?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for West Swan, do not argue with me.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: I say to the man who would be king—the member for Pilbara—that I have been up to Karratha and I have talked to people about the Pilbara underground power project. He was there on the same day, and he ran away on that day too.

Mr B.J. Grylls: You lied to them!

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Pilbara, I call you for the first time.

Withdrawal of Remark

Mr P.B. WATSON: Madam Deputy Speaker, the member for Pilbara said that the member lied and he will have to withdraw.

Mr B.J. GRYLLS: Sit down and I will withdraw. I withdraw.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Pilbara.

Mr Mick Murray; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr David Templeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Ms Rita Saffioti;
Dr Tony Buti; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr John Day; Acting Speaker; Mr Dave Kelly; Mr Bill
Johnston; Dr Kim Hames; Deputy Speaker; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Nathan Morton; Ms Eleni
Evangel; Mr Chris Hatton

Mr B.J. Grylls interjected.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: I did tell the truth.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The member for North West Central said, “It’s true”, so that implied that the member for Cannington lied, and I ask him to withdraw.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am sorry, I did not hear the member for North West Central.

Debate Resumed

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: Thank you very much.

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for West Swan!

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: The fundamental problem here is that this is a government that has run out of steam and that people are now sick of.

Ms R. Saffioti interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for West Swan, I call you for the first time.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: That is the problem for members of the Liberal Party; they know it. The backbenchers know it in their hearts but they cannot bring themselves to do the only thing they know that will get them out of the way; that is, to have a new Premier. There is going to be a new Premier very soon. The question is whether the people of Western Australia are going to do it or the Liberal Party backbench.

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: I expect that it will not be the Liberal Party backbench. I can tell members that. I expect it to be the people of this state. This is a government that has run out of steam and this week’s performance by the government is a demonstration of that. The defence of the Minister for Transport completely ignored the facts of the case. The Premier’s decision to attack individuals on this side with innuendo but no actual allegation, not a single actual allegation —

Mr C.J. Barnett: Did you hear my speech?

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: I was here the whole time. The Premier never made an allegation about anybody. I will accept this interjection. Tell us, Premier, what is it that you are alleging?

Mr C.J. Barnett interjected.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: I am sorry, what is the Premier saying?

Mr C.J. Barnett: I detailed in my speech what you have done over these three days.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: The Premier alleged that there were skeletons on this side of the chamber. Tell us what those skeletons are, Premier. I will accept his interjection.

Mr C.J. Barnett: I am not interjecting.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: Weak and not up to the job! This is a man who has been there too long and he knows it. This is a government with no future. It does not matter how long this government lasts until the election; this is a government that is going nowhere and doing nothing. The Premier’s Statement —

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, members! Thank you, member for Cannington.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: The Premier’s Statement in 2015 details only announcements that have been made previously. The Premier talked about Perth Stadium. Yes, the stadium is under construction. I have had media releases for the last five years about the stadium. The Premier talked about Fiona Stanley Hospital. That was funded and planned by the Labor Party. It is open. What is new? There is nothing new in this government.

Mr J. Norberger interjected.

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

Mr Mick Murray; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr David Templeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Ms Rita Saffioti; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr John Day; Acting Speaker; Mr Dave Kelly; Mr Bill Johnston; Dr Kim Hames; Deputy Speaker; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Nathan Morton; Ms Eleni Evangel; Mr Chris Hatton

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: I was interested recently—these are my concluding remarks—to read an editorial in *The Economist*. That editorial pointed out that Vladimir Putin and the Venezuelan regime have something in common. When oil and gas revenues were high and those governments were rich, they spent like drunken sailors. However, now that commodity prices have collapsed, both those countries have deep economic problems. I would make the observation that that is exactly what has happened in Western Australia. Western Australians had an opportunity to build for the future with this government, when we had the boom in iron ore prices and these massive projects came on. However, this government has spent the money. This government has a \$1.3 billion deficit.

Point of Order

Mr N.W. MORTON: Madam Deputy Speaker, I am not sure what Russia has to do with the amendment before the house.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is no point of order.

Consideration Resumed

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: This government has a \$1.3 billion deficit, and it is \$30 billion in debt. It will take a decade to undo the damage that has been done by this government. This government has run out of ideas. It has no accountability. Ministers do not get the idea that in order to receive their ministerial pay, they have to do the ministerial work. That is a surprise to ministers. They turn up every day, and they have work to do; and then when they are asked about it, they say, “I do not know.” Every time the Minister for Transport goes to a press conference with journalists, he cannot answer questions. It is time for accountability. We are not scared of the Premier’s threats, because we know they are empty. We know also that this is a government with no standards, and that the problem is the Premier. But, today, we are calling for the house to express its lack of confidence in the Minister for Transport, because we do not have confidence in the Minister for Transport.

MR B.S. WYATT (Victoria Park) [12.32 pm]: I want to make a couple of comments about the defence that was raised by the Minister for Transport on two issues—his conflict of interest, and the number of passengers on late-night trains. In respect of the conflict of interest, as far as I understand it, the minister’s defence was, “The Leader of the Opposition called for my resignation before the really bad stuff came out; therefore the Leader of the Opposition is not fit to be a leader.” That is what I understand the minister’s defence to be. The minister said on the Monday that the Leader of the Opposition had come out and said he should be sacked before all the facts—before the really bad stuff—became known during subsequent days. I want to remind the Minister for Transport, because he has a problem with the details of his portfolio, that all he needed to do was look at *The West Australian* to see what was going on back then.

Mr D.C. Nalder: Yes, a really good source of truth!

Mr B.S. WYATT: Yes. Remember? They are the ones who were coming after the minister, apparently. On the Monday, the first I heard about it was the probe —

Mr D.C. Nalder: The what?

Mr B.S. WYATT: I mean the investigation—into the minister by the Premier on Saturday, 29 November. There was no comment from the opposition at all. It was simply, “The Premier is investigating the minister.” On the Monday, the day the minister said, “The Leader of the Opposition got it wrong, because he said I should be sacked before the really bad stuff came out”, the only thing that was in any newspaper and the only media commentary from the opposition was this, and I will quote from *The West Australian* —

Opposition Leader Mark McGowan said yesterday that Mr Nalder should explain his business interests to the public.

This is followed by the following quote attributed to the Leader of the Opposition —

“Mr Barnett and the Liberal Party in Western Australia have a blind spot when it comes to standards and conflict of interest, and this is a classic example,” he said. “Are they going to protect their favoured son, or are they going to stand up for the public interest in WA?”

That was it. That was the one comment from the opposition. Remember? This is before the really bad stuff came out. Then, on the Tuesday, it got really interesting. That is the day the minister was asked to resign. The minister was asked to reflect on what he had been doing. The Leader of the Opposition then said, on Tuesday, 2 December —

Mr Mick Murray; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr David Templeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Ms Rita Saffioti;
Dr Tony Buti; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr John Day; Acting Speaker; Mr Dave Kelly; Mr Bill
Johnston; Dr Kim Hames; Deputy Speaker; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Nathan Morton; Ms Eleni
Evangel; Mr Chris Hatton

Opposition Leader Mark McGowan, who had been calling for an independent inquiry into Mr Nalder's
entwined business and ministerial activities, —

Not a bad suggestion in light of the Conran report —

stepped up his attack to demand the minister's resignation.

Why did the Leader of the Opposition step up the attack and demand the minister's resignation? It was because it
had emerged that the minister had met with the Chinese Consul General. That was described at the time by the
minister as —

... a “private dinner” and “not a formal meeting”.

“There was nothing discussed about the State,” he said.

“It was a private dinner with the consul-general.”

But *The West Australian* then got the photograph, and we found that this private dinner that had nothing to with
the state of Western Australia had the Department of State Development director general, Steve Wood, the
Department of Agriculture and Food director general, Rob Delane, and Mr Nalder's policy adviser, in
attendance. So, the minister was caught out. But the minister then changed his story—when he had been caught
out having the view that he can use directors general for his own private dinner and that he was not discussing
with the Chinese Consul General anything to do with the state. There is a fundamental problem. That is why
the Leader of the Opposition called for the minister's resignation. If the minister had any standards and good
grace, he would have resigned. The minister cannot even get his defence right months later. As far as I can tell,
the only way the minister's defence makes sense is if he is saying that the opposition called for his resignation
before the really bad stuff came out. That is the minister's defence.

Mr M. McGowan: And I didn't!

Mr B.S. WYATT: That would have been incredible foresight by the Leader of the Opposition! In fact, in caucus
next week I want to complain that he did not do that! That is the minister's defence.

We now get to the trains. The minister got up today and still he cannot tell us about the passenger numbers.
Incredibly, the minister's average includes the empty trains going back into the city! The minister made this
announcement during the Perth International Arts Festival, when the city was abuzz with people. That was just
clumsy politics. Everyone on the backbench must know that. So, minister, get across the brief. The minister
needs a better defence than that, because the defence that the minister has raised today is quite appalling.

Division

Amendment put and a division taken, the Deputy Speaker (Ms W.M. Duncan) casting her vote with the noes,
with the following result —

Extract from Hansard
[ASSEMBLY — Thursday, 19 February 2015]
p421b-457a

Mr Mick Murray; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr David Templeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Ms Rita Saffioti;
Dr Tony Buti; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr John Day; Acting Speaker; Mr Dave Kelly; Mr Bill
Johnston; Dr Kim Hames; Deputy Speaker; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Nathan Morton; Ms Eleni
Evangel; Mr Chris Hatton

Ayes (20)

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

Noes (36)

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

Pair

Ms S.F. McGurk

Mr J.M. Francis

Amendment thus negated.

Consideration Resumed

MS E. EVANGEL (Perth) [12.43 pm]: I rise to respond to the Premier's Statement, but first congratulate the Premier for his outstanding commitment to enhancing the lives and livelihoods of all Western Australians. From the far reaches of our state's north, south and east, to the heart and soul of our business district, culture and the arts, retail, events and entertainment precincts, being our capital city, Western Australia is an outstanding place to live, work and raise a family. We are the envy of not only the nation, but also the world. There are people from all corners of the globe who would give anything to be an Australian citizen and a resident of this great state. The term of this Liberal-National government has seen unprecedented investment in the state's infrastructure, across health, education, sports and recreation, the arts, and, of course, our major projects. Much has been said in this place about our government's unprecedented investment in the health system, and rightly so. WA's \$2 billion Fiona Stanley Hospital is a world-class facility. Fiona Stanley Hospital is a state-of-the-art facility for all Western Australians, with more than 780 beds, including the new 140-bed state rehabilitation service, 16 operating theatres, two maternity wards plus another dedicated to looking after children, large specialist units for intensive care, mental health and coronary care, a new state burns service and the biggest emergency department in WA. I applaud our Minister for Health, Hon Kim Hames, for his outstanding commitment to the provision of excellent health services for all Western Australians.

What an historic year for education and Western Australian schools. I would like to acknowledge the Minister for Education, Hon Peter Collier, for his complete devotion to delivering outstanding outcomes in Western Australian education. From the new student-centred funding model to the introduction of the 16 child and parent centres in schools where they are most needed, education minister Peter Collier has revolutionised education in this state. For the first time in this state's history, all secondary schools across Western Australian public education start in year 7. About 18 000 year 7 students joined public secondary schools this year. In order to welcome the additional students, this state government has invested a massive \$229.6 million into capital works programs across the state. Twenty-nine secondary schools from Margaret River to Broome received new buildings and works, whilst 19 schools have had minor works to accommodate the year 7s. This state government is investing \$1.16 billion over the next four years to build new schools and improve and extend the existing schools. Seven hundred and seventy graduate teachers have jobs and we have funded an extra 550 teaching positions. An additional \$10 million was provided to help schools to transition into the new student-centred funding model. Student numbers are growing rapidly, with 445 500 students expected to attend public and private schools this year, a figure that is up 3.9 per cent on last year. Under the new student-centred funding model public schools are receiving a record amount of funding, which reflects the allocation in the state budget of \$4.58 billion for 2014-15 and \$4.86 billion in 2015-16. That emphasis is further demonstrated by the government's \$48.7 million investment in the 16 child and parent centres in public schools to improve the health and learning of our young children.

Mr Mick Murray; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr David Templeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Ms Rita Saffioti;
Dr Tony Buti; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr John Day; Acting Speaker; Mr Dave Kelly; Mr Bill
Johnston; Dr Kim Hames; Deputy Speaker; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Nathan Morton; Ms Eleni
Evangel; Mr Chris Hatton

Closer to home, I would like to commend my Perth electorate schools and congratulate them on a smooth and successful start to the year. I have been informed by all Perth school communities that they are up and running and all is well. At a North Perth Primary Parents and Citizens Association meeting I attended a couple of days ago I was assured that the school year has commenced smoothly and informed that that school is in a very healthy place. I would like to take this opportunity to thank Mr Phil Sarich, the North Perth Primary School 2014 P&C retiring president, for his incredible contribution to the school community and to congratulate Ms Andrea King, the incoming president of the P&C.

Just a couple of weeks ago I was at the opening of the new Mount Lawley Senior High School music and year 7 centre with the Minister for Education, Hon Peter Collier, and the Speaker, Hon Michael Sutherland. What an outstanding facility for one of this state's exceptional secondary schools. I commend the outstanding work of the principal, Mr Milton Butcher, and his strong team of staff and supporters.

Yesterday was a historic day for Mount Hawthorn Primary School. I was privileged to attend the official opening by Hon Peter Collier, Minister for Education, of the \$1.25 million undercover area that has undergone additional outdoor area upgrades. This \$1.25 million investment was a state government election promise. It is an outstanding, much-needed addition to what is already an exceptional school. My sincere congratulations and thanks to the amazing Mount Hawthorn team led by the principal, Mr Dale Mackesey, board chair, Mr Michael Jenkin, and P&C president, Mr Tim Swart, who all pulled together to make this happen, with the support of the parent body and community.

I would like to shift my focus to the arts and culture, a strong focus for this government and our Minister for Culture and the Arts, Hon John Day. The arts and culture industry is a long-held passion of mine and an industry deserving of government and private sector commitment, and I am so pleased we have a minister who gets how important culture and the arts is as an economic driver for our state and city. Our capital city has been abuzz with artistic delights over the summer. Northbridge, in particular, has been incredible to say the least. Before I proceed to outline some of the major cultural events, I would like to acknowledge the state government's and the City of Perth's commitment to the improvement of our premier entertainment precinct, being Northbridge. In addition, I find it appropriate to acknowledge the good work of the Northbridge Business Improvement Group, or the Big N as it is widely known, the chair being Mr Michael Keiller. Traditionally, Northbridge has been an ethnic and cultural mix of opportunities for families to enjoy. Northbridge has really come the full circle. I would like to acknowledge *The West Australian's* Kate Emery and Lincoln Baker for their excellent summary on what is now seen as the new Northbridge. Their article appeared in the 2 February edition of *The West Australian*. I would like to share with members some of the quotes that perfectly sum up the sentiments and what certainly has been my experience with Northbridge, which dates back a lifetime —

Families, twenty-somethings out for a big night and couples, some ... with silver in their hair, shared and crowded the streets ...

...

Nearby the Northbridge Piazza has been filled with families since before the sun went down for a screening of *How to Train Your Dragon 2* on the big screen.

This perfectly summarises the feelings and the sentiment of Northbridge. Just a couple of weeks ago, I attended the new Northbridge Brewing Company with my husband and sister, and her husband and two little children. They were just delighted with the big screen and all the delights that Northbridge had to offer for families. It really has become a place where a person can safely take their family to enjoy a wonderful afternoon or evening. For those members who might be worried about their safety in Northbridge, they need not worry. Again I will quote from the same article —

... Police figures that show in the six years from 2009 to 2014 the number of assaults in Northbridge fell 50 per cent. In Perth the fall was 18 per cent.

WA Police, under the leadership and stewardship of the Minister for Police, has worked hard to bring down these figures and create a safe place for people to enjoy Northbridge.

I will move on to the events that I mentioned. I do not know if you, Madam Deputy Speaker, had a chance to head down to the Fringe World Festival, but I hope that you did because it really was a fantastic festival. It was quite incredible, to say the least. Fringe World has been a highlight on the state's annual culture and arts events calendar since it began in 2011. More than 500 events were planned for this year's festival, up from 450 events in 2014. The state government provided approximately \$1.3 million to this year's festival through Lotterywest,

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Thursday, 19 February 2015]

p421b-457a

Mr Mick Murray; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr David Templeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Ms Rita Saffioti; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr John Day; Acting Speaker; Mr Dave Kelly; Mr Bill Johnston; Dr Kim Hames; Deputy Speaker; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Nathan Morton; Ms Eleni Evangel; Mr Chris Hatton

the Department of Culture and the Arts, the Metropolitan Redevelopment Authority and the Department of the Premier and Cabinet. This was money very well spent as the figures for the 2014 festival show that it attracted more than 317 000 audience members and had an economic impact to the state of about \$45.5 million. I am sure that this year's festival will exceed these amazing results. I would like to commend the Fringe World Festival's Chief Executive Officer, Mr Marcus Canning, and the Director, Ms Amber Hasler, for their outstanding effort once again.

With the conclusion of the Fringe World Festival we will see the commencement of the Perth International Arts Festival ensuring another three weeks of outstanding artistic experiences. From 13 February to 7 March more than 800 shows will be presented. Lotterywest, the festival's principal partner, has contributed \$7.3 million to PIAF, which is also supported by the Department of Culture and the Arts and Tourism Western Australia. The state government has made a total contribution of \$8.65 million to the festival, which is an outstanding contribution to such an important sector in our economy. I must highlight PIAF's spectacular opening events, *The Giants*. The city centre was completely transformed by French company Royal De Luxe as *The Giants* moved through the city enacting a story inspired by the Anzac centenary. The \$2 million state government investment through Lotterywest, Tourism WA and the Department of Culture and the Arts was topped up by private investment. This enabled us to secure what really and truly has been a once-in-a-lifetime experience. I would like to thank our Premier, Hon Colin Barnett, for having such tremendous foresight to invest in this unique opportunity and for providing an opportunity for Western Australians that will be memorable for a lifetime. I acknowledge the genius of PIAF's Artistic Director, Jonathan Holloway, who has continued to raise the bar throughout his tenure as PIAF's creative artistic director. I recall his first opening event some three years ago when the city was raining feathers, so much so that we were blanketed by them as though it had been snowing for days. To watch adults and children alike squealing with excitement and running around and catching the feathers is a priceless memory I still have. I remember thinking, "How on earth is he going to top this one?" Well, he did. The city saw 1.4 million people flood its streets to share the incredible journey of *The Giants*.

I would like to continue on this government's commitment to culture and the arts. What better way to prove our commitment to this sector than through the construction of the new Museum. Early works are expected to start in late 2016, and the expected opening date is 2020. This government is embarking on one of the most significant museum redevelopments in the world at this time, with the state government committing more than \$428 million in capital funds to develop our new Museum within the Perth Cultural Centre. This will allow the Museum to present blockbuster exhibitions from around the world and will be a place where visitors can share, explore and connect with the past, present and future. The new Museum will be developed with a philosophy of people first, ensuring that the people of Western Australia are at the centre of its development and content. It is expected that many employment opportunities will be created during the construction phase and beyond for local business and service providers.

There are also other projects underway in our city, providing hundreds of jobs, and I am sure we are all very familiar with them; they are certainly worthy of mention today. One such project is the Perth City Link. Extending from the Perth train station to the new Perth Arena, the Perth City Link project will reconnect the city centre with Northbridge for the first time in more than 100 years. On completion, Perth will enjoy improved connectivity throughout the city, access to public transport, increased residential, retail and commercial opportunities, and public open spaces. The Kings Square development will provide high-quality office space and amenities that support the state government's vision for the precinct as a premier transit hub and recreational space. The first four towers are due for completion in mid-2015 and will deliver more than 60 098 square metres of A-grade commercial space and 2 800 square metres of retail space.

I turn now to Elizabeth Quay, the much-talked-about foreshore project, which has been heavily supported by my community. The government has invested \$440 million in it, and the project will attract \$2.2 billion in private investment. Elizabeth Quay is expected to create more than 1 600 jobs during construction and will become a future workplace for more than 10 000 people. When completed, Elizabeth Quay will attract more than four million visitors each year and will be a place where people can gather by the river to work, live and celebrate occasions big and small. After careful reconstruction work, the original 1928 Florence Hummerston kiosk will be reopened as a family friendly cafe, offering food and refreshments, with plans also underway to add a children's playground and public art. Public open spaces are expected to be open later this year, with the pedestrian and cyclists' bridge to be constructed by Western Australian contractors. I would like to acknowledge the generous \$10 million contribution by BHP Billiton to the construction of a water park within the Elizabeth Quay site. I am sure it will bring immeasurable joy to many Western Australian children—and perhaps some adults too! I note that our Minister for Planning, Hon John Day, mentioned in this place yesterday that the

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Thursday, 19 February 2015]

p421b-457a

Mr Mick Murray; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr David Templeman; Mr Mark McGowan; Ms Rita Saffioti; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr John Day; Acting Speaker; Mr Dave Kelly; Mr Bill Johnston; Dr Kim Hames; Deputy Speaker; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Nathan Morton; Ms Eleni Evangel; Mr Chris Hatton

Metropolitan Redevelopment Authority is in negotiations with quality food and beverage outlets for this project, and I look forward to these announcements being made very soon.

In conclusion, I would like to wish everyone a happy, safe and prosperous new year of the goat. There are many events planned over the next couple of weeks, but I would like to particularly acknowledge the Vietnamese community and Dr Anh Nguyen and wish them all the very best for the annual Tet Vietnamese Festival in Wanneroo. I would also like to acknowledge the Chung Wah Association and Mr Sammy Yap, its president, and wish them the very best for their annual Perth Chinese New Year Fair.

MR C.D. HATTON (Balcatta) [12.59 pm]: I rise for this short period to reflect on the Premier's Statement. For me and my Liberal colleagues, this is a very exciting time. It is exciting to be part of a Liberal–National government that has and will continue to transform Western Australia, both metropolitan and regional. In the six years of government since 2008 and leading into a seventh year, we have seen the types of investment, building and future planning that this state needs. From schools, hospitals and road infrastructure to 3 500 royalties for regions projects, WA is still a place where people want to live. It is going to become an even greater place to live and a greater tourist destination as major infrastructure projects are completed over the next few years.

Debate interrupted, pursuant to standing orders.

[Continued on page 166.]

Sitting suspended from 1.00 to 2.00 pm