

WESTERN AUSTRALIAN HEALTH PROMOTION FOUNDATION BILL 2015

Second Reading

Resumed from an earlier stage of the sitting.

MR W.J. JOHNSTON (Cannington) [2.46 pm]: Oh my god, I wish we had an opportunity to move a motion to suspend standing orders to allow the Treasurer to continue his remarks. We were being entertained by that!

The SPEAKER: Member for Cannington, you are really exciting this place; now calm down, please.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: That answer is the sort of thing that excites us on this side of the house—a government that has run out of ideas and gets the Treasurer to yell across the chamber about things that have not existed, ever. I remember when the Treasurer gave me a written answer about the hundreds and hundreds of people who were working down on the Riverside, East Perth project. I drove past it this morning. There was not a single person—nobody! The whole thing is blank. There was not even a guy with a wheelbarrow. What was he saying—that 1 500 people were working there? There was not a single person on the site.

Mr P.B. Watson interjected.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: They must have been working underground, down with the water. The performance of this government is appalling! The Western Australian Health Promotion Foundation Bill 2015 is another example of that appalling behaviour.

Point of Order

Dr K.D. HAMES: We are on the Healthway bill.

The SPEAKER: Number one: anybody who wants to have a private meeting, go outside. Number two: let us get back on track, member for Cannington.

Debate Resumed

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: This is about the performance of this government. The reason we cannot support this legislation is it is just another reflection of this government's incompetence. The dishonesty of the Liberal Party in this state knows no bounds. What is it holding up as a model for us? Tourism WA is a protected species, as we know, because it has been doing exactly what Healthway was doing in giving tickets to staff.

I remember during the last Parliament the thirteenth report, dated August 2012, of the Economics and Industry Standing Committee inquiry into the Kimberley Ultramarathon and the appalling management of it. I asked the chair of Tourism WA at the time, Ms Kate Lamont, whether she had a problem with none of the board papers that went to the board at the time the board made that decision being accurate. She said, no, she had no problem. This is what I asked —

Given the fact that it was inaccurate—not now; it was inaccurate then—does this not disturb you?

Point of Order

Dr K.D. HAMES: The member for Cannington is talking about Tourism WA; the bill is about Healthway. He is not talking about the matter.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Further to the point of order, clearly there is a link to Healthway funding, and the member for Cannington is getting to that.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: I have heard the point of order; I do not want a cross-discussion on the point of order. Member for Cannington, carry on.

Debate Resumed

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: As I say, what the government is doing is taking this organisation away from being an independent organisation that is not subject to ministerial control and making it like Tourism WA, which is subject to ministerial control. The point I am making is that we have a history of this with this government. What happened with the Kimberley Ultramarathon when we had ministerial control of the organisation that was providing the funding? I am not talking about the member for Churchlands, but what was the response by the chair of that board when asked whether it disturbed her that none of the papers provided by the executive of Tourism WA to the board when it was making a decision were accurate? Her response was —

The information that the board was given on the day we believed to be true.

But the point, of course, is that it was not true, and that is the process that this government wants. It wants to have ministerial control. It just wants Healthway to be another part of the public service.

Mr Bill Johnston; Dr Kim Hames; Speaker; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr David Templeman; Ms Janine Freeman;
Mr Paul Papalia; Dr Tony Buti

Mr C.J. Barnett: It's public money.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: That is exactly right, Premier: that is what the government wants. It wants to control the money. It does not want decisions about health promotion being made by professional people who know what they are doing; the government wants those decisions to be made by amateurs—the ministers. They want to be able to hand out the cheques. That is what this is about. The decision of the government to gut the independence of Healthway has nothing to do with health promotion or the best interests of Western Australia. It has got to do with the government's paranoia about independent decision-making processes. My colleague the member for West Swan points out that the TV series *Utopia* is about to recommence. It is always entertaining to watch *Utopia* because we can find out the planning processes of the Western Australian Liberal government. There is a great line in episode 8, when the guy from the minister's office comes to see Rob Sitch's character. Rob Sitch asks him, "Is there a cost-benefit analysis?", and the ministerial guy replies, "It's too late for that!"

Mr P. Papalia: That's the Liberal government.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: That is the Liberal government and that is what we are doing again today. It is too late to worry about whether it is going to be a good outcome. The decision has been made. They are away. They are off. They want the money. We cannot stand between them and the bucket of money. That is what this is about. They want to be able to go along to a community group and say, "Your junior football club is only being funded because I'm the Premier, and here's the cheque." The government does not want Healthway to be funded on the basis of a good outcome for health interests. That is what this bill is about. If it was not, why would the government allow ministers and members of Parliament to hand out the cheques? Why would it do that?

I note that the Premier was in my electorate a couple of days ago handing out money from Lotterywest to Richmond Wellbeing, formerly the Richmond Fellowship WA. That was Lotterywest money. That is money extracted from gamblers in Western Australia. There is a higher propensity among people in the eastern suburbs than in the western suburbs to buy lotteries products, yet the Premier came out and made a big hero of himself, got on TV, and handed over Lotterywest cheques. It was not taxpayers' money—it was not a decision of government but a decision of Lotterywest—yet he handed over the cheque. A couple of weeks before that he was out handing over \$4 million to the City of Gosnells for Mills Park in my electorate. Again, that was Lotterywest money. It was not the government's decision and it was lotteries' money.

Mr C.J. Barnett: They invited you to be in the photo.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: I crashed it. I was told. I told the Premier. The Premier invited me along that time, and I made a joke. I said that I had just come from having coffee with some friends of mine and they told me that I had better crash the picture. So when the Premier said, "Come on, Bill, let's go around and get in the photo, I was very happy to do it." But my point is: what the hell was the Premier doing there? It had nothing to do with him. That was \$4 million of Lotterywest money.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms L.L. Baker): Member for Girrawheen and the Deputy Premier, someone is on his feet giving a speech at the moment. Would you please not talk to each other across the chamber.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: What did a Lotterywest cheque have to do with the Premier? Why was the Premier involved? It was not a decision of the government. It was a decision of Lotterywest to fund Richmond Wellbeing and to fund the City of Gosnells. The Premier had no right to hand over that cheque—none at all. Then we had the Premier handing out a cheque in Vasse during the election campaign. It was an outrage! He was asked why none of the local members were invited to that cheque grant. He said, "Oh, well, it's politics." That was the answer given in the upper house—it is politics. For crying out loud, that is what we are doing here! The government knows it. The government wants to politicise the handing out of funding for health promotions. That is what it is doing. It is a deliberate strategy.

Mrs G.J. Godfrey: Yep!

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: As the member for Belmont says, "Yep". The government is politicising the handing out of health promotions. What an outrage! What is the logic to that? It is so the Premier can get his photo on TV. He is sick of not having his picture on TV. I want him to have his photo on TV; I just do not want to see him handing out cheques for Healthways. Every time the Premier appears on TV, the Labor vote goes up. Has he not noticed that?

Mr N.W. Morton: You ran the 2008 election for the Labor Party. You can't be too popular.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Forrestfield, I will call you, please.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: The member for Forrestfield is quite right. We won the seat of Forrestfield in 2008. Is that not interesting! Back in 2008 there was a good member for Forrestfield. That is the contrast between this

Mr Bill Johnston; Dr Kim Hames; Speaker; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr David Templeman; Ms Janine Freeman;
Mr Paul Papalia; Dr Tony Buti

Parliament and the previous Parliament. In the previous Parliament, the member for Forrestfield was competent, he was interested in his electorate and he advocated occasionally for the interests of his community. He would not have supported this bill. Rather than the empty nonsense from down the back there, at least —

Mr N.W. Morton interjected.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: Well, mate, as I say, in 2008 we won the seat of Forrestfield. That is what happened.

Mr N.W. Morton: I think it was a 4.3 per cent swing against the Labor Party in that seat.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: Excellent, mate! Nobody knows what is going to happen.

Mr N.W. Morton interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: That is enough of the interjecting, unless the member for Cannington is accepting it formally. I would like to get through this debate without that level of interjection.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: This behaviour of the government is disgraceful. It wants to politicise Healthways in the same way it has politicised Lotterywest. It wants to be able to direct Healthways to do things that are not about the health of people in this state, in the same way that it has directed Lotterywest money to be used for purposes that it should not be used for. That is what this bill is about. The Labor Party is very happy to defend the independence of Healthways, as it did back in the 1990s. The Liberal Party tried back then and it is trying again now. As I say, Philip Morris Ltd gave the Liberal Party \$45 000 on 19 July 2013. That is the sort of party that we are dealing with in this legislation. We have seen the way this has happened: a Minister for Health who was absent when he should have been active; a Minister for Health who did nothing about managing his responsibilities for the supervision of the policies of Healthways. He did nothing. He allowed that scandal to develop in the way that it did.

Dr K.D. Hames: You can't even get the name right. It's Healthway, not "Healthways".

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: Oh, my God! This is the minister who has gone fishing rather than run the health department! This is the minister who has completely destroyed the government's achievements in building Fiona Stanley Hospital by not being able to run the world's most expensive hospital. He built the best hospital in the world; he just cannot run the best hospital in the world, and this is the man who is going to retire. According to the Premier, he has got until February because the Premier said that a year out from the election ministers retiring are expected to leave the front bench. The question for all of us now is: who will be Deputy Premier when the member for Dawesville retires next year? As the Premier says, the ministers who are not going around need to leave the front bench.

MR D.A. TEMPLEMAN (Mandurah) [3.00 pm]: I am very pleased to make a contribution to debate on the Western Australian Health Promotion Foundation Bill 2015 before us today. I wish to make a few comments and observations on the operation of Healthway over a number of years. The opposition has raised the concern about what we believe to be an attempt to politicise the function of Healthway into the future. I have read the minister's second reading speech very closely and I also had a look at the bill. I think one of the things we need to do is remind ourselves of the unique nature of Healthway over a number of years. I read in the second reading speech the basis of Healthway's formation some years ago with reference to a move to address the smoking issue in the community. I believe the framework for Healthway was established on very sound principles. I am not the lead speaker on this bill, but the key sound principle for me—the point the opposition has made in numerous speeches on this bill so far—is the need to ensure Healthway can continue to operate under appropriate guidelines without inappropriate ministerial influence.

I will give the example of a flagship project that has been supported by Healthway now for a number of years. Unfortunately, many members of this place would not know anything about it, yet it is one of the most innovative health promotion events held annually in Western Australia focusing particularly on young people in Western Australia. The event was actually born in Mandurah a number of years ago. It has as one of its co-patrons Professor Fiona Wood, a renowned burns specialist, professor and surgeon. Ernie Dingo has been associated with the event for many years. I have actually been a junior patron of it for at least 10 years. It is called the Youth on Health Festival. It is in fact an event in which the Healthway board saw value a number of years ago when an approach was made for Healthway funding. Back then, a woman called Anne Leaver, who was a health nurse in Mandurah Senior High School, as it was known then, came up with the concept of using the arts to promote effective and important health-related issues for young people. Her dream was to create an event for young people with young people operating it and involving young people. In its history, the Youth on Health Festival has seen literally thousands of Western Australian young people engage in the event annually. As it has grown over the years, it has expanded into most regions of Western Australia, so much so that now a range of heats in the areas of dance, drama and solo performance take place in regional centres throughout WA, including Broome, Albany and Mandurah, and in Perth city as numerous metropolitan schools are involved. Last

Mr Bill Johnston; Dr Kim Hames; Speaker; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr David Templeman; Ms Janine Freeman;
Mr Paul Papalia; Dr Tony Buti

year there was even involvement from young people in remote communities of Western Australia and it has even expanded into the Northern Territory. It is a home-grown festival event for young people, operated by young people and involving performances by young people. I have attended nearly every final—grand final as they call it—in Mandurah for the last 10 or so years. In fact, from memory, I am the only member of Parliament who has ever attended. Despite ministers of the day of both political persuasions having been invited, I am the only member of Parliament who has attended.

A member interjected.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: No. That is despite ministers for health, ministers for youth and ministers for education having been invited. This is one of the best festival events for young people.

There we are: I am pleased to hear, through gesticulation, that Madam Acting Speaker (Ms L.L. Baker) has attended but not in her capacity as a member of this place.

The beauty of this festival is that it has reached across metropolitan and regional WA. It has engaged Indigenous students from the Kimberley and other regions of WA, and of course Indigenous students who live and attend schools in the metropolitan areas. Because the festival is driven by young people, it has been able to create a very special brand. The beauty of this event, which has been very strongly supported by Healthway WA, is that a team of volunteers are trained up to help run the heats and then to run the whole operation. Western Australia's Young Citizen of the Year for 2015, Rhys Williams, is CEO of Make Place in Mandurah, formerly known as Community Solutions. That organisation oversees the administration of Youth on Health. One of the critical aspects that has really pleased me about the Healthway model is the presence of a representative of Healthway at every event. Sometimes a board member and sometimes the CEO and/or senior staff have attended every event, particularly the grand finals, and seen for themselves why investment by Healthway in a festival such as this is so very beneficial to young people.

Mr P. Papalia: The press didn't mention that in their stories, did they?

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: No, they did not. It would be great if the Minister for Health came this year, because he has been invited a number of times. The minister would be welcomed.

Dr K.D. Hames interjected.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: It is at the end of October and it is a Saturday night. The minister would be very welcome. I can honestly tell the Minister for Health that he and any other members of this place will be absolutely blown away by what they will see, and not only the performances. There are two choices: the minister can go either Friday or Saturday night. I will send the minister the information, because we would love to see him—honestly. Schools from his area are involved, and have been for many, many years.

It is not just about the performances that we see on the night; it is what has gone on in the lead-up to it. The kids work hard with their teachers, and the volunteers support them. Last year, we had a team from Broome come down to Mandurah. To see young kids who are a long way from home come down and perform is remarkable. We had a video presentation from a community—I cannot remember the Aboriginal community—from the Northern Territory. They were not there in person on the night, but we showed a video presentation of some work that was done with regard to youth on health in that remote community; it was a very, very small remote Aboriginal community. It was only a five or six-minute presentation, but the crowd erupted because it was as though they were there. It was about young people exploring issues affecting health in their communities, and it was about them expressing that through one of the most effective mediums that I believe there is—the arts.

The sad thing is that when the proverbial hit the fan with regard to Healthway—when the Premier intervened with regard to *Carmen*—and then that sort of led to the allegations made —

Ms J.M. Freeman: It was overhyped, the *Carmen* stuff.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: Yes. Then we saw board members dragged into it; there was a whole range of things. Things like the effectiveness of programs and events like this were totally disregarded by the media and by the Premier, and, I am afraid, even by the minister of the day because —

Dr K.D. Hames: I do not think so; I made many positive comments —

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: I am not going to have a go at the minister today. I reckon if the minister had been along to see some of these events, he would have realised how important Healthway's support of events that do not get as much attention as others was, and the value of the money delivered to that project.

One of the beauties of the Youth on Health Festival is that we now have a number of young leaders in the Mandurah–Peel area who have been part of Youth on Health for a number of years. They are 14, 15, 16, 17 and 18-year-olds who have been part of the team that gets this thing underway and supports it when they have the

Mr Bill Johnston; Dr Kim Hames; Speaker; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr David Templeman; Ms Janine Freeman;
Mr Paul Papalia; Dr Tony Buti

grand final, particularly in Mandurah. They are now, having been exposed to working together—I call them “the blue army” because they wear these blue volunteer shirts when the show is on—young people who are doing something fantastic and positive in their community. They are doing for it other young people who are coming into the community because they are presenting what they rehearse over a long period.

Schools come from everywhere to take part. Schools come from the great southern district, the south west, the Peel, the midwest and Kimberley and Pilbara areas. There are heats in Port Hedland, and some schools as far away as Kununurra have been involved. It is one of most genuine across-Australia events that occurs every year, but, unfortunately, very few people know about it and they need to know about it.

Thankfully, the Healthway board, over a long period, recognised the value of this particular event. It concerns me when the Minister for Health, in his capacity as the promoter of the Western Australian Health Promotion Foundation Bill 2015, is not necessarily across some of the key events that take place. I am concerned that the minister is to be given the powers explained in the second reading speech, which include the powers of the minister to scrutinise and direct the foundation. I worry about that; I am concerned about that. His intention to effectively fetter some of the outstanding programs and projects that the foundation has embarked upon is a concern. The minister of the day, through what I think this legislation will do, will be able to decide on his or her whim that they want the focus on a pet project or issue.

I refer to the “Coca-Cola-gate” comments made by the member for Gosnells, to which I listened very closely. I was very impressed with the member for Gosnells’ passion for and understanding of the importance of Healthway when he articulated that “Coca-Cola-gate” concerns. The minister needs to respond to those in his second reading response because they are genuine concerns. I think the problem is—I think the member for Cannington highlighted this—that the minister can say it will be like the Lotteries Commission Act, and that in reality a future health minister will not be able to do X, Y and Z. But the reality is that this government has a track record of doing just that—of using powers such as those in the Lotteries Commission focus to do just that. To use throwaway lines as used by the Premier and articulated by the member for Cannington such as “That’s just politics”, is not good enough. The great thing about Healthway is that it is at arm’s length from the government and minister. The great thing about Healthway is the capacity of experts—good people—to say, under the guidelines outlined in the establishment of Healthway and using their expertise, “This is what we’re funding and why we’re funding it, and this is the thrust of what we think is important.”

[Member’s time extended.]

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: I think the fundamental problem the opposition has with the bill is that we do not trust the government anymore. It is becoming very clear now that the Western Australian people do not trust the government anymore, and they particularly do not trust the guy who sits next to the member for Dawesville.

Ms S.F. McGurk: They don’t trust the member for Dawesville either.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: They do not.

Dr K.D. Hames interjected.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: That is why we do not believe the government should be giving the minister the powers it is seeking to through this bill.

That is why. We do not trust the government, and, unfortunately, it has a track record and history of it now. There was demonstrated at the Vasse by-election and the real politicisation of the Lotteries Commission. I can just imagine the howls of anger had the Labor Party done that during a by-election. The Liberal Party would have been outraged and calling for heads.

Several members interjected.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: It would have been doing that.

I am a great supporter of the institution of the Lotteries Commission—not only a financial supporter—in that we are the only state or territory in Australia that owns such a commission; they are not like that in the eastern states. When we go to the eastern states, we know that some of the funds invested will go into the family who has the historical ownership of the Tatts Lotto-type set-up in the east. Ours is very specific and it is very important for Western Australians to know that when they invest money in the Lotteries Commission, the money that does not go to payouts or administration goes back into the community. There is a record of quality projects that that money has gone to. However, when that is politicised during a by-election campaign, the government gets a track record, and that is why we do not trust what the minister is proposing to do with this legislation. He is trying to deal with some administrative issues. No-one doubts that there were some issues that needed to be sorted out, but now the minister has come in and said that to sort out those issues, he will give more power to

Mr Bill Johnston; Dr Kim Hames; Speaker; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr David Templeman; Ms Janine Freeman;
Mr Paul Papalia; Dr Tony Buti

himself as Minister for Health. That will also allow a future minister and/or Premier to politicise a very good organisation, and that is the sad thing. If the government did not have a track record, and if the opposition and the people of Western Australia trusted it, there would not be a problem, but we know that people do not trust the government. That is why the opposition has indicated very clearly that it will not support this bill, on the principle that the government is now trying to politicise a very effective foundation.

The example I gave was just one project, but it is dear to me because I have been involved with it for over 10 years, and seen a number of young people come through that project. Teachers have been actively engaged in the Youth on Health Festival in various schools in my electorate and others in the Peel region, including Pinjarra Senior High School, Halls Head College, John Tonkin College, as it is now known, and previously when it was known as Mandurah Senior College and Mandurah Senior High School. Schools throughout the state have also been involved. I am concerned that projects such as this might be at risk in the future because of a power grab by the Minister for Health and the government. It is sad that it has come to this because if there were issues with free tickets and how they were sent out, or whatever, that should have been dealt with by an administrative process. But the minister is now changing the whole structure, and for no real reason except that he now wants to have more power, which I think will mean that he will have more influence on the content of what is funded, and that worries me. I have a history of being involved in some of these projects.

No politicians have attended this event, apart from the member for Maylands, in her former capacity as chief executive officer of the Western Australian Council of Social Service as a community partner. One of the sad things is that no politicians came. It was not a real sexy one for politicians to come to. We are all invited to things, and I do not criticise anyone for going to the football or whatever, but it is little bit sad to me that no Minister for Health in the past 10 years or more made the effort to understand what the invitation was for. The invitation was for a project that is actually a statewide festival, not a Mandurah-based festival. It may happen in Mandurah, and that is tremendous. One year they tried it in the Regal Theatre in Subiaco, because the management of that theatre thought there would be lots of people there. After that, the group overseeing Youth on Health decided that the event had had its organic birth, if you like, in the Peel region, and that is why it was brought back to Mandurah. I think it was only held at the Regal Theatre for one year. They brought it back to Mandurah, and that was the will of the young people involved. Holding the final in Perth resulted in those young people being dislocated from their involvement. They still came to Perth and helped out, but it was not the same.

I am genuine in this. The Minister for Health should come along this year. He will be given a chance to speak; he can say something at the end of it. It is literally hundreds and hundreds of students from around Western Australia coming together

Dr K.D. Hames: What date is it?

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: From memory, it is the last weekend of October, on the Friday and Saturday night. The minister will get an invitation; he gets one every year. I am not having a go at him for not coming; I am not doing it.

Dr K.D. Hames: I have just looked at my diary, and I have got large events on both Friday and Saturday.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: If the minister wants to attend an event that crosses all the regions, and all metropolitan area schools, he should come to this one. They would love to see him, because I think it is important that particularly senior ministers see this. I attended when I was Minister for Youth in 2007, so I was the first minister, but I was also the local member, and it was natural for me to go. However, I really encourage that because I hope that Healthway continues to be both the major contributor and the major beneficiary of its sponsorship. Exposure of Healthway's messages through young people is one of the critical things that we all understand is essential. If we are going to get through messages about healthy behaviour and healthy eating, and all of those sorts of things, and good quality physical and mental health, there is no better medium than the arts, and there is no better target group than young people. This hits the nail.

I will give some credit to the former Minister for Education, the former member for Churchlands. I asked Hon Dr Liz Constable to meet with the chief executive officer and the board chair when the government was first elected in 2008. One of the problems is that this project covers both health and education, and we all know what happens—education says it is the responsibility of health, and health says it is the responsibility of education. The Department of Health does not give any funding. I think it might have done so once or twice in the history of the project. In fact, Healthway was the saving grace for the festival, and that is why it is so crucial. Dr Constable understood the concept. She was invited, but she was unable to attend the festival, but she understood the concept. We still did not get any funding from the Department of Education; the silo still went up. She was very open in the meeting, but the silo still went up. However, we were appreciated, and I was very appreciative that she gave her time to listen to the CEO and the board chair.

Mr Bill Johnston; Dr Kim Hames; Speaker; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr David Templeman; Ms Janine Freeman;
Mr Paul Papalia; Dr Tony Buti

In my view, that is why the opposition is so opposed to what the minister is proposing to do. If things were broken with Healthway—I do not think they were fatal at all—or there were things that needed to be ironed out, they could have been ironed out fairly quickly and simply, but we cannot iron it out by giving the Minister for Health the power to effectively veto some of the very positive stuff that has happened over a long time. Unfortunately, the government does not have a track record of trust anymore, and when it tries to bring in these sorts of things, we look at that track record and realise the government has failed dismally.

MS J.M. FREEMAN (Mirrabooka) [3.29 pm]: I also rise to speak on the Western Australian Health Promotion Foundation Bill 2015, and I will continue somewhat in the vein of my colleague the member for Mandurah. I thank him for his contribution. The political nature of this bill is really evident, in that we are partway through consideration of the Public Health Bill—an extraordinarily important bill to the health community, and one that has been awaited for years. The Public Health Bill has been introduced and read a second time, and we were partway through consideration in detail, and here we are considering a new bill that the Minister for Health has decided has precedence over a bill that is very important for the delivery of public health in the community.

I think the fact that this government is allowing the Public Health Bill to languish and is bringing this legislation into the house for debate shows that this move is politically motivated, given the media surrounding this and the pulling apart of an organisation that was internationally recognised, had a history of operation and was well respected in the community.

It is really important for us to realise the critical nature of Healthway and what it does for our community; that cannot be overstated. It has been recognised the world over as best practice in a public health model. It came about in response to the amazing public health campaign that Western Australia led against tobacco products. The aspects of regulation, research and education combined to create a world-class demonstration of taking on a big public health risk—the tobacco industry—and delivering benefits to the community by making tobacco use economically unattractive and by having something to replace tobacco. That is well needed in that space now for alcohol. We can stand in this place and debate the Misuse of Drugs Amendment (Psychoactive Substances) Bill 2015 and we can close down shops that sell synthetic cannabis and other things, and we can have a debate and a national summit on ice and its impacts. All of those things are important, but all the health experts out there tell us that the biggest issue we face in the community is alcohol consumption. The government is undermining Healthway by handpicking its own people to sit on the board, and it raises questions about conflicts of interest. We should have people of standing from community agencies who have importance in this area, because they are able to champion it without fear or favour. They champion it, and they get criticised for it, but they know that they can continue to champion it. That was the strength of Healthway and the strength of the Tobacco Control Act—that we could continue to champion it.

People have lost the ticker for it. I have raised it in this place with alcohol previously, with the previous Minister for Racing and Gaming. I stood and asked, “Why can’t you stop alcohol advertising in sports clubs?” He was the Minister for Sport and Recreation as well. His line was, “Oh, we can just do education around it; we can just do these things.” That is not enough. Unless we have the aspect of Healthway and also regulate against it, we are not going to have that critical change that we need in society. We talk about public health and coming to a critical mass and healthy attitudes flicking over. There is a bit of a debate about fluoride, as the minister knows. Part of the debate about fluoride from the point of view of the people who think we should not have it in our water supply anymore is that we do not need it now because the majority of people have high dental hygiene from brushing their teeth and all those sorts of things, because the critical mass has flicked over and changed their dental hygiene practices. I note that the minister said in the second reading speech that the current act is largely based on the model of the Victorian health promotion foundation known as VicHealth. My question is: how does this new model depart from how VicHealth currently operates; and, if it does, why? Clearly, if we based it on something that is operating, and operating well, we need to continue that, and clearly the reasons are political.

Healthway represents best practice in the funding of a public health model the world over. That was evidenced in the University of Western Australia survey released last year that found an increase of more than five per cent in the effectiveness of Healthway promotions and programs leading to positive outcomes. The survey also shows that 16.5 per cent of people who were involved in Healthway promotions were likely to change their behaviours. The actions of this government has seen the organisation—this organisation that has had such a proud history—decimated over the past year. We have seen the effective removal of the Chair; the Chair stood down, but I think she was—I do not use the term lightly—“bullied” into stepping down. I think she had little choice but to step down. The board and the staff leadership were all undermined and effectively left the organisation or were dismissed in different ways, and that has undermined the health of the organisation, if members will excuse the pun. That has destabilised the organisation and its effective operations.

Mr Bill Johnston; Dr Kim Hames; Speaker; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr David Templeman; Ms Janine Freeman;
Mr Paul Papalia; Dr Tony Buti

What concerns me is that if we undermine this internationally recognised health organisation, then we undermine its power to promote that health message. Particularly, we undermine its power with regard to the alcohol lobby, which is such a powerful lobby. The community is concerned that this bill has been drafted to undermine the principles of its formulation, which occurred with WA championing the anti-smoking campaign. The government has damaged public health in Western Australia by doing this, and the government's motives are undermining Healthway and its good messages. By using the ticket scandal as a mechanism, the government hyped it up. By using the *Carmen* issue, the government hyped up this argument of, "Oh, they're just being too ideologically pure." If we had done that, there would have been a lot of opposition. Healthway and other organisations fought against the tobacco lobby, which is a huge lobby and has a lot of money behind it, promoting such an unhealthy product. If that same mentality had been around in that period, we would not have progressed as far as we have. Smoking areas are limited in Western Australia and the state's figures for the number of people in the community who do not smoke are some of the best in the whole world. With regard to *Carmen*, I was listening to the debate on the radio and thought it was a complete overreaction. The organisation said, "We're going to take Healthway funding and so we looked at what we would do and decided not to run *Carmen* because it had smoking in it." Healthway did not direct that; Healthway just had a very good policy. It was a bit like the ticket scandal as a mechanism for this government to go after the money it wanted. It wanted to have control of the money. That is quite clear. As I understand it, there are other government agencies that access tickets, and they have not been held to similar account.

What I want to discuss today is the shift from an independent organisation to a government department run and influenced by the minister of the day in the same way as Lotterywest now appears to be. The government says that the conflict of interest will be removed by the government appointing individual board members instead of board members representing health industry groups. The government talks about them as being specific groups and things like that, but these are groups that are put up by organisations that have an interest in the community health of people. They are coming from a base of knowledge and a foundation of knowledge and that is what they bring to Healthway.

These are not marginal groups; some of these groups are no friends of the Labor Party. Over the years the Australian Medical Association has been one of the great critics of the Labor Party. These organisations come with an organisational structure that ensures vigorous debate in the public health space and they can inform and interrogate how funding happens in Healthway, and that is really important. Instead of board members representing those groups, we will now have individual members chosen on criteria of an appropriate mix of skills and expertise. What does that mean? How is that formed? Can it be corrupted? That is our concern. Can it be used as a reward for supporting particular views or ideas? How do we ensure that someone who is captured by the alcohol lobby or an expert who believes that the public health message has gone too far and is really like social engineering does not get appointed to Healthway?

We have all witnessed the sugar versus fats debate in movies and things like that. The argument is that the health debate got hijacked in the United States by the corn syrup lobby—it is not fructose; it is another type of syrup—because they had built those big farms, the farms had to get big or get out, and suddenly they had too much maize, the bulk of it. At that time, it came out that the combination of sugar and fats was not good if people did not have them in moderation. However, the message from the US Department of Health and Human Services was for people to stop their consumption of fats, not their consumption of sugar, because the sugar lobby was such a powerful lobby group. Healthway is important because it stands apart from the political process and comes from organisations that have to be collective membership organisations in which those things are interrogated and are filtered up through their interests and objectives. In the case of the AMA, its objectives are for the health of the community and its members, as doctors, deliver that. That is what concerns us.

There is much discussion in the community sector at the moment about the changing nature of funding from Lotterywest. Our colleague the chief executive officer of Ishar Multicultural Women's Health Centre is concerned that in the period that she has worked in the community sector space, she has seen Lotterywest go from being a supporter of non-government organisations and a critical foundation with the goal of delivering services to the community, into something that basically tells groups that they can come for one grant a year and that should not be for anything that is about administration costs. I have been told by lots of NGOs that it is limited and they are excluded. Because Lotterywest has been harvested for its money for big, expensive, glitzy projects that this government has wanted to run, grassroots organisations on the ground delivering to the community are being disadvantaged.

We can look at Lotterywest and ask whether this is fair. Looking at the outcomes, we can see that money was not equitably allocated in the 2014–15 financial year. For example, the Nedlands electorate received \$17.5 million, while Butler got \$18 000. The Cottesloe electorate received \$1.2 million, while Rockingham received \$890 000.

Mr Bill Johnston; Dr Kim Hames; Speaker; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr David Templeman; Ms Janine Freeman;
Mr Paul Papalia; Dr Tony Buti

The Balcatta electorate received \$6.8 million, while Collie received \$400 000. The Mount Lawley electorate received \$4.9 million; West Swan received \$120 000. This is for last year.

Dr K.D. Hames: What about Dawesville?

Ms J.M. FREEMAN: I will come to the minister's electorate, if he wants me to. I have the figures and I will get them out for him.

Mrs G.J. Godfrey: What did we get?

Ms J.M. FREEMAN: The Belmont electorate received \$3.1 million and Willagee got \$255 000. The Churchlands electorate got \$1.3 million; Girrawheen got \$480 000. The North West Central electorate got \$4.7 million; Midland got \$500 000. I do not know whether members are getting a view of what is going on here about the electorates I am reading out and the contrast between them. The Pilbara electorate got \$3.2 million; Bassendean got \$470 000. The South Perth electorate got \$3.1 million; Mirrabooka got \$900 000. The Dawesville electorate received \$54 000 and Fremantle received \$1.983 million.

Dr K.D. Hames: What did you get, compare me with you?

Ms J.M. FREEMAN: I got more than the minister, I got \$900 000 and Dawesville got \$54 000. But the minister's electorate would be considered with the Mandurah electorate, and Mandurah got only \$561 000. The minister and the member for Mandurah need to get together —

Dr K.D. Hames: He got \$560 000 and I got \$54 000 and we are right next door.

Ms J.M. FREEMAN: That is because it would be delivered into the centre for Dawesville, which is Mandurah.

Mr P. Papalia: What did Warnbro get?

Ms J.M. FREEMAN: Warnbro got \$719 466 and that is versus Bunbury, which got \$1.4 million.

Can I seek an extension?

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms L.L. Baker): Granted, only if you tell me what Maylands got.

[Member's time extended.]

Mr P. Papalia: How much did Jandakot get?

Ms J.M. FREEMAN: The Jandakot electorate did not fare as well, with \$119 000, but Jandakot does not have a centre and in some ways one has to look at that.

But look at and add up the majority: the total for the metropolitan area Liberal seats is \$66 932 369 and for Labor it is \$24 523 262.

Dr K.D. Hames: We've got a lot more seats. I put it to you that the chief executive—she is not there now but she was there for a very long time—would not tolerate any political interference in grants —

Ms J.M. FREEMAN: Let me go on about political interference —

Dr K.D. Hames: But I am talking about these figures.

Ms J.M. FREEMAN: I have to say that that is our concern. Our concern is that if Healthway's independence is taken away, it will always be questioned, in the same way that we can question Lotterywest. We can question Lotterywest because —

Dr K.D. Hames: Can you not yell at me just because I interject?

Ms J.M. FREEMAN: No, I love yelling at the minister when he interjects! It means that I can talk over the top of him, which means that he stops interjecting and then I get my way.

Dr K.D. Hames interjected.

Ms J.M. FREEMAN: I am putting it out there that these figures have to make us wonder about the processes and the allocation of funds, not to speak about—this is the thing that galls me most about Lotterywest—all the cheques being handed over by government members. Be clear: it is only government members that do that. I was recently in a meeting with a couple of government members and it came up. They said, "But you hand them out, too, don't you?" I had to tell them it was only government members that hand over the cheques.

Dr K.D. Hames: You did when you were in government.

Ms J.M. FREEMAN: I was never in government.

Dr K.D. Hames interjected.

Mr Bill Johnston; Dr Kim Hames; Speaker; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr David Templeman; Ms Janine Freeman;
Mr Paul Papalia; Dr Tony Buti

Ms J.M. FREEMAN: I am not taking the member for Dawesville’s interjections.

I donate my time, my office’s time, and money, and I am on the committee of the Harmony Day event in Mirrabooka. I always pay for the welcome to country to ensure the community has a welcome to country, which is not an inexpensive contribution to the event. Looking at it as a percentage of my electorate allowance, it is probably quite high compared with a Lotterywest grant. I have worked with the community to showcase and celebrate the rich diversity and inclusiveness in the community in a great event, and a government member with no attachment to the area rolls up. I would make an exception for someone such as Hon Liz Behjat, who has lots of attachment to the area. If she had turned up to hand out the cheque, everyone in the community would have welcomed her. But when it is a member from the other house who has no attachment to the area and who demands to hand over a cheque on the stage, what do I say? Do I say, “I want to stand up and hand over my little cheque on the stage?” I do not want to politicise the event; it is about celebrating the community.

It is not about political point-scoring. My concern with the Healthway funding is that it will politicise community activities. The community activities in my area that have been funded by Healthway have been fantastic. Healthway has funded programs at Balga Senior High School and in Mirrabooka aimed at reducing harm from tobacco, and at Westminster Primary School on preventing overweight and obesity. It has funded a sexual health conference through the Metropolitan Migrant Resource Centre. Healthway has also funded programs in the area on reducing harm from alcohol and on preventing overweight and obesity in the council area. It has also funded programs on preventing overweight and obesity with wheelchair sports in the area, although it is questionable whether that is in Mirrabooka. I have been to many cultural events organised by newly arrived migrant communities—African, Burmese, Vietnamese—that have been supported by Healthway. The Healthway message gets out. If there is a Healthway person there, they can stand up, but no-one political stands up. Usually someone from the community has found out about Healthway and its message and will stand up and explain that this is why the group has got the funding and that they need to talk about anti-smoking, anti-alcohol or obesity messages and those sorts of things. That deepens the understanding of the message that is getting out, because the community has had to recognise and deliver it to the cultural event. That is a much better way of doing it than some polly turning up and saying, “Here is the cheque”, and everyone going, “Oh, yeah; that’s fine; thanks very much”, because that does not promote the health messages that we need to get out to the community.

This change comes to this house while the Public Health Bill languishes on the notice paper, waiting for less political times to come before us.

Dr K.D. Hames: You guys just keep going on and on and on.

Ms J.M. FREEMAN: It is one of the most important pieces of legislation that the Minister for Health will ever deal with. People will need to know how it has been analysed. It needs to be interrogated. The minister needs to bring it into this house so that it can be interrogated. The government has chosen political posturing for its own purposes. The Public Health Bill is languishing. It is needed in the community. The minister should not tell me that we keep going on and on. He should not tell me that I have not given a good contribution to that debate. He should not tell me that I have not been calling on the government to bring that bill on for debate for some time. I have; I can show the minister where I have.

Back to what I was saying! The minister is the only person who does it. He should not do it. I am meek and mild with everyone else, but he just riles me.

This bill comes before the house when the Public Health Bill is also on the notice paper. What concerns me is that we are going to politicise the Healthway bill while at the same time we are not going to include in the Public Health Bill any public health policy provisions. The draft Public Health Bill 2008 included a clause on public policies that provided that any activity or thing, or the supply of any goods or services, would be required to meet specified standards or comply with specified conditions to prevent public health risks. That bill was going to include a provision on public health policy. That is not in the current bill. Healthway, which has an independent capacity to look at public health policy, is going to be removed. Our public health act, which should have provision for public health policy and its drafting, is not going to have that. I am really concerned about that and what it means for the public debate.

I am particularly concerned because I think there is a march on by advocates of business that want to champion particular health messages. The new battle is going to be sugar. We have seen that; it is out there. We have seen the films; we have been looking at it. On the Tuesday just gone, Coca-Cola confirmed that the research it has been relying on to say that Coke is not so bad arose after it gave money to the research group so that it could get findings to claim that the main source of obesity is physical inactivity and not overeating. That is a really convenient message for a soft drink provider whose product is made mostly of sugar. It is a bit like the smoking lobby, which gave money to researchers to say that smoking was either healthy for people or was not that unhealthy, and that it was other things that people were doing that gave them lung cancer or related diseases. It is

Mr Bill Johnston; Dr Kim Hames; Speaker; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr David Templeman; Ms Janine Freeman;
Mr Paul Papalia; Dr Tony Buti

insidious. It is really important that that has come out at a time when the CSIRO has reported that our country's diet is showing that discretionary foods, which are junk foods and foods and drinks high in sugar, high in saturated fats, low in essential nutrients or alcoholic, have gone from being something that we just reward ourselves with every now and then to something that has become a daily habit. The CSIRO report came out on 10 August. I suggest that members go to the website and do the survey to find out how their dietary habits are going; it gives a bit of feedback. Australia was given a scientifically appointed score of 61 on a 100-point scale. The score would be higher if we were not consuming such high levels of discretionary foods that are so high in sugar. The average score for the discretionary foods category sits at around 37 in 100; the lower the score, the worse it is, the higher the score, the better it is. Professor Noakes has done this report for the CSIRO. She released that book on eating. This type of food is no longer just an indulgence but has become mainstream, and Australians are eating it each and every day. My concern is that if we take away the independence of Healthway, we place ourselves at the risk of these companies being able to use money from Healthway on spurious research or to influence Healthway on where that money should go in terms of research. Healthway does great work in research. It is an important part of health research in Western Australia.

Finally, I want to raise an issue that I have raised here before. I remind the minister that the December 2014 *Small Area Labour Markets*, published by the federal Department of Employment, showed that Balga and Mirrabooka sit at 18.9 per cent unemployment. If public health is about structural change and not individual blame, then we have a public health issue in that area that needs to be addressed. I have quoted before an article from the *Medical Journal of Australia* titled "Reducing the impact of unemployment on health: revisiting the agenda for primary health care". The article summarised research that showed that people who are unemployed have poorer physical and mental health than those who are employed. The article states —

The association between unemployment and poor physical and mental health is well described, and our understanding of the pathways through which these associations occur has increased.

We have a public health issue in our area. It is probably also highlighted by other lifestyle issues in the area. I wanted to raise that again given that we are discussing the Western Australian Health Promotion Foundation Bill.

MR P. PAPALIA (Warnbro) [3.59 pm]: I am pleased to be given the opportunity to speak on the Western Australian Health Promotion Foundation Bill 2015. Like most people on this side of the house, I share concerns that the Minister for Health has chosen a model that effectively politicises a body that has prior to now not been politicised. The likelihood that the intended objectives of the organisation will be met is diminished as a consequence of that politicising, because the minister has chosen to use, as has been referred to on numerous occasions already, the Lotteries Commission Act 1990 model for what he is doing, and is justifying that by saying it is going to provide a greater amount of probity or better governance.

In the final paragraph of the second reading speech there is a suggestion that this new structure will somehow restore and strengthen public confidence in the organisation. That is an interesting observation. I have to say that I was watching from afar, and without too much personal knowledge of Healthway, that intense period of scrutiny, primarily led by *The West Australian* newspaper, but echoed to some extent by senior members of cabinet in the public domain in Western Australia at the time. We could not avoid seeing the undeniably extraordinary attack on Rosanna Capolingua, and we could not avoid seeing what was done. If a person had been separate from it, and they did not have a personal conviction one way or the other, the focus would have seemed to have been pretty intense and very personalised. The focus at that time was aggressively personalised on someone who was not a public figure insomuch as a politician. I know she is a public figure—she has played senior public roles in Western Australia and was a respected individual in Western Australia and still is, in my view—but at that time I found it interesting to watch the way it played out. Everything was very personal. It was directed in a way that made Dr Capolingua in particular—because she was the central person who was held up as being responsible—appear to be guilty without any opportunity to respond. We as politicians are treated like that quite regularly, so it is not necessarily a big deal for us, but for someone like her it would have been very confronting and challenging.

Dr K.D. Hames: "Devastating", is probably the best word.

Mr P. PAPALIA: Yes, devastating. I note that since the retractions or apologies that have been published in a number of publications—not just *The West Australian*, but also a Western Australian medical magazine that was compelled to publish an apology and, I imagine, elsewhere on online sites and the like—I do not think there has been anywhere near enough acknowledgment of the impact on Dr Capolingua of what happened at that time. It was a very disturbing and intense period, during which it seemed that people were almost sensing the blood in the water and going as much as they could at somebody. In the end, as far as I can see, there was some level of questionable use of hospitality, but as was pointed out during the course of the investigations and the public discussion, other government agencies employ just as much, if not much more, hospitality in a very similar way.

Mr Bill Johnston; Dr Kim Hames; Speaker; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr David Templeman; Ms Janine Freeman;
Mr Paul Papalia; Dr Tony Buti

The presentation of the debate at that time does not seem to have been countered by a reasonable defence of Dr Capolingua and other board members subsequently. That would be something I would like to see in the event that the minister would be so inclined. I am sure the minister has probably done it privately, but I imagine there is an opportunity, perhaps through the course of this debate, to reflect a little upon that impact and just how negative the consequences were for those people caught up in it. As I say, I know that Dr Capolingua has a public persona—people know who she is—but she is not an elected officeholder and not someone who we would expect to be subjected to that sort of attack.

That aside, if we are assuming that because of all that which occurred there was a need to restore and strengthen public confidence, I am not convinced that this structure is the way to go. I am not convinced that this structure is going to restore public confidence, because, like everybody else in this place, I have had the opportunity to see what goes on with Lotterywest. I was fortunate enough to be elected in a by-election 18 months prior to the general election at which we lost office, so I have seen as a backbencher in government for 18 months what goes on with Lotterywest. I agree entirely with the health minister that it is politicised by both sides of politics. That is undeniable. I just heard from the member for Mirrabooka that the electorate of Warnbro received something like \$722 000 from Lotterywest in the last financial year. That is news to me. That is just the way it is. As the minister indicated, the current expectation when in government is for governments on our side and on the minister's side to have government operatives and government people going out and handing out cheques. Knowing that we are not going to be in office forever regardless of whether or not we are in office now, I think that we can sit and reflect a little on whether that is the best way to distribute those funds or whether it is best done in an apolitical way. I do not know whether it is completely politicised.

When I was listening to the member for Mirrabooka, I was wondering whether there was in fact any political benefit to someone who hands over those big cheques. I am sceptical about that. I do not think that people say, "Oh, the honourable Tony Simpson just gave me this big cheque. He's a wonderful guy. I'll vote for him at the next election." I do not think people do that.

Mr A.J. Simpson: We do not give out cheques anymore.

Mr P. PAPALIA: All right, let us say that it is the minister delivering whatever it is that he is delivering nowadays. Obviously in the old-fashioned days they had big cheques, so I imagine the government has something much more flash now.

Mr A.J. Simpson: A small plaque.

Mr P. PAPALIA: Is the plaque there permanently?

Mrs G.J. Godfrey interjected.

Mr P. PAPALIA: The observation is still relevant. I believe that if the minister considered it, he, too, would realise that people do not think, "Oh wonderful! Tony has delivered this cheque. I'll have to give him my vote." They are going to give the minister their vote anyway, because they know him; he is a good bloke and a good member of Parliament. They know he is going around his electorate and he is working hard. That is what people will reflect upon when they go into the polling booth, not whether or not the minister gave them a cheque from Lotterywest, the funds for which were obtained from a gambling activity.

Mr C.J. Barnett: It doesn't matter where it comes from. As soon as it comes into Lotterywest, they are the government funds and the responsibility of the minister.

Mr P. PAPALIA: That is the point, Premier. I am talking about this matter in light of the legislation. The government is choosing Lotterywest as the model to replicate, and the government's justification for doing that is to restore public confidence. I do not know whether that connection can be made. I think that in all likelihood what will actually occur is that people will look at what is happening. They will think that there was all this flurry of criticism regarding Healthway before and the use of tickets and things. However, Healthway used to do things aggressively on behalf of the health of Western Australians. It did not get pushed around by governments. It did not reflect government leadership necessarily on some issues and it was quite willing and able to stand up to government and senior government figures on specific issues when it felt that it was in the interests of the state. I do not think that anyone who sits and makes a considered appraisal of what the government is proposing now will say that this is a better outcome than what we had before. As I said before, I think there has been a really aggressive campaign to paint the Healthway board in a negative light. If the government is saying that it will be something different from that, maybe the government can make that argument. I do not think that is anywhere near justifying a new structure such as the one provided for in this bill. The government could have made the argument for the same structure but impose better governance of it.

Mr Bill Johnston; Dr Kim Hames; Speaker; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr David Templeman; Ms Janine Freeman;
Mr Paul Papalia; Dr Tony Buti

Mr C.J. Barnett: They failed in their governance; that's the whole point. They failed; that is why the changes are being made.

Mr P. PAPALIA: That is the government's argument

Mr C.J. Barnett: No, it's the fact. The Public Sector Commission report made it clear.

Mr P. PAPALIA: Before the Premier came into the chamber, I had been making the observation—and it was made at the time of the tumult of focus on the Healthway board—that there are a lot of other government agencies that get just as much, if not more, opportunity to get free tickets and attend events, and they do it without the scrutiny that was applied to Healthway.

Mr C.J. Barnett: Yes, they do. Tourism is accountable to its minister. Lotterywest is accountable to its minister. Healthway is not. It is the one that was not accountable.

Mr P. PAPALIA: Ipso facto, the direction that is given to those agencies by their minister means that they are no longer independent of that minister in the way that they operate. What people respected about Healthway, regardless of whether or not the Premier wants to accept it, was its independence. They respected its willingness to take on, at times, unpopular causes and drive the argument in the public domain—separately from government if necessary—until such a point that it became publicly acceptable to concede that it was doing the right thing. It did that on some very significant health issues. If the agency that the government is creating is responsible to the minister, what we will end up with is no longer an independent agency that is driven only by the health of Western Australians as its major priority. To the public eye, and to anyone who sits down to make an independent analysis of it with a reasonable consideration, the conclusion will be that an organisation is being created that will be directed by government. Like Lotterywest, the government will have priority for when announcements are made and what the money is given to; it will be driven by the wishes of the government of the day.

Mr C.J. Barnett: It never happened!

Mr P. PAPALIA: How can the Premier possibly say it never happened?

Mr C.J. Barnett: It never happened.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, Premier! Member for Warnbro, can you direct your remarks to the Chair, please. Thank you.

Mr P. PAPALIA: I do not mind the Premier interjecting; I just do not agree with him.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is just that it becomes difficult for Hansard when everybody is talking at once.

Mr P. PAPALIA: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker.

I do not think that anyone who has been a member of Parliament on either side of the house could possibly conclude that Lotterywest money is given in a completely objective fashion.

Mr C.J. Barnett: It is.

Mr P. PAPALIA: The Premier missed it, but earlier the member for Mirrabooka read out where the allocations have gone in the metropolitan area in the last 12 months. It was three to one in favour of government seats.

Mr C.J. Barnett: From where?

Mr P. PAPALIA: Within the metropolitan area. That is undeniable; it is the truth. When it comes down to where the money is being spent inside individual electorates, opposition members of Parliament have no idea where that money goes. They might read about in the paper or see where it went if they go to a sporting club, the Scout Association of Australia or whatever agency, organisation or club received the money. They might see the plaque—I understand there is a plaque now; a corflute plaque!—and then they can learn from conversations how much money has been given to that organisation. Opposition members are not aware of the deliberations that went on behind it. Government members are aware of it because they will often be sought to advocate for things.

Mrs G.J. Godfrey: That is not actually true, member, because I get advised by the council what they have applied for and then I follow it up with Lotterywest to attend.

Mr P. PAPALIA: At times I get asked by clubs and organisations to support an application. However, the member for Belmont will be told, because she a backbencher in government, in advance of any distribution of funds in her electorate. Normally she will be invited to attend and either hand out the money or make the announcement of it at the event that acknowledges and thanks Lotterywest—the government. The organisation will invite the member and she will be in a prominent position there. We did it in government too. I am not saying it is a Liberal Party or a National Party thing. What I am asking is: if the government's argument is that Healthway has lost public confidence, is this the model that it wants to implement to rebuild and reacquire that

Mr Bill Johnston; Dr Kim Hames; Speaker; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr David Templeman; Ms Janine Freeman;
Mr Paul Papalia; Dr Tony Buti

confidence? I do not think it is, because the immediate assumption has to be—and will be; we are making it here—that the government is politicising an agency that was not previously politicised. If the problem was with the administration of things such as free tickets to events, that could easily have been rectified with a more robust governance model.

Mr C.J. Barnett: Then they would lose their independence, by your argument.

Mr P. PAPALIA: No. Somebody who is independent could be appointed to look at its supervision in a more robust fashion. Someone such as the Auditor General, who is independent of government, could look at that on an annual basis in the same way that he looks at government agencies all over the place. It could have been done in a much more rigorous fashion. That would have prevented any problem.

Mr C.J. Barnett: So you are accusing the Public Sector Commissioner now, are you? I am just ticking off the numbers of groups in government that you are accusing of bias.

Mr P. PAPALIA: Who is the Premier talking about?

Mr C.J. Barnett interjected.

Mr P. PAPALIA: Who will he give that list to?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, Premier! Member for Warnbro, return to the bill, please.

Mr C.J. Barnett: Which group of public services are you talking about?

Mr P. PAPALIA: The public service is talking to us more than it is to the Premier; he should not worry about that. We have come to that part of the cycle.

The fundamental flaw with the concept is that the minister is saying that an organisation became vulnerable to accusations of impropriety and it lost public confidence. The government played a big part in that. It played a big part in Healthway losing public confidence. The Premier missed the comments I made earlier about what I thought were extensively unfair comments about and an attack on Dr Capolingua.

Mr C.J. Barnett: I didn't attack her.

Mr P. PAPALIA: I watched that press conference and she looked distressed standing beside the Premier at the time when he announced that she was leaving that position. I felt that he left her hanging out there. But that is up to the Premier. I thought there was an opportunity—there is an opportunity in the course of this debate—for the government to express concern and perhaps regret about the manner in which she and the other board members were treated. I do not think a solid argument was made for anywhere near the extent of criticism that was aimed at those board members—I do not think there ever was, as evidenced by the apologies that were printed in the media.

Mr C.J. Barnett: I think it is very clear. I made it very clear to the people on that board that their behaviour was unacceptable.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, Premier! Please allow the member for Warnbro to finish his remarks.

Mr P. PAPALIA: I think there is an opportunity now, Premier, to perhaps express a different attitude towards those people. I know that a lot of things were said at the time and it is always interesting for the media to magnify the focus and try to exaggerate, if possible, the extent to which people are criticised, but I think they went too far that time. So did they; they have even printed an apology. I think that the government has an opportunity to rectify what could be deemed as a wrong.

I will criticise one other aspect of the concept. The overall concept is flawed because I do not think public confidence will be reinvigorated by creating a political entity to replace this model. The suggestion is that board appointments will not come from organisations that have a direct interest in policy and funding decisions. Instead, they will be based on an appropriate mix of skills and expertise necessary to discharge the functions of the foundation. That rings alarm bells for me; the board members might just be friends of government who see the functions of the foundation as supporting government by advocating for government members of Parliament and making them look good. That is what the function of this board will be, by the look of it. Those people may have no expertise in the public health field.

DR A.D. BUTI (Armadale) [4.19 pm]: My comments will be brief—I actually mean they will be brief—in my contribution. We are, of course, debating the Western Australian Health Promotion Foundation Bill 2015, which is a significant step if we look at what the bill seeks to achieve.

If we just quickly look at Healthway's website, it states —

Mr Bill Johnston; Dr Kim Hames; Speaker; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr David Templeman; Ms Janine Freeman;
Mr Paul Papalia; Dr Tony Buti

Healthway seeks to promote and support healthy lifestyles to reduce the burden of preventable disease in Western Australia.

Healthway (the Western Australian Health Promotion Foundation) was established in 1991 under Section 15 of the Tobacco Control Act 1990 as an independent statutory body reporting to the Minister for Health. Healthway now functions under Part 5 of the Tobacco Products Control Act 2006.

It states also that to achieve its objectives —

Healthway provides sponsorship to Sports, Arts and Community organisations to promote healthy messages, facilitate healthy environments, reduce the promotion of unhealthy messages, and increase participation in healthy activities.

Healthway has an incredibly important mission in seeking to reduce the burden of preventive diseases in Western Australia. One, of course, would not deny that up until now Healthway has, in many respects, been independent of government in how it has gone about its duties or fulfilled its mandate.

We all know the history of certain activities of Healthway board members and the government's response to that; of course that issue had to be addressed. I suppose whether the Western Australian Health Promotion Foundation Bill 2015 will result in a better structure for the promotion of health in Western Australia is the factor that needs to be determined. Will the Western Australian Health Promotion Foundation Bill 2015 provide a better structure to achieve the purpose of promoting and facilitating in Western Australia good health and activities that encourage healthy lifestyles?

Of course, one of the big issues is that it would now appear that the independence Healthway enjoyed will, to a large extent, be removed. It will be more under the direct control of the minister of the day, and, therefore, under government control. As mentioned by the member for Warnbro, the second reading speech states that the board —

... will be reduced from 11 to seven members and the requirement that members be appointed on the basis of representing a specified group will be removed. This new arrangement is intended to minimise any potential conflict of interest.

The second reading speech does not state that people who represent a specified group will not be appointed; it is just that that will be removed as a criterion, to my understanding, so they could still be appointed.

The determining factor, really, will be the quality of the people on the board. We can have whichever structure we want, but the determining factor will be the quality of the people on the board. I suppose the danger here is whether—it would be the inclination of any government—the government appoints people to the board who have similar political views to the government of the day. That is just standard human nature, I suspect, but there is a problem there. Forget about the conflict of interest for a minute. It may be that the removal of the requirement that appointees be representatives of a specified group will reduce potential conflicts of interest; I am not so sure that will be the case. The board should be prepared—it should be its mandate—purely to promote a healthy environment in Western Australia. That should be its mandate. No government of any persuasion is the repository of all truth in any policy area.

Ms L.L. Baker interjected.

Dr A.D. BUTI: Yes, I know; I had to be careful there!

Unless there is a diversity of opinions and backgrounds on the board, I am concerned that this new structure will become just a rubber stamp for the policies of the government of the day. Of course, governments should have a major say in preventive health policy in any society because they have great powers to determine how finances are distributed and also policy direction. But we do need people who are outside of the political process. We are, in the end, a political institution. We are, in many aspects, governed by the politics of the day, so our health promotion policy will always have a political dimension to it. It would be good to have a counter-viewpoint in respect to any health promotion foundation. If the board is a mirror of the views of the government, what is the point of even having it? I worry about that. Why does the Department of Health just not look after the promotion of a healthy lifestyle in Western Australia? The idea was, I assume, if we look through the history going back to the 1990s, that we wanted a separate instrument from government to promote a healthy lifestyle. As we know, health promotion should have a comprehensive and multistrategy approach, and, as far as possible, stand independent of the government of the day. There is no doubt that the greater the diversity, the greater the chance fresh ideas will be generated; hopefully, some of those fresh ideas will hit the mark when it comes to the promotion and facilitation of a healthy lifestyle.

Health promotion is incredibly important. Referring to health promotion, the World Health Organization has stated —

Mr Bill Johnston; Dr Kim Hames; Speaker; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr David Templeman; Ms Janine Freeman;
Mr Paul Papalia; Dr Tony Buti

Health promotion is the process of enabling people to increase control over their health and its determinants, and thereby improve their health.

We are trying, with this foundation, to facilitate the ability of people to engage in a healthy lifestyle.

We could talk about the history behind this bill being brought before the house. The government can articulate the view that it believes this new structure will better facilitate the promotion of a healthy lifestyle, but I am not sure where the minister has done that. The minister can articulate the case for his bill, but I am not sure that he has articulated the case that it will result in the better promotion of a healthy lifestyle in Western Australia. Surely that should be a determining factor? In regards to the behaviour —

Dr K.D. Hames: You are right, and I will, to a degree, during my response.

Dr A.D. BUTI: The behaviour regarding the tickets et cetera needed to be addressed of course, but I do not necessarily think that it had to follow that we needed this new structure. Maybe it did, maybe it did not, but the determining factor should be whether this bill will improve our ability to create a better environment, to promote better health or a healthier lifestyle, to reduce the burden of diseases in Western Australia, and basically to have a greater focus on preventive health care and promotion in Western Australia.

Debate adjourned, on motion by **Mr J.H.D. Day (Leader of the House)**.