



Parliamentary Debates

(HANSARD)

FORTIETH PARLIAMENT
FIRST SESSION
2020

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, 24 June 2020

Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, 24 June 2020

THE SPEAKER (Mr P.B. Watson) took the chair at 12 noon, acknowledged country and read prayers.

BILLS

Notice of Motion to Introduce

1. Electoral Amendment Bill 2020.

Notice of motion given by **Mr J.R. Quigley (Attorney General)**.

2. Industrial Relations Legislation Amendment Bill 2020.

Notice of motion given by **Mr W.J. Johnston (Minister for Industrial Relations)**.

DR COLIN CLARKE — TRIBUTE

Statement by Minister for Health

MR R.H. COOK (Kwinana — Minister for Health) [12.03 pm]: On behalf of the government and, in particular, the member for Fremantle, I inform the house of the sad passing of Dr Colin Clarke, an active supporter of voluntary assisted dying legislation in WA. Colin died recently at the young age of 45 years after being diagnosed in 2016 with mesothelioma from an unknown source. He leaves behind his loving wife, Lizz, their children, Harry and Eva, and their extended family and friends. I extend my deep condolences to them all.

Prior to his diagnosis, Colin was an emergency physician at Fiona Stanley Hospital. Lizz is a nurse. They, therefore, had deep understanding of the prognosis of this awful, terminal disease. Both Colin and Lizz became vocal participants in the VAD campaign and worked closely with Go Gentle Australia and local media to champion the introduction of the legislation. Colin recorded a very personal and powerful video to help Western Australian members of Parliament to understand why this is such a key issue. Their messages are compelling and human, and all the more potent as they are being steeped in deep medical experience. They spoke of the death that Colin would inevitably face—the death that he did not want to put himself or his family through. At the time, he said —

In my 20-year career, as a Doctor, I've come to appreciate death is not a failure. We all die at some stage. Ours is not to preserve life at any cost, but to preserve the sanctity of living. Which means preserving the dignity, the autonomy and humanity of each individual. Life is precious—but when there is no hope of recovery, where there is suffering, our focus should be to maintain dignity and the well-being of the patient in accordance with their wishes.

He also said —

I would like to see assisted dying laws introduced into Western Australia, to protect families like mine.

He also said —

Voluntary assisted dying is an extension of palliative care—an additional tool. Health care professionals need to talk and to listen to their patients: To be brave and frank about the limitations of medicine.

He continued —

It's hard enough knowing that I will die, leaving my kids before they complete school. I don't want their enduring memories to be of me in pain, struggling to do things for myself. I want to retain my dignity and control over my life and death.

He also said —

Assisted dying laws—whether I chose to use them or not—in the end would put my mind at ease, allowing me to concentrate on living the remainder of my life, my way.

Unfortunately, the law was too late for Colin. However, because of his bravery and of others who campaigned, from mid-2021, Western Australians who are dying with intolerable suffering will have a choice at the end of their life.

His proud wife, Lizz, recently said that it was always important to Colin to stand up for what he believed throughout his life. She described Colin as a strong and principled man who had said that if one good thing were to come out of the sadness, others not suffering when they did not need to was a pretty good memorial.

Vale, Colin Clarke.

CORONAVIRUS — PRISONS — SOCIAL VISITS*Statement by Minister for Corrective Services*

MR F.M. LOGAN (Cockburn — Minister for Corrective Services) [12.07 pm]: I rise to inform the house that as part of the current recovery planning and the state government's roadmap, from Saturday, 27 June 2020, social visits to all prisons and Banksia Hill Detention Centre will resume. In response to COVID-19, the Department of Corrective Services moved quickly to implement a range of measures that were intended to prevent COVID-19 from entering WA prisons and detention centres and to keep those who live and work in our correctional facilities safe. This included the suspension and restriction of a range of prison services and operations to reduce unnecessary movement within and in and out of facilities, and to support social distancing and other health and infection control measures. The suspension of contact and social visits was one such step that was taken.

We recognise the impact of these decisions on prisoners and detainees, as well as their families and loved ones, has been significant. The decision to suspend contact and social visits was particularly important given the roles that families and loved ones play in the successful rehabilitation and reintegration of prisoners and detainees in the community. These steps were, however, necessary. It was recognised that the best way of protecting individual prisoners, detainees, staff and their families from exposure to COVID-19 was to protect the prison community as a whole. In this regard, prevention is the most effective strategy. So far this approach has been very successful, with no confirmed cases of COVID-19 within the WA custodial estate.

In line with the Western Australian government roadmap, a range of prison services and operations are being recommenced. This will occur incrementally in a planned and safe manner and in consultation with the WA Department of Health and the Chief Medical Officer. All social visits will include social distancing measures, such as keeping 1.5 metres away from each other, the closure of communal play areas for visiting children, and no touching or physical contact between prisoners and their visitors. In line with the reintroduction of visits, the Department of Corrective Services has focussed on safety and the prevention of illicit substances entering the prison system. Since visit restrictions were applied, drugs and other contraband in prisons have significantly decreased. Steps to assist prisoners' abstinence from drugs have been implemented, including the trial of new electronic security and scanning equipment. Increased penalties will also apply for those who are caught attempting to smuggle drugs into prisons.

This has been a very difficult time for everyone, including those with family and loved ones in prison and detention. It is important to acknowledge the impact that decisions, particularly around contact and social visits, have had and to thank those who have been affected for the sacrifice that they and their families have made to help keep our prisons and detention centres safe.

PRO BONO LEGAL MODEL*Statement by Attorney General*

MR J.R. QUIGLEY (Butler — Attorney General) [12.10 pm]: I am pleased to advise the house about the new pro bono requirements that will apply to all law firms that undertake legal work for government departments and agencies. The Western Australian pro bono legal model builds on the national approach, but is more specifically focused on targeting services to individuals who are disadvantaged. Under our model, law firms that undertake legal services for government must subscribe to the national pro bono target—a voluntary and aspirational target of at least 35 hours of pro bono services per lawyer per year. Reports are published annually nationally. In addition, law firms must undertake pro bono services in “approved causes” for at least 10 per cent of the value of their government legal work. “Approved causes” is defined to include the provision of legal services for individuals. Law firms will be required to report annually on the total fee charged to government and the types of pro bono services delivered for 10 per cent of the total fee. The pro bono requirement will take effect as of 1 July 2020.

The WA pro bono model, with its focus on individuals from disadvantaged and marginalised backgrounds, is at the forefront of procurement reforms and social justice. We are making sure that those in the greatest hardship—at times of real need—are assisted to secure access to justice. Increased funding to Law Access and the Community Legal Centre Association will mean that individual need for legal services will be triaged. Individuals can then be referred more quickly to the right provider.

Of course, law firms have been providing pro bono services for a very long time. It confirms that the legal profession is more than just a marketplace; it is a vocation for those who believe in justice. I acknowledge the many law firms that contributed to the development of the WA pro bono model. I would like to emphasise that pro bono legal services are an adjunct to, and never a substitute for, publicly funded legal aid. They supplement but do not replace the responsibilities of state and national governments to provide legal assistance.

People sometimes talk about access to justice as though there were a golden age when everyone would be represented by a lawyer. I do not believe this was ever true. Effective and sustainable results are achieved by agencies involved in the legal system working together, sharing resources and ideas. As the Premier observed, the issues that we are trying to solve are “not just the responsibility of one department, one portfolio or even government alone”. The complexities that shape disadvantage make it imperative that legal services to the marginalised are delivered through

networks, on the ground, when we work in partnerships with not-for-profits and the corporate sector. I am pleased to commend the work of law firms, community legal centres and peak bodies involved in enhancing access to justice for all with the introduction of the WA pro bono model.

HIS HONOUR CHIEF JUDGE STEPHEN THACKRAY — TRIBUTE

Statement by Attorney General

MR J.R. QUIGLEY (Butler — Attorney General) [12.13 pm]: I would now like to inform the house of the sad passing of the Honourable Stephen Thackray, former Chief Judge of the Family Court of Western Australia.

Stephen Thackray spent his formative years on his parent's farm in Mogumber. Many of his classmates at primary school were part of the stolen generation. His concern for and affinity with Indigenous peoples continued throughout his professional career. For all the highlights and achievements of his professional career, to which I will return, some of his happiest and most satisfying professional moments came during his work in Newman with the Martu people of the Western Desert towards the end of his tenure as Chief Judge.

Stephen Thackray had an outstanding career as a family lawyer before his appointment as principal registrar of the Family Court of Western Australia in 1997, and his inevitable and well-deserved appointment as a judge of that court in 2004. He was appointed Chief Judge of the Family Court of Western Australia in February 2007 and served with distinction in that role until his retirement in January 2019.

Over the course of his judicial career, he established a well-deserved reputation as one of Australia's finest and most respected family law jurists. As a judge, he was both wise and empathetic. His brilliant legal mind was paired with an open, patient and courteous demeanour that ensured that all who appeared in his court felt that they had been heard and treated with respect.

As Chief Judge of the Family Court of Western Australia, and in his role as a senior member and head of the Appeal Division of the Family Court of Australia, he took on some of the most difficult cases ever to come before those courts. He led the development of family law jurisprudence throughout Australia to an extent matched by very few in the history of the Family Court. He led the Family Court of Western Australia by quiet example, grace and good humour. His judicial colleagues, and support staff at all levels within the court, respected him, enjoyed his friendship and strived to meet his example. His leadership was largely responsible for the collegiate nature of that court, and its success as the best Family Court in Australia, which was also largely accredited to the leadership and skills of His Honour, the late Judge Stephen Thackray.

Stephen Thackray was also a devoted friend, father and husband. His wife, Janet, was his greatest support, and he valued her counsel above all others. He was immensely proud of his children, James and Amanda, and his daughter-in-law, Leandri. We extend our profound sympathy to all of his family and friends.

Stephen Thackray made an enormous contribution to the justice system throughout Australia, and most particularly to the people of Western Australia. The state is poorer for his loss.

Vale Stephen Thackray.

BRIAN GRIFFIN — TRIBUTE

Statement by Minister for Sport and Recreation

MR M.P. MURRAY (Collie–Preston — Minister for Sport and Recreation) [12.17 pm]: I rise to inform the house of the passing of Mr Brian Griffin last Wednesday, 17 June 2020, and to pay my condolences to his family, including his daughter, Nadine, and his son, Scot, and his five grandchildren.

Brian was an esteemed member of the Sport Australia Hall of Fame, having played 30 years of senior lacrosse at the international, national and state level. Brian first represented Australia in 1962, and went on to represent Western Australia and Australia a record number of times, playing in more than 500 matches and scoring over 3 000 goals in his career. Making his A-grade debut for Nedlands–Subiaco in 1957, at just 16 years old, Brian became the youngest player to compete in a senior club team. When playing for the Western Australian under-21 side at just 17 years old, he was crowned the team's leading goal scorer, a title he held onto in local teams for the next 22 years straight. Brian later led Nedlands–Subiaco to its first ever A-grade premiership. Recognised as one of the greatest to have ever played, his style of play changed the game of lacrosse in Australia, and in fact around the world, as he was both the first player in the game to throw and catch with both hands and the developer of a back-hand shot that changed the way the game was played.

In 1967, Brian captained the Australian team at the Toronto World Championships, at which he was named the most valuable player in the entire tournament. Even the Americans could not get enough of Brian's skill, labelling him the best player in the world and inducting him into their United States Lacrosse Hall of Fame in 1972. Later in his career, in 1982, Brian introduced a modified version of the game called softcrosse, which was adopted through the Aussie Sports program and introduced into the sporting curriculum in schools around Australia.

Brian truly changed the sport of lacrosse, as a player, administrator, mentor and coach, and has left an enduring legacy through his revolutionary style of play. He is a legendary Western Australian athlete who will be sadly missed.

“FILLING THE POOL” REPORT — GENDER EQUALITY

Statement by Minister for Women’s Interests

MS S.F. McGURK (Fremantle — Minister for Women’s Interests) [12.20 pm]: I rise to inform the house of the fifth anniversary of the Committee for Perth’s “Filling the Pool” report. “Filling the Pool” was a landmark gender equality research report led by Dr Terrance Fitzsimmons. This report explored the particular settings in Perth, in particular the mining, energy and construction sectors in Western Australia, that have led to a highly masculine corporate and social culture in our state. It looked at the entrenched gender stereotypes that contribute to increased levels of direct and indirect discrimination through recruitment, selection, performance and promotions.

This year marks five years since the launch of the report and it is important that we reflect on progress and what remains to be done to drive gender equality in WA. I was pleased to join the CEO of the Committee for Perth and Dr Fitzsimmons to host a virtual celebration of this milestone. We reflected on the many organisations that have worked hard to change attitudes, and I have been heartened by shifts throughout the state as gender diversity policies and initiatives are implemented by a range of companies.

But I think we are all aware that much more needs to be done if we are to achieve both a cultural and a structural shift. Many issues raised five years ago in the “Filling the Pool” report remain today. The COVID-19 pandemic has highlighted the importance of working together to change cultural norms and to recognise that seemingly intractable issues, such as flexible work or shared domestic and caring duties, are in fact achievable.

In March 2020, I launched “Stronger Together: WA’s Plan for Gender Equality” as part of International Women’s Day celebrations. As we move forward into the next phase of the COVID-19 pandemic, our plan for gender equality is more important than ever. I would like to congratulate the Committee for Perth on the fifth anniversary of “Filling the Pool”. Its commitment to gender equality in Western Australia has been remarkable and mirrors the government’s commitments. With a whole-of-community and determined approach, we can build a stronger and more equal Western Australia.

ANIMAL WELFARE AND TRESPASS LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL 2020

Introduction and First Reading

Bill introduced, on motion by **Mr J.R. Quigley (Attorney General)**, and read a first time.

Explanatory memorandum presented by the Attorney General.

Second Reading

MR J.R. QUIGLEY (Butler — Attorney General) [12.22 pm]: It gives me great pleasure to now move to the second reading of this bill, which the Nationals WA have been demanding the presentation of for some good time and we deliver on today.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members!

Mr J.R. QUIGLEY: That is why I am so pleased to introduce the Animal Welfare and Trespass Legislation Amendment Bill 2020.

I move —

That the bill be now read a second time.

This is a bill that the National Party has waited a long time for and it has been vociferous in its demands that it come forward.

The bill will amend three primary acts: the Western Australian Criminal Code, the WA Restraining Orders Act 1997 and the WA Animal Welfare Act 2002. This bill has been prepared in response to a number of incidents occurring nationally and across our state when people have trespassed on land used for commercial animal food production, and interfered with those businesses, purportedly to draw attention to inhumane animal husbandry practices. These events reflect important and related issues of community concern. The unlawful behaviour of these people is not acceptable to the WA community. There is a clear need to protect our agricultural sector, and in particular, regional farming families from the adverse economic, biosecurity and personal effects of this type of trespass. What is also evident is that the WA community cares very strongly about animal welfare. There is a clear need to maintain community confidence in the animal welfare practices employed by our agricultural sector. High consumer confidence in animal welfare has the added benefit of securing the long-term viability of commercial animal food production. The bill responds to these complex issues by bringing together a number of law reform measures in a single package. I will address each of these in turn, starting with the reforms set out in parts 3 and 4 of the bill.

Criminal Code and Restraining Orders Act amendments: The amendments to the Criminal Code and the Restraining Orders Act are aimed at deterring trespass on land used for animal-source food production. The bill increases the applicable criminal penalties and improves accessibility to misconduct restraining orders in specific

circumstances. The current maximum penalty for trespass under section 70A of the Criminal Code is imprisonment for 12 months and a fine of \$12 000. The bill seeks to amend the Criminal Code to provide for circumstances of aggravation when in the course of or as a result of the trespass on an animal-source food production place, an offender interferes with, or intends to interfere with, animal-source food production; or assaults, intimidates or harasses, or intends to assault, intimidate or harass, a person in the context of their engagement in animal-source food production or a family member of the person. That the trespass occurred on an animal-source food production place is a key element of the aggravated offence. This is defined to mean an abattoir, a knackery or an animal-source food production facility, and is intended to capture traditional family animal farms, piggeries, poultry barns, feedlots, abattoirs and knackeries. Finally, the offence must be committed in circumstances of aggravation.

The first circumstance of aggravation is that the person has interfered with animal-source food production. This includes negatively impacting biosecurity, damaging or stealing property, or releasing or causing animals to escape. The second circumstance of aggravation is that the trespasser intimidates, harasses or assaults a person engaged in animal-source food production or a family member of such a person. The reference to “family members” recognises the reality that farms are often family homes as well as commercial operations. This circumstance of aggravation only applies when the intimidation, harassment or assault occurs in the context of the person’s engagement in animal-source food production. This is designed to exclude disputes of a purely personal nature. This offence has been narrowly framed with the deliberate intent of minimising the risk of unintended impacts. The amendments introduced by this bill are not aimed at stifling protest; instead, they are intended to deter or prevent trespass that has an adverse effect on relevant commercial operations or that unreasonably targets persons engaged in such operations. It is also important to note that the new offence contained in this bill does not propose to expand the circumstances in which a person commits the offence of trespass. When a person has a lawful right to access land or to enter property, the offence of trespass is not committed and the proposed circumstances of aggravation do not apply. This principle applies in the industrial context; for example, a person exercising the right of entry under division 2G of the Western Australian Industrial Relations Act 1997 or parts 3 and 4 of the commonwealth Fair Work Act 2009 does not commit trespass and will therefore not be affected by the new measures. The government has been very considered in the drafting of this new offence to ensure that it is appropriately directed.

The proposed maximum penalty for the new offence of aggravated trespass is two years’ imprisonment and a fine of \$24 000. This is double the usual maximum penalty for trespass, reflecting the seriousness of the conduct. If a court does not impose a term of imprisonment, it must impose a minimum penalty of a community service order and a fine of at least \$2 400, unless exceptional circumstances exist. A community order made pursuant to the minimum penalty must contain a direction prohibiting the offender from attending specified places—for example, animal farms—and require that the offender undertake unpaid community service. A person who commits another offence while subject to a community order and who breaches a condition of the community order may be resentenced for the original offence. This will allow penalties to be escalated for repeat offending to the maximum penalty of two years’ imprisonment or a \$24 000 fine.

The Restraining Orders Act: In addition to the harsher penalties available under the proposed new Criminal Code offence, part 4 of the bill amends the Restraining Orders Act to make it easier for a person who has been, or may in the future be, affected by aggravated trespass to obtain the protection of a misconduct restraining order.

Animal welfare amendments: I now turn to the amendments to the Animal Welfare Act, contained in part 2 of the bill. The Animal Welfare Act creates powers of entry and inspection for the purposes of investigating animal cruelty. At present, these powers do not allow for the implementation of a monitoring program and permit only general inspectors to enter a place either by consent or when the inspector reasonably suspects that an offence has been, is being or is likely to be committed. These powers are inadequate to meet the community’s expectations; namely, that the appropriate authorities have, and exercise, the necessary powers to monitor for compliance with welfare standards in animal source food production.

The powers-of-entry provisions in this bill are limited to designated inspectors employed by the Department of Primary Industries and Regional Development and may be exercised only when monitoring activities in abattoirs, knackeries and intensive production places. An “intensive production place” is defined to mean a non-residential place where intensive production is carried out. This definition will ensure that the powers of a designated inspector do not extend to a residence. Limiting the powers of entry in reference to intensive production places, abattoirs and knackeries will also help ensure that inspectors are targeted towards higher-risk production methods. This specifically excludes extensive farming operations for which grazing is a key component of the animal food production system. The proposed amendments will provide a level of assurance to concerned members of the public that animal welfare standards in these types of establishments can be properly monitored by the appropriate authorities.

The intent behind the ability to regulate certain stocking densities is to enable the inclusion of livestock that are, for all intents and purposes, intensively produced but that may not be adequately caught by the definition in the act. A prescribed stocking density provides a clear, confident measure to regulate in these instances. Taken together, these reforms address the difficult question of how best to encourage transparency in, and extend protections to, commercial animal farming operations. Most of us here in WA consider ourselves to be animal

lovers and do not want to see animals mistreated. However, we equally do not support the activities of those who trespass on agricultural land, causing distress to the animals, farmers and their families, as well as negatively impacting on biosecurity. For these reasons, I commend the bill to the house.

Debate adjourned, on motion by **Mr A. Krsticevic**.

**WORKERS' COMPENSATION AND INJURY MANAGEMENT AMENDMENT
(COVID-19 RESPONSE) BILL 2020**

Introduction and First Reading

Bill introduced, on motion by **Mr W.J. Johnston (Minister for Industrial Relations)**, and read a first time.

Explanatory memorandum presented by the minister.

Second Reading

MR W.J. JOHNSTON (Cannington — Minister for Industrial Relations) [12.35 pm]: I move —

That the bill be now read a second time.

The bill that I am introducing today will provide for a number of important and urgent reforms to the workers' compensation system. A central part of the need to bring this reform forward at this time is to make sure that healthcare workers have timely access to workers' compensation entitlements if they contract COVID-19.

The bill addresses a small number of constraints and barriers in the workers' compensation legislation that are exacerbated by the COVID-19 pandemic and the responses to it. Each of the issues covered by this COVID-19 response bill are being brought forward from the broader rewrite of the Workers' Compensation and Injury Management Act 1981, given the imperative to deal with them as a priority.

The first and main issue this bill provides for is a rebuttable presumption in favour of workers who contract specified diseases for the purpose of accessing workers' compensation entitlements. At the forefront of our mind in bringing forward this reform are healthcare workers. Healthcare workers, and particularly those in hospital settings, are clearly at a heightened risk of contracting COVID-19, given their proximity to people with the disease. In recognising this, the McGowan government applauds the efforts of all workers providing essential services to the community during the pandemic.

Under the current legislative requirements, a worker's employment must be a significant contributing factor to the contraction of the disease in order to access workers' compensation entitlements. The requirement to prove an occupational link to diseases that are prevalent in the community can be difficult and costly. Without any specific legislative arrangement, healthcare workers would be left to prove COVID-19 was contracted from exposure at work, and produce medical evidence to support the claim. This, in turn, may prompt factual investigations and medical reviews by the relevant insurer if there is any doubt about the cause of the disease. When there is conflicting medical or factual evidence, the claim is likely to be disputed, with any resolution of the claim dealt with as a dispute in WorkCover WA's Conciliation and Arbitration Services. This is not the best way for claims to be resolved for healthcare workers who are working under such difficult circumstances in close proximity to the WA community. They should not have the added stress of having to prove the cause of COVID-19, should they contract the disease.

The bill will provide for regulations to be made that establish the presumption of work-related injury for diseases suffered by workers in prescribed employment. It will be up to the employer or insurer to rebut that presumption and establish that the disease was not contracted at work. This regulation-making power is brought forward from the rewrite of the act. Although the regulation-making power needs to be flexible to accommodate other occupational diseases and classes of employment if the circumstances justify it, the government's priority is to ensure that regulations are made in the first instance for healthcare workers in frontline settings who contract COVID-19.

The bill will enable regulations to be made with retrospective operation from 16 March 2020, the day of the first COVID-19 emergency declaration in WA. The legislative change required is small, but the effect on our healthcare workers is big. It will mean that they will be supported through the workers' compensation process and get the compensation they need for medical treatment or time off work, or their dependent loved ones will receive financial support if the worker tragically dies as a result of the disease.

The bill also removes what is known as the "termination day". This is an additional and more restrictive statutory time frame to the general limitation period that applies to common law claims for personal injury. Some workers have experienced problems obtaining impairment assessments from approved medical specialists due to the availability of specialists and social distancing requirements during the COVID-19 response. This is problematic for workers pursuing common law damages because they must have an impairment assessment completed and lodge the assessment and election to pursue common law by the "termination day". This is generally 12 months from the workers' compensation claim date. Although the procedural requirements to elect to pursue common law damages based on an impairment of at least 15 per cent will remain, the "termination day" will be removed.

The only time constraint on workers commencing common law proceedings will be the general limitation period that already applies to common law claims for personal injury. The removal of the common law termination day is also being brought forward from the rewrite of the workers' compensation legislation and was broadly supported by stakeholders as part of WorkCover WA's review of the Workers' Compensation and Injury Management Act 1981.

The bill also addresses two other important issues. The bill will introduce a protection against any indexed worker entitlement reduction. Caps on worker entitlements are indexed annually based on movements in Australian Bureau of Statistics indices such as average weekly earnings, the wage price index and the consumer price index. Without this protection, the economic impacts of COVID-19 may be reflected in future ABS indices being negative, which would result in payments to workers receiving compensation being reduced. We are also bringing forward changes to facilitate electronic service and exchange of certain notices and documents required to be sent under the workers' compensation legislation. I seek unified support from members for the timely passage of this COVID-19 response bill to ensure our healthcare workers are supported, and constraints and barriers in the workers' compensation legislation that are exacerbated by the COVID-19 pandemic are removed.

I commend the bill to the house.

Debate adjourned, on motion by **Mr A. Krsticevic**.

CONSERVATION AND LAND MANAGEMENT AMENDMENT BILL 2020

Introduction and First Reading

Bill introduced, on motion by **Mr R.R. Whitby (Parliamentary Secretary)**, and read a first time.

Explanatory memorandum presented by the parliamentary secretary.

Second Reading

MR R.R. WHITBY (Baldivis — Parliamentary Secretary) [12.42 pm]: I move —

That the bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of the Conservation and Land Management Amendment Bill 2020 is to amend the Conservation and Land Management Act 1984—the CALM act. It gives me great pleasure to introduce these amendments. These amendments will give effect to our election commitment to enable joint vesting of marine reserves with traditional owners.

Leading into the March 2017 election, we stated —

At its heart, A McGowan Labor Government will protect the rights of Traditional Owners to their land and sea Country. We will recognise rights through improved consultation, recognition of indigenous leadership in land management, supporting participation in economic activities on Country, and the joint vesting of marine parks.

I am aware that traditional owners have long held aspirations to be both joint managers of, and have a formal vesting interest in, their land and sea country. Changes were made to the CALM act in 2015 to enable terrestrial reserves, such as national parks, nature reserves and conservation parks to be jointly vested with the Conservation and Parks Commission and an Aboriginal body corporate. The amendments in this bill extend the joint vesting provisions to marine parks, marine management areas and marine nature reserves.

The bill will also provide statutory recognition that the conservation purpose of marine parks includes the protection and conservation of the value of marine parks to the culture and heritage of Aboriginal people. This means that in special purpose areas—referred to as special purpose zones in management plans—the protection and conservation of Aboriginal culture and heritage values will be a conservation purpose in addition to the other purposes referred to in section 13(1), which are considered when determining incompatible uses. Special purpose zones in marine parks will continue to be identified through the well-established consultative marine park planning processes, which require the approval of the Minister for Environment and the concurrence of the Minister for Mines and Petroleum and the Minister for Fisheries.

Also included in the bill are amendments that clarify the regulatory framework for the management of section 8C lands. Section 8C provides for unallocated crown land and unmanaged reserves to be managed by the CALM act CEO, with the CEO's management functions for the land specified in the order. Crown land remains subject to the provisions of the Land Administration Act 1997 and its regulations, so the amendments will clarify that the CALM act and its regulations will apply only to the extent specified in the section 8C order. Specifically, Part IX of the CALM act, which provides for compliance and enforcement, and the Conservation and Land Management Regulations will apply only to land subject to a section 8C order if the section 8C order specifies that they do. Similarly, a function of the CEO in section 33 of the CALM act will apply only if it is specified in the section 8C order.

Other amendments that the bill will make are administrative in nature and will update and modernise the CALM act in accordance with the government's goal of pursuing legislative reform to reduce red tape and ensure that legislation operates efficiently. These include amendments that will remove the requirement for permit and licence forms to be prescribed, and other amendments to address miscellaneous minor anomalies and omissions.

I commend the bill to the house.

Debate adjourned, on motion by **Dr D.J. Honey**.

**DEPARTMENT OF PRIMARY INDUSTRIES AND REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT —
AGRICULTURE BUDGET**

Removal of Order — Statement by Acting Speaker

THE ACTING SPEAKER (Mr T.J. Healy) [12.46 pm]: I inform members that in accordance with standing order 144A, the private members' business order of the day that appeared on the last notice paper as "Western Australia's Agricultural Sector" has not been debated for more than 12 calendar months and has been removed from the notice paper.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE — COUNCIL MESSAGES

Standing Orders Suspension — Motion

MR D.R. MICHAEL (Balcatta) [12.46 pm]: On behalf of the Leader of the House, I move —

That for the remainder of this week, so much of the standing orders be suspended as is necessary to enable messages from the Legislative Council to be taken into consideration on the day on which they are received.

MR Z.R.F. KIRKUP (Dawesville) [12.46 pm]: The opposition will support the suspension of standing orders. This is not the responsibility of the acting Leader of the House or the government Whip, but I note that presently some 53 bills that the government has introduced have yet to pass this place.

Mr W.J. Johnston: The other place—not this place.

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: Sorry. I mean the Parliament generally speaking.

Mr W.J. Johnston: The upper house.

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: In the other place.

The reason that we are suspending standing orders, member for Cannington —

Mr W.J. Johnston interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Minister!

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: — is that we have five bills that are coming back —

Mr W.J. Johnston interjected.

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: It is not dysfunction at all. It is mismanagement by the government, which cannot get its legislative agenda —

The ACTING SPEAKER: Minister, you can also seek the call if you wish to. Please allow the member to continue his remarks.

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: The government cannot get its agenda together in the other place. That is the problem here. The government in the other place —

Mr P. Papalia interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Minister!

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: The government in the other place cannot get its priorities together. Consistently, time and again, it changes its order of priorities for important legislation. Then we find ourselves in this place and, unfortunately, the government has to move a suspension of standing orders so that bills can be dealt with without delay.

Mr W.J. Johnston: This happens every year. This is rubbish.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Minister!

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: Every year? It does, indeed, member for Cannington, but it happens towards the end of the year. I have not seen this in a June sitting period before a winter break. More than 50 bills have not passed the Parliament —

Mr W.J. Johnston interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member, do you seek to take interjections?

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: I am always enthralled by the contributions of the member for Cannington.

The ACTING SPEAKER: I will ask you to please not encourage them. Please continue your remarks and please keep talking through the Chair.

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: There is no-one I enjoy speaking to more in this place than you, Mr Acting Speaker.

I only point out that there are some significant pieces of legislation that, because of the government's mishandling of the Parliament and its legislative agenda, have yet to pass. I am concerned that once again we are facing a suspension of standing orders motion to make sure that messages from the other place can be considered without delay. The opposition will agree to the suspension of standing orders because, of course, as the member for Cottesloe rightly points out, we are here to make sure that the government gets an expeditious approach to its legislative agenda for important legislation.

MR D.R. MICHAEL (Balcatta) [12.49 pm] — in reply: I appreciate the opposition's support for this motion, although I have to say that we heard more whinging from the Liberal Party. On every decision this government has taken during the COVID crisis, we have heard whinge, whinge, whinge. This is the least supportive opposition party in Australia. Members had a crack at all the bills in the upper house. I will not go through the speeches made by some members of the upper house on those bills, the time that they have taken or whether that was appropriate. There are some members—this will be unpopular on my side of the chamber—of the Liberal Party in the upper house who I have a great deal of time for, especially the members for the North Metropolitan Region, Hon Michael Mischin and Hon Peter Collier. I have spent a lot of time with them. I will not go through their speeches, how long some of them have taken or the crack they had at us yesterday. I will not do that, but I will say that important legislation has come to this chamber and, first, we are about to enter the winter recess and it is completely normal, whether it is at the end or the middle of the year, to put through legislation that has the support of most parties and will make Western Australia better. Second, we are in the middle of a pandemic and some of this legislation will get jobs going, including the Planning and Development Amendment Bill 2020 we are about to deal with and some other legislation that will be coming down to this chamber. It is critical that this Parliament can deal with that legislation this week and that is why we need to suspend standing orders.

Question put and passed.

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT AMENDMENT BILL 2020

Returned

Bill returned from the Council with amendments.

Council's Amendments — Consideration in Detail

The amendments made by the Council were as follows —

No 1

Clause 2, page 2, after line 10 — To insert —

- (2) However if a provision of this Act does not come into operation before the end of the period of 10 years beginning on the day on which this Act receives the Royal Assent, the provision is repealed on the day after that period ends.

No 2

Clause 4, page 4, lines 7 to 13 — To delete the lines.

No 3

Clause 4, page 4, line 21 — To delete the line.

No 4

Clause 4, page 4, after line 25 — To insert —

- (vi) the *Local Government Act 1995*;

No 5

Clause 4, page 4, lines 26 and 27 — To delete the lines and substitute —

- (c) any enactment, other than the following —
- (i) this Act;
 - (ii) an enactment covered by paragraph (b);
 - (iii) the EP Act;

No 6

Clause 4, page 5, lines 5 to 20 — To delete the lines.

No 7

Clause 4, page 5, lines 27 to 29 — To delete the lines.

No 8

Clause 4, page 6, lines 3 to 22 — To delete the lines and substitute —

- (a) development that has an estimated cost of —
 - (i) in the case of a development that is wholly or partly in the metropolitan region — \$20 million or more;
 - or
 - (ii) in any other case — \$5 million or more;
 - or

No 9

Clause 4, page 6, line 26 to page 7, line 3, to delete the lines and substitute —

substantially commenced, subject to subsection (4), has the meaning given in the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015* Schedule 2 clause 1 as in force at the beginning of the recovery period;

No 10

Clause 4, page 8, after line 16 — To insert —

- (3) To avoid doubt, this Part is subject to section 5 of the EP Act.

No 11

Clause 4, page 10, after line 6 — To insert —

- (7) The Premier, within 14 days after the day on which a direction is given under subsection (5), must cause a copy of it to be published in the *Gazette* and, as soon as is practicable, must cause a copy of it to be laid before each House of Parliament or dealt with under section 268A.

No 12

Clause 4, page 15, line 22 — To delete the line and substitute —

- (a) consult the CEO (as defined in the *Contaminated Sites Act 2003* section 3(1)) if the development is of land referred to in section 58(1)(a)(i) of that Act in respect of which a memorial is registered under section 58 of that Act; and

No 13

Clause 4, page 16, after line 13 — To insert —

- (d) have due regard to any submission made, or advice given, to the Commission in the course of a consultation under paragraph (a), (b) or (c).

No 14

Clause 4, page 16, line 28 to page 17, line 7 — To delete the lines and substitute —

- (6) The Commission must —
 - (a) consult any person or body not referred to in subsections (2) to (5) whom the Commission considers it appropriate to consult; and
 - (b) in the manner the Commission considers appropriate, advertise the development application, inviting submissions from members of the public generally or from a class or group of members of the public that the Commission considers appropriate; and
 - (c) have due regard to any submissions made by members of the public in response to the invitation under paragraph (b).
- (6A) The Commission may do anything else that is not covered by subsections (2) to (6) and that the Commission considers it appropriate to do in order to obtain a document, information, an opinion or any other contribution from any person or body.

No 15

Clause 4, page 17, lines 8 and 9 — To delete “referred to in subsection (6)(a), (b) or (c),” and substitute — under subsection (6)(a) or (b) or (6A),

No 16

Clause 4, page 18, lines 34 and 35 — To delete the lines.

No 17

Clause 4, page 19, line 14 — To delete “48 months” and substitute —
24 months

No 18

Clause 4, page 24, after line 24 — To insert —

- (6A) The Minister, within 14 days after the day on which the direction is given, must cause a copy of it to be published in the *Gazette* and, as soon as is practicable, must cause a copy of it to be laid before each House of Parliament or dealt with under section 268A.

No 19

Clause 4, page 26, after line 24 — To insert —

- (7) The Minister, within 14 days after the day on which the direction is given, must cause a copy of it to be published in the *Gazette* and, as soon as is practicable, must cause a copy of it to be laid before each House of Parliament or dealt with under section 268A.

No 20

Clause 4, page 29, line 21 to page 30, line 3 — To delete the lines and substitute —

- (2) Without limiting subsection (1), Part 17 regulations may prescribe powers, duties, procedures or any other matters for the purposes of, or in relation to —
- (a) applications, notifications, referrals or directions under this Part; or
 - (b) the consideration or determination of applications or notifications under this Part.

No 21

Clause 67, page 67, lines 21 to 27 — To delete the clause.

No 22

Clause 106, page 94, lines 28 to 32 — To delete the lines.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I move —

That amendment 1 made by the Council be agreed to.

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: I understand that amendment 1 seeks to insert a subclause on commencement and was moved by the opposition in the Legislative Council. What effect will the subclause have on the operation of the bill and why is it considered necessary?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: First of all, I want to put on the record my appreciation for the work done on this bill by the crossbench and the Liberal and National Parties in the upper house and in this place. Not all members were fair in their analysis of the legislation, but some members were—I do not think anyone was. Anyway, I thank members for their cooperation, particularly members of the upper house. I thank the Leader of the Nationals WA, Hon Tjorn Sibma and Hon Rick Mazza—whom I started to get to know and like through this process of looking at planning—for their keenness to engage on this legislation. I thank members very much for their contributions and their support for the bill.

I understand that this amendment goes to the point that the member for Balcatta raised earlier about the management of these bills in the upper house. This subclause was put forward by Hon Nick Goiran—I understand that he puts forward the same amendment for every bill that goes through that place—and states that if a provision of the bill is not operational within 10 years, the provision will be repealed. We accepted the amendment on the basis of working cooperatively with the Liberal Party. I understand that the member puts forward the same amendment for every bill. I am not sure what point he is trying to prove but it is something we have to deal with in the upper house. We were happy to accept the amendment and move that it be agreed to in this place.

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: I thank the minister. Given the minister has been so glowing in her praise for the opposition, I would also like to thank Hon Tjorn Sibma and members of the upper house for their diligent work amending and tidying up this bill. I note that of the 22 amendments before us, 11 were moved by the government and the remainder were moved by the opposition or crossbench. Hon Tjorn Sibma has done some very good work in helping to improve the bill overall. Assuming this legislation comes into place, amendment 1 means that the remainder of this clause will have no effect. Is that the case? If a provision of the bill does not come into operation within the next 10 years, it will be repealed. Does the minister anticipate that any part of the legislation would be covered by this amendment?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I truly hope that this amendment will never be used. I am hopeful that all provisions will be in place and proclaimed within the next 10 years.

Question put and passed; the Council’s amendment agreed to.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I move —

That amendment 2 made by the Council be agreed to.

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: I am looking to my friends in the National Party to signal the point at which they will jump in. To clarify, I believe that this amendment was moved by Hon Rick Mazza and is consequential to a more substantial amendment on a clause that appears later in the bill before us. My reading of the amendment is that it will delete the definition of “dwelling”, which is obviously a term that is relatively significant to be defined in this legislation. Why is it imperative that this definition be deleted?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I am sorry; I forgot thank the member for Dawesville, too, for his contribution to debate on this bill in this house. I am sorry about that, of course.

Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup: I’m not here for the praise.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I will be condemning the member soon, apparently. Currently, I am in the congratulating phase.

As the member pointed out, this amendment deletes the definition of “dwelling”. The definition of “dwelling” is no longer required because a subsequent amendment will remove the criteria of the number of dwellings needed for a project to go on the significant project pathway. As that definition has changed somewhat, the requirement for a definition of “dwelling” is no longer required.

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: To clarify, in that case, has the threshold for what is a substantial project changed? From memory, I think a project developer needed to construct 100 apartments or dwellings to qualify as a significant project under this legislation. I assume that because that is no longer a requirement, the definition of “dwelling” is no longer needed. Is that the case?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Correct.

Question put and passed; the Council’s amendment agreed to.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I move —

That amendment 3 made by the Council be agreed to.

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: Amendment 3 seeks to remove the reference to the Environmental Protection Act 1986 as a legal instrument as defined in the act. Could the minister provide some clarity on why that was required? I understand Hon Dr Steve Thomas moved this amendment in the other place.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Hon Dr Steve Thomas put an amendment on the supplementary notice paper. The government looked at that amendment, and with the aim of working well with the opposition, we moved our own amendment and picked up some of the consequential amendments. A package of amendments needed to be put in place to make sure that the intent of Hon Dr Steve Thomas’s amendment could be carried through. It alters the definition of “legal instrument” by removing the reference to the Environmental Protection Act. In a sense, it removes the Environmental Protection Authority from the conflict resolution pathway that had been established for insignificant projects.

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: I thank the minister very much for that response. Does that mean the EPA will have zero role to play with regard to the operation of this bill? If we remove the EP act as a required legal instrument for a significant project, the EPA will no longer have a role in that conflict. Does that take the EPA out of this process altogether now?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Yes.

Question put and passed; the Council’s amendment agreed to.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I move —

That amendment 4 made by the Council be agreed to.

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: I understand this amendment will insert “the Local Government Act 1995”. From my cursory reading of it, this amendment was moved by Hon Tjorn Sibma in the other place and provides some resolution for conflicts that would have been created between local governments and Main Roads WA; is that correct?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Yes. That conflict resolution existed anyway under the definition of “legal instrument”. We do not believe that this amendment does anything more than already existed, but in view of working well with the opposition in the upper house, we supported that amendment. Again, we do not think it has any impact but we supported the amendment to facilitate goodwill in the upper house.

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: I appreciate the minister has agreed on the basis of “goodwill”, to quote the minister. I realise it was already a requirement for any other legal instruments as part of this catch-all. Does this provide any further certainty in that case as part of this process? I am sure that the upper house members were seeking more certainty as part of this process. I am sure it helps strengthen the bill.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Not really, but it explicitly states it, so I suppose it adds more clarity—maybe—but not really.

Mr R.S. LOVE: If I am to read this correctly, the insertion of “the Local Government Act 1995” provides no greater certainty and provides no greater duty upon the decision-maker. Why, then, is there a list of acts to be considered in the first place?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: It is because they are the ones that are most commonly used in development applications. They tried to identify those that were most commonly used. On the whole issue about conflict resolution at Main Roads, I understand why the amendment was moved, but that is dealt with in by-laws under the Local Government Act. Hon Tjorn Sibma moved this in an attempt to pick that up. We believe it would have been picked up in any other legal instrument. We did not think it was appropriate in the initial drafting stage to put in “Local Government Act” because of some of the local government concerns generally. We thought it would be picked up anyway. We do not believe that this, legally, has any further requirements. All it does is add clarity. The reason those acts are listed is that they are the legal instruments that are most often not in conflict but are used in the planning process.

Question put and passed; the Council’s amendment agreed to.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I move —

That amendment 5 made by the Council be agreed to.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms S.E. Winton): Member for Dawesville.

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: Good to see you today, Acting Speaker.

The ACTING SPEAKER: I am looking forward to the debate.

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: Indeed.

A member interjected.

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: I do; always.

The ACTING SPEAKER: I am here now; all is well!

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: That is right. The world is a better place for it, let me tell you, Acting Speaker!

I understand this amendment is —

Mr D.J. Kelly: You might love it in here, Dawesville, but you should be doorknocking!

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: Thank you very much for your fantastic contribution as always, member for Bassendean. I find you so witty! You tried that line a couple of times earlier.

Mr R.S. Love interjected.

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: No-one wants to see the member doorknocking. It reminds me of some candidates we ran in earlier elections—you would lose votes as you go doorknocking, but anyway, we will see!

The ACTING SPEAKER: All right. Shall we talk about planning?

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: Sure.

Mr D.J. Kelly: Take the advice!

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: Thank you very much, minister. It is much easier from the cheap seats at the back!

Amendment 5 was moved by the government in an effort to tidy up and strengthen part of the bill. Could the minister explain the amendment and why it was moved in the upper house rather than in this place?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Again, it deletes the reference to the Environmental Protection Act. Hon Dr Steve Thomas put this simple deletion on the supplementary notice paper. We sought advice about how we could achieve its intent. After advice, it was recognised there needed to be a number of amendments to a number of clauses. This is part of that package. This package supports the definition of “legal instrument”. If reference to the EP act is deleted in proposed paragraph (b)(ii) under the definition of “legal instrument” at proposed section 269, the EP act would still be captured by proposed paragraph (c). Proposed paragraph (c) states that it applies to any enactment, which means any written law, and that would include the EP act. Therefore, proposed paragraph (c) puts the issue beyond doubt by explaining that a legal instrument does not include the EP act.

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: Is this effectively consequential housekeeping as a result of the amendment moved by Hon Dr Steve Thomas in the other place?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Yes, it is part of a package. From the small amendment that Hon Dr Steve Thomas moved, it grew into a range of different amendments to ensure that the intent of Hon Dr Steve Thomas’s amendment could be executed. That involves four to five different amendments, as we work through, to remove the EP act from that definition.

Mr R.S. LOVE: It might be tidying up, but it is actually the final removal of the EP act in this context. Could the minister please explain to me and to the house what the practical implications of the removal of the EP act will be for the deliberations of the decision-maker?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: As normally happens, the EPA issue became a bigger perception issue than it is in reality. I think the figures are that over the past four and a half to five years, two out of 270 development assessment panel DAs have been referred to the EPA. Normally, DAs do not require assessment by the Environmental Protection Authority. Normally, they are operating in existing development spaces or existing boundaries. It is unlikely that any would be referred. Looking at the mathematics, it is unlikely that any, or many, would be referred anyway.

This is something that was put in initially by the government to ensure that the EP act was dealt with similar to other acts and other legal instruments. Some people took issue with that. We understood that, and that is why we agreed and then moved these amendments to clarify that. We do not think the actual impact will be of any significance whatsoever.

Mr R.S. LOVE: That is an interesting understanding, because I would have thought that when dealing with more complex and larger applications, which is the intent here, the likelihood would be much greater than the average to have triggered some sort of an interaction and therefore I question the wisdom of the minister's acceptance of that. I understand it was debated at length in the other house. I am still scratching my head as to how that helps the aim of the bill.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I thank the member for that contribution. There is another amendment a bit later on that will, I suppose, give the member some—what is the word?—comfort about the Environmental Protection Authority's interactions with this bill, which I will explain later. Most development assessments that go before development assessment panels are significant buildings in urban corridors and in an urban context. Development assessments in the regional context do not normally involve natural environments. Environmental considerations really come into effect in planning schemes and metropolitan region schemes, when people are operating in greenfields and new areas, and structure plans. The EPA would come into play more significantly when people are working with new, untouched areas.

Mr R.S. LOVE: That might be the advice that the minister was given, but from my experience certainly in my area and region—not just my electorate, but regionally speaking—very often it is very large projects that have an interaction with the natural environment that come adrift. I do not have to think very far back to be reminded of a situation in a town in my electorate that split the community.

Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup: Where was it?

Mr R.S. LOVE: In Lancelin. The community was split over whether a particular project should go ahead. The former Deputy Premier, the good Dr Hames, was a great proponent of a particular development in that community, while another prominent Western Australian politician, who happened to be a dentist, not a doctor, appeared not to be in support of the project. It all hinged on environmental interactions and environmental assessments. I am talking about iconic developments on the coast. I can think of another example going back a few years when the Minister for Regional Development was the Minister for Planning and Infrastructure and was dealing with a submission by a developer in Geraldton for the Abrolhos Islands. Again, the lack of ability to interact on the environmental issues was the killer of a large iconic project. I can think of many up and down the coast. I will not talk about Coral Bay and other areas. That has been the stopper on many occasions. I question whether removing that from the process will limit the ability of the minister's organisation to achieve the aims that the minister stated. It might be that my communities are happy with the outcome. I am sure many of them would be—certainly many of the residents would be—but it might not have the outcome that the minister is hoping for.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I move —

That amendment 6 made by the Council be agreed to.

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: I understand that this amendment was moved by Hon Rick Mazza in the other place and that it is a consequential or housekeeping amendment as a result of amendments that were moved by Hon Rick Mazza to the rest of the bill. Is that the case?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: That is correct. This amendment relates to the definition of "net lettable area". Again, those criteria were set for the significant pathway. Those criteria are no longer needed, so this definition is no longer needed.

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: Just to clarify, there was an inclusion originally to ensure that a significant project would have to have 20 000 square metres of net lettable area. The amendment removes that requirement because the value threshold has also been changed in an amendment in the bill. I assume that that is the obvious reason to get rid of this. The government is obviously comfortable with removing "net lettable area", because it has been based on the aggregate value of a project generally.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: We could have kept the definition and not used it, but we thought that we would remove it because it is no longer required in the new significant pathway criteria. The amendments agreed to by many of the parties in the upper house on the threshold meant that not only was the value decreased, but also two other subsets of net lettable area requirements and dwelling requirements were removed. In a sense, a much wider net will automatically qualify for the significant pathway.

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: In that respect, does the minister see a significant change because it has changed the obvious definition in terms of the operation of the act? The removal of "net lettable area" is a significant shift from what the government had originally intended, because, of course, 20 000 square metres of net lettable space is significant and it defined what a significant project was. In going to an overall value and getting rid of this definition, given that there was no real need to get rid of it, I do not quite understand why the government accepted the amendment to not include the definition of "net lettable area". Is it effectively because the value will override it?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I will refer to the whole package, because this amendment is a consequence of the major policy change on the size of projects. I had discussions with the shadow Minister for Planning and Hon Rick Mazza, not in the other place but in the corridors between this and the other place. I also talked briefly with the Leader of the National Party about the proposed amendments. It was felt that the current definition was too narrow to allow projects to automatically qualify, so there was a move to bring that threshold down, originally to \$10 million but we agreed to \$20 million, with a \$5 million threshold in regional areas. The proposition was to bring it down to \$10 million and we compromised on \$20 million and \$5 million in regional areas. As a result, the discussion was that the requirement of 20 000 square metres would mean a very large building and it would not pick up additional buildings worth between \$20 million and \$30 million because the net lettable area reflects a very significant building. We would nullify the threshold for commercial buildings if we brought it down to \$20 million. Having the net lettable area requirement would eliminate all the projects that people wanted captured in the \$20 million to \$30 million area.

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: Effectively, as the minister said, it will make no change to the operation in that case because there is nothing that would not be captured already by the dollar amount of the significant project value. This does not help because a project of 20 000 square metres would not be built for less than \$20 million.

Ms R. Saffioti: Yes.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I move —

That amendment 7 made by the Council be agreed to.

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: Amendment 7 deletes lines 27 to 29 on page 5, which removes the requirement for R-codes. I assume that this is because the definition of “dwelling” was removed in amendment 2 and, as such, the R-codes do not need to be referenced. Is that right?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: That is very well put.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I move —

That amendment 8 made by the Council be agreed to.

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: This amendment is one of the most significant changes in the bill because it changes the definition of “significant development”. To refresh members’ memories, the government’s original intent was to ensure that a “significant development” is any development that includes the erection, construction and alteration of 100 or more dwellings and have an estimated cost of \$30 million or more; or any other development to which R-codes would not apply but included the alteration, construction or erection of one or more buildings with a total net lettable area to be constructed of 20 000 square metres or more and cost \$30 million or more. We will now change it to ensure that there is no longer the requirement for the dwellings and no longer the requirement for the net lettable area, and it is judged entirely on a value basis; that is, a project now moved wholly or partially in the case of a development in the metropolitan area would be \$20 million or more, and in any other case, which I assume would be regional, it would be \$5 million or more. This was an amendment moved by Hon Rick Mazza in the other place and agreed to by every party except the Greens, as I understand, and our good friends in the Nationals WA. That is a significant shift from where the government’s original policy was, and I will probably explore that a little bit more, but can the minister provide an update to the house on why the government thought it was necessary to change that value? It has gone from a value of about \$30 million down to \$20 million, and that is a fundamental shift in the government’s positioning on what a significant development is. Why did the government agree to this amendment?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: As the member knows, we had to negotiate this bill through the other place, and so we opened our doors to all parties for amendments and how people in the other place wanted to proceed. Hon Rick Mazza approached me about amendments put to him by industry—in particular, about the threshold. People in the commercial building area believed that the 20 000 square metres net lettable area and \$30 million was basically too high a threshold for projects to fall under. There was also my concern and that of the Premier that reliance on the other pathway would be too heavily utilised as more and more people would try to use that pathway rather than an automatic pathway. That view was put forward and I discussed it with the Premier to get his sounding on whether we would consider a reduction in the threshold. The reduction put forward was \$10 million, and \$5 million in regional areas, which we thought was quite low and would lead to a lot of projects automatically coming through that process.

I approached the Liberal Party, in particular, and the National Party to get their views on the proposal. I do not want to verbal anyone, but I think that the general consensus in the Liberal Party was that \$10 million may be a bit low, but if we could get the majority of the parties in the upper house to support \$20 million, that would be a good thing to do. It would give more certainty to industry and reduce the reliance on the other pathway. That is why I was comfortable with that amendment. Of course, it has implications for the number of projects that we will be receiving; there is no doubt about that. However, it is an 18-month period; it is a special case. If we were looking at the longer term, there would probably have been more discussion, but given that there was a movement in the lower house and the upper house, we were happy to entertain it and support it, and that is what we did.

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: I will use the change from \$30 million to \$20 million in aggregate terms—of course, I realise the implication of what that means commercially and residentially for the net lettable area or dwellings that would have to be constructed. With the change from \$30 million to \$20 million, are we going to see a significant increase in caseload for the Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage? I imagine we would. Has the minister anticipated what that might look like in real numbers of applications? Is there any extra resourcing for the department to deal with that increase in caseload?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Based on last year's development assessment panel figures, we estimated about 57 or 60 applications. We expect it to go to between 90 and 100 applications, just from that pathway. It will mean that for the alternative pathway, we will be very clear that it will not be used as much as it would have been when the threshold was a lot higher. Some of the commitments that we have given are releasing the specific criteria for that, which will include things like the application being in the public interest and it being a jobs generator. These things happen quickly, but overall I am content and satisfied that we have reached a good number. Yes, it will mean an increased workload, but we are looking at resourcing that unit of the department very quickly, and we will resource it with whatever we need to make sure we can do our work properly.

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: I appreciate that that is the resourcing that will be required. That is quite a jump from 57 or 60, based on the last DAP figures, up to 90 to 100; that is a very significant increase in that respect. Obviously, this amendment will help with the economic activity that the government and, indeed, the opposition want to see generated in this state. To be frank, I think it is quite a generous change to move from \$30 million to \$20 million and to remove some of those other requirements. I hope that there is a flow-through of some of that activity down the line, if we are going to see nearly a one-third increase in DAs. That is not without consequence in terms of its economic activity. This is my last question on this amendment, member for Moore. For clarity, I will assume that the metropolitan region is the Perth and Peel regions as defined, or is it just Perth, and then Mandurah and Peel are defined as regional? I am keen to understand that, because in usual planning parlance, the Perth and Peel regions are considered to be in the metropolitan region. There is no definition in the bill, but I assume it is in the act itself. Undoubtedly, it will be quite long, defined by either local government or a cadastre, but I imagine in that case that the minister could provide me with some comfort about where, at the very least, Mandurah falls into this definition.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Schedule 3, "Metropolitan region", on page 230 of the Planning and Development Act, describes, point by point, the metropolitan area compared with the regional area. Mandurah would be a regional area.

Mr R.S. Love: I was going to make that point.

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: As a fellow regional member, member for Moore, I will continue to prosecute it then. It is very consequential for Mandurah to have a \$5 million threshold; that is a good thing. Hopefully, it can stimulate some important economic activity in our community. No response is required, but I am pleased in that case to see that Mandurah is included as a regional community in this respect. I appreciate the amendment.

Mr R.S. LOVE: I am pleased that someone regards Mandurah as a regional community as well, because quite often most people would consider it to be a metropolitan area. From the point of view of the Nationals, the real problem is the diversity of regional areas—for instance, trying to define the City of Mandurah, the Town of Port Hedland, the City of Karratha or the City of Kalgoorlie–Bowler, and then lump in there a small one such as the Shire of Nungarin, which is a very small local government in the wheatbelt. How does one arrive at a figure that is meaningful in trying to define a threshold that has some significance? The minister showed me a diagram that had about a one per cent difference in the number of applications between the \$5 million and \$10 million, but I think setting it at \$5 million is the issue, because previously we had a definition for regional areas, which was that they would be of regional or state significance rather than being set at a level. Knowing the history of some complex and very valuable approvals that have taken place that certainly would have been worth well over \$5 million, Western Australian Planning Commission involvement is important because the process is usually about the complexity of the application, not the figure. Approvals worth up to \$5 million can go through the wheatbelt development assessment panel in no time—it is not that big a deal—but we have failed to pick up that the complexity is the issue here. I do not agree with the \$5 million. I know my colleague in the upper house Hon Colin de Grussa—I hope I got that right; I often get the two Colins there mixed up—outlined the concerns of the Nationals WA. I will refer people to *Hansard* rather than go through in great length and replicate the upper house debate, otherwise we will be here until question time. I will just pick up on that point again and say that we cannot look at the Cities of Karratha and Mandurah and—what is the member for Roe's area?

Mr P.J. Rundle: Broomehill.

Mr R.S. LOVE: We cannot look at those cities and the Shire of Broomehill with the same level of expenditure and say that there is any sense in picking that figure. I would have thought that the City of Mandurah would have been at the same level as a metropolitan area because the level of development there is of a greater scale than it is in Broomehill—and one would expect that. This is not necessarily about the dollar figure. The right measure was to leave the wording to refer to a type of project that is of significance to the state and the region and significant enough for the Premier and the Minister for Planning to feel that WAPC involvement would be of benefit.

On Friday and Monday, I attended the Western Australian Local Government Association's meetings for the Avon–Midland country zone and the northern country zone in my electorate. Those local governments are somewhat perturbed about this. Just to illustrate the imbalance, the City of Greater Geraldton is sitting in a country zone with the Shire of Mingenew; the difference in scale is quite spectacular. The capacity of one area to attract projects of state significance is much greater than the other, but there might be an industrial development or otherwise in Mingenew, which has quite a significant space industry. Member's might have to give me a bit of time here.

Mr W.R. MARMION: I am fascinated with what the member has to say.

Mr R.S. LOVE: Thank you, member for Nedlands. I am glad that you are on the ball. Thank you, Mr Whip!

This is why we chose to oppose this measure in the other place. We are not of a mind to support it here, either, because of these concerns. We support the Planning and Development Amendment Bill 2020, as we have supported pretty well every COVID-19-related legislation. This bill was not put under that particular temporary order, as I recall, but it certainly had elements that responded to COVID-19, including the 18-month period in which the Planning Commission can be involved, and it was treated as an urgent bill. We supported it. I assured the government that the Nationals would support it in the other place. We supported the bill in its entirety in the other place, but we do not support this amendment. We supported the original provision in the bill that was brought into this house because we thought it was good to refer to applications of regional and state significance.

Picking a figure of \$5 million has not helped. I have nothing else to say about the \$20 million for the metropolitan area other than that I understand the points that have been put and I do not find them or the consequential amendments concerning whatsoever. However, the \$5 million is not necessary. It makes what appears to be a simple measure more complex when we look across the breadth of the state. As I said, the local government representatives whom I spoke to on Monday and Friday were, in the main, concerned about it. Representatives from WALGA who were there were also concerned. I also know that members of the other place were contacted by some regional council representatives who were very concerned about what this might mean, and they mainly came from local governments with a larger industrial footprint. I am not sure that we will go into detail about their communications with their local members, but a great deal of the people who came forward were concerned about this. On that basis, the Nationals WA will not be supporting this proposed amendment and we will probably vote against it.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I will make a couple of points. Firstly, on the significant pathway of over \$5 million, if a proponent gets on well with the local government and has a keenness to continue using the existing pathways, it is able to do that. But I note that the development assessment panel's threshold is \$2 million. In a sense, that threshold is lower than the \$5 million. We will continue to have the regional pathway for regional projects to pick up the differences between smaller and larger towns. Yes, the member is right about regional WA—the size of towns differs—but trying to pick up the boundaries for Geraldton and the Pilbara versus the smaller regions was seen as problematic. I pretty much know which council the member is referring to, and I do not think that it supports anything that the Labor Party does—that has been longstanding and will continue to be the case.

Division

Amendment put and a division taken, the Acting Speaker (Ms S.E. Winton) casting her vote with the ayes, with the following result —

Ayes (44)

Ms L.L. Baker	Mr W.J. Johnston	Mr K.J.J. Michel	Ms C.M. Rowe
Dr A.D. Buti	Mr P.A. Katsambanis	Mr S.A. Millman	Ms R. Saffioti
Mr J.N. Carey	Mr D.J. Kelly	Mr Y. Mubarakai	Ms A. Sanderson
Mrs R.M.J. Clarke	Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup	Mr M.P. Murray	Ms J.J. Shaw
Mr R.H. Cook	Mr A. Krsticevic	Dr M.D. Nahan	Mrs J.M.C. Stojkovski
Ms J. Farrer	Mr S.K. L'Estrange	Mrs L.M. O'Malley	Mr C.J. Tallentire
Mr M.J. Folkard	Mr F.M. Logan	Mr P. Papalia	Mr P.C. Tinley
Ms E.L. Hamilton	Mr W.R. Marmion	Mr S.J. Price	Mr R.R. Whitby
Mrs L.M. Harvey	Mr M. McGowan	Mr D.T. Punch	Ms S.E. Winton
Mrs A.K. Hayden	Ms S.F. McGurk	Mr J.R. Quigley	Mr B.S. Wyatt
Mr T.J. Healy	Ms L. Mettam	Ms M.M. Quirk	Mr D.R. Michael (<i>Teller</i>)

Noes (4)

Mr I.C. Blayney	Ms M.J. Davies	Mr R.S. Love	Mr P.J. Rundle (<i>Teller</i>)
-----------------	----------------	--------------	----------------------------------

Pairs

Mr D.A. Templeman	Mr V.A. Catania
Mrs M.H. Roberts	Mr D.T. Redman

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI — by leave: I move —

That amendments 9 and 10 made by the Council be agreed to.

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: These amendments delete the requirement for “substantially commenced”. I will talk to this later on in a further amendment, but I just want to confirm that.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: At page 7 of the bill, amendment 9 removes the ability for the definition of “substantially commenced” in the regulations to be altered.

Mr R.S. LOVE: Amendment 10 inserts reference to section 5 of the Environmental Protection Act. What is section 5 of the Environmental Protection Act?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: It will enshrine the pre-eminence of the EP act in this legislation by inserting something similar to section 5 of the EP act.

Mr R.S. Love: Could the minister explain that?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Explicitly, section 5 of the EP act states that the Environmental Protection Act is a pre-eminent piece of legislation and overrides other legislation.

Question put and passed; the Council’s amendments agreed to.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I move —

That amendment 11 made by the Council be agreed to.

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: This is only one of very few amendments that I intend to speak to in the remaining time. This amendment introduces a measure of transparency. I understand that its inception was from Hon Tjorn Sibma and that this amendment is a government version of what initially was moved in the Legislative Council. It is an important transparency measure that the opposition initially flagged in this chamber that will ensure that any directions that are given by the minister will have to be gazetted and laid before the house. I appreciate that this is an important amendment and I recognise the work that was done by Hon Tjorn Sibma as part of that.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: We agreed to it. I think we redrafted it or made some slight changes. This is a bipartisan amendment.

Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup: A lot of love!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Just on the issue of a lot of love, I noticed that a couple of members on the other side did not vote in that last division. I understand that we lost the member for Cottesloe.

Mr R.H. Cook: No love there.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The Liberal Party split on its own amendment. We lost a few members. Of the members I could see, we definitely lost the member for Cottesloe. I do not know how many other members were lost. Fortunately, we still won the vote. The opposition has lost a couple of members in the last 15 minutes. The member for Cottesloe did not support amendment 8.

Ms S.F. McGurk: There’s not many of them; you shouldn’t let them roam.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The member for Dawesville should really look after his members a bit better.

Mr R.H. Cook: What is your Whip doing?

Ms S.F. McGurk: You need one of those cattle dogs.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The member for Dawesville seems to have lost the member for Cottesloe. Perhaps that means he will be able to slander me in his local paper continuously and say disgraceful things. He continues to do that.

Mr R.H. Cook: Surely he wouldn’t do that given that his party supports this.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Surely, he would be held to account, but he does not seem to be. He can be an example of hypocrisy. He sits in this Parliament and supports a bill, but then, sneakily, does not come into the chamber to vote on an amendment. He will probably go out and criticise the amendment and me in the local paper.

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: I had anticipated that this bill —

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Dawesville, it was going so nicely!

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: Was it not, Acting Speaker? I had hoped that this bill would have been dispatched by two o’clock so that we could get on to the Health Services Amendment Bill 2019.

Mr R.H. Cook: We can.

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: Maybe we cannot, Minister for Health, given the attitude of the minister and her reflection on what undoubtedly would have been urgent parliamentary business that the member for Cottesloe had to attend to.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Dawesville!

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: I will do my best to get this bill out of here in time, but when detractors like that are made, it may take longer than I had otherwise anticipated.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Dawesville, was there a question in that?

Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup: It was a statement.

Mr R.S. LOVE: I highlight that the member for Cottesloe apparently supports the Nationals WA on this. That is nice to know. He comes from a farming background in Cranbrook, so I see a potential recruit for the National Party in Cottesloe. He is a very fine man.

As for this amendment, I think that there were three divisions in this chamber on similar transparency matters. On each occasion, the National Party, along with the Liberal Party, moved to support the imposition of a clause like this—not exactly the same but very similar to it—in the bill. We are pleased that at long last something like this is being inserted in the bill. I think that it will make the bill more transparent and give the public some comfort.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I thank both members for their contributions.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI — by leave: I move —

That amendments 12 to 16 made by the Council be agreed to.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendments agreed to.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I move —

That amendment 17 made by the Council be agreed to.

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: Very quickly, this changes the substantial commencement from 48 months to 24 months, which is a significant change. Would the minister have an understanding of what projects would be included now as part of that that would have to be substantially commenced within that time, and how many in the state would be affected by this amendment?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: It changes the default period. Initially the default period was 48 months. We believed that was the right number, because as part of the COVID-19 response, we automatically extended, for example, every development approval out there by two years, so in many instances there are already development approvals out there that are three to four years. We thought that having four years for significant projects matching what is really the outcome of our previous post-COVID-19 decision was appropriate. This changes the default to two years. In answer to the member's question, this bill could potentially have a lesser impact, but it is a default period, so the Western Australian Planning Commission can have a longer period if it deems fit.

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: Does the minister have an anticipation of any projects that would be affected by this? Does the minister have a list of projects that would be captured by this legislation and affected by this change?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I do not have the projects, but it is more what normally happens, particularly for those projects subject to finance and presales. Sometimes it does take many years to build the finance for particular developments. I think we saw that with Civic Heart, but that was a seven or 10-year saga. Like I said, we took a view about whether this harmed the bill and it does not really. We still have the availability for longer than a two-year substantial commencement period. We thought four years was appropriate at the time, but we are happy to accept the two years.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI — by leave: I move —

That amendments 18 to 22 made by the Council be agreed to.

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: The opposition agrees to the remainder of the amendments being moved en bloc, because, of course, we have previously covered amendments 18 and 19 in the referrals largely with the Premier, and these are now covering the minister to ensure that any referred projects have to be gazetted. They are similar to amendment 11. These amendments were moved by the government, and I understand that they are basically the government's version of the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition. Amendments 20 to 22 address a Henry VIII clause and were moved by the opposition to tidy and strengthen the bill. I am just clarifying that that is the case. We have largely covered amendments 18 and 19, but they are largely transparency measures that were advocated for vociferously by the Leader of the Opposition. Indeed, we divided on this issue at one point, and the government voted against similar transparency measures when they were moved in the Assembly, only to agree to them in the Legislative Council.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: In response to the points the member made, yes, there was a Henry VIII clause, which it appears members of the upper house are very focused on. I heard that Henry VIII was the most mentioned figure last night in that chamber! Yes, we dealt with the Henry VIII clause. In relation to the amendments for transparency, we said at the time that if the opposition in this place had given us a bit more warning, we would have agreed to the transparency measures to ensure that the drafting was consistent with parliamentary counsel's advice. We are always open to negotiations to support these amendments. That is what I said in this place at the time, and our action in the upper house was in no way different from what I said in this place.

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: I appreciate in that case that the government agreed to an amendment the inception of which was in the Legislative Assembly. It aims to increase the level of transparency, and that was not in the bill as originally proposed. I think it is a good move. I welcome the government supporting the opposition's amendment in that case.

Mr R.S. LOVE: I refer to amendment 21, which, I think, is the removal of the definition of "R-codes". Can the minister explain what that does and why the removal of that definition is important?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: This was a transitional provision to define "R-codes", because we are moving to change where they sit in the whole planning system. We are changing R-codes from a policy to a code. As a result of that change, we had to pick up this proposed section to cover the transition period as they move from a policy to a code. Now, because "R-codes" is no longer defined in the earlier definitions, we no longer need this transitional provision because we no longer refer to R-codes.

Mr R.S. LOVE: Does this then mean that the idea of a planning code at the moment lacks any real definition at all, and does that render sections such as proposed section 32C completely meaningless?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: There is no explicit definition of "R-codes" as a planning code, but we will be making regulations to facilitate their movement from a policy to a planning code.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendments agreed to.

The Council acquainted accordingly.

HEALTH SERVICES AMENDMENT BILL 2019

Second Reading

Resumed from 19 March.

MR R.H. COOK (Kwinana — Minister for Health) [1.58 pm] — in reply: I rise to close off this debate on the Health Services Amendment Bill 2019 in the last minutes I have before me. Obviously, my notes are much more extensive than this speech will be, so I will take the opportunity to clarify some of the issues raised in second reading contributions during the consideration in detail stage. They include a number of issues raised by the member for Dawesville about the Queen Elizabeth II Medical Centre reserve and a requirement on board members, particularly with respect to conflict of interest. There was also an issue about the commissioning and delivery of capital works. The members for Mirrabooka, Mount Lawley and Armadale raised some issues about compensation payments. As I said, I will clarify these issues at the consideration in detail stage. I commend the bill to the house.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

Leave denied to proceed forthwith to third reading.

Point of Order

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: Madam Acting Speaker, I just wanted to clarify the question you put to the house. I believe you asked whether we grant leave to go to consideration in detail. Maybe you can consider that, in fact, the process would be to proceed to the third reading debate. Perhaps you can take a moment to consider whether the statement that you originally provided to the house was correct?

Mr R.H. COOK: It is important to note that the point of order that was raised by the member for Dawesville was about the issue of whether we should proceed immediately to the third reading.

PROCEDURE AND PRIVILEGES COMMITTEE

Inquiry into the Legislative Assembly's Response to the COVID-19 Pandemic — Statement by Speaker

THE SPEAKER (Mr P.B. Watson) [2.01 pm]: Members, I advise that the Procedure and Privileges Committee has resolved to inquire into and report on the Legislative Assembly's response to the COVID-19 pandemic and how the Assembly could better respond to any future pandemic. The committee will report to the house by 10 September 2020. I will send an email to all members inviting them to make a submission to the inquiry.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

WESTPORT TASKFORCE — FINAL REPORT

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

I refer to the Westport Taskforce, which has taken three and a half years and has cost Western Australian taxpayers \$10 million, including \$650 000 on spin doctors. Given that the government received the final report on 10 March, can the Premier outline to the house what the decision is for the future of Fremantle port?

Mr M. McGOWAN replied:

The government will be progressing that issue over the coming months. Obviously, it is a big decision and a big issue for the state. Members might recall that back when Troy Buswell was the Minister for Transport, he was very supportive of a new port in Kwinana and outlined the reasons. Clearly, the state needs long-term planning, so we will be putting

in place that sort of long-term planning in the future. Obviously, we took that to the last election as a commitment. Progressing major projects and making sure that we create jobs and opportunities for Western Australians is what we are all about.

WESTPORT TASKFORCE — FINAL REPORT

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

I have a supplementary question. Now that the government has the final report, is it now clear that the outer harbour is an unnecessary duplication of resources at this time that will destroy thousands of jobs at Fremantle port?

Mr M. McGOWAN replied:

No, that is not the case. As I said, it has been government policy for 20 years to progress long-term planning for freight and trade for this state. Fremantle port was built 120 years ago. Making sure that we have a long-term solution to Western Australia's freight and trade issues is important. We are a trading state. We are the trading state of the nation and one of the great trading states of the world. A large part of our state and national income comes from our international trading relationships. Having a long-term large port infrastructure that will meet the needs of container traffic in particular, but other forms of traffic as well, is very important for the future of the state. Glib lines and very poor policy understanding are no substitutes for good long-term planning.

CORONAVIRUS — TRANSPORT PROJECTS

473. Mrs R.M.J. CLARKE to the Premier:

I refer to the McGowan Labor government's unprecedented investment in transport infrastructure right across regional Western Australia, which is supporting the economy as it recovers from the COVID-19 pandemic. Can the Premier update the house on this government's efforts to secure a federal government commitment to its regional road safety program and advise the house how the program will not only improve safety on country roads, but also support jobs?

Mr M. McGOWAN replied:

I thank the member for Murray–Wellington for her excellent commitment to regional Western Australia. She has been a strong supporter of the regional road safety program. This government has driven that program through the Minister for Transport, who has put it on the national agenda. I am pleased to see that the commonwealth government has committed to it across Australia. I raised this project with the Prime Minister and the Minister for Transport raised it repeatedly at national meetings. We did the policy work behind it to show the cost benefits of this program and how it would not only create jobs, but also save lives across regional Australia, especially regional Western Australia. We got it listed on the Infrastructure Australia priority list and I am pleased that we were able to announce it in conjunction with the commonwealth government on Sunday. Initially, it will be \$100 million from both the state and commonwealth governments—that is, \$80 million from the commonwealth and \$20 million a year from the state government.

In the initial part of this program, we will be able to get on and fix 1 400 kilometres of roads across regional Western Australia with low-cost treatments to improve safety, including sealing shoulders and putting in place audible edge lines and wide centre lines. Those are designed to prevent single vehicle accidents, in particular the run-off-road crashes that kill and maim so many people across regional WA. Single vehicle run-off-road crashes are the major cause of trauma in regional WA. Modelling indicates that this program will be able to reduce that trauma by up to 60 per cent across regional Western Australia.

The good thing about these projects is that they are shovel ready; therefore, we can get this project underway very quickly. Obviously, the state has brought our share of funding for this program to the table. As part of this program, roads in every region across Western Australia will obtain improvements. We will see some significant improvements to South West Highway, through the member for Murray–Wellington's electorate; Brookton Highway; Albany Highway; Great Northern Highway; and sections of Vasse Road and Sues Road, in the electorate of Vasse. In fact, it will be in every region. This builds on our commitment to the Bunbury Outer Ring Road, the Tom Price–Karratha road and the Albany ring-road, and all our government's excellent work with the commonwealth to secure commonwealth funding for these projects.

This is a program that I think the Minister for Transport can be justifiably proud of. She is the one who came up with the idea, promoted it nationally, put it on the agenda of the Deputy Prime Minister and ensured that it secured support not only in Western Australia, but also across the entire country. Many people's lives will be saved because of the work of this transport minister in Western Australia.

WESTERN POWER — REFERENCE TARIFF

474. Mr D.C. NALDER to the Minister for Energy:

I refer to the recently released Economic Regulation Authority price list for Western Power's tariff charges. Can the minister confirm that the reference tariff that Western Power charges for residential customers to be connected to the electricity grid is 87¢ a day?

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON replied:

One of the interesting things about the Economic Regulation Authority is the move it made in access arrangement 4 to shift \$250 million of costs that are recovered by Western Power from transition customers, or large users of the grid, to distribution customers, or small users of the grid. That has shifted \$250 million of costs from large users of electricity to Synergy and Synergy's customers. This is one of the issues that I raised with the member in last year's estimates committee hearing. It is one of the challenges in the electricity system. It does not have any impact on Western Power's income, because all that is being done is costs are being shifted from one set of customers to another. It does not increase the amount of revenue that Western Power receives, but it transfers costs from large users to small users. One of the challenges with the ERA was the way it made its final decision. Ordinarily, a regulator would be expected to make a draft decision, which would then get commented on, and a final decision, which would then get implemented. The ERA chose to make a second final decision. That is a very poor outcome for regulatory practice. In fact, I have asked the ERA what was the legal basis that it used to have a second final decision, because I am unaware of a provision in the legislation that allows the ERA to do that. I have not yet heard from the ERA—of course, it is independent of government—about why it chose to do this unusual practice. It is certainly a suboptimal outcome for any regulator. I have reflected on the ERA in this chamber previously. One of the challenges is that because of that delayed structure of the decision, Western Power had to publish its tariffs prior to the second final decision, and that meant that it had to update those tariffs at short notice. That is another regulatory challenge in the sector that arises out of the AA4 decision.

The AA5 decision would require a submission from Western Power during the caretaker period for the next election, so I have made the decision to delay the AA5 process so that whichever party wins the next election will be able to deal with the AA5 decision after the election, because we would not want such a critical process to be dealt with during the caretaker period. That would be unacceptable, and I am sure that everybody here would agree on that.

As part of the energy transformation strategy, we are also looking at restructuring the way that these decisions are issued so that there is an opportunity for a workshop following the draft findings and all the people involved in the sector can come together and make verbal submissions on the draft AA5 decision and then have an opportunity to be heard on the final outcome of the AA5 when it is finally made.

There is no question that the ERA processes are inadequate to properly protect the interests of all Western Australians. The energy system in Western Australia is in a massive state of transition, just like it is everywhere else in the world. Fortunately, in Western Australia, because we have not privatised the system and we have not handed our regulation over to the national bodies, we are able to make much more rapid decisions to deal with the regulatory outcomes of our system. We can be much more dynamic and respond to the needs of Western Australians. I am very pleased to say that, in the future, the regulatory framework that manages Western Power will be completely changed so that it is more transparent and agile to respond to the needs of all Western Australians.

WESTERN POWER — REFERENCE TARIFF**475. Mr D.C. NALDER to the Minister for Energy:**

I have a supplementary question. From 1 July, will all households have the supply charge from Synergy dropped from \$1.03 to 87¢?

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON replied:

The daily supply charge for Synergy recovers not only the Western Power fixed costs, but also other fixed costs that Synergy takes account of. As the member knows, as a former minister of government, when he was in government, there was a regular discussion. Almost every time the then Minister for Energy or the then Premier spoke about the energy system in Western Australia, they discussed a range of fixed costs; for example, they discussed the question of the capacity charges. That was one of the issues that were constantly being raised in this chamber. The idea that the only fixed costs that Synergy labours under is the Western Power connection cost is a bizarre question from a person who holds himself out to be the future energy minister. I would have suspected that before he asked about a charge from Synergy, he would have asked what fixed costs Synergy is recovering through its charge, because Western Power does not bill consumers in this state. It may be that direct billing of consumers by Western Power would be a superior way of making arrangements in Western Australia, but that is not what happens at the moment. What Synergy does in its daily supply charge is recover its fixed costs. Some of those fixed costs—in fact, the majority of those fixed costs—are the Western Power costs. The member has recently asked a question about the cost stack for energy supply in Western Australia, and I believe he has the answer already. He should go back and read the answer to that question and he will see the range of fixed costs that Synergy suffers. I am not quite sure why he thinks it is only one fixed cost, when that has already been provided to him in answer to questions.

PLANNING REFORMS**476. Mrs J.M.C. STOJKOVSKI to the Minister for Planning:**

I refer to the McGowan Labor government's landmark reforms to planning law that will drive economic activity as the state recovers from the impacts of COVID-19.

- (1) Can the minister outline to the house what will be the next stage in delivering this government's comprehensive package of planning reforms and how they will support local jobs and businesses?

- (2) Can the minister advise the house whether she is aware of anyone who wants to compromise or undermine this government's efforts to support the state's economic recovery?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI replied:

I thank the member for Kingsley for her question and, of course, her interest in planning, given her substantial experience in that area.

- (1)–(2) First of all, I put on record my thanks to everyone in this house and the upper house who supported the Planning and Development Amendment Bill 2020, which we have just passed through this house. This is very important legislation to drive jobs and economic activity in this state. I put on record my thanks to the Liberal Party and the Nationals WA for their positive engagement and to the crossbench in particular in the upper house who put forward some amendments and also worked with us to get this bill through. I thank everybody.

I also thank my team, in particular Kathy Bonus, Stephen Ferguson and Gail McGowan from the department; David McFerran and Emma in my office; John Carey, the parliamentary secretary; and also the Premier and cabinet for their support for what is very significant legislation.

This legislation of course will help streamline approvals in WA and really drive new projects to drive jobs in WA. As part of the negotiations, the threshold for projects going into the significant pathway has dropped to \$20 million for the metropolitan area and \$5 million for regional WA. That will probably see more projects go through that significant pathway. It was a negotiated outcome and I think it will do a lot to create more jobs in WA. We are now moving to establish that team in the department. The new assessment team is being established as we speak. We are also making sure that we draft the necessary regulations as soon as possible to have them in place, particularly the measures to cut small business costs and also to facilitate a smoother approvals process. I think this pathway will really help drive jobs and new projects in WA.

Of course, as part of our economic confidence and our confidence in the community, one of the key reasons that WA is moving forward rapidly is the hard borders in this state. And there are many who are trying to break that by challenging that. Yesterday, I described the many times the Leader of the Opposition has called for us to abandon the hard borders in Western Australia. Many times, both in this house and also through the media, there is quote after quote after quote about getting rid of that border and, if we did that, of course that would undermine confidence in our economy and in our community.

Other people out there are trying to challenge those hard borders, including, for example, Clive Palmer who has put forward a High Court challenge in relation to the borders. We understand that he is now supported by the federal government, members, in trying to undermine our stance on the borders. The question is: what is the WA Liberal Party's stance on the Clive Palmer challenge? Does the Leader of the Opposition support the Clive Palmer challenge in the High Court? Does the WA Liberal Party support the Clive Palmer challenge? No response. Obviously, it might do. It might already have had negotiations; we do not know that. Maybe they have compared notes. Does the Liberal Party support the challenge?

Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup: We cannot be asked a question in question time, Speaker.

The SPEAKER: But you cannot ask me a question either!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I think it is incumbent on the opposition today to outline whether they support the High Court challenge. Do they line up with Christian Porter and the federal Liberal Party who are challenging the validity of our borders in the High Court?

CORONAVIRUS — AT-RISK YOUTH

477. Ms M.J. DAVIES to the Minister for Community Services:

I refer to the Department of Communities' presentation titled "Impact of COVID-19 on the WA community (Youth)" dated 29 May 2020, and specifically the statement that for close to a year the south west, great southern and wheatbelt have all had close to zero available youth crisis beds.

- (1) Does the minister agree that the economic impacts of COVID-19 facing our state and nation will see more people fall into homelessness?
- (2) Will the government fund more youth crisis beds in regional Western Australia in light of growing demand as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic?

Ms S.F. McGURK replied:

- (1)–(2) One of the very challenging responsibilities that I have as a minister is to deal with homelessness throughout the state. Anyone who has been involved in this policy area, or even thinks about it for more than a minute, understands that this is a complex area to deal with. Often, it is a coming together of poor economic circumstances as well as personal circumstances, many of which are many years in the making. Overcoming the challenges to homelessness can be very difficult. No area is more tragic than youth at risk and those young people who are needing emergency supports, particularly those who are at risk of homelessness.

I understand the concerns of many regional members when they see high levels of youth unemployment that we are seeing around the country, including what we face in WA. It has been widely commented that it is an area of concern for us, but we are not alone in that challenge. Making sure that we have a good evidence base on which to draw when we consider our response is really important. Making sure that we prioritise any additional spends we are able to secure is also really important. That is why we took the better part of a year to develop, with the community services sector, a strategic approach to homelessness. In fact, I was taunted in this chamber on more than one occasion because we took so long to partner with the community services sector and the services sector, which knows that work and does that work every day.

We drew on the work of the University of Western Australia's Centre for Social Impact, which undertook a good analysis of the most up-to-date information not only of where homelessness is presenting throughout the state, but also what the evidence is showing us around the world. The result of that work was "All Paths Lead to a Home: Western Australia's 10-Year Strategy on Homelessness 2020–2030", and we backed up the homelessness strategy with a \$72 million funding commitment in December last year. In fact, we announced recently in Bunbury that we would bring forward some of the spending from that commitment so that we can start to implement the Housing First approach to the strategy, which is really the cornerstone of the strategy—that is, permanent accommodation for people, the right sorts of supports, and continuing to work with those people to keep them in accommodation. The international evidence is that is our best chance of giving people the best hope in life and overcoming their homelessness.

I will make two comments about youth homelessness. The first is that we have some good models in Western Australia through Foyer Oxford, for instance. If we give people support earlier, we are in a good position to steer them away from an ongoing life of welfare dependency and disadvantage. There is a very good success rate through Foyer Oxford. The state government put extra money into Foyer Oxford late last year, during Homelessness Week, to help support that model. The second comment I make is that jobs are the cornerstone of any good recovery. That is why jobs have continued to be a key mantra of this government since coming to office in 2017. There is no doubt that the COVID-19 pandemic is providing particular challenges to ongoing jobs. We heard today about the investment in roads being facilitated by the Minister for Transport. Planning reforms will free up opportunities for local builds to actually take place and get people employed on the ground, which will help stimulate employment.

I am sorry, member for Moore, if you find this a little tedious, but I am sure that at-risk youth and youth unemployment are of concern to most members. My point is that jobs are crucial and economic stimulation, for direct employment either in roads or in construction, is important for the flow-on industries that come from healthy regional economies. Having a good evidence-based approach to our homelessness strategy is also a priority for this government.

The SPEAKER: Can I remind ministers to make their answers quicker. We are battling to finish question time by 3.00 pm today, like we did yesterday.

CORONAVIRUS — AT-RISK YOUTH

478. Ms M.J. DAVIES to the Minister for Community Services:

I have a supplementary question. The minister's own department has observed that for close to a year the south west, great southern and wheatbelt have all had close to zero available youth crisis beds. Has the government prioritised crisis housing for youth in the south west, great southern and the wheatbelt in its budget process?

Ms S.F. McGURK replied:

One of the elements that I outlined in my response was a bringing forward of the \$34 million Housing First commitment that we announced last December. We announced that in Bunbury because some of that Housing First work will be done in Bunbury. I was very pleased to meet, with the member for Bunbury, a whole lot of stakeholders, service providers, the local council and the local regional development commission to talk through our approach. We received a really good response from the people who are working with homeless people on the ground and understand that we need a strategic, evidence-based approach, and that is what we are doing. The Housing First approach includes some rental assistance for people to get into private rentals. Some of that assistance will be available for young people. It will also take pressure off the system which, in turn, can mean that young people can avail themselves of some of the services that might be freed up.

ANIMAL WELFARE — GREYHOUND RACING INDUSTRY

479. Mr C.J. TALLENTIRE to the Minister for Racing and Gaming:

I refer to the McGowan Labor government's commitment to bring an end to the cruel and abhorrent practice of puppy farming and note the legislation includes the de-muzzling of greyhounds. Can the minister outline to the house how this government's legislation to bring an end to puppy farming will support those people who wish to adopt or rehome a greyhound?

Mr P. PAPALIA replied:

I thank the member for his question and his well-known love for dogs and advocacy for the welfare of dogs. I am worried about the Western Australian Liberal Party. I am seriously worried about where it is going and its intentions. It would appear that it has become so bereft of direction and leadership that it has now chosen to adopt —

Point of Order

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: The member for Thornlie asked the minister a question about greyhounds, in particular the muzzling of greyhounds. I am curious about how this has anything at all to do with the Liberal Party.

Mr P. PAPALIA: Mr Speaker —

The SPEAKER: No, I have not ruled on it yet. Give him a chance to spread it out a bit. I would like to muzzle some people in the chamber, but I cannot!

Questions without Notice Resumed

Mr P. PAPALIA: As I was saying, I am worried about the Western Australian Liberal Party. It is so bereft of leadership and direction that it now appears to have adopted the mindset of opposing everything for opposition's sake, to the extent —

Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup interjected.

The SPEAKER: Calm down!

Mr P. PAPALIA: — that it has chosen to advocate on behalf of cruelty to animals as a policy direction.

Withdrawal of Remark

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: The imputation is that somehow the Liberal Party supports cruelty to animals. That is not the case. I ask him to withdraw.

The SPEAKER: It is not a point of order. Do not keep making points of order or I will call you to order.

Questions without Notice Resumed

Mr P. PAPALIA: The question was about the Liberal Party's support or lack thereof of the puppy farming bill, which is entirely focused on ending cruelty to dogs, ending cruelty to animals—to ending cruelty to puppies! In opposing the Dog Amendment (Stop Puppy Farming) Bill, the Liberal Party of Western Australia is clearly, irrefutably and undeniably advocating cruelty to animals. It is an extraordinary position. We did not get here by accident. This process has been championed by the member for Maylands for years. She began in 2015 when she established and convened a steering committee, which comprised people from all over not just Western Australia but the world, who are advocates for better quality standards for animal welfare. That led to the Labor Party declaring early during the election campaign that it would commit to legislation to counter puppy farming. We have now delivered on that legislation. There were years of consultation.

Point of Order

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: Just one final point of order.

The SPEAKER: No, it just has to be a point of order.

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: I am curious about how this relates to the minister's portfolio. The legislation is the responsibility of the Minister for Local Government, not the Minister for Racing and Gaming.

Ms L.L. Baker interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Maylands, I call you to order for the first time. It is a point of order and you of all people should know. Double zip—or muzzle!

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: I am curious about how this relates to the minister's portfolio, given that it covers racing and wagering in Western Australia.

The SPEAKER: It is about animals and I think racing and wagering is also about animals. It is not a point of order.

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: I understand and appreciate that response, Mr Speaker, but he is specifically referencing —
Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Just wait, will you!

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: The minister is not responsible for the legislation he is referencing and it is not relevant during this question time.

The SPEAKER: It is not a point of order.

Questions without Notice Resumed

Mr P. PAPALIA: It is extraordinary that the Liberal Party of Western Australia would advocate for animal cruelty as opposed to supporting legislation to prevent it.

With respect to the greyhound industry, the intended outcome, should the bill pass, is to remove the requirement that greyhounds have to be muzzled in public, and that is absolutely central to my portfolio. I have ministerial responsibility for greyhound racing in Western Australia. Tens of thousands of Western Australians support removing the requirement that greyhounds be muzzled in public. The Liberal Party is opposing that measure. The Liberal Party supports continuing the requirement that greyhounds be muzzled in public, against the wishes of tens of thousands of dog lovers across Western Australia. The Liberal Party is also advocating for an environment that supports animal cruelty through supporting puppy farming. I do not understand why the Liberal Party is doing that. It is an extraordinary position to take. If the Liberal Party opposes the bill, we will not be able to remove the requirement that greyhounds be muzzled in public. They will still be required to be on a leash. It is absolutely safe for them to be allowed in public without a muzzle. I sought advice from the chief executive officer of Racing and Wagering Western Australia about that very matter. The racing industry is very comfortable that leashed dogs are quite safe, and tens of thousands of Western Australians are also very comfortable with that requirement. They will be appalled to hear that the Western Australian Liberal Party lacks the direction to support such a basic fundamental objective as protecting puppies.

CORONAVIRUS — SMALL BUSINESS AND TOURISM — GOVERNMENT SUPPORT

480. Mrs A.K. HAYDEN to the Minister for Tourism:

I refer to the minister's response to a question last week in which he revealed that assistance would be provided to only 1 600 tourism small businesses as a consequence of the amount of money available from residual overseas marketing money. Did the minister ask the Treasurer or the Premier for additional money to assist all the struggling tourism businesses; and, what was their reason for not providing additional funding prior to the release of this assistance?

Mr P. PAPALIA replied:

I thank the member for her question. As I have said many times in this place, no government, federal or state—regardless of the massive resources available to the federal government and the significant contribution by the state government of more than \$2.3 billion—would be able to replace the loss of income suffered by small businesses and other businesses across Western Australia as a result of the COVID-19 crisis. We have used the residual funding within Tourism WA's budget for overseas marketing to draw people to Western Australia to construct a fund to support two grant schemes for the tourism industry across Western Australia. The first grant scheme, to which the member referred, is for recovery. The second one is the \$14 million business survival grant scheme, which is open for applications right now. I would like the federal government to match that so that we have greater capacity to support small businesses engaged in the tourism sector in Western Australia. If it does not, that is what we have got. We are doing what we can. There is no possible way that any government can support or replace all the lost income as a consequence of this once-in-a-lifetime, once-in-100-year crisis that we are confronting.

CORONAVIRUS — SMALL BUSINESS AND TOURISM — GOVERNMENT SUPPORT

481. Mrs A.K. HAYDEN to the Minister for Tourism:

I have a supplementary question. Instead of the minister constantly putting his hand out to the federal government, why does he not do his job and go to the Treasurer and the Premier to fight for and secure additional funding to help all struggling tourism small businesses that are being impacted by the COVID job crisis; and, the minister did not answer the first part of the question—did he ask?

Mr P. PAPALIA replied:

Thanks, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Minister, wait until the member has sat down.

Mr P. PAPALIA: I did not think she was ever going to finish.

The SPEAKER: Minister, there are certain protocols of the Parliament.

Mr P. PAPALIA: Part of my job as the tourism minister of Western Australia is to advocate for support from the federal government for Western Australian tourism businesses. I point the member to a statement by the Prime Minister on 12 March this year about an economic stimulus package and a subsequent report on the same day in *The Sydney Morning Herald* about the comments and announcements made by the Prime Minister and the federal Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment, Simon Birmingham. The headline of *The Sydney Morning Herald* article states, "Tourism industry gets \$1 billion boost amid 'unprecedented' crisis". Not one cent of that money has gone to Western Australian tourism businesses. It is my job to advocate on behalf of Western Australian tourism businesses for a share of the federal government's \$1 billion tourism support package, which has not crossed the Nullarbor. We put a \$14 million grants scheme on the table. We have made our effort. It is about time the federal minister stood up for Western Australian businesses. In fact, it is about time the Liberal Party of Western Australia asked its federal colleagues for a contribution. The member for Darling Range is the shadow Minister for Tourism in Western Australia; what has she done? Has she asked Simon Birmingham to give Western Australia a contribution?

Has she stood up on behalf of Western Australian small businesses? I have not heard her once call on the federal government to do anything in Western Australia on behalf of the WA tourism sector.

Ms R. Saffioti: Apart from asking it to take the borders down.

Mr P. PAPALIA: That is right. The one thing the Liberal Party of Western Australia has cut through with is its calls for the border to come down. The worst possible thing for any business or citizen of Western Australia would be for that border to come down and community transmission to come here earlier than when we would like to confront that challenge. We have the freest economy in the country; that is the best thing for all Western Australians, including every single tourism business.

ROAD TRAFFIC LEGISLATION

482. Mr R.R. WHITBY to the Minister for Police:

I refer to amendments to the Road Traffic Act that are currently before the Legislative Council that would mean that drivers who test positive for drugs would be taken off the road immediately, as well as introduce a new offence for drivers who test positive for both drugs and alcohol.

Can the minister advise the house whether the legislation would finally allow for radar detectors to be banned; and can the minister advise the house whether she is aware of any proposed amendments or opposition to the legislation?

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS replied:

I thank the member for Baldivis his question and for his commitment to road safety and reducing the number of fatalities and serious injuries on our roads.

Members may recall that last November I introduced to this house an amendment bill to the Road Traffic Act, the Road Traffic Amendment (Impaired Driving and Penalties) Bill. I did that so that it would be on the notice paper and be available to people over the summer break so that we could get that important legislation through this autumn session of Parliament. That bill provides for those who test positive for drugs to immediately be taken off the road. It also introduces a polydrug offence for people who have been found to have drunk alcohol and also tested positive for drugs. That recognises the additional impairment of being under the influence of both drugs and alcohol. In addition, I sought through a further amendment in the bill to ban radar detectors in Western Australia and to make sure that the minister has the power to make a regulation—which would have to lay on the tables of both houses of Parliament—to be able to ban radar detectors once and for all.

Some people, it would seem, do not want to see radar detectors banned. Hon Rick Mazza has moved an amendment to strike out that regulation-making clause in the upper house and he has the support of the Liberal Party for that. Let us be clear: radar detectors serve no road safety benefit at all. There is no evidence to support the notion that the use of radar detectors has a road safety benefit. Radar detectors are simply used to enable drivers to speed without detection, and are predominantly used by people to exceed the speed limit. That is their only purpose. They were banned in Victoria in 1997, and they had been banned in every other jurisdiction by the year 2000. I have been seeking to have them banned for a long time. In 2017, when we came to government, I tried to move by way of regulation to ban both radar detectors and laser jammers. I was told that because the jammer interfered with police equipment, I could do that under the existing regulations, but the State Solicitor's Office was concerned that the regulation power was not broad enough to ban the radar detectors, so it drafted an amendment and put it into that bill for me.

It would seem now that Hon Rick Mazza is seeking, by way of an amendment, to delete that clause from the bill, and Hon Michael Mischin has indicated his support for that amendment. Shame! Shame, because it is unbelievable that, over 20 years after other jurisdictions have banned it, the Liberal Party would not get behind that. It is based on Hon Rick Mazza's press release that says, "Oh, the minister might ban a whole lot of other things and not allow a whole range of other things!" Then he lists a whole lot of other things that are already regulated, where there is already the power to make regulations, and where regulations have been made. It lists anything from reversing cameras to GPS systems and so on and so forth—those things are already regulated. The kinds of bull bars someone can or cannot have on their car is already regulated, and there are already powers. This is not an unfettered power that has been put in; it is a sensible power for the minister to be able to make regulations. The regulations then lay on the table in both houses of Parliament and can be disallowed in the upper house.

In being highly critical of Liberal Party members who have blocked the banning of radar detectors in the state for 20 years past their use-by date, I want to put on the record my thanks to the Nationals WA members who have definitely seen the light, because they see the tragedies on our country roads and they have indicated their most sensible support. I am sure all those mums and dads and families in the wheatbelt and other country regions do not want to see their family members using radar detectors so that they can go in excess of 110 kilometres an hour. Because of this extraordinary circumstance, I am not going to let the Liberal Party off the hook this time. I am putting it in the substantive legislation. I am putting an amendment to the bill upstairs. The banning of radar detectors will be done by way of an amendment to the act. It is not the best way of doing it, but it is the way we will do it because we are not letting the Liberal Party off the hook this time.

GERALDTON HEAVY VEHICLE BYPASS

483. Mr I.C. BLAYNEY to the Minister for Transport:

I note the minister's comments in the *Midwest Times* this morning about the proposed Geraldton heavy vehicle bypass. The minister has continually said that the planning study for the bypass is expected to be completed in coming weeks. Why will the minister not make this a priority and put a hard date on her preferred route, given that the community has been expecting a decision since January?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI replied:

I thank the member for that question. We will be releasing some information in the coming weeks. It has been an extensive and exhaustive process, consulting and trying to determine the appropriate route. We are very committed to regional WA and regional road spending, as the member would be aware. We are very keen to continue to request funding from the commonwealth, receive funding from the commonwealth and deliver road projects throughout regional WA. We are delivering more than the coalition government ever did when it was in government. In fact, the member may not be aware, because he was not a member of the party at the time, but when the Nationals WA was in government, it said that it should not spend too much money on roads, and that royalties for regions should not be used for road spending. It is interesting, now that the member for Geraldton is a member of the Nationals WA —

Mr R.S. Love interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Moore, please!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: What did the member for Moore do to fix the safety issues on Indian Ocean Drive? What have we done? We have spent a record amount on Indian Ocean Drive.

Ms M.J. Davies interjected.

The SPEAKER: Leader of the National Party—shh!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Did the member for Moore secure funding for the Bunbury Outer Ring Road? No, the National Party did not. Did the National Party secure funding for the Albany Ring Road? No.

Ms M.J. Davies interjected.

The SPEAKER: Leader of the National Party!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Did the National Party secure funding for improvements to the South Coast Highway? No. Did the National Party secure funding for the Karratha–Tom Price Road? No. Did the National Party secure record funding —

Mr R.S. Love interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Moore!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: — for regional road safety funding in WA? No. The National Party did not do any of that in eight and a half years in government, but it is now asking me to hurry the process, which I know is very important, but we want to make sure we get the consultation right on this very, very important issue. We have already allocated and spent funds through Geraldton, and will continue to spend a record amount of funding in regional WA on roads. Therefore, would the National Party just accept the fact that we are spending probably —

Ms M.J. Davies: All these months you've been promising—six months.

The SPEAKER: Leader of the National Party, I know you want to get on my list, so now you are on it. I call you to order for the first time.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: As far as I can tell, the National Party was in government for eight and a half years and never sorted it out. The National Party has to accept that we are spending more on regional roads than it did.

Ms M.J. Davies interjected.

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

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: They are very angry on this issue because they know that Hon Brendon Grylls said that RFR should not be spent on roads and on saving lives in regional Western Australia.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Minister, through the Chair.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Mr Speaker, as a representative for the Albany area, you know that the previous government did not allocate a cent to the Albany ring-road, but we are getting on with the job.

Ms M.J. Davies interjected.

The SPEAKER: Leader of the National Party! Do you want to go home early?

GERALDTON HEAVY VEHICLE BYPASS

484. Mr I.C. BLAYNEY to the Minister for Transport:

I have a supplementary question. Why is the minister continuing to ignore and delay critical road planning in Geraldton and the midwest that means further critical investment decisions cannot be made, such as the previous government's decision to build the new Greenough River Bridge that included funding from royalties for regions?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI replied:

I am glad that in eight and a half years the previous government did something. It built a bridge in eight and a half years—congratulations, National Party! The premise of the member's question is completely false. We are spending more on regional roads than the National Party in government ever did. We are spending record amounts on regional road safety. The single biggest cause of deaths on our regional roads is the single vehicle run-off. We have secured \$100 million to work on improving 1 400 kilometres of roads around regional WA. The Premier outlined some of the roads in regional WA—I will probably outline more tomorrow—that will have a widening of the shoulder and the installation of audible edge lines to try to save lives. One would think that National Party members would appreciate the effort that we have undertaken. They should not come in here with those false allegations; they should appreciate that this government is doing more for regional road spending than they ever did.

SPACE INDUSTRY

485. Ms J.J. SHAW to the Minister for Science:

I refer to the McGowan Labor government's commitment to diversifying the Western Australian economy, especially as it recovers from COVID-19. Can the minister update the house on the work underway by the state government to secure funding for projects that support and grow WA's space industry, and can the minister outline to the house what opportunities these projects will provide small businesses and startups in Western Australia?

Mr D.J. KELLY replied:

I thank the member for Swan Hills for this very important question. One of the commitments that the Premier made when Labor was elected to government was that we would seek to diversify the Western Australian economy. One of the opportunities that we have pursued as part of that is the opportunity for growth in the space industry in Western Australia. A lot of Western Australians do not understand that we have a long history in the space industry. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration tracking station at Carnarvon was the largest tracking station outside the United States and played a pivotal role in the Apollo missions right through to Skylab and beyond. At its peak, over 200 staff were employed at Carnarvon. The European Space Agency cannot operate without the facilities that it has here in Western Australia.

As a government, we want to build on the strengths that we have. We are world leaders in the areas of robotics, remote operations and artificial intelligence, largely out of skills that we have learnt through our expertise in the mining industry. We want to take those skills and transfer them into the space industry. We are also leaders in the management of data through the work that has been done at the Pawsey Supercomputing Centre in preparation for the Square Kilometre Array. With those advantages, last year we signed a memorandum of understanding with the commonwealth to partner on projects to develop the space industry in Western Australia. That memorandum is already starting to bear fruit. This week, with Minister Andrews, we jointly announced funding for two projects. The first is the Australian space robotics, automation and AI command control complex, which will be established in Western Australia, supported by \$4.5 million from the commonwealth and \$3.5 million from the McGowan government. There is a great company called Fugro that already operates a command and control centre at Gnangara. It remotely operates underwater maintenance vehicles for the oil and gas industry from its facility in Gnangara. Unlike remote operations for the mining industry, which uses fibre-optic cable, this is done via satellite because obviously oil and gas platforms are offshore and underwater. Fugro has managed to overcome the issues of latency and can now have an operator operate those underwater vehicles in real-time from Gnangara. We believe that we can transfer those skills to the space industry and take up the opportunities that are presented by NASA's return to the moon and, ultimately, to Mars. The funding that we have put into that project run by Fugro will allow small businesses, small to medium-sized enterprises, to really have an opportunity to build on the skills that we have in the area of robotics and AI and take Western Australian companies into the space industry.

The second project is the Australian space data analysis facility that will be hosted by the Pawsey Supercomputing Centre. It will receive \$1.5 million funding from the commonwealth and \$750 000 from the McGowan government. It will work with the WA Data Science Innovation Hub, established by this state government through the new industries fund. Again, the space industry will require the management of significant amounts of data. We have a comparative advantage in that area because of the work that has been done in preparation for the SKA. We see this as an opportunity for Western Australian companies to be part of the space industry. Once we can manage data, we can produce products for not just the space industry—the possibilities are endless. This government is committed to create Western Australian jobs. The space industry has great opportunities. As a government, we are working cooperatively with the commonwealth to deliver jobs in Western Australia.

EMERGENCY SERVICES — PERSONAL PROTECTIVE EQUIPMENT

486. Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE to the Minister for Emergency Services:

Given what has happened in Victoria, does the minister have enough items of COVID-19-specific personal protective equipment held in storage for all emergency services personnel and volunteers if a second outbreak of COVID-19 occurs in Western Australia?

Mr F.M. LOGAN replied:

Thank you very much indeed for that question, member for Churchlands; it is a good question. The answer is yes, we do. It is being managed through the director general of the Department of Health and the Chief Medical Officer. At every meeting, the state disaster committee is updated on the gamut of PPE that is available, particularly for hospital staff. Through the coordination of the SDC, other government agencies that have frontline interaction with the general public are also checked for their levels of PPE. I point out to the member for Churchlands that the commonwealth also has a significant storage of PPE that can be called upon by the Department of Health in Western Australia and other Departments of Health around Australia at any time.

EMERGENCY SERVICES — PERSONAL PROTECTIVE EQUIPMENT

487. Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE to the Minister for Emergency Services:

I have a supplementary question. Given the minister's answer that things are under control with regard to personal protective equipment and, no doubt, resources, does he think that we still need to be under a state of emergency?

Mr F.M. LOGAN replied:

The answer is yes, absolutely. Of course, the State Emergency Coordinator, who is also the Commissioner of Police, provides his advice to me, as the minister, on why a state of emergency should be continued. The Minister for Health, the Chief Health Officer and the director general of the Department of Health also provide arguments and reasons why the state of emergency should continue. At this point in time, it should absolutely be continued. The border restrictions are a classic example why a state of emergency is in place. As the member pointed out right now, there is always the possibility of another outbreak in Western Australia. COVID-19 has not gone away, as we have seen in Victoria.

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: Will you have a state of emergency for the foreseeable future?

Mr F.M. LOGAN: We will be under a state of emergency for the foreseeable future.

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: How long?

Mr F.M. LOGAN: To answer the member for Churchlands' interjection, that will be up to the advice that I receive from the people who I have already indicated provide that professional advice to me.

The SPEAKER: That is the end of question time.

MINISTER FOR HEALTH — PORTFOLIOS — STAFF*Question on Notice 6133 — Answer Advice*

MS M.J. DAVIES (Central Wheatbelt — Leader of the Nationals WA) [3.00 pm]: I rise under standing order 80(2) to ask the Minister for Health when I can expect an answer to question on notice 6133. It was due yesterday.

MR R.H. COOK (Kwinana — Minister for Health) [3.00 pm]: My apologies, member. I am sure it will be with us very shortly.

MINISTER FOR EDUCATION AND TRAINING — PORTFOLIOS — STAFF*Question on Notice 6134 — Answer Advice*

MS M.J. DAVIES (Central Wheatbelt — Leader of the Nationals WA) [3.00 pm]: I ask the same question under standing order 80(2): when can I expect an answer to question on notice 6134 from the minister representing the Minister for Education and Training?

The SPEAKER: You do not have to come up.

MR P. PAPALIA (Warnbro — Minister for Tourism) [3.00 pm]: It is okay.

The SPEAKER: I am trying to get finished by three o'clock and everyone is making it hard.

MS M.J. DAVIES: I understand, but if ministers would answer questions, I would not need to take up the time of the house.

MINISTER FOR POLICE — PORTFOLIOS — STAFF*Question on Notice 6136 — Answer Advice*

MS M.J. DAVIES (Central Wheatbelt — Leader of the Nationals WA) [3.00 pm]: I rise under standing order 80(2) and ask the Minister for Police when I can expect an answer to question on notice 6136?

MRS M.H. ROBERTS (Midland — Minister for Police) [3.01 pm]: I had anticipated that that question had been answered, but I will check for the Leader of the Nationals WA.

MINISTER FOR WATER — PORTFOLIOS — STAFF*Question on Notice 6148 — Answer Advice*

MS M.J. DAVIES (Central Wheatbelt — Leader of the Nationals WA) [3.01 pm]: This is the final one. I rise under standing order 80(2) and ask the Minister for Water when I can expect an answer to question on notice 6148, which was due on 23 June?

MR D.J. KELLY (Bassendean — Minister for Water) [3.02 pm]: I will check to see where that is and get back to the Leader of the Nationals WA.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE*Inquiry into the Use of State Funding by the Western Australian Football Commission — Terms of Reference — Statement by Speaker*

THE SPEAKER (Mr P.B. Watson) [3.02 pm]: The Public Accounts Committee has commenced an inquiry into the use of state funding by the Western Australian Football Commission in its role as caretaker of football in WA. The inquiry will focus on —

- (a) how effectively state funds have been used to develop football across all levels;
- (b) whether the WAFC is meeting its obligations under the funding agreement with the state; and
- (c) the effectiveness and transparency of monitoring and reporting functions included in the state's funding agreement with the WAFC.

The committee intends to report by Thursday, 4 November 2020.

DOG AMENDMENT (STOP PUPPY FARMING) BILL 2020*Second Reading*

Resumed from 23 June.

MRS A.K. HAYDEN (Darling Range) [3.03 pm]: I rise today to join the opposition in noting that we will not be supporting this legislation. Before I go on, I put on the record that just because the WA Liberal opposition does not support this bill, that does not in any way mean that it condones animal cruelty. The fact is that the government, the Minister for Local Government and backbenchers have carried out a fearmongering campaign by saying that all WA opposition members support animal cruelty. That is a disgrace to this place and this government. It is false, misleading and wrong. Putting that fear amongst the community shows the worst type of leadership of any government or individual. It is disgraceful to lead by fear.

Several members interjected.

Mrs A.K. HAYDEN: I will not be bullied by anyone on the government side. Government members stood in here and said that we believe in animal cruelty, but they cannot sit and listen to my contribution to this debate that we do not condone animal cruelty —

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Thank you, members.

Mrs A.K. HAYDEN: I want to put on the record that this bill will not stop the puppy farming that the government alleges happens. It will not stop animal cruelty. That already is happening under the Animal Welfare Act. That is where animal cruelty lies—under the Animal Welfare Act. The Animal Welfare Act needs tweaking and strengthening to improve the power of local governments and the RSPCA to stop people being cruel to animals. We should focus on that and not on a pretend bill called “stop puppy farming”, and we should stop the fear campaign. Whipping up fear in the community is a sign of weak leadership and is just an attempt to win political votes. It is a little like the federal Labor Party's “Medicare” campaign from a few elections ago. It ran that campaign to scare people into voting for it. Members should know that the majority of Western Australians are smarter than that. Every Western Australian, bar a minority of sick people, is not cruel to animals. Every Western Australian would always protect and stand up for the welfare of any kind of animal. To come in here and spread mistruths is very unfitting of this government.

I have taken the time to meet with Dogs West and with a number of constituents on this matter. A number of dog breeders and animal lovers raised this matter of animal cruelty with me during the Darling Range by-election campaign, which occurred two years ago yesterday. Therefore, it is fitting that this bill was debated yesterday and continues today. Just because someone is a dog breeder does not mean they do not love animals. In fact, all dog breeders I have met look after their pets better than anyone else. They care for their animals and for their animals' welfare. During the Darling Range by-election, the member for Riverton, the Leader of the Opposition at the time, and I went along to a consultation program at Dogs West run by the member for Maylands and, I believe, the Department of Local Government, Sport and Cultural Industries. We listened. There was a huge crowd there and they were not happy with the way that the government was handling this legislation. They tried to express their concerns. It is true that the government has consulted with and listened to the public, but it has not acted on all the concerns

of those people it consulted. It certainly has not acted in the best interests of the main stakeholders—Dogs West and the Western Australian Local Government Association. I will come to WALGA in a moment. The concerns of the two main stakeholders—WALGA and Dogs West—have been completely ignored by this government.

I want to put it on the record that I grew up with dogs. My dad was a breeder of Dobermans and greyhounds. I grew up with litters of dogs around me. My dad also had kennels for large dogs. A number of dogs would come to stay with us while people went on their holidays because they had nowhere to board their big dogs—their Pyrenean mountain dogs, German shepherds and the like. I am a true animal and dog lover and I hate to see anyone mistreat any animal.

As I grew up, I learnt that breeders put more time, effort and care into where their puppies ended up. Sometimes I saw my father turn away people who wanted to buy his puppies because he believed that they would not be going to a safe home or that the type of home they would be going to was not conducive for Dobermans. They need exercise and space. If he thought that a person who wanted to buy one of his puppies could not provide the best home possible for that puppy, he would not sell it to them. To ignore the breeders who care about their breed, their industry and their animals is a major misstep of this government. I hope it leads the minister to making an amendment to rectify that mistake. During consideration in detail, I will move an amendment to have the registered dogs of Dogs West members exempted from sterilisation and for members to be exempt from the need for local government approval for breeding. I will touch more on that a little later.

I want to start off by talking for just a moment about the fearmongering that has occurred. During question time, the Minister for Racing and Gaming was asked about greyhound muzzling and how it will improve the welfare of greyhounds. Not one word in his answer answered that question—not one word. He did not even touch on the fact that this bill is better for the welfare of greyhounds because the need for muzzling will be removed. Not once did he raise that in his answer. I am totally perplexed about why. Does he not believe that it is in the best interests of greyhounds? I do not know, but he did not answer the question. Instead, he chose to further spread fear amongst the community. As I said, there is no bar low enough for this government.

Today, the Minister for Local Government released a media statement. The very minister in control of this legislation released a media statement in the middle of the debate, before a vote and before consideration in detail. He said —

- The WA Liberals are ignoring the overwhelming community support for the State Government Dog Amendment (Stop Puppy Farming) Bill 2020 to end puppy farming in WA and ensure responsible pet ownership

That is false. The bill will not stop cruelty to animals; the bill will not stop puppy farming. If the minister were outside this chamber, he would be able to admit that to himself. The bill will not stop it; nothing in the legislation will stop it. I would like to see where we have this overwhelming underground puppy farming industry. Where do we have this overwhelming underground puppy farming industry? I have spoken to people who say they get the puppies from New South Wales—they get the puppies from over east. If we have this overwhelming, growing, underground industry of puppy farming, show us. Make it stop in the act that can stop it, which is the Animal Welfare Act. It is under the Animal Welfare Act. This bill is not worth the paper it is written on without the Animal Welfare Act being amended. If the government is unable to shut someone down because of cruelty right now, how does it think this piece of paper will stop puppy farming? I will be very interested to hear how the minister can see that happening.

I understand that two cases have been prosecuted in the last 10 years. If there is a reason that other cases have not been prosecuted, fix up why they have not been prosecuted. The government should tell us which cases, and how many, have come forward and not been able to be prosecuted because the government was unable to do so due to the Animal Welfare Act. Do not just say they are out there with no real proof that we have a growing, underground puppy farming market. If the puppies are coming from farms in New South Wales, how does this legislation stop that? Other jurisdictions have said laws against cruelty to animals will stop this, not stop puppy farming legislation. We are a little lost on why this bill is meant to be the be-all and end-all, and I cannot see how it will fix things in any way.

The member for Maylands posted on Facebook earlier this week that it would be a big week in Parliament. The post says —

... eight years of blood, sweat and tears —

The government has not been doing this for eight years —

Several members interjected.

Mrs A.K. HAYDEN: I am not taking interjections, because I do not have a lot of time.

Several members interjected.

Point of Order

Mr W.R. MARMION: I cannot hear the member, and I do not think she is taking interjections. She only has 30 minutes to speak, and government members are deliberately interrupting her to cut her time.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr I.C. Blayney): Thank you, members! The member has indicated that she is not taking interjections, so I will have to call people if they interject.

Debate Resumed

Mrs A.K. HAYDEN: Thank you, Acting Speaker, I appreciate your support.

Let us move on to the Western Australian Local Government Association, which is the organisation that will be responsible for implementing all the changes that this legislation, if passed, will put forward. WALGA does not support this legislation. The very body that will be responsible for policing this bill, the very body that will be policing upholding it in the community, does not support it.

Mr D.A. Templeman: It will be the local councils, not the local governments. You are not even on the right page.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members!

Mrs A.K. HAYDEN: The WA local governments do not have —
Several members interjected.

Point of Order

Mr W.R. MARMION: I think the minister can respond to any questions or concerns he has when he delivers his second reading reply.

Mr T. Healy interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Southern River!

Mr T. Healy interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Southern River, I am calling you for the first time.

Debate Resumed

Mrs A.K. HAYDEN: I know what WALGA is and I know what local government is, but the peak body for local government authorities disagrees with this legislation. It represents all the local governments. The fact that the minister does not think it is a problem shows how little government members know. If the government does not have the support of the WA local government organisation of authority, it does not have the support of local government, and how can the government breach its own agreements with local governments and not give them warning? I believe the member for Moore raised this last night. I was not here last night, but I have read everyone's second reading contribution in the uncorrected *Hansard*. I have to say that the member for Southern River's constituents are not happy with him. I have already had phone calls to my office, and we will not talk about other members who had hair in their food! We will go to the executive summary of the minutes of a WALGA stop farming puppy meeting held in March 2020. It states —

- No opportunity was provided under the State and Local Government Partnership Agreement for sector consultation prior to the Bill's introduction to Parliament.

The secretariat comment stated —

There are some understandable and arguably foreseeable concerns with some aspects of the *Dog Amendment (Stop Puppy Farming) Bill 2020* ... from the perspective of the Local Government sector.

The Bill was introduced to Parliament prior to consultation with the Local Government sector under the State and Local Government Partnership Agreement, where a 12-week consultation period is considered appropriate if new legislation or amendments to existing legislation are likely to have a significant impact on the sector.

I will not read it all out, because I believe the member for Moore went through the discussion, but I will read out the motion that was moved and carried. It stated —

That WALGA write to the Minister and request that he withdraw the Stop Puppy Farming Bill and more appropriately consult with the sector, traditional custodians and the wider community, or failing that, that he remove any reference to Local Government in the bill as the sector does not endorse it in its current form.

The local government sector does not endorse this bill, yet it will have to be responsible for delivering its policies. We are in a COVID-19 pandemic and are asking local governments to dig deep in support of the community, which is in crisis. We are asking local government to freeze its rates. We are asking local government to look after any tenants in their properties. We are asking local government to remove any fees and charges for community sports. Local governments have already taken a massive hit with reduced income and have to foot the bill for promoting and supporting small business in their regions, and here we have the state government in the middle of this COVID-19 crisis putting another impost on them. It is going to take manpower, resources and money to set this all up, yet the local government minister did not even consult under his own agreement with the local government authority and make sure local government supported this bill. Do members know what? Even if he had, local governments do not support this bill and the minister is just ignoring them. He is totally ignoring the sector that needs to deliver on

the bill. It is shameful, and I do not know how the minister thinks it will work. The fact is that every local government authority can make their own planning laws and say they will not allow breeding in their areas. If the local governments do not allow breeding, what happens to all the dog owners currently living in their local districts who can no longer keep their dogs? What does the minister say about that? To me that is animal cruelty. It is cruel to the families, the children and the lovers of this animal who have been able to operate when their local authorities suddenly tell them they will no longer allow breeding. They may not be breeding, but under this legislation, if they do not desex their dog, they will have to become a breeder registered by the local government authority. If the local government authority does not allow breeding, what will happen to that dog? Does the minister expect these people to give up their dog? Does the minister expect them to pick up their homes and move to another area where they may be allowed to get breeding approval? Right now, in the electorate of Darling Range, hundreds of dog lovers, breeders and members of Dogs West are scared that they will no longer be able to keep their dog on their property as a whole. Many of them enjoy showing. It is a great hobby, and the dogs, families and dog owners love it. This government is going to tell them that if their shire does not allow breeding they must either get rid of their dog or move home.

[Member's time extended.]

Mrs A.K. HAYDEN: Guess what! The people of Darling Range are already in a cost-of-living crisis. Most of them have debts on their homes that are more than they can sell them for. What will they do? They cannot just pick up and move home. They love their animal and they love their hobby, and the government is forcing them to decide whether to neuter their dog, get rid of their dog or to move home. That is cruelty! That is not fair to the animal, the families, the owners or the breeders.

I will move on to Dogs West. Dogs West engaged with the government, thinking that it was going to get a good hearing. It wanted to make this legislation as positive as possible. I want to thank all the people at Dogs West, in particular, the president, Pam Campbell; the vice president, Des Kehoe; and the CEO, Ann Rushby. They have been great supporters of trying to make sure that members of Parliament on all sides of politics understood their argument. That is all that they were asking—that everyone understand where they were coming from. Dogs West's code of ethics and rules and regulations are second to none. If the government were to pick up its code of ethics and rules and regulations and put them into the Animal Welfare Act, we would not need this bill, because that would stop breeding being misused, stop dogs being abused and weed out those who are not doing the right thing. But the government has decided not to listen to the members of Dogs West, who are experts in this field, have a longstanding practice and are highly regarded. The biggest issue is, of course, the desexing. Their whole being is connected with making sure that they have a good pure breed, protecting the line, developing it and getting a good strong bloodline for any breed that they work with. They do not want to see that diluted. They also do not want to see cruelty to animals. These people have all the answers that this government needs to get rid of inappropriate breeders in our society.

No-one supports people mistreating dogs. That is why we get emotional when our words are twisted and falsehoods are put out there. We all love our dogs. We all love our animals, whether they are cats, dogs, birds or rabbits. We do not want to see harm come to them and neither does Dogs West. I am asking for the minister to consider exempting Dogs West members from having to desex their dogs and having to go to the local government authority to apply to be a breeder. I will move that amendment during consideration in detail. I hope that the Minister for Local Government will look at that favourably—that he will not worry about political pointscoring and will do the right thing by the hundreds and thousands of Dogs West owners and dogs. We need to make sure that these dogs are protected in the long run. The best way to do that is to make sure that the people who know the best way to breed and can teach breeders —

Several members interjected.

Point of Order

Mr W.R. MARMION: I cannot hear the member.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr I.C. Blayney): We were going very well. If you want to stay and listen, that is very good, but if you make interjections, as I said before, I will have to call you.

Debate Resumed

Mrs A.K. HAYDEN: I note that when government members were speaking last night and making silly comments, our side stayed quiet. We showed respect. We do not get respect from this government.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: The Acting Speaker is on his feet! Member for Belmont, I am calling you for the first time.

Mrs A.K. HAYDEN: This government keeps showing its lack of respect for debate, honesty and its role as a government. As I said, leadership by fear is the worst type of leadership and, unfortunately, that is what this state is operating under.

Noting the time, I wanted to quickly touch on some of the emails I received, but before I do, I want to talk about my biggest concern. It is the same concern that Dogs West has. There are 138 local government authorities. Can the minister explain how the government is going to make this system consistent? How can it be consistent when

each local government has the right to change its own planning rules and block breeding totally? That is one of the biggest concerns that local government authorities have, but it is also a concern of dog owners and Dogs West. I have been told that Dogs West members have contacted a couple of shires and have already been told that they will be banning breeding because it will be too hard to manage. I would hate to see that happen. To be honest, I got quite a few emails that were all in support of including Dogs West in the legislation and exempting its members' dogs from being sterilised. I do not have time to read them all in, but I would like to make a few comments. The recurring thing in all of them is their disappointment. An email from a Doberman owner stated —

We are extremely disappointed that we have not been recognised in The Bill after being told by Lisa Baker MLA that we are the Gold Standard and would not be affected by The Bill.

That has been repeated in just about every piece of correspondence or conversation that I have had with dog breeders. When they were at the consultation with the member for Maylands, she told them that they were the gold standard. If they were the gold standard, why have they been excluded from this legislation? If they are good at what they do, and the government recognises that, why have they not been recognised in this piece of legislation? I believe that email went to all members of Parliament—it was not sent just to me—so all members should be well aware of that one. I have also had emails from people in Kelmscott, Oakford, Keysbrook, Serpentine, Darling Downs, Roleystone and Bedfordale. The biggest issue that has been raised is a fear of their local government shutting them down. One email states —

I am a member of Dogs West and actively participate in Conformation showing and Dockdogs with my dogs. I actively show every weekend at the Canine Grounds in Southern River and also support the country dog shows in Geraldton and Albany.

I own and breed Bernese Mountain Dogs which are a large breed dog and quite rare still in Australia.

...

Mr McGowan quoted that currently dog breeding is totally unregulated and that there are not any minimum standards for keeping a dog.

Well I beg to differ, as I am a registered breeder who is:

- A member of the ANKC —

Which is the Australian and New Zealand kennel club —

Mr T.J. Healy: National!

Mrs A.K. HAYDEN: No, kennel club —

and its affiliation in the west being Dogs West:

- I had to pass a breeding examination before I could even become a 'Registered Breeder':

...

- I agree and am bound in accordance with the Dogs West Regulations and Code of Ethics.

When we say that there is no regulation around breeding, there is a massive code of ethics, and rules and regulations under the Dogs West breeding code of ethics. That is why we need to ensure that we include them.

I noted an interjection that was made last night when a member said that Dogs West would not take on registration — Several members interjected.

Mrs A.K. HAYDEN: Will you just shoosh and stop harping! Seriously, you members are just disgraceful. Just shoosh!

The ACTING SPEAKER: Thank you, members. I see that the member has five minutes left. I would appreciate it if we could hear her out in silence.

Mrs A.K. HAYDEN: The problem is that this government does not listen. Its members say that they doorknock and they know their constituency. They know that their constituents do not want this legislation, yet members are ignoring it. They have rose-coloured glasses on. They have blinkers on. They are only listening to their own little collective; they are not listening to the other people out there.

Member for Southern River, honestly, you are in big trouble, mate, because you got up in your electorate and told the same story for a couple of months now about a breeder who did not look after an animal well. Why was the RSPCA not called? Why have you not acted on this? You keep getting up and telling the same story. Do you have no more stories than that one little story that you keep grasping at and do not fix? Stand up and fix the issue and it will not be a problem anymore. Shut them down now. This legislation will not fix the problem. The Animal Welfare Act will fix it, not this legislation. I do not know how thick everyone is on the other side, but they do not understand —

Mr T.J. Healy: Mr Acting Speaker.

Mrs A.K. HAYDEN: The member finds "thick" offensive, yet he tells us that we believe in animal cruelty. Please! Animal cruelty is the lowest of lows, and you guys find that bar every time and go to rock bottom.

In closing, we support stopping animal cruelty. Bring in the right legislation that will enable that to happen, and we will support the government at 100 miles an hour.

Mr D.A. Templeman interjected.

Mrs A.K. HAYDEN: Try to be a minister for once and be responsible!

Mr D.A. Templeman interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Minister, I will have to call you if you keep —

Mr D.A. Templeman interjected.

Mrs A.K. HAYDEN: Chuck him out.

The ACTING SPEAKER: It is not within my powers to chuck him out.

Point of Order

Mr W.R. MARMION: Mr Acting Speaker, I cannot hear the speaker.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr I.C. Blayney): We have three minutes to go. Please, can we hear the member for Darling Range out.

Debate Resumed

Mrs A.K. HAYDEN: In summary, this legislation will not put a stop to animal cruelty. We all know that it comes under the Animal Welfare Act. The government should fix that legislation. This bill will not put a stop to puppy mills over east. Puppies will still come into WA. When the government stops the number of proper breeders, it will create more demand. There will be less supply and more demand. When there is less supply and more demand, it goes underground. If the government wants to force breeding underground and make puppies harder to get, that is what it will be doing with this legislation. It should include Dogs West in the exemptions. It should allow Dogs West to help it make this bill work. It should allow Dogs West to help the government to stamp out anybody who is doing it wrong.

Everyone is struggling in WA right now as a result of COVID-19. We are here talking about a piece of legislation that will not fix anything that the title says it will. Stop leading by fear and stand up for what is real in this state. Right now, if someone is being cruel to an animal, stop them. With COVID-19, we have seen issues relating to the cost of living and unemployment. Stop putting more burden on our local government that is trying hard to keep up with the struggles right now, and listen to it as it has told the government that it does not support this legislation. The government should stop ignoring its stakeholders. For a government that has only been in for three years, the arrogance that is coming out is second to none. Its members have come in believing their own rubbish. They spin their own rubbish. They will do whatever it takes to politically pointscore instead of doing what is right by the community. The government and the minister have sworn an oath to do right by the community of Western Australia. It is about time you all started doing your job and started leading this state the way the state actually deserves.

MR D.A. TEMPLEMAN (Mandurah — Leader of the House) [3.34 pm] — in reply: I would like to respond. We will not get to consideration in detail today. I will speak until 4.00 pm, when we will adjourn the debate for private members' business.

Once again, we were forced to listen to a contribution by the member for Darling Range that was quite unremarkable. The simple fact is that this government is implementing an election commitment, which members opposite did not do in eight and a half years. With reviews to the Animal Welfare Act 2002 or work for the protection of animals, the previous government did nothing. That is its history. If members opposite care so much about the protection of animals in Western Australia, where was their legislation? There was nil. We saw not a skerrick of legislation from the member for Darling Range. She does nothing. All she does is get up and bellyache and billow on, but does absolutely nothing.

History shows very clearly in this state that the McGowan government believes in the protection of what are very much loved pets in Western Australia. We heard the statistics from many members about the number of dog lovers and the percentages et cetera. The member for Maylands highlighted that very clearly. It is a pity the member for Darling Range was not here last night. We allowed her to come back and speak today. I was going to finish the second reading debate last night. I said that if the member for Darling Range could not be here yesterday, she could speak today. Goodness me; I made a mistake last night because the contribution that we waited for was pathetic! It was a pathetic performance by the member for Darling Range. She came into this place and talked about a range of matters that I will highlight demonstrate how out of touch not only she is with her electorate, but also how out of touch the Liberal Party is with the general public's understanding and support for this legislation.

The member for Darling Range said that she read the second reading contributions. She obviously did not read the speech made by the member for Maylands. The member for Darling Range and a number of other members talked about lack of consultation, saying that no-one knew what this legislation meant and no-one was consulted. What a load of balderdash! The simple fact is—the member for Maylands made it very clear—that the issue of puppy farming and the need for the government to do something about it goes back many years. In her second reading contribution, the member for Maylands highlighted that back in 2014, there were non-political discussions—across

party and political lines—with key stakeholders about the issues relating to puppy farming and the abhorrent practice of puppy farming and cruelty to dogs that puppy farming is renowned for. That is the point of this legislation. Before 2014, a number of research papers came out of the United Kingdom and other parts of the world. As a result of that consultation, in the lead-up to the 2017 election, in 2016, the Labor Party, with great leadership and pressure from the member for Maylands, said, “If we want to be elected to government, we need to address this issue.” That included a range of consultations.

Then we came to the election commitment. In 2016, going into the 2017 election, we said very specifically that, if elected, we would introduce legislation to Parliament to stop puppy farming. That is why it is in the title of the bill and that is why this bill outlined very clearly the points that we said we would address in the legislation, including a centralised registration system. I want to talk about the centralised registration system and explain the issues around Dogs West. We are not attacking Dogs West. We want to explain very clearly why a centralised registration system is one of the pivotal points to ensuring that we have a strong piece of legislation that deals with puppy farming.

The issues that the Labor Party put to the election were very clear—a centralised registration system. We said we would define breeding and how that can happen, and how that can continue so that people who have a dog they wish to breed can continue to do so, but they will simply have to have a one-off registration. What is wrong with that? There is nothing wrong with that.

The member for Cottesloe really needs to buy a cardigan and a pipe because he belongs in the 1950s! One of the contributions that he made yesterday was, “How do we know how many dogs there are?” That is the point of a centralised registration system! Central to that is we will be able to trace a dog’s life from its birth through to its end of life. That is the point. We will have a centralised system that is transportable. Take, for example, a dog owner who lives in Yokine who is registered to breed their dog. If they move to another local government area, the data is transportable. The data is centralised. That is what we will do with regard to that.

Some members opposite made some embarrassing contributions. I am sorry, member for Nedlands: last week during private members’ business it was embarrassing because it took the member for Nedlands 47 minutes out of 60 to get to his first point. Last night, there was no point to the member’s argument. The member for Nedlands clearly has not read the bill and he clearly only focused on some emails and some highlighted bits of paper that he had earmarked probably some months ago. There was no structure to his criticism of this bill.

A number of other members opposite simply raised a number of matters that clearly they did not understand. The member for Dawesville, who reluctantly got up to speak, could not even bring himself to say whether he would vote against the bill. When we asked, “Are you voting against it?” he could not even say he was not going to vote against it. All he said was, “I’m supporting what my shadow is proposing.” This is pathetic politics by the Liberal Party. It is appalling politics by the Liberal Party. It has not analysed the intention of the bill, nor has it looked at the protections in it. We recognise that Dogs West is a reputable organisation. No-one is denying that. It has to be understood that Dogs West is a private membership-based organisation and that it does not capture all breeding dogs in Western Australia. That is the point. Yes, it does a magnificent job, but it is an independent organisation. It does not capture all breeding dogs in Western Australia, like those people who want to cross-breed dogs, which was an issue raised by an opposition member. We have heavily consulted on the proposed legislation. It was very interesting when some members opposite claimed that Dogs West was not consulted, that WALGA was not consulted, and other key parties were not consulted. What a lot of rubbish! They were right there at the beginning. When we established the working group under the magnificent leadership of the member for Maylands, they were front and centre of it, including members like the WA Rangers Association; the very people in local governments throughout Western Australia who do on-the-ground work with regard to cats, dogs and other important matters.

The member for Moore attacked me and said we were not going by the agreement signed between this government, Local Government Professionals Australia WA and the Western Australian Local Government Association. The member for Maylands put down the member for Moore beautifully last night when she highlighted that there is a difference between consultation, determination and participation. We have made it very clear to WALGA, as it has to us, that we are not going to agree on everything. The partnership agreement is focused on a relationship; talking about what policy matters we may introduce. It knew about that before the election of 2017 because we were consulting with it! We told WALGA we were going to introduce this policy and that these were the key factors that underpinned that policy. Through the leadership of the member for Maylands, we worked through the paper and how those key factors would work. We then went to the broader public and said this is how we think we will be able to stop puppy farming in Western Australia. This is how we believe that we are going to bring an end to this abhorrent practice. It is going to involve a centralised registration system. It is going to involve mandatory standards. It is going to involve making sure that there is a simple one-off process. I want to underpin that: a one-off process of registration. If people want to breed dogs, they can; they simply have to submit a one-off application. Do people have to do it every year? No. It does not have to be renewed every year. That is the point of these matters.

No secrets were kept from the stakeholders that I just highlighted, as well as a number of others. We consulted with the broader public. I have to say that this is where the Liberal members of Parliament are so off bar: they are on another planet with regard to this. Not only do people in Western Australia understand the wonderful relationship

they can have with their pets and their mutual love of them, particularly dogs—the loyalty and all those things—they also want to protect them. This policy also makes sure that a person buying a dog knows what they are buying. How many times have we heard of people spending a lot of money purchasing a dog but not getting what they thought they were getting? Sadly, history is littered with sad cases of people buying dogs that, unfortunately, have been very cruelly bred and raised, and it has ended in tragedy. Not only has the dog lost its life, but it also impacts on the family. Kids see a pet that they thought they would have for 10 to 15 years—or however long the normal lifespan is for that dog's breed—die within months because of a terrible genetic disorder or whatever. It happens.

We were challenged about this. We were told that puppy farming does not happen. Last night, the cardigan-wearing, pipe-smoking member for Cottesloe bellowed, “Give us the proof!” Two days ago, the RSPCA raided a place in the northern suburbs of Perth. Over 20 pups and dogs were seized, with alleged—there will be court action so I cannot say any more—cruelty to these animals. In the last two years, the RSPCA has been involved in a dozen cases of the authorised seizure of pups. We all saw some of the more graphic examples of that in Gingin earlier this year or late last year. The member for Cottesloe has to get out of his happy coat! He has to understand that this is an issue that so many people in Western Australia support; that is, we want to stop puppy farming. After consultation, we received the biggest number of responses that I remember in my 19 years in Parliament—certainly in my portfolio area. We received nearly 5 000 responses. A whole range of people put in writing that they want to see puppy farming stopped. They want to be able to buy a pet—absolutely. People will still be able to buy a pet. We want them to. But we want to make sure we can trace that pet's life from birth to death—a centralised registration system. We want to ensure that we know where those pups are being bred and that they are being bred in appropriate circumstances. What is wrong with that? The member for Darling Range wonders why we get angry and say that she does not get it and that she does not care, which she demonstrated in her response last night. I appreciated the member for Moore's approach to the debate because he put an argument. But no-one else on that side of the chamber did. The member for Dawesville did not. Come on! He should not put his hands up like that. He could not even demonstrate that he was saying no. Do not do that, member for Dawesville. I asked him, “Do you know how you're going to vote?”. The member for Dawesville replied, “Oh, I'm with the shadow minister's view.” The member for Dawesville knows it is wrong. He knows that many of the people who live in Dawesville are older people who have pets. They want to ensure that when they get a pet, they know what they have paid for and they want to know that that pet has been bred appropriately and looked after before they received it as a puppy or a dog.

One aspect of this bill that the opposition forgets entirely is the statistics that show how many dogs in Western Australia have traditionally ended up in a haven. Down my way, we have the magnificent organisation K9 Dog Rescue, which is run by volunteers. Yesterday, the member for Belmont and I went to the animal haven in the member for Forrestfield's electorate. It is run by Sylvia and Clare, who are brilliant people. They are magnificent Western Australians. They are passionate people. They love their dogs and want to protect them. What do they see all the time? What have they seen over the last 30 or 40 years? They have seen cruelty. Pups have been delivered by owners who have discarded them. They have seen a whole range of things happen. What do they do? They rehabilitate them, find new owners and rehome them. They are magnificent Western Australians—brilliant. The Clares and Sylvias of the world are magnificent and they are replicated in a number of dog haven and dog rescue groups throughout Western Australia, including those at the K9 Rescue Group in Nambeelup.

One of the planks of this legislation is to highlight that we want to move people to genuinely consider adopting a dog that finds its way, for a variety of reasons, into a refuge. Not every dog that goes to a refuge has been mistreated. Sometimes people's circumstances change. Yesterday, I was talking to a fellow who volunteers. He is a fly in, fly out worker. He said that a couple of dogs have found their way to the animal haven because people have had to move north or whatever for work and they cannot take the dog. They go to places such as the animal haven, K9 Rescue, the Dogs' Refuge Home in Shenton Park et cetera and the people there find those beautiful animals a home. That plank is about addressing and encouraging adoption.

One of the other fundamental things that is forgotten by members opposite, because they have not read the bill and have not understood the consultation and what we are attempting to do, is the issue of education. This is all predicated on making sure that we continue to educate pet owners about their responsibilities. It is an important responsibility to take on a pet, no matter what it is. It is important that people understand what they are taking on and that a pet requires protection, safety, love—all those things. As we have said, we want to include proper education in this policy directive.

I want to address the issue of Dogs West Canine Association of WA. I mentioned that Dogs West is a private membership-based organisation. We have no argument with Dogs West. But, as I said, it does not capture all dog breeds in Western Australia. The member for Nedlands asked how a person can buy a crossbred dog. He talked about his dog breeding experiences. Many people still want to breed dogs and it is not prohibited in the bill—it is not—which is what the member for Darling Range has tried to make out. The member for Darling Range talked about scare tactics. That was her scare tactic: “You're not going to be able to do it anymore.” That is rubbish—absolute rubbish. Many people do not want to sterilise their dogs. That is okay in this bill, too. That was another scare tactic from the other side. It is not going to happen. The bill does not intend to change that. The member for Nedlands will still be able to get a crossbreed. Although Dogs West can cancel a member from its organisation, it does not have

the power to prevent that person from continuing to breed. That is a key point and a difference—it is the difference—and why a centralised registration system is required. It is not about having a go at the arrangements with Dogs West. We are saying that it is not the be-all and end-all, and that is why we need a centralised registration system.

Another claim made by members on the other side is that Dogs West was not consulted. The president of Dogs West was a member of the Stop Puppy Farming Implementation Working Group. I do not know how it can be conceived or perceived that we were not inclusive of Dogs West when its president was part of the working group. I admire the president. I have the greatest respect for the president of Dogs West. Members on the other side said that Dogs West was not part of the process and was not consulted, but that is not true—it is rubbish! The member for Nedlands has gone down the wrong track with this issue. If he is the shadow spokesperson, it surprises me that he has led the puppies in his team down this path, because it is the wrong path. I think he knows it. If he does not know it, I would like to say something, but I will not.

I turn to working dogs. A representative of the Australian Federation for Livestock Working Dogs was on the implementation group. Again, I am sorry, but how can someone say that it was not consulted when it had a representative on the implementation group? They were there. The policy that we took to the election was there in black and white, but we wanted to include that group. As a result of agitation from the group representing working dogs, we agreed to give them an exemption under the regulations.

Mr M.P. Murray interjected.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: I am sorry to keep the old hound over there up!

We agreed to that. In fact, livestock working dogs—I say this very clearly—have been granted an exemption from mandatory sterilisation and it is the only group to be granted such an exemption under this legislation.

Mr R.S. Love interjected.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: The member should read the second reading speech. We made it very clear that that group would be the only one given an exemption.

I have mentioned the Western Australian Local Government Association, which has been right there. There are a number of things on which WALGA and I do not agree, such as the gross rental value issue. On that, we do not agree, but that does not mean that we do not have a good relationship. Members opposite think that the agreement means that if we do not agree, we tear up the agreement. It has not happened and it is not going to happen because we have the type of relationship in which we are constantly talking. WALGA was right there from the very beginning.

I finish by thanking all the members who spoke and acknowledge their contributions, but it is very clear that members opposite have not read the bill and have not looked at the government's record in putting this forward as important legislation. I am sorry; COVID-19 or not, this is the right time for this legislation because it is about protecting one of the most loved animals on earth. It is the time to do it. We did not bring it on in the last couple of months because of the COVID-19 crisis but, as members know, through the Premier's leadership, we are the safest place in Australia and, indeed, the world and this is the time to do it. Let us go into consideration in detail. We will answer members' questions, but I call on the Liberal Party to reverse its steadfast decision to say no to this. Without even waiting for the debate, without even questioning during consideration in detail, it came to a no. I would like to know who really influenced the member for Nedlands, because I do not think it is anybody who has any brain, quite frankly—they do not!

I want to finish with this. I want to talk very briefly about the member for Maylands. Some members have attacked her or used some terms that have been inappropriate and quoted her in some forums that she has been in. I want to tell members that there is no better member in this Parliament, for as long as I can remember, who has been steadfastly supportive of the protection and welfare of animals. That is why I asked her to be the chair of the task force. She did a brilliant job—a magnificent job. Yes, she gets criticism every now and again, but she is tough. Why is she tough? She understands that the people of Western Australia also understand the importance of this legislation. I want to thank the member for Maylands for her tremendous leadership in this, for her advocacy and for her stoic passion. I am proud of this legislation. Let us vote for it. Let us vote yes, and send it off to the upper house and pass this bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

CORONAVIRUS — HOMELESSNESS SERVICES

Motion

MS M.J. DAVIES (Central Wheatbelt — Leader of the Nationals WA) [4.02 pm]: The Nationals WA are very pleased to bring this motion to the house for private members' business this evening. I move —

That this house notes the increase in homelessness and vulnerable members of the community seeking assistance in regional Western Australia and calls on the McGowan government to deliver an immediate funding increase to provide the community services sector with the capacity to respond appropriately to the additional pressures of COVID-19.

This is a very genuine and serious motion that we bring to the house today for its consideration, and it is timely given the horrendous unemployment rate recorded in recent days for Western Australia. Our state, as has been canvassed in this place over the past two weeks, has the highest unemployment rate in the nation, with 8.1 per cent in May rising from 6.1 per cent in April. When we talk about such percentages in this place, it helps for us to talk about it in terms of real bodies because it is a bit clinical to talk about percentages or statistics. To the average punter, it is a bit removed from what those figures actually represent, and we are talking about a significant number of Western Australians who have lost their jobs. It means, specifically, that more than 30 000 Western Australians lost their job in just the month of May. It means that more than 112 000 people are now unemployed. It means that 104 000 people in Western Australia have lost their jobs since February as a result of the COVID-19 crisis.

The Treasurer has acknowledged in the media during the week that these figures are not pretty. We would all agree that nobody likes to see these figures that we have seen over the past months. The Treasurer was quoted in an ABC article on 18 June as saying —

They represent people, they represent lives, they represent families.”

He is exactly right and that is why this motion is not condemning anyone and is not calling on the government to say that it has done an awful job; it is simply saying that this is a situation that we think needs special attention and it is a looming crisis, if it is not already right on our doorstep. The figures are not pretty and we are talking about people in our communities who are faced with the loss of their job, which comes with a loss of self-worth, the anxiety of not being able to provide for a family, the distress of losing a home, and that is why we bring this motion to the house today.

There has been a rapid and successful response to the health crisis that the state is facing. We are not too mean in our praise to acknowledge that the state government, with support from the federal government, has done a remarkable job keeping our communities safe. The health crisis has been, in anyone’s measure, managed well here in WA, but we must acknowledge that the hard work to recover from this crisis is still to be done, and for many months, perhaps years, we will be feeling the impact of this crisis. For many, it is going to be the first time that they have faced such difficult economic times, the first time they have had to engage with a government agency or the first time they have even had to ask for help from people outside their immediate circle. These are quite confronting circumstances. I, as the local member for Central Wheatbelt, have had a number of business owners and individuals come through my office and I have seen this confrontation reflected in their distress: they have been very self-sufficient up to this point and they now find themselves, through no fault of their own, in a circumstance in which they have to interact with agencies that they have never had to deal with before. Of course, there are people who have been engaged with that system prior to COVID-19, and all that is happening in that circumstance is that they are becoming further embedded and distressed. I think that is something that we need to remember.

We also know, and it has been canvassed over the past few weeks, that women, in particular, and our youth have been the hardest hit as a result of COVID-19. They typically work in that part-time sector and service sector work. To respond to this, we need a very well-resourced communities sector, and this is where the problem is. It is an indictment on this government that prior to the COVID-19 crisis, more than 450 not-for-profit community service sector organisations had banded together to launch a campaign titled Your Help WA. This was designed to send a very clear message to the McGowan government that more funding was urgently needed to help vulnerable and at-risk people. I have a comment here from the executive director of Community Employers WA, Mr John Bouffler; he said —

... the community services sector is in crisis—demand for social services in WA is outstripping the available resources.

There is also a statement from the CEO of the Western Australian Council of Social Service, Louise Giolitto —

... the Community Service Sector and the State Government have reached an impasse which is underpinned by a lack of understanding the investment required for people who are in need in our state and for the community providers working on the frontline.

They are two very influential people in the community services sector and it is very concerning because those statements were made before COVID-19 struck in Western Australia and across the world. In the media statement that was issued by those 450 not-for-profit groups under the banner Your Help WA, there was a fast facts section, and I preface the following statistics by the fact that, as I have just said, these relate to prior to December last year.

The list of fast facts states —

HOMELESSNESS	More than 9,000 Western Australians, including 3000 children and young people, don’t have a place to call home.
DOM. VIOLENCE	In Western Australia, almost 300,000 people have experienced physical or sexual violence by a current or former partner.
	Family and domestic violence affects one in every four women in Australia.

FAMILIES	240,000 Western Australians are living below the poverty line and many of them are children.
CHILDREN	Each week more than 20 000 WA children go to school hungry because they didn't have breakfast.
LIVING COST	19,740 households had their power cut off in the last year because they could not afford to pay the bill.
EMPLOYMENT	WA's community services organisations employ more than 96,000 full and part time staff, that's 7.0 per cent of the State's workforce. WA's youth (15 – 24 years) unemployment rate of 14.5% is the highest in 20 years, according to the Department of Training and Workforce Development.
DISABILITY	One in five Western Australians have some form of disability.

Those are some fairly stark statistics. For that sector to get to that point, especially against a government of the current persuasion, is remarkable. It is remarkable that those organisations felt the need to express their concern back in December that they had reached an impasse with the state government. Prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, there was a crisis in that sector in terms of adequate resourcing for the organisations that support the most vulnerable in our community.

I will now refer to a document created by the Department of Communities dated 29 May 2020 and titled "Impact of COVID-19 on the WA community (Youth)". I referred to this document in question time. On page 2, there is a presentation summary of the issues raised that I will read into *Hansard*. It states —

- We are already seeing areas of concern across the State, particularly in:
 - family and domestic violence
 - homelessness
 - child protection
 - rental and public housing supply
 - Youth
- Likely to be increased demand on a range of services, as well as pressure on accommodation (including homelessness and social housing).
- Financial impact on agencies will be significant if they are to meet increased demand.
- Difficult economic and housing market conditions will reduce usual State revenue sources.
- Economic recovery may be compromised by a failure to also appropriately address social recovery.
- Many of the social impacts are likely to continue for some time (potentially, several years). Some of those impacts will be permanent (e.g. impact of children going into care can last a lifetime).

I will read the section specifically about youth homelessness. It states —

- COVID-19 health impacts disproportionately affect people experiencing homelessness — particularly those with underlying health issues.
- ...
- Bed vacancies for youth crisis accommodation remain low in the metropolitan area, this means there is limited capacity to respond to any increase in demand —

This was dated in May this year —

- **For regional WA, bed vacancies for youth crisis accommodation have increased since the low point seen in early April, but are still low in comparison to historical levels. The South West, Great Southern and Wheatbelt have all been close to zero available youth crisis beds for close to a year.**
- Isolation and distancing requirements mean fewer homelessness services and less access to services.
- ...
- Economic impacts will likely see more people fall into homelessness. This will be a lagged, long-term impact if people have lost rentals or their own homes. Demand for support, services and accommodation will continue to increase for some time.

Finally, I will go to the section on mental health, because this is something that I have also raised with government, particularly from a wheatbelt perspective. The impact of COVID-19 on youth mental health is an issue that is raised right across the state. In this document, the department makes the following observation —

- Social isolation, long-term unemployment and homelessness are particular issues for youth, and contribute to and compound mental health issues and increase suicide risk. Access to mental health services is an immediate priority. Likely to be increased demand on services (and funding) for some time.

I do not think that that would surprise anyone, but the challenge is how the government will respond to those very concerning issues raised by the Department of Communities. It underpins the seriousness of what we are talking about today.

WACOSS is an organisation that is very well trusted—I do not think I need to be saying that to Madam Deputy Speaker or anyone in this place. It has a long history of engagement with the community services sector right across the state. As a part of its state budget submission for the 2020–21 budget, it held a series of consultations right across Western Australia. This submission was completed for the normal budget process and not the October budget process, and it highlighted that everything was not rosy prior to COVID-19 coming into play. We cannot be under any illusion that there were not serious concerns brewing and bubbling away, as we have outlined in terms of that 450 community sector not-for-profits coming together to start pushing the government to do something. At a glance, the WACOSS state budget submission for 2020–21 highlights some revealing community profiles. It has gone to regional communities and delved into some of those issues that face our regional centres, one of which was the City of Greater Geraldton. I do not want to steal the thunder of the member for Geraldton who I know will talk about some of the services under pressure there and the impact that COVID-19 has brought to bear, but I draw members' attention to the fact that in March 2019, the City of Greater Geraldton reported an unemployment rate of the 8.9 per cent compared with about 6.9 per cent across Western Australia, and that had grown from 5.4 per cent in March 2017. That happened under this government's watch from March 2017 to March 2019—significant unemployment growth in the City of Greater Geraldton. I would like to highlight one paragraph from this case study in its submission —

The WACOSS community conversations revealed the real effort service providers have put into resourcing and networking to develop formal and informal collaborations across governments, the community service sector and Aboriginal Community-Controlled Organisations. Many discussed the increasing focus on community services developing more partnerships, without recognition of the time and work needed to do this effectively, while some expressed frustration that the promised place-based planning and co-design had yet to occur.

The key words in that paragraph are “without recognition of the time and work needed to do this effectively”. That is echoed when I speak to the community sector right across the state: there is simply too much work and they are not resourced adequately to do the planning needed to effectively bring those collaborations that make that dollar go further. Certainly, I would like to raise a number of issues for those organisations located in the Central Wheatbelt, but I will also talk about some located in the Pilbara and Kalgoorlie. That comment is reflective of the sentiment of organisations like Share and Care, which delivers a suite of community support services in my electorate of the Central Wheatbelt, and in the wheatbelt in general. For those who are unaware of the good work that that organisation does, it is a not-for-profit that is funded by a mix of state, federal and Lotterywest funding. Its head office is located in Northam. It has a women's centre and homeless accommodation buildings offsite. It operates 22 services with about \$5 million a year in funding. It is very good at making a dollar go a long way. I know that the lack of funding puts enormous pressure on its board and executive to deliver those services, and that it is never able to meet the need that it sees in our communities. In Share and Care's annual general report of October 2019, which was pre-COVID, the treasurer's report states —

The last financial year proved once again to be challenging as we continue to work in an ever increasingly tight fiscal environment and competing for limited funding opportunities which is compounded by funding indexation not keeping up with true cost of service delivery and an increase in overall wages. Share & Care continues to be highly dependent on government grants and have had to tighten our belts and find innovative ways of operating to ensure that our core business of serving the needs of the most vulnerable in our community is never diminished.

The CEO, Carol Jones, has been in that organisation for many years. There is not much that Carol does not know and is not aware of when it comes to how to secure funding to support that community. Carol states in her report —

Funding is ... an ongoing issue. Some services have had the same funding rate for over 9 years with the additional top up for the award and Equal Remuneration Order, which sadly in no way covers the ever increasing costs of running a service or wages.

Carol goes on to say —

Our Suicide Bereavement Service is very busy, supporting those who have been bereaved by suicide across the Wheatbelt, the numbers have risen sadly against last years. Share & Care are still funding this service until we find an alternative.

I have raised this matter with the government. I know it is difficult for the minister or the government to say to me or my electorate that the mental health or support services in the wheatbelt are in good financial shape in terms of staffing or personal. I think that that is acknowledged broadly. They are under enormous pressure. There has been a spike in suicides. Share and Care offers a bereavement service, but it cannot be funded by the state or federal government, or any other government organisation. To its great credit, though, it continues to offer that service because it recognises the real benefit it has for the community. Members will recall a spate of suicides that occurred in Narrogin at one point and a number of others more recently in my electorate. Share and Care offers and will continue to offer that bereavement service, but it will have to cut back on other very important services. Carol goes on to say —

Youth numbers needing accommodation and supports are rising, Emergency Relief is being accessed more frequently, housing stresses and homelessness are increasing exponentially.

We should not accept any of this. For me, it does not paint a rosy picture of the situation pre-COVID. These statements were in Share and Care's annual general report, dated October 2019, well before the impact of COVID-19 came into play and well before the impacts of the global pandemic. Share and Care does a marvellous job, but its services are stretched and, like many other service providers, it needs more funding.

I would like to briefly talk about another organisation that also covers the entirety of the Central Wheatbelt electorate, and that is Avon Community Services. The minister and I have discussed this matter. I really thank her for making time in her schedule to discuss it because it is something that the community and I are very passionate about. I know she understands the challenges that this organisation faces. I also understand the challenges of government. I do not come to this place not knowing about the hard discussions that need to be made about where every dollar is spent. However, I raise these issues that face Share and Care, and the homelessness statistics and the looming unemployment wave that is coming to our state in the hope that it strengthens the minister's voice in cabinet so that she can take the concerns that are raised by speakers in this place today to the Treasurer and Premier and say that we need do more.

Avon Community Services is based in Northam and provides support for vulnerable and at-risk youth in the wheatbelt—that is, 18 to 25-year-olds. It delivers housing services and works with people in unsupported and supported accommodation. It provides supported accommodation for young people aged between 15 and 25 in National Affordable Housing Agreement housing in Northam. That program requires participants to sign up to participate in a number of life skills. It is essentially a contract with the organisation. They go through the NAHA and are connected with services and educational opportunities and are transitioned into more sustainable and stable housing and, hopefully, into employment or further training. The program has been going for only 18 months but has had some success. The organisation as a whole has had a bit of a chequered history, but this program has demonstrated some success. The key to its success is through the 24/7 support that is available at the house. The participants have highly complex issues. They often come in as part of court orders out of the juvenile justice system, or have mental illnesses, or drug and alcohol issues, or are survivors of sexual or domestic violence. As members would appreciate, having someone on hand to provide these young people with guidance and support 24/7 so that they can be mentored to make good decisions and so that they can get into more stable workplaces is the key to its success. The board, chair and CEO have told me that they have seen a number of people go through that program and transition into the community. I am told that they no longer have appropriate funding to run that 24/7 support service. They tried for some time to engage with the government on this front to demonstrate that the program is worth supporting. It covers the entire wheatbelt. Nothing else in the wheatbelt—I am happy to be corrected—offers this type of service. It is something that we need right across regional Western Australia. It is very difficult when police or other departments come into contact with young people at risk. Often it is the job of the police to try to find these young people a safe bed for the night. This is an issue that the police should not have to deal with. But the can keeps getting kicked down the road, not because the police do not want to deal with it, but because there are not enough facilities in regional Western Australia to deal with these complex issues.

This is causing great distress for Avon Community Services. NAHA housing in particular used to be a challenge for the community. It was not well managed and there were poor outcomes for the community and the individuals involved. The NAHA program now has the support of agencies such as the Department of Communities, the Department of Education, the Western Australia Police Force, the mental health office, the Wheatbelt Health Network and the juvenile justice team. They consider it to be an enormous asset. It is for people from not only Northam, but also Merredin, Narrogin Katanning and further afield in the member for Moore's electorate. It offers supported housing options for people in the wheatbelt. The only alternative, as far as I am aware, is for people to go to Perth. I do not think that that is acceptable.

Given the observations of the Minister for Community Services, or in the Department of Communities presentation on 29 May, and given the challenges we know will be coming as a result of higher employment, stretched services and other pressures on families and individuals, I urge the Minister for Community Services to find funding in this year's budget for it. She needs to find a way of asking the Treasurer to release the purse strings. On that note, we do this in the genuine hope that this will allow the minister to go back to the cabinet and the Treasurer to say that we cannot ignore this. This is just one example of the enormous burden on our community when we do not spend

the first dollar on prevention and support. We all know in this place that if we do not spend that first dollar, we end up spending \$10, \$20, \$30 or hundreds down the track on the juvenile justice system and the health sector. That is unacceptable to me. I understand the budgetary challenges that will face us as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic. I appreciate the fact that the minister took time to meet with us. This organisation is doing its very best, but it has already cut support and it has had to let people go. Now that 24/7 support is not available at times in that housing accommodation. Unfortunately, that compromises the outcomes. I do not think it will work nearly as well without that.

I now turn to issues in Newman, which we have previously canvassed in this place. I note that the industry made a significant announcement today about some of its housing. I have to say the challenge in Newman is not just with the industry. Overcrowding in the housing stock in Newman has been a significant problem. There is simply not enough housing and the standard is very poor. I have to say that when I have visited Newman, it has been quite confronting. I have seen streets of boarded up homes and heard serious concerns raised by the community sector about the impact of overcrowding in government social housing. Continued calls by local government and the not-for-profit sector for senior members of the Department of Communities and Department of Housing to be located in Newman to deal with issues on the ground and to provide the level of support that is needed, as opposed to being based in Port Hedland, some hours away, have fallen on deaf ears. That is the experience in regional Western Australia every day. I recall similar calls being made for senior level decision-makers to be located in Kalgoorlie so that they could make decisions and respond quickly so that issues would not escalate and become a problem for the government of the day and to get better outcomes for the community. We see that in all our communities and it is very frustrating. Of course, people would expect the Nationals WA to say that we prefer decentralised decision-making with senior roles so that people can pursue their careers wherever they live, as opposed to having to move to Perth to make those decisions. It is really simple to provide a level of support to the community through a person or persons in the community. Quite often the police and the Department of Education are the only decision-makers in those communities. That could be rectified to provide support to the community.

It is very challenging that the issue in Newman continues. We have seen the industry pick up some slack, after much prodding I have to say, with those boarded-up houses in Newman. I really look forward to Newman being rejuvenated and going through a process of urban renewal, because it is a fantastic place to live. There are jobs in Newman. There is actually an opportunity to have employment in Newman, in the mining and resources sector at the very least. There are also other opportunities. The state of housing and the support offered in that community is wanting, and I think that community services and not-for-profits would unhesitatingly say that it is a challenge. They would be very nervous because of COVID-19. The community generates a significant amount of the state's income and wealth, but there are some very serious issues there that are taking a long time to get traction.

I want to touch on some issues in Kalgoorlie. There are concerns about support services there. Again, I think this is a reflection of the lack of funding and support. There is under-resourcing, which means that businesses and organisations have whittled back the support they can provide. Nearly one in 10 women in regional Western Australia have been homeless in the last five years. Everyone would be familiar with the Red Cross in Kalgoorlie. It announced a withdrawal of its services from Kalgoorlie–Boulder, although it appears to have moved back. It is moving its Kalgoorlie–Boulder Aboriginal Short Stay. There is great hope that it will not affect its delivery of services on the ground, but, again, these decisions are made based on financial challenges. Instead of focusing on delivering for the people it is supposed to be supporting, it is looking at ways to stay and survive. We need to monitor that service very carefully. I note that the Department of Communities has established a task force in Kalgoorlie to address homelessness and to consider the immediate risks faced by people at risk of becoming homeless.

The sector is engaged in that. This is probably taken out of context, but there was an article in the *Kalgoorlie Miner* in March titled “Help for homeless amid COVID-19 crisis”. In the article, Labor member for the Mining and Pastoral Region, Hon Kyle McGinn, was quoted as saying —

“On a local level we have supplied soap and hand sanitiser to the Goldfields Aboriginal Language Centre to help with hygiene.

I am not sure that is going to cut the mustard as a response. I am sure it was very welcome at the time as people were very concerned about their health and wellbeing, but we need something slightly more substantive than that if we are to deal with some of these new challenges. We acknowledge that it is far more difficult to deliver these services in regional Western Australia—the population is sparse and we are operating on the smell of an oily rag in many circumstances. All of the issues I have canvassed were impacting our communities prior to COVID-19. We understand that the Lotterywest account and funds and a range of other things were announced to deal with the short-term issues facing the regions—the ledge that all of those organisations faced as they were overwhelmed with people coming to them. My challenge, and the challenge facing the sector now, is that these issues will continue, because more and more people will have to engage with that community services sector. Unfortunately, more people will become homeless. That is what the Department of Communities' own presentation said. The risk is very real and is likely to come to fruition over the next two years if we do not see significant funding.

It is hard not to be cynical when we come to this place every week and listen to ministers talking about the millions of dollars that are being pumped into projects such as Metronet and cyclepaths, yet we see real need among families that are under enormous pressure. For us it is about getting those priorities right. We understand the need to get the economy pumping, but we do not want these very important community sector organisations that offer these incredibly important services to be overlooked because they cannot provide a big shiny rail line or a flashy ribbon to be cut at the end of the day. We know the government's priorities are right when it is doing the things that will make a long and real difference to people in real stress. I point to the \$415 million being spent on three elevated rail crossings on, I think, the Armadale train line, which will reduce the commute by 90 seconds. I feel like we might be able spend that \$415 million in the community services sector. I am sure those 450 community organisations would happily accept that additional support, and we could push that project back down the line. I understand that the minister will probably say that we need to create jobs so the people do not fall into that space, but the reality is that there will not be enough jobs for everyone and we need to support people under real pressure right now.

So far, what has been put on the table has got us through an immediate crisis. I feel that more members will have this conversation with their not-for-profits. We need to have a serious conversation about rapidly injecting funding into our community services sector. The statistics I talked about at the beginning of my speech are really concerning. They come from the Department of Communities. We want to empower the minister to say to the Premier, the Treasurer and cabinet that we need a bigger slice of the pie to look after the most vulnerable people in our community.

MR I.C. BLAYNEY (Geraldton) [4.37 pm]: Homelessness is quite a big issue in my electorate. It has been made worse since the closure of Cameliers Guest House, which was a local institution, in August 2018. Of course, to a point the closure of Cameliers was triggered by the closure of the Geraldton Sobering Up Centre before it. Like everywhere else, we are watching and expecting that homelessness will be exacerbated by the COVID-19 pandemic. We have a reasonable number of services offering emergency accommodation. They all do a fantastic job, as do the services in other electorates as I am sure most members would agree. Sun City Christian Centre has a tailor-made accommodation unit that was built under the Barnett government and opened by the current Minister for Housing. I have had a bit to do with Chrysalis House Women's Refuge, because it had two upgrades during the time we were in government. There is also Short Term Accommodation for Youth—STAY—which accommodates youth experiencing homelessness or trouble in the family situation. All these bodies provide a fantastic service and they have also provided assistance to my office reasonably often to help with vulnerable constituents who have had nowhere to stay for the night.

Sun City Christian Centre has 34 beds, and it accommodates single parents and families as well as individuals and couples. For \$35 a night it provides a bed, three meals a day and a shower, as well as facilities such as a lounge room and a kids play area that can be utilised by those staying there. The manager of the centre has informed me that frequently all 34 beds are full and he has to increasingly turn away families and single parents, especially since the closure of Cameliers, because he does not have enough beds. The Salvation Army has a number of small units built just next to its church, which are quite neat, simple brick housing units of, I think, two and three bedrooms, and there are a couple of them there. There is a reasonable amount of land there, and in the past I have had a go at trying to get more of these for the Salvation Army, but unfortunately that was not successful.

Chrysalis House Women's Refuge caters for females and has 16 beds available for emergency accommodation. Like everywhere else, it sometimes exceeds the number of spaces that are available. The CEO of Chrysalis has informed me that a consortium of local agencies has applied to the City of Greater Geraldton for funding to establish a connections week for all homelessness and mental health services in Geraldton to meet and discuss what is needed. It sounds like a good idea and I hope it gets off the ground. It is interesting that it has to get money from the city to do that, but it may also be getting money from the state government.

Emergency accommodation services often liaise with other organisations in town such as the Salvation Army and the St Vincent de Paul Society, which can often financially assist individuals who are experiencing homelessness or point them in the direction of drug and alcohol and/or mental health services. In fact, individuals who work in the sector often go out of their way to assist the most vulnerable in our community. They are crying out for more funding so they can employ staff to take on the liaising role full-time, including being able to take service users to medical, legal or financial appointments.

Residents of Geraldton, like everywhere, engage with such service providers for a number of different reasons. It may be that someone is coming to the end of their tenancy and has not been able to find a new rental property, someone has relocated to Geraldton and has not been able to finalise accommodation yet, or someone has lost their job and has fallen behind on rent. There are also people who are nearly permanently homeless due to mental health issues, family problems, domestic violence, or drug and alcohol issues. Cameliers Guest House was a port in the storm for individuals who were experiencing permanent homelessness. Before it closed its doors, it had residents who had been staying at the guesthouse for 12 years. I tried to help it get a new project up but, unfortunately, it was one of the interesting things you sometimes come across with the government—the government was quite prepared to agree to fund it to develop a project, but decided not to fund building the

project. Cameliers had some land that the council had given it to put its new project on. Unfortunately, it went ahead and did the earthworks, but it could not get funding to build the project. It is now stuck with that block of land. It has spent most of its money on the earthworks and cannot do anything with it. It is likely that a lot of the individuals at Cameliers were suffering from mental illness or had problems with drugs or alcohol. Another interesting thing that the people who were running Cameliers told me was that if they offered people free accommodation—they used to give new people free accommodation for a week—as soon as they asked people to make a contribution, they would leave.

Cameliers worked closely with the sobering-up centre. People dried out at the sobering-up centre and then could go to Cameliers. However, when the sobering-up centre closed, rather than the police taking people who were either in an intoxicated or drug affected state to the sobering-up centre, they took them directly to Cameliers, which was not able to cope with that because it was not set up for it. It made a request for \$250 000 or \$300 000 a year so that it could be run with people who would be able to deal with that, but that was rejected, so it closed. The other function Cameliers performed was to provide accommodation to backpackers and short-term workers in Geraldton.

The impact of those closures on those who are experiencing homelessness in Geraldton has been huge. The other day, a constituent arrived at my office at about midday with all her belongings. She had been dropped off at my office by one of the local organisations that looks after homeless people. They left her there with all her stuff and said that she had nowhere to sleep that night. I asked a bit more about it and it turned out that her car had been impounded. I think she had been living in her car. She needed \$1 500 to get the car out of impoundment and she had only 24 hours in which to do it. The car was already on a payment plan, so there was no way around it with that. We spent the afternoon contacting people and trying to get someone to take her. Eventually, we directly contacted the minister's office for some help. Crisis Care was going to contact us, but by the evening that contact had not come. Centrelink gave us an advance of \$100 so she would be able to buy some food for the evening. She ended up contacting someone she knew who was able to put her up for the night. Crisis Care rang us back the next day but she did not appear back in the office. We had expected that she probably would, but she did not. It was clear that the constituent was extremely vulnerable. She was confusing her facts and obviously had some mental health issues. I was advised by one service provider that it had tried to get her to engage with mental health services, but she refused to do so. Another service provider said that it had had her there in the past, but it did not have the facilities or staff to deal with her disruptive behaviour. That was a real dilemma for a member of Parliament to find themselves in. The services that we would assume should be able to take such a person find that they cannot, but the individual concerned does not want to admit themselves into treatment for mental health issues. Deciding what to do with such a person is a real dilemma, especially at five o'clock. My staff had gone home and I was wanting to go home myself. No doubt I would have got on the phone and found somewhere for her to stay, but I found myself in a very difficult position. I think that it would not be possible for me to put a middle-aged woman who has mental health problems and all her worldly goods out on the street at five o'clock and say that she was someone else's problem. I could not do that. It was a very difficult position for a member of Parliament to find themselves in. I had not really been aware of that situation before—that is, someone needing to engage with mental health services but refusing to do it and running around the streets, running their own lives and causing chaos wherever they go. To its credit, the Sun City Christian Centre said that it would have another go with her. It had found her very disruptive when she had been there before but it was prepared to take her in and see whether it could work with her. However, she has not appeared back in my office since that time.

The point to highlight is that when services such as the sobering-up centre or Cameliers are removed, the burden of care and responsibility falls on the police, the hospital and emergency accommodation providers, which are already stretched to capacity. I am told that the police now find that a lot of their time is taken up driving around town in the evening looking for places to leave people that can look after them overnight.

I reflected on the fact that it has been 40 years since John Pat died in Roebourne. There have been a number of demonstrations around the country on the subject of Black Lives Matter and the rate of Aboriginal incarceration. The sobering-up centres were built to address the problem of police having nowhere else to put drunken people than in the cells. Our centre in Geraldton was built in 2003. The project had a very high level of interest and the then member for Geraldton, Shane Hill, had pushed very hard for it. I think it is a shame that this government, which is the same party that Shane was a member of and still is, closed our sobering-up centre on 30 December 2017. As someone who was part of the Barnett Liberal–National government, I can hold my head up, and that government can hold its head up, because the sobering-up centre and Cameliers both remained open during our eight and a half years in government.

I see it as a connected issue, but other people may not. I have had this argument before, both when we were in government and now in opposition. There used to be a truancy officer in regional education offices and their job was to find the kids who were not turning up for school. That is another thing that is strongly linked with social disadvantage. I know primary school kids in Geraldton who go to school probably 20 per cent of the time and secondary school kids who have just ceased going altogether. No-one in our system is proactively out there in the community looking for these children and trying to get them back into school. The schools will say that they have badged attendance officers, but if the families of those children have moved towns, no-one who is out there looking

for them will find them. If we cannot get those kids to go to school, the cycle will just repeat itself. If kids have no education, it means that this cycle will basically repeat itself. As I said, the last few governments have seemed to think that this is the job of the police. I do not regard this as the police's job. I think it is unfair to expect that the police can undertake this job.

Another observation—the minister, like me, is probably wondering about this—is that at the start of the COVID crisis, some homeless people were housed in five-star hotels. I thought that they would have been happy there, but I understand that most of them left after a few days. I think there is a message there. I wander up from the railway station most mornings when Parliament is sitting and I often wonder whether people who are in a position to make decisions have ever spoken to homeless people to see what sort of house or shelter they would prefer. Along a similar line, I remember reading about an alternative housing project that was run in the Northern Territory whereby architects were given the job of talking to the homeless people in communities and asking them what sort of house they wanted. We keep delivering these houses that we think these people want, and generally they are not that happy with them. The architects in the Northern Territory came up with some really interesting and quite different housing designs. It was good. In our minds, we would never have thought that someone would want a house like those that these architects came up with. I did a bit of a search yesterday and, interestingly, I came across this particular housing project at the same time as the member for Kalgoorlie was talking about dog issues in this community—that is, Tjuntjuntjara. It is interesting to look at the housing designs that they came up with there. I wonder whether we could speak to homeless people and ask them to tell us the type of shelter they would like to live in, because if they are not happy with where we put them, they generally up and leave. I note the project that the Bunbury city council has built. It is a very simple project, but I wonder whether we could build something that provides more shelter and more security that is similar to what has been done in Bunbury. It is some sort of hybrid thing that is not conventional housing, which, to me, seems to frequently fail them. There might be something else that they would be happy with. That is just a thought.

I will talk for a little while about housing in Geraldton. As of 31 January 2020, there were 532 housing applications waiting to be processed in Geraldton and 822 in the midwest. Respectively, 31 and 38 of those applications were priority applications, with over 1 000 people in the region on the waiting list. At the same time, it was identified that there were 145 vacant properties in Geraldton, with 60 undergoing maintenance and repairs and 85 scheduled for demolition, sale or redevelopment. Figures such as this frustrate the services in Geraldton that provide support to homeless individuals and those experiencing mental health issues. All public housing should be adequately maintained and immediately available to individuals in need.

[Member's time extended.]

Mr I.C. BLAYNEY: Of course, we all understand the difficulties and that things have to be tendered for and it takes a while.

I want to talk a little bit about a suburb of Geraldton that I have been putting a bit of time into. I have been aware of the problems there for probably as long as I have been the local member. The suburb is called Spalding and it has a very high proportion of public housing. It is particularly critical that houses in this area are not left. If houses are left without anyone living in them, immediately they suffer damage. The city council has come up with a redevelopment plan for Spalding that has been supported by the state government. The government did the work for it, but of course no funds are available to revitalise the area. The minister has previously suggested that the government is waiting for market conditions to improve in Spalding before it can progress in this area. I think it might be waiting for a very long time, purely because of the fact that there is so much unsold land in new estates around Geraldton, so it will take a long time before Spalding comes good. In a way, it is similar to what I have read about the city of Detroit in the United States, where people move out, the houses are left vacant and the houses immediately get vandalised, and because they get vandalised, it drags down the whole suburb.

I also have an intense amount of frustration with Spalding because right in the middle of Spalding is a site for a new school, but some years ago the government decided that it was not going to happen, so it gave the land to an organisation called the Property Asset Clearing House to get rid of. At the time, the Sun City Christian Centre had plans to build a church and housing there, which would have lifted the whole suburb. The then Department of Housing put up its hand and said that it would take the land, and it has done nothing with it ever since. There is 12 hectares of land in the middle of this suburb that is empty when it could have been used. I was extremely frustrated by that, because I think that could have changed the face of the entire suburb. Instead of that, another government department has taken the land and done absolutely nothing with it.

I spent some time in the suburb the other day and I was surprised at the number of boarded-up brick houses there. I am quite used to seeing the old Homewest-type asbestos houses boarded up; that is not unusual. I suspect that some of those houses have reached the end of their worthwhile life. However, I was really surprised to see a reasonable number of brick ones like that. I suspect that they could be renovated into a good house that we could get another 20 or 30 years out of. Under the housing stimulus package that was announced earlier this month, with \$100 million to be spent in the regions, Geraldton, and Spalding in particular, cannot be overlooked. Redevelopment of the 34 vacant properties in Spalding is long overdue, so it is imperative that the stimulus package provides the

boost that is needed to enable work on these properties to finally start. Not only will this give much-needed encouragement to Spalding residents and community organisations that regularly use the area, but also the program will be welcomed by very depressed local building and construction companies that were struggling even before the COVID-19 pandemic started. The COVID pandemic has been a huge blow to them, and I can illustrate the magnitude of that. In 2013, about 380 houses in Geraldton were started and I think last year about 40 were started, so that gives members an idea of the scale of the drop in that industry. The minister's announcement lacked details about where the money reserved for the regions will be spent. Obviously, now is the optimum time for the government to say where the money will be spent.

I also wrote to our federal local member, Hon Melissa Price, and to Senator Dean Smith to underline to them the importance of funds for Spalding. They both replied to me. In the case of Senator Smith, it was a handwritten letter—everyone knows that you do not get them very often these days! They both agreed how important the area is and said that they would look out for it. Of course, it is frequently regarded that Western Australia runs these projects quite well, so the federal government tends to just hand a block of funds to the state government and tells it to work out how to spend it. It is vital that the government still considers injecting funds from royalties for regions into the Spalding development, especially considering the underspend from the program under this government. Plans drawn up for the Spalding development include changes to roads and housing. A significant proportion of royalties for regions funding should be directed to this instead of it all being spent in Perth or redirected to Treasury.

As the Leader of the Nationals WA said, Geraldton's unemployment rate is higher than average. The COVID-19 pandemic has certainly made conditions for local businesses a lot harder. The problem is that nearly all of the industry in Geraldton is focused on trade with China. The crayfishing industry exports about 98 per cent of its product to China and about 90 per cent of Geraldton's minerals go to China. In agriculture, we do not grow a huge amount of barley but most of our grain goes to Indonesia or China. That is of particular concern to me because if relations with China continue to slide, we will probably trade less with it. Once again, that will provide a further dampening of the local economy. That will feed into higher unemployment and fewer opportunities for people, resulting in a spiral effect. I hope that does not happen. They are all my problems in this area. I know the minister's heart is in the right place, so good luck!

MR D.T. REDMAN (Warren–Blackwood) [5.01 pm]: I, too, would like to make some comments to support my colleagues and also the Leader of the Nationals WA in the motion she has moved in private members' time. The motion states —

That this house notes the increase in homelessness and vulnerable members of the community seeking assistance in regional Western Australia and calls on the McGowan government to deliver an immediate funding increase to provide the community services sector with the capacity to respond appropriately to the additional pressures of COVID-19.

I do not envy the minister's portfolio. It is not a portfolio that would suit me. Having been a minister for some time in the previous government, I got to see a lot of the vulnerable parts of our state and the challenges that many people face. The minister's portfolio is on the front line of that. I do not for a minute underestimate her challenge in trying to meet all those challenges.

On a broad level, we are in a very unique scenario right now. Before the COVID issues came to bear, we knew this government's history in regional Western Australia. It has taken fairly significant hits in the royalties for regions program. The most recent update in the March quarter financials shows what the Nationals have highlighted: we are heading towards a \$200 million underspend in royalties for regions. I would have thought there is capacity within the government's coffers to respond to challenges. The National Party does not want a \$200 million underspend given that the government said it was committed to royalties for regions going into the last election. That was important to highlight up-front.

We are in a very unique circumstance. The COVID issues are very challenging. I even stood at this very spot a week or so ago, or maybe it was a bit longer, and said that the government is doing a good job in its response. We are certainly getting a sense from people in Western Australia that all the settings the government has put in place have been right. I, for one, will certainly acknowledge that. As I have said privately to a couple of ministers, the challenges going forward are big. The lockdown bit was relatively easily. It was a tough decision but relatively easy. The challenge now is how we come out the other side once restrictions are lifted; also what is resourced and where, to deal with the many and varied issues that have come to the fore. A litmus test of the pressures that will come out will be Parliament itself. There is a state election in March, not that that changes what members of Parliament do so much, but we are a focal point for issues that arise in our respective communities. We will be the litmus test for the pressures that are happening. What the Nationals are bringing to the table is some of that sentiment that sits in our electorates. As the Leader of the Nationals WA quite rightly highlighted, this is not a condemnation motion; it does not have a massive crack at the government. We are saying, "Please note, we are getting these issues and therefore it very much needs to be at the front and centre of discussions that happen around the cabinet table and discussions that happen in the various forums that this minister has in order to respond appropriately to the issues."

I will touch on four main items. If I have time left, I will touch on a couple more. Homelessness is an issue that comes to the fore. The electorate of Warren–Blackwood runs from Mt Barker–Denmark to Margaret River. The hotspots are probably Denmark and Margaret River at either end; they are the preferred locations to live. They have traditionally had reasonably high unemployment rates. That is now a focus, with the amount of available employment dropping, particularly casual work. The unemployment rate has gone up and probably more so than even the state average. It is certainly a focal point. The challenges that sit in those communities are complex. Many complex factors contribute to the homelessness challenge in and around mental health, family and domestic violence, and disability, and managing complex issues in some cases. Margaret River went through a very challenging issue not that long ago. There are programs that are funded not only in the social services and homelessness space, but also affordable housing. It was an issue that came up, Acting Speaker (Mr S.J. Price), in a committee that we are involved in, the Economics and Industry Standing Committee. We were involved in the Airbnb inquiry. The online platforms were causing housing stress by artificially putting up the price of rents in that community. It encouraged home owners to take short-term rentals rather than long-term rentals and therefore displaced people who might want to have longer term rentals in the affordable rental space. A whole range of factors contribute to the issues.

An article about homelessness headed “Residential crisis” was published today on page 1 of the *Augusta–Margaret River Mail*. I want to quote from it. It commences —

MANY livelihoods in the region have been shattered during the COVID-19 crisis, seeing an increase in people seeking help to find affordable housing.

As people lost their jobs in the region the number of applicants seeking the government’s JobSeeker payment increased by 153 per cent in Busselton and 133 per cent in Margaret River.

Advocacy group Just Home Margaret River had 18 new clients with 10 children between March 27, 2020 and June 9, 2020 seeking help to find housing.

Just Home chair Naomi Godden said it was triple their usual intake.

Further down, the article states —

“We recently completed our quarterly data reporting for March 2020, it showed a total of 101 clients came through the service since July 2017. Of those 38 people were rough sleeping (on the street, in a car, or in a tent) or couch surfing at the time of intake to our service.”

...

“We were overwhelmed with community requests for support from people experiencing financial stress, people who have lost their jobs and are now homeless, and women and children experiencing family and domestic violence.

That is in response to the COVID challenges. They are big challenges. The point they are making is that their resources as a not-for-profit group are stretched. They go on to say that even the funding available through Bunbury, in particular, is also stretched. Another part of the article states —

“As a proportion of the Augusta Margaret River Shire population of 14,500, our figures indicated that the incidence of homelessness and need for support in Margaret River is significant.

“Unfortunately, the funding allocated to Bunbury will not address the needs in our community, and we await with hope for further funding allocated to Margaret River and other regional communities to address the entrenched and growing issues of homelessness.

It is certainly a very acute issue, and one that is extremely challenging. I am absolutely certain that the minister is aware of it. Dr Naomi Godden made the comments about Margaret River. As you are aware, Mr Acting Speaker (Mr S.J. Price), she also presented to the Economics and Industry Standing Committee during our Airbnb inquiry. I passed on Dr Godden’s requests in a letter to the Minister for Community Services, which sits on her desk. The letter I wrote is dated 3 June. I sent a copy of the letter that I received requesting \$150 000 so that Just Home Margaret River could continue to support the community in the 2020–21 financial year. That money will help it as a not-for-profit to manage issues. In the letter of request to the government, Naomi states —

Given the insufficient social housing stock in AMR and high local rental prices, we request that the WA Government allocate funding for a rental subsidy program for AMR people experiencing homelessness to access and maintain secure housing.

Again, Naomi has put together a comprehensive request to government citing data and information. This was not just quietly snapped together in a hurry. It was put together with some thought and by a person who, as you know, Mr Acting Speaker, is very much committed to sort out the many challenges faced by her community.

The homelessness issue is there. I also wrote a letter to the Minister for Housing. I remember when I was housing minister, I was very sold on the housing affordability strategy—I think that is what it was called—that the previous government put in place, which was a continuum from homelessness through to home ownership. There was a heap of points on which we would encourage people to move along. It is not just about building a house for someone who

is homeless. We need to find a way to move someone from social housing into employment and rental subsidised housing, and then we can make a house available for someone behind them to move into. We tried to encourage people along the continuum of points, going from being homeless to having access to a job, rental subsidies and shared equity arrangements in housing, and then getting a loan from Keystart, for example, to buy their own home. A lot of requests from members of Parliament are to build more houses, but it is much more complex than that. The Minister for Community Services knows that, and I am sure that the Minister for Housing knows that. With the information available to me, I do not pretend to have the easy answers. I do not know the full profile of what is happening in places such as Margaret River and Denmark, but I know that there is a need there and that through the lens of COVID-19, that need is getting worse. Unless action is taken, we will have some challenges going forward.

Before I get onto my next topic, I want to touch on the backpacker issue. I am very pleased that the minister chased up this issue. Backpackers in Margaret River and Manjimup in particular are fundamentally required during harvest in the horticultural season for picking. Of course, as the COVID-19 crisis came into play, they could not move and were locked in, as were the jobs they were coming off, so fewer jobs were available and they were therefore displaced. They did not have support. They could not get Centrelink payments. They did not have anywhere to live. One community in particular, the Manjimup community, led by the Shire of Manjimup, did a tremendous job. I talked to the minister about it and she got someone from her office to give them a call. I was really pleased about that, because it is important to highlight good models so that they can be repeated in other communities to support particular issues. That was good, and I hope the minister got something out of that contact. I attended a funeral this morning in Margaret River so I had to drive to Margaret River and back today. As you will know, Mr Acting Speaker, I was missing from the committee meeting this morning. I heard on the radio that harvest is coming on for many horticultural crops and they need backpackers. I do not know how well the numbers match up—I am not sure how many backpackers are there—but the work the Manjimup shire did found that between 800 and 1 000 backpackers were in the Manjimup shire when the COVID-19 crisis hit, which is not insignificant. If they are all still there, I am sure that they can help with the harvest. I want to highlight the good work done by the shire in response to the backpackers having nowhere to go and needing support.

Another person I want to talk about is Ed Fallens, who has bought and upgraded the pub in Manjimup. He is housing backpackers in 60-odd rooms and has received donations from the community. The last time I spoke with him, he said that the donations had amounted to \$3 000. That money will be used to provide food for the backpackers who do not have any money. They are really looking after them. I want to put his name on the record because what he is doing is absolutely significant.

Mr D.T. Punch: It's about time it was done up.

Mr D.T. REDMAN: Yes, but when we come out of this, he is also investing in Manjimup. He is backing in that community. The member for Bunbury would be well aware of Tall Timbers Manjimup. Having bought the pub, he wants to build a distillery, a brewery and a few other things. He will be well and truly a part of the return to normality, but, more particularly, to getting our economy up and moving.

I want to talk about community resource centres and my concern about the government's actions, particularly the Minister for Regional Development's actions, relating to Linkwest. From memory, there are 105 community resource centres around the state. At one point, the McGowan government was ready to cut their resources in half. There was a massive outcry from regional Western Australia, and, quite rightly, the minister reinstated the funding. They have a support network through an organisation called Linkwest, which basically provides network support services to all community resource centres around the state. Up until a week's time, Linkwest has been funded by government to support centralised network services to all the community resource centres. I will go through a few steps that are concerning, but the landing point is not where the community resource centres want to be. In December, the Premier wrote to Linkwest and said that for governance reasons, the CRC support services contract would go out to tender in expressions of interest. This process was cancelled after the expressions of interest were received and Linkwest was provided with two short extensions to deliver services up until 1 July 2020, which is at the end of this month. Of course, one wonders why expressions of interest were called for and then put on hold. Recently, the Department of Finance advised that due to the COVID-19 crisis, the state government would extend current community resource centre contracts to June 2021. The contracts of all CRCs were extended, but Linkwest was not included in that. The network support services for CRCs through Linkwest was not supported in the same way that the CRCs were supported. Twice, the CRCs have been surveyed about what sort of support services they want, and both times Linkwest was strongly supported. That organisation centrally supporting the CRCs was supported by all the CRCs; therefore, one would have thought that the government would have responded, "Okay, we're going to keep funding you"—even if it was a one-year extension, which is what it did with the CRCs. However, the government said that it would give \$2 500 to each of the CRCs and let them procure their own services. Subtly, the scuttlebutt around the tracks is that that is the Minister for Regional Development's strategy to divide and conquer and let other people come into the mix and take away what has been fundamentally a supported essential service support from Linkwest to all the CRCs in the state.

[Member's time extended.]

Mr D.T. REDMAN: It is interesting that during the COVID-19 crisis—this is the reason I highlight it here—the support from Linkwest was significant. It stepped up and, as described by one of the CRCs in my region, it was absolutely outstanding. It stepped up to the plate and coordinated a whole range of support through the CRCs to provide services to those regions. Linkwest stepped up to the plate during the COVID-19 crisis. I would have thought that the government would have said, “That is great—fantastic. We’ll back them in.” It could have backed it in for a period until the COVID-19 crisis was over. To give members some examples, from 26 March, there were weekly “Corona Convos” on a Thursday afternoon via Zoom with a guest presenter from a range of peak bodies. Those peak bodies included the Western Australian Council of Social Service and emergency relief and charity food relief. Linkwest organised conferences for all the CRCs with WACOSS and emergency service relief arrangements, Volunteering WA, the Western Australian Local Government Association, ConnectGroups, Playgroup WA, the Women’s Council for Domestic and Family Violence Services, People with Disabilities WA, the Western Australian Association for Mental Health, Community Legal Western Australia and a group of others. The point I make is that during the COVID crisis, this central group that has been providing support services to all CRCs stepped up to the plate and provided a wealth of information that the community resource centres have been absolutely rapt with. Why, then, has the government pulled the funding? It tried an expression of interest, but then it backed away from that and said, “Right, we’re going to give a little bit to all the CRCs. Go and get your own services.” It is a disappointing arrangement. At the very least, the resourcing could have been extended to keep that service going so that there was a bit of continuity during the COVID crisis. There was also a range of sessions for the staff and the committees involved with the CRCs to upskill in HR, JobKeeper and hosting groups online. We know that there were challenges in getting connection in regional WA. People had to use online services. Managing mental well-being, making effective requests and engaging with communities were a range of services provided to support the CRCs during that time—and we are still in it; we are not out of it yet. I call on the government to provide a little bit of money to each of the CRCs and to keep funding Linkwest. It is well supported by the CRCs and it has shown its mettle during the COVID crisis in a coordinated way across the state, independent of the government and independent of other groups. That is exactly what we want to see—resilience built in our communities. I will strongly support the minister to take up that case.

Mr P.J. Rundle: Now they get rewarded by pulling the rug out!

Mr D.T. REDMAN: Absolutely!

The minister will come back and say, “Yes, we’re pulling the Linkwest funding, but we’re going to give it back to all the CRCs individually.” That is a divide and conquer strategy, and those CRCs that have less capacity may hire someone who may not even get it right, and the CRC may be strapped with having to pay \$2 500 and will not get the grant. Then it will have to be acquitted, and there is a whole process attached to that, so I am not supportive of the divide and conquer strategy. We will have a broader debate later, but at this time—when we have the lens of COVID sitting over all of us—we need to have those support services across our CRC network because they provide a fantastic service to all our regional communities.

I want to talk about mental health, but I suspect I will not have time.

Seniors and aged-care services are probably more appropriately pitched to the Minister for Health, but the Minister for Housing is in this space a little bit as well. The transition from home and community care—effectively from state to federal responsibility of the commonwealth home care packages—has not been good. I have, to some extent, accepted that there will be transitional challenges, but what worries me is that the landing point that we are finishing up on is not where we expected to be when we started out with this transition. Also, a whole range of services will slip during that course and it might just be accepted as the new normal. I know my colleague the member for Roe may not have those full services rolled out in his patch—I know there is a staged approach to this—but I can make a couple of comments about my patch. Basic cleaning and gardening packages are available, but it is hard to access higher level support. There are recurring issues of lack of transport for people to get to appointments, particularly specialist appointments, in major regional centres—for example, from Boyup Brook to Bunbury and Augusta to Busselton. Silver Chain is relying on volunteer drivers who are not always available, driving to areas is more difficult due to COVID restrictions and older drivers do not want to compromise their health. Cleaning is still available, but there is less social support—for example, shopping trips and outings to cafes et cetera, which were there under the old HACC model. In many cases, that was supported by local government and the not-for-profit sector services through the WA Country Health Service.

It may not be quite right for some of my colleagues in terms of where they are at, but to me it is almost time for an audit of the delivery of state government-focused services compared with where we are now with the federal model that this government signed off on. I recognise that there are challenges in that transition, but the landing point needs to be at least where we were when we started. I do not believe it is. I believe people are falling through the gaps. We almost need to have an audit to see a snapshot of where we are at. I remember having a debate in the house—it may have been a grievance—and the Minister for Health and I talked about the service provider of last resort. In many cases, providers fail due to thin markets when there is not competition for services, as competition hopefully produces a better outcome. In many cases, there is only one provider, if any at all, and even that one provider

finds it challenging to deliver the services. Many parts of regional Western Australia have very thin markets. I am unconvinced that the new model is going to deliver on that, and for me it is probably time for an audit to see a snapshot of where we are at with the transition to the federal arrangements, because I regularly get contacted by constituents who find their unique circumstances very, very challenging to manage.

One issue in the aged-care services space is the provision of housing. As I said before, it is very challenging. I have an ageing demographic in my electorate. We want to encourage people to live near where they work. When we were in government, we made significant investments through the royalties for regions program. Some of that was cut pretty much the day the McGowan government came to power, but there are some examples that could work. I recently wrote a letter to the Minister for Housing with an example from Margaret River. Baptistcare has units located in Margaret River at Silver Vines Village in Mirrambeena that are jointly owned and co-funded in partnership with the Department of Communities. The issue raised with me was that a number of units were not habitable and required an investment of approximately \$467 000 to bring them up to an appropriate standard. The letter reads —

According to the level of ownership by the State Government, the DoC would be required to contribute \$224,000 with Baptistcare covering the balance to proceed with the upgrades.

That did not happen and the department did not make a call on that. Baptistcare then approached the Department of Communities to purchase the department's share in the development, which would then allow it to renovate the units and provide accommodation needs for the elderly. But after waiting a considerable time, the Department of Communities reneged on that, so we still have, as I understand it, the white elephant of a number of units that have not been upgraded. The government could do it for nothing. The government could allow Baptistcare to purchase the units and put the necessary investments in place to make those units available for the elderly in Margaret River.

That is one example that, on the face of it, does not sound like it is a complex issue to resolve. The minister replied in a letter —

I acknowledge that the negotiations have been protracted, however the Department of Communities has assured me it is working with Baptistcare to reach an outcome that will secure long term aged care accommodation in Margaret River.

That was in May and, through the filter of COVID, those issues are not getting any easier.

I will not stand here and give criticism on all fronts. I will touch on another couple of issues. I am very pleased with the government's support for regional men's health. The regional men's health program started in Wheatbelt Men's Health many years ago and it provides a fantastic service in the rural communities. Its next funding round was recently approved for three years. It sends me its annual report every year, which is actually a good read. The report highlights its efforts in many remote and regional parts of Western Australia to deliver services for people who are isolated and are some distance from some of the bigger centres and therefore would not normally get access to those services. In fact, from time to time, we find ourselves—I have as a member of Parliament—referring people we have come across to that service. If people who find themselves in difficult circumstances give them a call, it is right there on the phone to support them. That service is there all the time, depending on the season. It is more challenging in the bad seasons than it is in others, but right now, due to the challenges of dealing with COVID-19, we are hearing about this issue in our electorate offices. It is becoming a more dominant issue that needs a response. If we are not careful, we will have a lot of very disaffected people who could very well do harm to themselves. We certainly do not want to see that landing point with the mental health challenges that are about.

One of the next crisis points, which I am sure the minister is aware of and has had briefings on, will be when the JobKeeper payments cease. We do not know the settings of the federal government yet. I hope that it puts in some sort of glide plane—I am pretty sure it is thinking about this; I do not expect the federal government to listen to my speech in Parliament and respond to it. Perhaps it might put in place a glide plane as it comes off those payments or it might respond by making investments into specific sectors. That will be another cliff face because it will put more people into the unemployment queues and more mental health and homelessness issues will arise as a consequence. That is another point in time that we have to be on the lookout for.

As the member for Geraldton said, the Minister for Community Services is hardworking and her heart is in the right place on this. This is a huge challenge, but, hopefully, she has listened to the discussions here that highlight that many of these issues are coming through our electorate offices. We hope that the government comes up with a good response.

MR A. KRSTICEVIC (Carine) [5.31 pm]: I rise today on behalf of the Liberal Party to express our support for the motion moved by the National Party that deals with homelessness issues in the regions, and more broadly, and the community services sector. I have a few things that I want to go through.

In question time today, I was listening to the minister answer a question. Like on many occasions, I listened to the minister's words and I started to feel heartened about the way she spoke. I thought, "That's good. I'm hearing the right words and the right intentions", but, unfortunately, we never see the follow through. I am not necessarily

blaming the minister for that because I know that she is one of 17 members of cabinet, one of 40 members on that side of the house. If she does not get the support of her colleagues and the Premier and she does not get the vocal activism necessary to support homeless people, victims of family and domestic violence, people with mental health issues and all the other things that fall under the community services portfolio, it is very hard for her to deliver on those outcomes, and that is very disappointing. Today, there was an energy in the room when members talked on the Dog Amendment (Stop Puppy Farming) Bill. Obviously, nobody supports puppy farming. The energy in the room was electric and the debate was strong. But when we talk about homelessness, family and domestic violence and the victims and perpetrators, suddenly the atmosphere becomes very sombre. It seems that no-one wants to participate. The energy level and activity falls off. It is quite disappointing to see.

Several members interjected.

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: The members are right; there are not many people in this chamber for this very important debate, which is disappointing.

In March 2017, when the Labor Party was elected to government, the community services sector and its providers got a bit of a stride in their step. They were thinking “The Liberals have been in government for the last eight and a half years. They did a pretty good job of helping us out. They gave us a \$600 million boost. They built Foyer Oxford and all these facilities.” Obviously, we could have done better. One can always do better in this space; there is no doubt about that, but we did a pretty good job. Obviously, those providers are now educating me on how we can do a better job the next time we are in government. However, those providers had an expectation of the WA Labor Party, especially when they looked at its platform document for 2017 and what was mentioned about homelessness, the not-for-profit sector, case management and the acknowledgement of issues. I note one interesting thing in that document. It states —

... there has been a large amount of uncertainty in the homelessness sector due to short-term funding contracts, and the lack of a clear strategy ...

Do members know what? Today, six months out, or a little more, from the next state election, short-term contracts are still ongoing. There is still uncertainty. Providers in the sector still do not know whether they will get funding when their contract expires, and sometimes they do not find out until a few months before the end of the contract. I regularly talk to them and this is what they tell me. Labor also promised increased funding to the community services sector. A statement in the document refers to the support of early intervention programs and initiatives; all these things were in there, and, of course, there was the equal remuneration order, which we know has been a big problem and has still not been fixed. Many organisations are still suffering under the equal remuneration order and are being told to cut their services. They tell me that when they talk to the minister and the government they are told that the funding will not be cut: “You were getting X dollars previously. You’re getting the same dollars now.” Of course they are getting the same amount of money, but when we take into account the ERO and the increasing costs of services, the services have to be cut by 30 or 40 per cent. These issues were an extreme problem before COVID. Now, in the COVID environment, one would have thought that there would be a massive influx of money into this space. Unfortunately, that has not happened. I know that the minister will list a couple of services that have been funded, which is great; they are good little projects but they do not come anywhere near close enough to scratching the surface.

The issues for the Department of Communities started with the machinery-of-government changes; that was the first big mistake that this government made. It rolled all these services into one department that had four ministers; the department did not know which way it was going. We have seen plenty examples over the last three and a half years of the serious issues, concerns and problems that have occurred in that department. I know that people in that department are struggling for direction and enough capacity and resources to deliver what needs to happen. The National Party and the Liberals want to help the minister in this space, albeit that three and a half years under this government have passed and nothing significant has occurred. But one more budget is approaching. Let us try to pretend that we care. Let us make sure that this next pre-election budget contains all the bells and whistles, even though it is all too late, and at least show that there is some level of interest, care and support for all these service providers that also engage a lot of volunteers in that sphere.

In 2019, the Labor Party released a document titled “Our Priorities: Sharing Prosperity”. There is nothing in there about community services, homelessness or housing. There are a lot of great motherhood statements, but, firstly, there is nothing of substance, and secondly, it does not refer to community services, homelessness, family and domestic violence or any of those sorts of issues. The Labor Party does not appear to be promoting prosperity.

The Leader of the National Party mentioned the campaign that started in December 2019. It was the first time in history that the community services sector had ran a campaign against the Labor Party, saying: “You have messed this up. You have destroyed the community services sector. You are hurting people.” Reluctantly, and unbelievably, those 450 organisations combined forces to start a campaign and were publicly vocal on this issue. They were not scared by Labor Party statements that funding might be cut or that they might be hurt in some way financially. They stood up to the Labor Party and were strong and united.

It is interesting to note that a media release in December 2019 states —

Representatives from the Community Services Sector have held meetings with senior bureaucrats in the Departments of Treasury and Finance, and with Premier Mark McGowan and he gave no clear acknowledgement of the scale of the issues faced.

There was no acknowledgement of homelessness, family and domestic violence, the abuse of women and children or the programs to stop perpetrators doing what they do. The government had no idea of the scale of the problem, which I find absolutely amazing. Obviously, there was an impasse and the community services sector needed to step up in this space. That media release also states —

“We need the State Government to put people first and adequately fund the organisations that have skills, local knowledge and empathy ...

It is not the Liberal Party saying this. This is coming from 450 community service organisations before the COVID pandemic. I am sure that there were tens of thousands of people behind this who had the same sentiment and were crying out for help. We know that post COVID, family and domestic violence has increased dramatically. We know that homeless people have been left behind while everyone has tried to look after their own personal financial, emotional and psychological circumstances. Again the most vulnerable have been completely ignored, bar a few media opportunities. Fundamentally, they have been ignored. As I said, the equal remuneration order is serious. That was all the way through to 2020. Again, it has not been addressed appropriately. As I have said, we put \$600 million into that space. It really needs something to be done. I know the minister has changed the indexing and a little bit of money has been put towards that scenario. That is great; it is fantastic. But, again, the minister is only scratching the surface. I am sure the minister is not blind to this. I am sure that she can step back and look at this objectively and look people in the sector in the eye and say, “I know you’re suffering. I feel your pain. I want to help you, however, I am not allowed to help you. I do not have the capacity to help you, but I can’t because there are no votes in it for the government.” If there are no votes in it, there is no compassion and no interest in helping. We know the sector needs a 23 per cent increase in funding. That is what it is asking for. The government needs to come on board.

It was interesting to listen to Treasurer Hon Ben Wyatt on radio 6PR a while ago when he said, “We’re not going to give the not-for-profit sector the same funding that the Liberal Party gave them, because the Liberal Party gave a lot of money to the not-for-profit sector and they squandered it; they wasted it; they didn’t use it well. We do not think it was a good investment.” Of course, we know from experience that the not-for-profit sector delivers things on the smell of an oily rag. No better efficiencies and no better results are achieved, both through employees and volunteers. Predominantly, women work in this space. They are highly underpaid and undervalued for what they do. I was shocked to hear the Treasurer come out and say on radio that the not-for-profit sector does not deserve any extra money and needs to prove that the funds from this government would be spent wisely. We keep talking about equality and equal pay, but, of course, the most vulnerable and underpaid do not get that help.

We know about funding for homeless support services. I have said in this place previously that every time the federal government tops it up, the state government more or less takes out the equivalent amount of money. There has been \$90 million for the homelessness services in the last three budgets—from 2017–18 to 2019–20. The federal government has increased its contribution over that period by about \$14 million.

Ms S.F. McGurk: You either do not understand finances or you’re being very misleading.

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: It is right here in an answer the minister gave. It has her signature on it. It says \$15 million. I know the sector agrees that the funding has been cut massively. I look forward to seeing much higher figures in the budget papers this year. Hopefully, the government will not cut funding again after the feds have put more money in. Only five per cent of those in the community services sector believe that they can meet the demand. The rest believe that they cannot meet the demand. That is an absolute disgrace.

We know that since this government came into office, it has sold more than a thousand social homes at a time of unprecedented need. More than 350 homes under the Government Regional Officers’ Housing program and 900 affordable houses have been sold at a time when need has never been greater. For what purpose were all those homes sold? Again, it is on the public record. They were sold because the government wanted money to spend on its pet projects and other initiatives.

Interestingly, I wanted to see how many new social homes have been built. In 2016–17, under the previous government, 956 social homes were delivered. In 2017–18, when this government came into office, 89 homes were built. In 2018–19, there were 70. In 2019–20, for the first six months from 1 July 2019 to 31 December 2019, 25 homes were built. The level of social housing investment has been abominable. I know some money is going into that now. Again, it is very insignificant relative to what has been got rid of and what has been sold. Of course, in remote communities, in 2017–18, 71 homes were sold; in 2018–19, 34 homes were sold. In the first six months of this year, from 1 July 2019 to 31 December 2020, how many homes were delivered in remote areas—zero. That is absolutely unbelievable!

Of course, when we look at demand for specialist homelessness service providers, in 2017–18 they provided roughly 10 303 accommodation places, exactly. How many were needed—13 884. That means 3 545 people, or

25 per cent, who were desperately in need of a home were told, “Go away. We can’t help you. We’re not interested.” This is from the specialist homelessness service providers. It is not even through the ordinary course of events. It is quite amazing that we have had that level of demand.

Believe it or not, for the young lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, intersex, queer plus cohort, there are only four beds in the state—four beds! That is all! That is unbelievable. In September 2019, I asked a question about crisis, transitional and short stay accommodation, and family and domestic violence refuges and got an answer in October 2019. I note that in March 2020—a significant time after—the minister resubmitted the answer, because the original answers given to me in October 2019 were wrong. The department did not even know how many family and domestic violence refuges it had over those five years. It did not know the figures for how many crisis accommodation places it had and it had to correct the record. That is interesting. We heard a lot about the creation of a Minister for Prevention of Family and Domestic Violence, so I thought that that would mean something; there would have to be something behind it. But when I asked how many family and domestic violence refuge beds there are, I was told that in 2017–18, when the minister came to government, there were 298. Three years later, in 2019–20, guess how many there are? There are 298. Not one extra bed has been created—zero. That title is fantastic but there is absolutely no service delivery.

I can only go on the information that the minister provides to questions and ask why these things are still happening. We know that during coronavirus, domestic violence has been spiking astronomically. I know at a national level, calls to 1800RESPECT and people accessing the online chat tool increased by 38 per cent between March and April. Police records show that assaults within families were up by more than 10 per cent between February and March. The statistics are there but the support is not.

It is interesting to note the number of people in remote and regional areas fleeing family and domestic violence who are flown or transported by bus to the metropolitan area because there is nowhere for them to go in the regions. In Geraldton, there is nowhere. I heard the member for Geraldton say that he could not find any accommodation for someone. They bus those people down from Geraldton and were flying them down—obviously not now—from the Kimberley and other places to the metropolitan area because they had nowhere to put those people. That is an indictment of what is going on. Does it not surprise us that this is going on? It should not surprise us because we all remember.

[Member’s time extended.]

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: We remember the stories in *The West Australian* and issues with homeless people in the City of Perth. When Parliament is on a break I still walk down to the City of Perth with the member for Dawesville and we see what is going on with the homeless. The problem is still there in the City of Perth, as it was before. The only advantage for homeless people now is that when they sleep in front of shops in the City of Perth, they know they will not be disturbed in the morning because there are “for lease” signs on the shops. The shops are empty. They are not woken up in the morning and moved on. They can camp there permanently if they want to. It is an absolute disgrace and a shame that that is still going on. Anyone who walks into the City of Perth at any time will see that.

We have heard stories about the problems on the waterfront in Mandurah. Rockingham has well-documented issues. We know that the Premier wants nothing to do with the homeless in his electorate. We know how that played out. I do not want to go through that sad story. The Premier promised other individuals they would be helped. As members know, after a lot of pressure and a lot of media, the Premier finally did go to Rockingham to see what was going on. He made a commitment to a couple of people there that he would help them out. Of course, as I brought to the attention of this house previously, I went there a month after he made the commitment and, of course, there was no follow-through in the commitment. The media got involved after that, and all of a sudden things started happening. I am obviously talking to the councillors in Rockingham as well, so I am fully aware of what goes on there. I ring them to make sure of what the situation is. I know there are still issues on the foreshore in Rockingham. I have not ventured there, but I am sure that during the parliamentary break I will spend a bit of time in Rockingham. I will have a look, see what is going on, take some notes and see what I hopefully do not need to bring back to Parliament. Hopefully, the Premier will be aware that I will go there to show an active interest in what is going on in his electorate with the homeless people down there and try to do my bit to help them.

I am surprised that the government does not care about this, but the biggest rising cohort of homeless people is women over 55 years of age. They are on the verge of filling that gap. In WA there has been a 16 per cent jump in homelessness for those aged 65 to 74, so the numbers are growing in the older demographic, whether it is through negative equity, mortgage stress, separation or other sorts of issues. It could be due to cost-of-living pressures. We know how bad they have been. There have been cuts to the hardship utility grant scheme. There have been massive cuts to HUGS worth of tens of millions of dollars, which is very interesting.

Several members interjected.

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: I will go through the statistics, because I have all information here. I will go through that, because I have 10 minutes.

Young people are very compromised in this situation, and they are at a very vulnerable stage in their lives. Again, the Youth Affairs Council of WA is scathing of this government and what it is not doing to help young people to get

them off the street and on the straight and narrow. Youth unemployment is over 16 per cent. Youth are the hardest hit in this coronavirus. Hospitality and the sectors they work in are the hardest hit, and nothing is being done to help them—nothing at all. It is an absolute disgrace.

How do we not mention the City of Fremantle and the homelessness issues there? The minister refused to even acknowledge that there was a homelessness problem, but I can tell her that when I went there and spoke to traders and had a look around, there was a serious homelessness issue in Fremantle. I suppose that is an indictment of the fact that the minister cannot even fix her own electorate. She cannot even put enough funding and support there. I am sure the minister wants to, but the Premier is not interested. He was not interested in Rockingham, so why would he be interested in Fremantle? That is just ridiculous. Other ministers have zero interest in homelessness or family and domestic violence, because where are the votes in that? I talk to the sector regularly and I tell it that the only way it is going to move this government is to shake it up. I say, “Get public, get vocal. Don’t be scared by threats of funding cuts, don’t be scared of intimidation, don’t be scared to stand up for what you believe in, because you know what? You’re fighting for the most vulnerable people in this state. They need a voice and your voice should not be scared to be heard.” I tell them that they need to stand up, and if they are not given the support they need and they are given an ultimatum by the government, they should walk away. I know it is hard to do that, but the sector should give the problem back to the government.

Ms S.F. McGurk interjected.

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: Pressure is mounting —

Mr D.T. Punch: Smear and innuendo!

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: The member needs to talk to people. As I said before, they may not necessarily be funding cuts. A body may not be given additional funding but has to cut services by 30 per cent. I suppose that is not technically a funding cut; it is a cut to services. They are not even maintaining the cost of wages and expenses so they cannot deliver the same services.

Ms S.F. McGurk: So it is not a funding cut, is that right?

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: No, I am saying that is one example, but the people I have spoken to have indicated that funding cuts are also potentially on the table.

Ms S.F. McGurk: There are no funding cuts at all—none. You just make it up.

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: That is good, so the minister is saying that if those organisations speak up, she will not cut their funding. If they publicly attack her and her government for failing, she will not cut their funding.

Ms S.F. McGurk: What are you talking about?

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: There we go, so no answer.

Ms S.F. McGurk interjected.

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: I am not taking any interjections, because I do not have much time.

Anyway, we know about the 10-year homelessness strategy and how long it took for it to come out. There is another 10-year strategy, is there not, minister—the one to do with family and domestic violence? Hopefully, that will come out before the next election. In four years the government has come up with one strategy, and maybe a second one will come out. The first strategy means two five-year action plans, and I am not even sure whether anyone has seen those yet. It was interesting, because, again, the minister only met with the Western Australian Aboriginal Advisory Council of Western Australia once in the development of the 10-year homelessness strategy—only once. I found that amazing. The Youth Homelessness Advisory Council went to only one meeting, and the Multicultural Advisory Group also went to one meeting. Those are not many meetings. It has taken two and a half years to develop a 10-year strategy, and these key groups, which I think make up quite a large cohort advocating for homeless people, were consulted infrequently in this whole process. The government came up with this Common Ground facility, to be developed over the next three years. The government is supposedly going to build it somewhere. It does not know where the land is and whether it will be government or private land. The government does not know how many rooms it will have or where it will be. It thinks there will be one in the city. There are various councils such as Mandurah and Rockingham saying to build it in their region. I am sure the regions are calling for them to be there. Do members know what? There is no evidence or information. It is just a pie in the sky. Not only that, the document produced by the sector to deal with the Common Ground facility said that one 100-bed Common Ground facility would cost \$36 million. The government has only put \$34.5 million on the table, and it reckons it will build two. The documentation says that only one can be built for \$36 million, so the government is short to build one 100-bed facility, let alone two, unless it makes them 10-bed facilities or really minuscule. The government does not know where it will build them. If the government uses private land, it will cost more money. The government tells us how it brought forward \$6 million for the Housing First Homeless Initiative and put \$34 million towards a Common Ground facility. Do members know what? That was \$34 million over five years, up to 2023–24. It was roughly \$6 million to \$7 million a year over that five-year period. We have a crisis now. In five years’ time it will be much worse. The fact that the government has brought forward \$6 million is very generous, minister. Why does the minister not bring forward

the whole \$34 million? Bring the whole lot forward; do not spread it out over four or five years. Everything the government does is spread over four or five years. Nothing is for now. It is as though the government is saying that it will give people 50¢ today, 50¢ tomorrow, 50¢ next week, and good luck for surviving and coping in between. I can talk a lot more about that sort of information. It is quite disappointing in terms of what we are trying to achieve.

The budget submission of Western Australian Council of Social Service stated —

There is clear frustration that the promises of more collaborative and joined-up service design and delivery have not materialised, particularly place-based reforms in regional areas. Meanwhile, the focus on complex machinery of government changes —

Which I mentioned earlier WACOSS supports —

and a lack of communication have led to a loss of clarity in roles and responsibilities and contact points, particularly in the Department of Communities.

WACOSS is scathing of the Department of Communities and the minister in that budget submission. It is an absolute disgrace.

I can talk about the Hotels with Heart project. Again, the government should not have stopped the project. I picked up a whole lot of faults. The government takes people off the street, puts them in a room and tells them they cannot leave for 14 days—they have to self-isolate in case they have COVID-19. Hold on—the government is taking homeless people off the street and locking them up in a room and saying they have to stay there for 30 days, 14 of which they cannot even leave. Why did the government not test them? For a start, we know they did not have COVID-19, because we did not have that community spread. Firstly, we knew that reasonably comfortably. Secondly, test them. The government should have put them there for one or two days or however long it takes to get the test results, not for 14 days. Then the government wonders why some of them leave. It put all these stupid restrictions on them. In saying that, of the 30 people through who went through, 18 had a positive outcome, which is 60 per cent. The minister was telling us that that was a failure. It did not fail! To me, 60 per cent of the homeless people had a positive outcome —

Ms S.F. McGurk: You just say whatever you like. You make things up. It doesn't matter that it bears absolutely no resemblance to reality.

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: I have the minister's comments here. I can read them.

Ms S.F. McGurk: I've never said it was a failure.

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: She said in the paper —

If successful, the program would be scaled up to support people fleeing domestic violence and struggling with mental health issues ...

Has the program been scaled up? No, it has not been scaled up. The government has dropped the program and is not doing it anymore. It is not supporting people who are fleeing domestic violence and struggling with mental health issues. I only have two minutes. I have the evidence here and could read it to the minister.

Ms S.F. McGurk: I did not say it was a failure. I don't think you've read that in.

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: That is not a problem. I can read it for the minister. Homelessness advocate Jesse Noakes said that that this government's contribution towards homeless people during the pandemic was insignificant and minuscule compared with that of New South Wales, which funnelled \$34 million into the issue; Victoria, which did \$9 million; and Queensland, which did \$25 million. What did we do? The minister put \$497 000 towards this COVID experience. Although 60 per cent of people found a home, the minister called it a failure. Why would the government not scale it up straight away and help people with family and domestic violence or mental health issues? Why did the minister not say that this program was a success and should be kept going? The COVID threat is no longer there, so the government thinks that it does not have to worry about homeless people anymore and can throw them back onto the street. Why did it spend that money and go through that process? It is an absolute disgrace. The evidence and the information is there. I could read it out but, unfortunately, I only have one minute, so I cannot go into the detail. Again, answers to questions on notice can give members all the details about how many men and how many women were involved.

MR D.T. PUNCH (Bunbury) [6.01 pm]: I appreciate many of the comments that members of the Nationals WA made today. I want to deal with those in a little more detail and talk about them in terms of my own experience. I also want to comment on the member for Carine's contribution right up front. Four words in the member for Carine's contribution really stood out to me. It might be corrected in *Hansard*, but I am pretty sure that I heard them. I heard the words: "Let's pretend we care". That about sums up the member for Carine's contribution. All it was was innuendo, scaremongering, conversations here and parts of conversations there, stitched together in some sort of argument that, at the end of the day, did not add anything to the issue of the vulnerable and homeless—those most at risk in our community. If the member for Carine were really serious, he would look at how he could make a contribution that says something. I think it is a race between him and the member for Dawesville for the award for saying a lot of words that do not mean anything at the end of the day.

I come back to this motion. It talks about the impact of the coronavirus. The biggest thing that this government can do for our community, which includes people who are homeless, those who are vulnerable, people in business and families is to make Western Australia safe. That has been the focus and has been based on health advice. The government has put in arrangements that have been pretty tough for all of us. I think that has been acknowledged today in this place. Those arrangements are geared to making Western Australia as safe as possible and we have succeeded. I think it is pretty well recognised that if there is anywhere to live in the world at the moment, it would be Western Australia. At the end of the day, we need to come out of this with an economy and a community that is strong, resilient and capable of moving forward.

There was a lot of mention in the contributions by members of the National Party about the need to strengthen the arm of the Minister for Community Services in her dealings with the cabinet. I can say that on this side of the Parliament there is a very strong consensus within cabinet and a strong commitment that is backed up by our backbenchers. I know that the minister also regularly receives contributions from members opposite. We have a very strong approach in cabinet and the issues of the community services sector are well recognised.

Mr A. Krsticevic: Are you in cabinet?

Mr D.T. PUNCH: I talk to our ministers. The member clearly does not. I am not taking interjections from someone who has not made any sensible contribution at all to the debate.

Mr A. Krsticevic interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Carine!

Mr D.T. PUNCH: We need to have an economy —

Mr A. Krsticevic interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Carine!

Mr D.T. PUNCH: — that is capable of supporting a strong community services sector. Equally, we need a community services sector that is capable of supporting people who work in an active and vibrant economy. That is the balance that this government is seeking all the time to find in our fiscal response and our policy response. Going into this pandemic, we were well-positioned because of the hard yards put in by this government. One of the historical things that members opposite like to forget is that we came to government with something around \$35 billion of debt and an operating expense account that was going to take us well over \$40 billion. Imagine if we had not brought that under control! We would be in a very difficult position.

Mr A. Krsticevic interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Carine!

Mr D.T. PUNCH: Members opposite have no fiscal responsibility. Their approach to everything is to spend and spend and not think about strategy, the outcomes we are after, or how we can do things better. Their response is to spend the money but not engage properly and effectively with members of the community services sector to deliver the best outcomes for regional Western Australia and the state as a whole. That is why we talk about being evidence-based and taking the time to put strategies together. I heard the member for Carine say, “Why didn’t you do this? Why don’t you do that?” It is like a grab-bag of lollies of ideas—trying anything in a rush and putting it out there with no regard for the unintended consequences or the lives of people who might be subjected to those impacts. There is no regard for sensible decision-making, sensible budget application and a sensible approach to policy.

Mr A. Krsticevic interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms J.M. Freeman): Member for Carine, can you stop interjecting, please? It is now on record in *Hansard* that I have asked you to stop interjecting. Thank you.

Mr D.T. PUNCH: They are not even sensible interjections, Madam Acting Speaker.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Bunbury, that is not helpful.

Mr A. Krsticevic interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Carine!

Mr D.T. PUNCH: I want to talk about the issue of homelessness. I heard very generic terms coming from across the chamber about the concept of homelessness. It embraces a whole range of issues, but the fundamental part of it is people who do not have a place where they can feel safe and that they can call home. It includes people who are sleeping rough, sleeping in cars, couch surfing or relying on friends. It is a very complex issue.

I think it was the member for Geraldton who mentioned the Bunbury experience. The council down there has been proactive in trying to address the issue of how to support people who are living on the street. It put a shelter in place and I think it has some regrets about that shelter because we have found that an unintended consequence of a very well-meaning intervention, which was made for absolutely the right reasons, was that people became very territorial over that space and fought over it. The impact on drawing people into that space was quite significant. The consequent implications in terms of risk to people and behaviour that is not appropriate escalated significantly.

The City of Bunbury has made the decision to continue working and having conversations with people who use that shelter, but it is not the best option. It highlights that we need to have an approach that treats people as individuals and not just a generic label of homeless. It must take into account the individual circumstances of each person.

Mr A. Krsticevic interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Carine!

Mr D.T. PUNCH: That is a combination of providing housing —

Mr A. Krsticevic interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Carine!

Mr D.T. PUNCH: — and looking at opportunities for a case management approach to support people.

There are many reasons people end up without a place they can call home. It can be due to family breakdown, alcohol and drug usage or contact with the justice or child protection systems. In my experience, homelessness mostly arises out of poverty. That has been driven significantly over the past three years by the federal government's approach to Newstart and supporting people who are in dire straits. We know that Newstart as it existed has not been able to adequately support people to enable them to maintain accommodation. It has directly transferred what should be income support from the commonwealth to the very agencies that we are talking about, and has had an impact on their demand profiles. I know that the member for Warren–Blackwood talked about the tapering or the blading out of those income supports. Until we can address that in a proper, positive and long-term way, we are always going to have demand transferred onto the not-for-profit sector.

A few people talked about a couple of issues I found really interesting. One was on the notion of how funding is organised. One of the outcomes over the eight and a half years of the Liberal–National government was that, certainly in regional Western Australia, it drove tendering and competition to such an extent that it pitted agency against agency. That, coupled with short-term contractual arrangements, meant that those agencies could not strategically plan their future. There was also an absence of any sort of strategic policy from the previous government.

Mr P.J. Rundle interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Roe!

Mr D.T. PUNCH: The impact and legacy of that has come up time and time again, because it is still washing through in the contractual obligations that we inherited.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members!

Mr D.T. PUNCH: If the member for Warren–Blackwood listened, he might actually learn something for a change. The member is very quick to offer an opinion, but he has acknowledged that this area is not his highlight, but economics is.

Mr A. Krsticevic interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Carine!

Mr D.T. PUNCH: One of the tragedies of that eight and a half years is that the National Party had over \$8 billion to spend. I remember the instructions were for “transformational projects”, which stood for glossy projects. The Minister for Regional Development was not far off the mark when she said that a significant amount of that money went into the petunia building, but when it came to services for the community services sector, very little money was provided. As a point of fact, if I can find it in my notes —

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Bunbury. Can we stop now, members.

Mr D.T. PUNCH: They do not like the truth, Madam Acting Speaker.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Bunbury!

Mr D.T. PUNCH: The reality is that royalties for regions did fund the construction of Indigenous visitor hostels—short-stay accommodation in Kalgoorlie and Derby.

Mr A. Krsticevic interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Carine!

Mr D.T. PUNCH: This government funded it in Broome. Interestingly, I can recall very little in the way of funding for homelessness support in the southern half of the state.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Carine, I think this is a very important motion, but your continued interjection without listening is not helpful. You will desist from interjecting. I call you for the first time.

Mr A. Krsticevic: I am listening!

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

Mr D.T. PUNCH: I will move on. I commented earlier on the importance of getting agencies to work together within a strategic framework that has clear objectives. This is what this government's Housing First initiative is about: working individually with people, linking them to an appropriate option for accommodation and then providing the wraparound services to give them the best chance of success. It includes things like specialist services for alcohol and drug issues, or health issues, because often people's health has declined, particularly if they have been homeless for a considerable time. It includes specialist services for income management issues. I mentioned that trying to survive on a Newstart arrangement is particularly difficult. If that is compounded with issues of mental health, drugs, or even contact with the justice system, it becomes even more difficult. Transport support, residential rehabilitation support, life skills and mentoring services are also included. In fact, one of the things I noticed in the previous eight and a half years of the Liberal–National government was that it became so complex to access services that it was beyond the skills of everyday people to actually manage the organisation of getting to appointments, with transport and all the different criteria that were reflected in different key performance indicators from contractual arrangements that lacked strategic focus. That is what this government is bringing with this initiative.

In my own electorate, I have talked regularly with the not-for-profit sector. We had telephone link-ups every week to touch base on how things were going. By and large, the sector really responded strongly. It rose to the occasion, as did Western Australians generally. The Salvation Army, Accordwest, Alliance Housing and community health care all looked at ways to deliver and adapt services to meet the needs of people in the area. Another issue I want to mention is that this government does not look at these services in isolation; we have also put the infrastructure in place. The Minister for Health has stood in this chamber on a number of occasions and talked about step-up, step-down facilities. The previous government talked and talked about those services but failed to deliver them. In Bunbury, I remember that those facilities were announced in 2013 and re-announced just prior to the election in 2016, but were not actually acted upon and delivered until this government came into office. Those are now open. That is a good example of building the infrastructure network so that when we have our Housing First strategy, and when we start talking about the vital role of case management in addressing these issues, we can link people into very opportune support services.

Tiny housing is another initiative I wanted to mention that I think is particularly innovative. We know that within the housing agenda, one house does not fit all. There is a need for a diversity of housing, particularly to suit the needs of single people. In Bunbury, one of the commitments we took to the election was to pilot the concept of tiny housing. I am very pleased to be able to say that that project is now balancing. It will be located with the Salvation Army on land that it owns. It is being built by the local community, and the Rotary Clubs of South Bunbury and Bunbury–Leschenault are contributing to make it happen. Challis Builders is the builder and project manager, but, importantly, Accordwest, the lead agency in the Bunbury area and for the south west, is going to be providing those support services, because to simply house people without those support services would be to repeat the mistakes of the past. People have different special needs, and we have to tailor the response to support those people individually.

Homelessness is a serious issue and deserves serious debate, but it is an issue right across the broader community services sector. We can add money and add money, but we have to stop and ask the questions: What is the evidence? What is the best way of delivering the service? We need to build a strategic framework around that. We need to build collaboration and then look at the individual components of the service network so that we can make sure that it is seamless. We need to make sure that when a person is identified and supported into housing, they have access to the right kind of support services and case management services and are assisted in the organisation of their contact with those services. That is the difference, and that is what this minister has been working on. That is the difference that this minister is bringing to the community services sector. I know it takes time, and I know there might be some impatience out there, but it is important that we get it right. Otherwise, we will be in the scenario where we are simply adding money to the pile and not seeing a difference in people's lives.

I would like to finish by thanking all the community service organisations, certainly in my electorate. There are far too many to mention. I also think that this house should be giving a vote of thanks to organisations across the whole of the sector for the work they have done. They worked in incredibly difficult circumstances during the COVID-19 crisis. There have been discussions with those organisations and they have been supported as far as it is possible to do so, but they have made a unique contribution to help people who are most vulnerable in our community. There is no doubt that the COVID pandemic will add to the number of people who need support and to the challenge of how we can effectively support those people. But the best thing this government can do, aside from that direct support for the community services sector, is to flatten the curve, make sure this state is safe, proceed with phase 4 of the lifting of restrictions and ensure that our economy can function as much as possible to support people to get their businesses back on track and stay in jobs, and to build up the financial capacity of the state to support the community services sector. If that means that we need to retain the hard border to stop the infection and the second wave coming in, so be it. This government is strong and it is resilient on that issue, and it is supported in my electorate on that issue. My electorate has worn the pain, in the same way as every other electorate, but the people of Western Australia and the community services sector have risen to the challenge and responded superbly.

MR P.J. RUNDLE (Roe) [6.20 pm]: I rise to support our leader's motion, which states —

That this house notes the increase in homelessness and vulnerable members of the community seeking assistance in regional Western Australia and calls on the McGowan government to deliver an immediate funding increase to provide the community services sector with the capacity to respond appropriately to the additional pressures of COVID-19.

I will cut my contribution a bit short tonight because we want to hear from the minister on several issues. I would like to focus a little more on a couple of examples of some of the good things that are happening and some of the things that I am worried about in my electorate of Roe. It is not all negative; some good things are happening and I would like to draw the minister's attention to those. I also note the member for Carine's contribution. As I said to him, I look forward to him leading by example when we get to see him sleep out with many CEOs and the like in time to come.

Today the member for Central Wheatbelt talked about unemployment, and I think the real worry is the flow-on effects of COVID-19, including the 112 000 jobs that she spoke about; the effect on families and young people who will not have jobs in not only the next few months, but also the years ahead; the lack of confidence that is going to flow through, and that is where the government will really need to step in; homelessness issues; and other social issues such as domestic violence and the like. Homelessness takes many forms—couch surfing, overcrowding in family homes and people living on the streets. Another element of homelessness is people who present to hospital emergency departments on successive multiple occasions knowing what terminology will get them admitted for a few days. I have a few other examples, but Esperance is the main area that I want to highlight.

Since becoming the local member, I have noticed that some fantastic community members and some fantastic community support services have sprung up in the Esperance community, and I will name some of them—Escare and its leader, Jo Aberle; Esperance Care Services and Sue and Chris Meyer, who do a fantastic job; Hope Community Services; Centrecare Esperance; Bay of Isles Community Outreach; Esperance Crisis Accommodation Service, Lachies House and Christine Smith; and Esperance YouthCARE. Those groups do a fantastic job and some of the leaders in the community lead those services.

The Shire of Esperance has been leading the charge, Minister for Local Government. It has created two groups—an economic recovery group and a community service recovery group. One area of concern that an Esperance community member raised with me, Minister for Community Services, was that when the community group was established at the start of this crisis, the Department of Communities representative stood up at the community meeting and told everyone that the department was the contact point for community issues such as housing, homelessness and access to food, and then they went missing. The local office pretty much deflected everything to Perth, which turned out to be a black hole. As an example, the shire sought to collaborate with the Department of Communities on the backpacker accommodation issue, but it ended up having to fund a facility and the operating costs in the absence of any response from the department. That is one matter that the minister might want to look at, because it is concerning to the people of Esperance. The recovery group, which is a fantastic initiative by the council, is concerned about that response from the Department of Communities.

One of the issues that some of the people who work in those care services and support groups have pointed out to me is the lack of affordable housing. That is not in the minister's portfolio, but it flows through and can create homelessness and, potentially, domestic violence. Of course, there is a long waitlist for Department of Housing housing. Two groups of people who are particularly vulnerable in a tight housing market are families in crisis and those who need supported accommodation, which they feel is available more so in Albany, Geraldton and Bunbury. That was pointed out. Obviously, there has been an increase in domestic violence due to COVID-19 restrictions, which has made the situation worse. Certainly, they pointed out that Esperance would love to get some of the \$97 million that has been earmarked for housing. If the minister could point that out to the Minister for Housing, that would be appreciated. Of course, other issues include the normal flow-on effects, such as drug and alcohol use, domestic violence, health concerns and—this is the one that I think will be a worry—the fallout at the end of the JobKeeper and JobSeeker scenario at the end of September. There is a concern about that. Those are probably the majority of issues in Esperance that I wanted to raise.

While I have the opportunity, I also want to point out that the Activ Foundation has been in Esperance for about 40 or 50 years. It supported about 18 or 19 families and was doing what I thought was a good job. Recently, for unknown reasons, it pulled out of Esperance and created a real disruption in the community. I went to the community meeting, which was chaired by Ian Mickel, the shire president, and those families were distraught at the way that Activ just pulled out. Those families were not given any notice. As members can imagine, the young people in the 15 to 25-year age group who went along every day were distraught at the way the rug had been pulled out from under them. To top it off, the building that Activ occupied had received a lot of community contributions over the last 30 or 40 years. Activ, which somehow had its name on the title, gave a bit of money back to Rotary and the like that had contributed and said, "Thanks very much. We'll sell the property and take the proceeds. We're off back to Perth." That has been a real frustration to the community of Esperance. The shire president and councillors are also very upset about it. Quite frankly, I think Activ has a lot to answer for in that space. They are just a couple of the things that are happening in Esperance.

We seem to be going along not too badly in Narrogin. There is a women's shelter in Narrogin for victims of domestic violence. However, there is no men's shelter or emergency accommodation available, so that is an issue. Once again, there are some support services in Narrogin that are doing a good job, and I certainly compliment them.

One place that I would like to point out to the minister is the Katanning Regional Emergency Accommodation Centre, or KREAC, which is a fantastic model. I would love the minister to come to Katanning one day to look at that model. The centre has cubicles that are accessed with biometric sensors. It is open to families with children and single males and females over the age of 18 who are registered. Their fingerprint information is collected and can be used to open the door and give them access to a bed and a bathroom that are lockable. That is funded through Lotterywest and run by a committee in Katanning. The centre has a three-night limit; however, it is available 24/7. The committee also provides people with advocacy to access housing and referrals to other agencies as required. This model is great for people in a domestic violence situation or who need refuge. People take to the centre a lot of their furniture and other good-quality goods that they may not need. When my wife and I had a recent clean-out and decided to do some renovations, we took quite a bit of furniture and other things to that group. It is great that they also help domestic violence victims or young mothers with young kids to set up a new house. That is a really good community model. As I said, I urge the minister to come to Katanning and look at it one day, because it is quite a good model that she could use further down the track. They are probably the main elements that I wanted to talk about.

I will continue for a couple of minutes. The member for Warren–Blackwood brought up the community resource centres, which are a fantastic model for our regional communities. I honestly believe that the Minister for Community Services could look at incorporating or using the CRCs much more. We have recently had advocacy from Karrina and Donna in Hopetoun, Gabrielle and Kylie in Ravensthorpe and Jess Hamersley in Wagin. Throughout the COVID-19 crisis, the CRCs in these and many other communities have done a great job. They are the link, especially in smaller communities like Hopetoun and Ravensthorpe. The communities look to them. I think this is a great opportunity for the Minister for Community Services to talk to the Minister for Regional Development to see how she could become involved in advocating for her portfolio. I agree with what the member for Warren–Blackwood said about Linkwest. I think the Minister for Regional Development has taken a divide and conquer attitude to this one. Linkwest has been doing a great job in providing overriding communications for the whole network of CRCs, but that has now been swept away from it. The minister has said, "Here's a couple of thousand dollars. You go and worry about it yourself and I'll be on my merry way." That is a network that the Minister for Community Services could use. I, once again, agree with what the member for Warren–Blackwood said about regional men's health: I think that is a real feather in the cap of that group. It does a great job. Once again, we have a pretty tough winter with not a lot of water in the dams. A lot of our farmers and regional men are struggling mentally. There is a lot of pressure on people who have to cart water in the middle of winter for their livestock and the like. That group does a great job. People like Ross Ditchburn and Justin Taylor, with his football training group in Tambellup, do a fantastic job in keeping the morale of local men and farmers up to speed. I congratulate them and certainly encourage the minister to come and take a look in the electorate of Roe to see some of the good things that are happening as well.

MSS.F. McGURK (Fremantle — Minister for Community Services) [6.34 pm]: I take this opportunity to address some of the issues that have been raised this afternoon, some with good intent and some a little more mischievously. I would even go so far as to say that some were raised maliciously. I note that, overall, members are very connected to their communities. We have a number of country and regional members who I know see disadvantage in their local areas, as we all do, and are frustrated by that level of disadvantage. In a state such as Western Australia and a country like Australia that have so many resources, both material and human, we still often have poverty, disadvantage and intergenerational challenges. It seems that it should not be beyond us to try to resolve them, but these challenges beset the modern world in many ways.

I know that I am not the first to make this observation, but during the pandemic our state and country had world's best practice in accepting the science and good advice, and in having discipline, good governance and good communication between the state and federal governments. Western Australia had a good budgetary situation, which we had worked very hard on for the last couple of years. We also have good public services, including a fantastic public health service. We have been able to draw on not only state services, but also not-for-profit community services. We have had some incredible results in dealing with this pandemic. Many observers have said that we have been able to make changes to work arrangements, get the public messages out far and wide and get people on board and to understand that they need to adhere to the public health messages. As a result, our state has done incredibly well. We should be very proud of not only our government, but also the whole system and the public itself. If we can apply that sort of discipline to other challenges and wicked problems, as they are often described, I think we could overcome some of them.

When I talk about the strategic approach that the government is determined to take, I mean that very sincerely. Members have given examples of disadvantage in their electorates. I know that they are aware that those problems have been around for a long time. They might peak and trough—they might be more extreme at the moment because of COVID-19 or the economic downturn across the state or in particular regions at different times, and be less

visible at other times—but we know that they have not really gone away. We need to take a strategic approach and look at the best evidence to resolve some of these issues. I believe we will be able to make a difference. That is the approach that has been adopted in the homelessness strategy. I have been taunted in this place—the member for Carine could not resist having another poke this afternoon—for taking the time to work with the sector and researchers to properly understand what is best practice in addressing homelessness. That is what we have adopted in “All Paths Lead to a Home: Western Australia’s 10-Year Strategy on Homelessness”. I know that a strategy will not keep people warm at night or give them a bed, but it does mean that we now have an approach that I think will result in some good outcomes.

I will briefly speak about the Housing First approach. There are examples of the Housing First approach in the United States and Ireland, where it has been very successful. It has also been adopted in Western Australia through the 50 Lives, 50 Homes project. That is a much smaller project that used the Housing First approach. Its latest figures show that it has been successful in housing 237 people through the Housing First approach, and 92 per cent of those people are still in that housing one year later. These were street-present people. This was not low-hanging fruit—people who were perhaps at risk of homelessness. These were the most disadvantaged—these were street-present people. They are very good results.

One of the reasons we have those sorts of results is that the model says we have to track our efforts. We have to have a fidelity—a discipline around tracking our efforts. An example that 50 Lives 50 Homes gave in its most recent report on the Housing First approach was of Ben, who was first approached through its outreach workers in August 2019. He was housed in October. Between May 2018 and September 2019, Ben had had 42 emergency presentations and 12 nights in hospital. That was costed at about \$70 000. Since being housed, Ben has not needed any emergency accommodation—no ED. The costs are clear. I understand that Ben now has a vegetable garden and is happy. He will require some ongoing support and that is appropriate. We know that they are dollars well spent; it is probably cheaper and it is certainly better for the individual.

I wanted to quickly paint the picture that is the cornerstone of our homelessness approach. We understand we have to do a range of different things. We also understand that there is demand across the state, as there always has been—this is not new. The member for Carine particularly riles me when he says that we are doing little, because he said nothing about homelessness before he got the shadow portfolio—not one word! He had some interest. In 2009, he had a view about a particularly challenging large family in his electorate who had some foster care kids. He was in favour of evicting them and selling the house from under them. That is what his record is.

Mr A. Krsticevic interjected.

Ms S.F. McGURK: We have a strategy now.

Mr A. Krsticevic interjected.

Ms S.F. McGURK: I am not taking any interjections from the member for Carine.

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

Ms S.F. McGURK: Homelessness is a complex issue. We have a strategic approach and an evidence-based approach. We have brought through the funding. We went down to Bunbury and spoke to the stakeholders, who fully understood this approach. We will be partnering with all of them to do the work that is centred on those people. The member for Geraldton asked whether anyone has actually spoken to homeless people to ask them what they want. That is exactly what this approach is about. The approach is centred on them: What sort of accommodation are you interested in? What appeals to you? Is it in a shared house? Is it by yourself? Does it have to be near transport? Do you drive? What is this sort of accommodation? It is permanent accommodation for them, not transitional. Working with those people to understand their needs is crucial to this approach. That is why they get those sorts of results. It might mean getting people’s identification, organising their Centrelink payments, stabilising their mental health and organising their meds. It is very difficult work. It does not always come off, but that is our best chance of getting those people off the street and into stable accommodation. The evidence shows us that that works.

As the member for Bunbury said, the first thing we can do during a pandemic is keep those people safe. We are very focused on that. As a state, we should be incredibly proud of what we have done. Under the leadership of the Premier and the McGowan government, all the community has been on board to deliver these good outcomes. I am not the only one who is incredibly grateful that the Liberal Party is not in power, because the borders would be down. It would have got a second medical opinion when it did not like what the Chief Health Officer said. We would have had no money to rely on in dealing with the emergency before us. We need to prevent homelessness. I spoke at question time about the need to provide jobs. We need to keep people safe and then we need to provide them with jobs. We have talked about investing millions and millions in roads. We are partnering with the federal government to do that. The transport minister has done an incredible job in delivering that for Western Australia.

The government is pushing through planning reforms to stop any sorts of barriers to projects going ahead. We are encouraging people to avail themselves of local tourism opportunities. People have an incredible chance during the

pandemic to travel within Western Australia, and of course there is our emphasis on local procurement. That is backed up with supporting TAFE, supporting skills development and making sure TAFE qualifications are affordable. We inherited a terrible legacy from the current Leader of the Opposition. She had absolutely no regard for TAFE training and the importance of it. In fact, she racked up TAFE fees to an astronomical amount.

This is all being backed up by \$159 million in a COVID relief fund, which we are now starting to get out to the community sector. We have introduced residential law reform, particularly related to COVID, but also in relation to people experiencing domestic violence. We are ensuring that people understand what those reforms mean, so good communication about those sorts of protections is important. We are investing significantly in housing. The Minister for Housing is responsible for putting in place a \$444 million housing stimulus package. The vast majority of that will be in public and social housing. It will make a huge difference to some of the more vulnerable people we are talking about in this motion today. It will also include people accessing affordable housing. That will take the pressure off social housing and the public housing list.

An element of the Housing First approach that we have brought into the Fremantle 20 Lives 20 Homes project and into our current announcement is an ability for those people who are being housed to access the private rental market. The state government will pay the difference between what those people would have paid as public housing tenants and what the private rental market is asking. In turn, the tenancy will be managed by a community services provider such as Foundation Housing or Access Housing. It is good for the landlord because they get a secure tenant for at least 12 months. They get what they would have got anyway in the market, and they have someone to help manage the tenancy. We would like to get that information out publicly. We need ethical landlords—people who might be interested in saying, “I’d like to do my bit for homelessness or people at risk. I’d like to put my hand up to support that sort of scheme.” But also, when the rental market comes and goes, this is a good, secure tenancy that is available for the private rental market. We are doing some innovative things with the housing that is available and not pushing into the queue. For instance, if we are housing street-present people, obviously they are a priority, but if they push out someone else and displace people in the queue, that can be challenging.

A big part of our agenda is making sure that we prevent homelessness, but of course we have existing homelessness. Essentially, that is the nub of the motion we are debating today. I spoke about the housing strategy being backed up by research and evidence. It took some time to put together and I am very proud of it. It will be the cornerstone of a very effective approach in our state. When we announced that strategy, we also announced funding of \$72 million. Half of that will go towards the Housing First approach, which we have brought forward. We are now starting to implement it. That will include an investment in the Housing First approach in Bunbury, Geraldton and Mandurah. Some regional work will start to be done in partnership with the community services sector. A database to underpin it will be funded to make sure that people tell their story just once, and the information is there and shared between providers. There will be some data sharing between organisations to make sure we have good intelligence—a person-centred approach. We know that is the most effective. Also, the feeders of homelessness are incredibly important. People recognise that. It is commonsense to understand that we need to address the feeders of homelessness. Nowhere is that more the case than the need to address family and domestic violence. It is interesting that again the member for Carine could not help himself when he took a pot shot against me as the first Minister for Prevention of Family and Domestic Violence.

Mr A. Krsticevic: I was quite nice.

Ms S.F. McGURK: That is not the sentiment I get when I speak to the sector. It is very grateful that it has a government that takes this issue seriously. Again, it is kind of galling for this to come from a Liberal member of Parliament. During eight and a half years of government, the Liberal Party did nothing about domestic violence. Actually, that is not true, it did two things: firstly, it took away the dedicated family and domestic violence courts after a very flimsy evaluation that has since been discredited; secondly, on the second to last sitting day of its term in government, we were able to get the Restraining Orders and Related Legislation Amendment (Family Violence) Bill 2016 through Parliament. That is because it was a national agreement. Hon Michael Mischin, the then Attorney General, could not back out of it. That was the Liberal Party’s record after eight and a half years. It was absolutely woeful. We had Rosie Batty, Australian of the Year; Victoria set up a royal commission; and Dame Quentin Bryce carried out a significant investigation in Queensland.

For the member for Carine to criticise us over domestic violence is gobsmacking. The member for Carine has an opportunity to redeem himself. There are plenty of opportunities to support good work. A debate is going on in the upper house now about the most comprehensive piece of family and domestic violence law reform that this state has seen. I urge the member to communicate with his members in the upper house, if he ever does that, and get them to support this legislation. Again, it has had fulsome and unequivocal support from the sector because it will adopt best practice in Australia for law reform. There is no doubt that there is more work to do. The high levels of domestic violence that we have in our state and our country are an enormous challenge. It is not a situation that we can turn around overnight. I believe that we are putting in place some very good fundamentals on which we can build and turn the situation around. A good example of that is the Respectful Relationships program that we are implementing in schools. As the Leader of the Nationals WA is aware, there are many challenges in regional

areas and across the state. Many people say to me that we need to speak to schoolchildren and turn things around in schools. I know that the Minister for Education and Training gets a little frustrated at that; she says that all social ills could be removed if we added another subject to the curriculum. It is part of the solution. Primary schools in Boyanup, Pinjarra, Northam and Katanning have opted into the Respectful Relationships program, along with Northam High School. We will continue to extend that program. It provides teaching facilities for schools to alter their existing curriculum and start to tackle some of those issues at a school level.

I am very grateful, as other members have commented, for the fantastic work that is done by services in the regions. The government has a lot more to do, but all layers of government—local, state and federal—need to work on this issue. We need to work in partnership with the community services sector. There are a number of organisations in the areas that we are talking about. In the great southern, we have the Albany Women's Centre run by Anglicare, and the Southern Aboriginal Corporation is doing a good job providing legal advice and support. In the south west, we have Tuart House, run by Communicare, the Waratah Support Centre and the South West Refuge. In the wheatbelt, we have the Narrogin Women's Refuge and the wheatbelt women's refuge, which has been mentioned before in this debate. We have great organisations out there. We have to support them. We have to work with the peak body—the Women's Council for Domestic and Family Violence Services—and the sector as a whole to make sure there is good information exchange.

Again, the member for Carine could not help himself. He wants to make light of a strategic approach to this sort of work. It is not a quick fix; we are in it for the long term. It is important that we take the time to work with the sector to prioritise that work, and look at the evidence across the country and internationally to determine how we tackle these issues. I think we have many of the right elements that we need to tackle this. We have a government that is committed, and we have incredibly good cooperation in the ministry. I am very grateful to have worked in partnership with the Attorney General on some very significant law reform—residential tenancy and now the Family Violence Legislation Reform Bill. The Minister for Police is on board, along with the Commissioner of Police, Chris Dawson, who is providing fantastic leadership amongst his workforce—the police force. We have many good elements but we have a lot to do. We have high rates of domestic violence in this state, as I have mentioned many times. These issues cannot be overturned quickly.

Another feeder of homelessness is in the area that I have responsibility for—child protection. We have put new money into child protection through the earlier intervention and family support strategy, and we put over \$20 million of new funding into the Aboriginal in-home support service, an Aboriginal consortium led by the Wungening Aboriginal Corporation. That is in the metropolitan area. In the regional areas, we are working very hard to give some of that work to Aboriginal community-controlled organisations, but also to the community sector, depending on the cohort that they are working with, to work with families whose children are at risk of entering the child protection system. We work with them to prevent that from occurring, to keep the family together and support them to stay together and to be safe, happy and healthy. The early indications of that work are looking very good. I want to continue that work. I hope that I can present some statistical analysis of that work down the track to demonstrate that it is not only good investment of public money—also, money spent now will be money saved later—but also obviously manifestly better for those families.

Target 120 is another example of new money that the government has put in to make sure that we have a person-centred approach to try to stop young people who are almost certainly at risk of ending up in the juvenile justice system, if not in youth detention or the adult correction system. We have put over \$20 million of new funding into that program. We have rolled it into a number of regional areas, and we will continue to roll it out. I have not talked a lot about its implementation because it is slow, hard work. It will help young people aged between 10 and 14 who are not in the justice system yet, but all indications are that that is where they will end up. Engagement with them and their families is slow work. To gain the trust of families and continue to work with them and their local community organisations to provide the sort of support they need to keep young people engaged at school and away from the justice system and other antisocial behaviour that is so easy for them to get involved in is challenging work. I hope I can demonstrate that we are doing good work in that area. Yes, there is more to do. There is no doubt about that. As I said, I think some of those examples will stand us in good stead in the future, importantly for those very vulnerable families.

Finally, we are embarking on significant child protection reform as a result of the bill that passed through the lower house. We are putting in place significant strengths to acknowledge the need for Aboriginal children to have a connection to their culture, their community and their country. That is an important protective behaviour for those children and gives them the best chance, if they are in the child protection system, to have a stable placement, to stay engaged with school and to stay connected to their identity and their broader family. The bill has been debated in the lower house and is now under consideration in the other place. I hope that members in the other place have a genuine debate. I know that we can say that we want better outcomes for some of those vulnerable young people but exactly what that looks like as a system design is another challenge altogether. We are committed, as I said many times in that debate, to work with Aboriginal-controlled organisations to get better outcomes for vulnerable families.

I could speak about many other things that this government has invested in. Financial counselling is another huge investment in making sure that people are supported when they need it so they can get back on their feet and continue to lead happy, successful lives with their families. Of course, we know the record that the Liberal–National government had when it came to financial counselling: it had no appreciation of it, it slashed services in the metropolitan area and then reinstated a measly half of the money that we put in place. I guess that attitude to financial counselling is also reflected in the previous government’s attitude to financial management as a whole. There was no better example of that than how it managed royalties for regions. The way it was managed was an absolute failure.

Mr D.T. Redman: You committed to it and then you got rid of it.

Ms S.F. McGURK: We have not got rid of it at all. We have committed to good management of it and investment in — Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms J.M. Freeman): Members, I will yell as loud as you. Stop now!

Ms S.F. McGURK: We have committed to investment in real outcomes for those people in regional areas where they need it.

Debate adjourned, pursuant to standing orders.

DOG AMENDMENT (STOP PUPPY FARMING) BILL 2020

As to Third Reading — Standing Orders Suspension — Notice of Motion

Mr D.A. Templeman (Leader of the House) gave notice that at the next sitting of the house he would move —

That so much of the standing orders be suspended as is necessary to enable the Dog Amendment (Stop Puppy Farming) Bill 2020 to proceed forthwith to the third reading following consideration in detail.

House adjourned at 7.00 pm

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Questions and answers are as supplied to Hansard.

MINISTER FOR WATER — CGM COMMUNICATIONS — CONSULTATIONS**6016. Mrs L.M. Harvey to the Minister for Water; Forestry; Innovation and ICT; Science; Youth:**

I refer to the Premier's Circular 2019/06 – Report on consultants engaged by Government, noting that excluded from the report are contracts in respect of engineering services, training programs, printing, computer development and support services, actuarial services, publicity and promotional programs, project management services, valuations, accounting services, customer surveys and bench marking, and I ask:

- (a) Since 1 January 2017, have public affairs firm CGM Communications been engaged by any government department, agency or government trading enterprise in the Minister's control and if so:
 - (i) for what purpose has the firm been engaged; and
 - (ii) was the engagement subject to an open tender process;
 - (iii) what is the total cost of each consultancy?

Mr D.J. Kelly replied:

Aqwest

- (a) (i)–(iii) No, not applicable.

Busselton Water

- (a) (i)–(iii) No, not applicable.

ChemCentre

- (a) (i)–(iii) No, not applicable.

Department of Communities

Please refer to Legislative Assembly Question on Notice 6017.

Office of Digital Government

- (a) (i)–(iii) No, not applicable.

Office of the Government Chief Information Officer

- (a) (i)–(iii) No, not applicable.

Department of Water and Environmental Regulation

- (a) (i)–(iii) No, not applicable.

Department of Water

- (a) (i)–(iii) No, not applicable.

Forest Products Commission

- (a) (i)–(iii) No, not applicable.

Department of Jobs, Tourism, Science and Innovation

Please refer to Legislative Assembly Question on Notice 6019.

Water Corporation

- (a) (i)–(iii) No, not applicable.

MINISTER FOR WATER — CGM COMMUNICATIONS — CONTACT**6035. Mrs L.M. Harvey to the Minister for Water; Forestry; Innovation and ICT; Science; Youth:**

Has the Minister, or any former or current Ministerial staff, met with or had any contact with representatives of registered lobbyist CGM Communications since October 2017 and if so:

- (a) What are the dates for each meeting or instance of contact;
- (b) Who did CGM Communications meet with or contact;
- (c) What was the topic of discussion for each meeting or instance of contact;
- (d) What third party, if any, was being represented by CGM Communications;

- (e) Was any follow-up action agreed to by the Minister or ministerial staff:
- (i) If so, what action was agreed to; and
- (f) What form did the contact take (i.e. email, phone) for meetings, and where did they take place?

Mr D.J. Kelly replied:

Representatives of CGM may also have been at functions, forums or informal events at which the Minister and/or his staff were also in attendance where incidental contact has been made.

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)
28 August 2018	Luke Clarke	STEM Strategy	N/A	No	Phone
17 October 2018	Luke Clarke	Water Allocations in North Wanneroo	North Wanneroo Residents Association	Yes, agreed to meet	Email
25 October 2018	Luke Clarke	Water Allocations in North Wanneroo	North Wanneroo Residents Association	Yes, agreed to provide updates on the Gngara Water Allocation Plan	Ministerial Office, Dumas House
6 November 2018	Luke Clarke	Invite to CGM Communications Christmas Party	N/A	No	Email
14 November 2018	Alyesha Anderson	Invite to CGM Communications Christmas Party	N/A	No	Email
26 February 2019	Luke Clarke	Requested copy of STEM strategy	N/A	No	N/A
12 September 2019	Naomi Arrowsmith, Alyesha Anderson and Tegan Bensley	STEM Campaign	N/A	Range of actions came out of meetings as campaign was developed	Ministerial Office, Dumas House
25 September 2019	Alyesha Anderson and Tegan Bensley	STEM Campaign	N/A	Range of actions came out of meetings as campaign was developed	Ministerial Office, Dumas House
29 September 2019	Alyesha Anderson	Invite to WAFL Community Football Showcase	N/A	No	Email
1 October 2019	Alyesha Anderson	STEM campaign	N/A	No	Email
3 October 2019	Alyesha Anderson	STEM campaign	N/A	No	Email
4 October 2019	Alyesha Anderson	STEM campaign	N/A	Yes, to meet to discuss campaign	Email
7 October 2019	Alyesha Anderson	STEM campaign	N/A	No	Met at Dumas House
22 October 2019	Alyesha Anderson	STEM campaign	N/A	Yes, provide advice on DPC advertising requirements	Email

17 December 2019	Naomi Arrowsmith and Tegan Bensley	STEM Campaign	N/A	Range of actions came out of meetings as campaign was developed	Ministerial Office, Dumas House
9 January 2020	Naomi Arrowsmith, Alyesha Anderson and Tegan Bensley	STEM Campaign	N/A	No	N/A
9–10 January 2020	Alyesha Anderson	STEM Campaign	N/A	No	N/A
16 January 2020	Alyesha Anderson and Tegan Bensley	STEM Campaign	N/A	No	N/A
23 January 2020	Alyesha Anderson and Tegan Bensley	STEM Campaign	N/A	Range of actions came out of meetings as campaign was developed	Ministerial Office, Dumas House
24 January 2020	Alyesha Anderson	STEM Campaign	N/A	Range of actions came out of meetings as campaign was developed	Ministerial Office, Dumas House
24 January 2020	Patricia Pedely and Amy Cowdell	Request for meeting regarding development in Peel region	Golden Group	No	Email
29 January 2020	Alyesha Anderson	STEM Campaign	N/A	Range of actions came out of meetings as campaign was developed	Ministerial Office, Dumas House
30 January 2020	Tegan Bensley	STEM Campaign	N/A	Range of actions came out of meetings as campaign was developed	Ministerial Office, Dumas House
4–5 February 2020	Alyesha Anderson	STEM Campaign	N/A	Yes, provide feedback on content	email
6 February 2020	Alyesha Anderson and Luke Clarke	STEM Campaign	N/A	Range of actions came out of meetings as campaign was developed	Ministerial Office, Dumas House
9–11 February 2020	Alyesha Anderson	STEM Campaign	N/A	Yes, provide feedback on content	email
12–13 February 2020	Alyesha Anderson	STEM Campaign	N/A	Yes, provide feedback on content	Email

13 February 2020	Alyesha Anderson and Tegan Bensley	STEM Campaign	N/A	Range of actions came out of meetings as campaign was developed	Ministerial Office, Dumas House
17 February 2020	Amy Cowdell and Patricia Pedelty	Meeting request	Golden Group	No	Email
19 February 2020	Amy Cowdell and Patricia Pedelty	Follow up questions	Goden Group	No	Email
20 February 2020	Alyesha Anderson, Luke Clarke and Tegan Bensley	STEM Campaign	N/A	Range of actions came out of meetings as campaign was developed	Ministerial Office, Dumas House
27 February 2020	Alyesha Anderson and Luke Clarke	STEM Campaign	N/A	Range of actions came out of meetings as campaign was developed	Ministerial Office, Dumas House
4 March 2020	Minister Kelly, Naomi Arrowsmith and Alyesha Anderson	STEM Campaign	N/A	Range of actions came out of meetings as campaign was developed	Ministerial Office, Dumas House
5 March 2020	Alyesha Anderson and Luke Clarke	STEM Campaign	N/A	Range of actions came out of meetings as campaign was developed	Ministerial Office, Dumas House

POLICE — RANDOM ROADSIDE TESTING

6055. Mr P.A. Katsambanis to the Minister for Police; Road Safety:

I refer to the monthly operations of the four Random Breath Testing Booze and Drug buses, and ask:

- (a) How many days for each month (breakdown) since 1 January 2017 was each bus deployed;
- (b) For each month of each year since 2017 (monthly breakdown), for how many days was each bus deployed in metropolitan Perth and regional Western Australia?

Mrs M.H. Roberts replied:

The Western Australia Police Force advise:

- (a) January – Bus 1, 78; Bus 2, 83; Bus 3, 81; Bus 4, 81.
February – Bus 1, 73; Bus 2, 74; Bus 3, 69; Bus 4, 66.
March – Bus 1, 66; Bus 2, 72; Bus 3, 66; Bus 4, 65.
April – Bus 1, 63; Bus 2, 64; Bus 3, 68; Bus 4, 60.
May – Bus 1, 70; Bus 2, 72; Bus 3, 75; Bus 4, 80.
June – Bus 1, 54; Bus 2, 54; Bus 3, 67; Bus 4, 59.
July – Bus 1, 55; Bus 2, 60; Bus 3, 51; Bus 4, 61.
August – Bus 1, 62; Bus 2, 65; Bus 3, 64; Bus 4, 55.
September – Bus 1, 58; Bus 2, 50; Bus 3, 64; Bus 4, 52.
October – Bus 1, 61; Bus 2, 58; Bus 3, 58; Bus 4, 61.
November – Bus 1, 58; Bus 2, 54; Bus 3, 58; Bus 4, 55.
December – Bus 1, 54; Bus 2, 59; Bus 3, 54; Bus 4, 61.

(b) 2017

January – Bus 1 Metro 20; Bus 2 Metro 19; Bus 3 Metro 21; Bus 4 Metro 21; Bus 1 Regional 2; Bus 2 Regional 1; Bus 3 Regional 5; Bus 4 Regional 1.

February – Bus 1 Metro 14; Bus 2 Metro 17; Bus 3 Metro 17; Bus 4 Metro 13; Bus 1 Regional 4; Bus 2 Regional 1; Bus 3 Regional 1; Bus 4 Regional 5.

March – Bus 1 Metro 18; Bus 2 Metro 20; Bus 3 Metro 11; Bus 4 Metro 16; Bus 1 Regional 1; Bus 2 Regional 2; Bus 3 Regional 7; Bus 4 Regional 6.

April – Bus 1 Metro 15; Bus 2 Metro 13; Bus 3 Metro 13; Bus 4 Metro 14; Bus 1 Regional 6; Bus 2 Regional 8; Bus 3 Regional 8; Bus 4 Regional 6.

May – Bus 1 Metro 19; Bus 2 Metro 17; Bus 3 Metro 16; Bus 4 Metro 12; Bus 1 Regional 1; Bus 2 Regional 1; Bus 3 Regional 5; Bus 4 Regional 13.

June – Bus 1 Metro 17; Bus 2 Metro 11; Bus 3 Metro 17; Bus 4 Metro 15; Bus 1 Regional 0; Bus 2 Regional 5; Bus 3 Regional 6; Bus 4 Regional 0.

July – Bus 1 Metro 10; Bus 2 Metro 14; Bus 3 Metro 9; Bus 4 Metro 16; Bus 1 Regional 7; Bus 2 Regional 6; Bus 3 Regional 7; Bus 4 Regional 2.

August – Bus 1 Metro 17; Bus 2 Metro 19; Bus 3 Metro 18; Bus 4 Metro 18; Bus 1 Regional 2; Bus 2 Regional 1; Bus 3 Regional 1; Bus 4 Regional 1.

September – Bus 1 Metro 13; Bus 2 Metro 16; Bus 3 Metro 19; Bus 4 Metro 9; Bus 1 Regional 5; Bus 2 Regional 1; Bus 3 Regional 7; Bus 4 Regional 8.

October – Bus 1 Metro 21; Bus 2 Metro 17; Bus 3 Metro 12; Bus 4 Metro 17; Bus 1 Regional 0; Bus 2 Regional 1; Bus 3 Regional 8; Bus 4 Regional 2.

November – Bus 1 Metro 19; Bus 2 Metro 14; Bus 3 Metro 18; Bus 4 Metro 18; Bus 1 Regional 1; Bus 2 Regional 6; Bus 3 Regional 2; Bus 4 Regional 1.

December – Bus 1 Metro 17; Bus 2 Metro 20; Bus 3 Metro 19; Bus 4 Metro 20; Bus 1 Regional 1; Bus 2 Regional 2; Bus 3 Regional 1; Bus 4 Regional 1.

2018

January – Bus 1 Metro 18; Bus 2 Metro 20; Bus 3 Metro 16; Bus 4 Metro 16; Bus 1 Regional 2; Bus 2 Regional 2; Bus 3 Regional 4; Bus 4 Regional 6.

February – Bus 1 Metro 19; Bus 2 Metro 18; Bus 3 Metro 12; Bus 4 Metro 17; Bus 1 Regional 0; Bus 2 Regional 6; Bus 3 Regional 5; Bus 4 Regional 0.

March – Bus 1 Metro 21; Bus 2 Metro 16; Bus 3 Metro 18; Bus 4 Metro 14; Bus 1 Regional 0; Bus 2 Regional 6; Bus 3 Regional 3; Bus 4 Regional 3.

April – Bus 1 Metro 12; Bus 2 Metro 11; Bus 3 Metro 14; Bus 4 Metro 11; Bus 1 Regional 12; Bus 2 Regional 12; Bus 3 Regional 13; Bus 4 Regional 9.

May – Bus 1 Metro 16; Bus 2 Metro 17; Bus 3 Metro 20; Bus 4 Metro 13; Bus 1 Regional 7; Bus 2 Regional 6; Bus 3 Regional 6; Bus 4 Regional 10.

June – Bus 1 Metro 15; Bus 2 Metro 15; Bus 3 Metro 18; Bus 4 Metro 18; Bus 1 Regional 4; Bus 2 Regional 0; Bus 3 Regional 0; Bus 4 Regional 0.

July – Bus 1 Metro 19; Bus 2 Metro 15; Bus 3 Metro 14; Bus 4 Metro 19; Bus 1 Regional 0; Bus 2 Regional 5; Bus 3 Regional 5; Bus 4 Regional 0.

August – Bus 1 Metro 19; Bus 2 Metro 18; Bus 3 Metro 19; Bus 4 Metro 18; Bus 1 Regional 5; Bus 2 Regional 4; Bus 3 Regional 1; Bus 4 Regional 6.

September – Bus 1 Metro 15; Bus 2 Metro 17; Bus 3 Metro 21; Bus 4 Metro 15; Bus 1 Regional 5; Bus 2 Regional 0; Bus 3 Regional 0; Bus 4 Regional 5.

October – Bus 1 Metro 14; Bus 2 Metro 8; Bus 3 Metro 13; Bus 4 Metro 17; Bus 1 Regional 6; Bus 2 Regional 12; Bus 3 Regional 7; Bus 4 Regional 6.

November – Bus 1 Metro 20; Bus 2 Metro 15; Bus 3 Metro 19; Bus 4 Metro 13; Bus 1 Regional 0; Bus 2 Regional 0; Bus 3 Regional 0; Bus 4 Regional 5.

December – Bus 1 Metro 18; Bus 2 Metro 19; Bus 3 Metro 17; Bus 4 Metro 21; Bus 1 Regional 0; Bus 2 Regional 0; Bus 3 Regional 0; Bus 4 Regional 0.

2019

January – Bus 1 Metro 13; Bus 2 Metro 14; Bus 3 Metro 19; Bus 4 Metro 18; Bus 1 Regional 6; Bus 2 Regional 6; Bus 3 Regional 0; Bus 4 Regional 0.

February – Bus 1 Metro 16; Bus 2 Metro 15; Bus 3 Metro 12; Bus 4 Metro 18; Bus Regional 0; Bus 2 Regional 0; Bus 3 Regional 5; Bus 4 Regional 1.

March – Bus 1 Metro 19; Bus 2 Metro 18; Bus 3 Metro 18; Bus 4 Metro 13; Bus 1 Regional 0; Bus 2 Regional 0; Bus 3 Regional 0; Bus 4 Regional 4.

April – Bus 1 Metro 12; Bus 2 Metro 14; Bus 3 Metro 14; Bus 4 Metro 14; Bus 1 Regional 6; Bus 2 Regional 6; Bus 3 Regional 6; Bus 4 Regional 6.

May – Bus 1 Metro 13; Bus 2 Metro 13; Bus 3 Metro 18; Bus 4 Metro 18; Bus 1 Regional 14; Bus 2 Regional 18; Bus 3 Regional 10; Bus 4 Regional 14.

June – Bus 1 Metro 14; Bus 2 Metro 17; Bus 3 Metro 16; Bus 4 Metro 16; Bus 1 Regional 4; Bus 2 Regional 6; Bus 3 Regional 10; Bus 4 Regional 10.

July – Bus 1 Metro 13; Bus 2 Metro 18; Bus 3 Metro 16; Bus 4 Metro 18; Bus 1 Regional 6; Bus 2 Regional 2; Bus 3 Regional 0; Bus 4 Regional 6.

August – Bus 1 Metro 18; Bus 2 Metro 19; Bus 3 Metro 19; Bus 4 Metro 11; Bus 1 Regional 1; Bus 2 Regional 4; Bus 3 Regional 6; Bus 4 Regional 1.

September – Bus 1 Metro 14; Bus 2 Metro 16; Bus 3 Metro 17; Bus 4 Metro 11; Bus 1 Regional 6; Bus 2 Regional 0; Bus 3 Regional 0; Bus 4 Regional 4.

October – Bus 1 Metro 20; Bus 2 Metro 14; Bus 3 Metro 18; Bus 4 Metro 13; Bus 1 Regional 0; Bus 2 Regional 6; Bus 3 Regional 0; Bus 4 Regional 6.

November – Bus 1 Metro 18; Bus 2 Metro 19; Bus 3 Metro 13; Bus 4 Metro 17; Bus 1 Regional 0; Bus 2 Regional 0; Bus 3 Regional 6; Bus 4 Regional 1.

December – Bus 1 Metro 18; Bus 2 Metro 18; Bus 3 Metro 17; Bus 4 Metro 19; Bus 1 Regional 0; Bus 2 Regional 0; Bus 3 Regional 0; Bus 4 Regional 0.

2020

January – Bus 1 Metro 11; Bus 2 Metro 15; Bus 3 Metro 16; Bus 4 Metro 19; Bus 1 Regional 6; Bus 2 Regional 6; Bus 3 Regional 0; Bus 4 Regional 0.

February – Bus 1 Metro 16; Bus 2 Metro 13; Bus 3 Metro 12; Bus 4 Metro 13; Bus 1 Regional 4; Bus 2 Regional 4; Bus 3 Regional 5; Bus 4 Regional 3.

March – Bus 1 Metro 7; Bus 2 Metro 10; Bus 3 Metro 9; Bus 4 Metro 7; Bus 1 Regional 0; Bus 2 Regional 0; Bus 3 Regional 0; Bus 4 Regional 2.

Note: Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, on 17 March 2020 the Western Australia Police Force temporarily suspended the Breath and Drug Bus operations. These operations have resumed.

POLICE — ON-THE-SPOT FINES

6119. Mr P.A. Katsambanis to the Minister for Police; Road Safety:

I refer the Minister to on-the-spot-fines, and ask:

- (a) For each of the years 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019 and 2020 year to date, how many on-the-spot-fines have been issued by the Western Australian Police Force;
- (b) For each of the years listed above please provide a breakdown of fine type?

Mrs M.H. Roberts replied:

The Western Australian Police Force advise:

- (a) In 2016, 150 404; in 2017, 180 036; in 2018, 187 918; in 2019, 162 391; and in 2020, 43 469
- (b) In 2016 – Careless driving 1 134; Exceed Speed Limit 83 354; Mobile Phones 14 894; No Authority to Drive 4 716; Other Traffic 32 389; Non Wearing Restraint 7 021; Traffic Alcohol Offences 2 413; Disorderly Behaviour 1 659; Stealing <\$500 1 077; Liquor Licensing Offences 1 747
 In 2017 – Careless Driving 1 082; Exceed Speed Limit 107 791; Mobile Phones 16 718; No Authority To Drive 5 118; Other Traffic 34 059; Non Wearing Restraint 8 325; Traffic Alcohol Offences 2 429; Disorderly Behaviour 2 047; Stealing <\$500 905; Liquor Licensing Offences 1 562
 In 2018 – Careless Driving 1 018; Exceed Speed Limit 115 514; Mobile Phones 17 697; No Authority to Drive 5 107; Other Traffic 36 058; Non Wearing Restraint 6 915; Traffic Alcohol Offences 1 932; Disorderly Behaviour 1 728; Stealing < \$500 918; Liquor Licensing Offences 1 031

In 2019 – Careless Driving 1 141; Exceed Speed Limit 102 254; Mobile Phones; 11 850; No Authority to Drive 4 585; Other Traffic 32 370; Non Wearing Restraint 5 498; Traffic Alcohol Offences 1 955; Disorderly Behaviour 1 344; Stealing <\$500 795; Liquor Licensing Offences 599

In 2020 – Careless Driving 367; Exceed Speed Limit 26 453; Mobile Phones 3 028; No Authority to Drive 1 330; Other Traffic 9 265; Non Wearing Restraint 1 582; Traffic Alcohol Offences 585; Disorderly Behaviour 367; Stealing <\$500 240; Liquor Licensing Offences 251

MINISTER FOR EMERGENCY SERVICES — PORTFOLIOS — STAFF

6138. Ms M.J. Davies to the Minister for Emergency Services; Corrective Services:

- (1) For the date 13 March 2017, please provide the following staffing arrangements with regard to each of the Minister's departments and agencies:
 - (a) Total number of staff in the department or agency;
 - (b) Total number of staff who were based regionally per department or agency;
 - (c) Position title of each staff member based regionally;
 - (d) Employment level of each staff member based regionally; and
 - (e) Full time equivalent hours of each staff member based regionally;
 - (f) For each regionally based employee, please provide the geographic location of the office?
- (2) For the date 13 March 2018, please provide the following staffing arrangements with regard to each of the Minister's departments and agencies:
 - (a) Total number of staff in the department or agency;
 - (b) Total number of staff who were based regionally per department or agency;
 - (c) Position title of each staff member based regionally;
 - (d) Employment level of each staff member based regionally; and
 - (e) Full time equivalent hours of each staff member based regionally;
 - (f) For each regionally based employee, please provide the geographic location of the office?
- (3) For the date 13 March 2019, please provide the following staffing arrangements with regard to each of the Minister's departments and agencies:
 - (a) Total number of staff in the department or agency;
 - (b) Total number of staff who were based regionally per department or agency;
 - (c) Position title of each staff member based regionally;
 - (d) Employment level of each staff member based regionally; and
 - (e) Full time equivalent hours of each staff member based regionally;
 - (f) For each regionally based employee, please provide the geographic location of the office?
- (4) For the date 13 March 2020, please provide the following staffing arrangements with regard to each of the Minister's departments and agencies:
 - (a) Total number of staff in the department or agency;
 - (b) Total number of staff who were based regionally per department or agency;
 - (c) Position title of each staff member based regionally;
 - (d) Employment level of each staff member based regionally; and
 - (e) Full time equivalent hours of each staff member based regionally;
 - (f) For each regionally based employee, please provide the geographic location of the office?

Mr F.M. Logan replied:

The Department of Justice advises:

- (1)
 - (a) 3684 FTE (Previous Department of Corrections)
 - (b) 1650 FTE
 - (c) Attachment 1 [See tabled paper no [3470](#).]
 - (d)–(e) Attachment 2 [See tabled paper no [3470](#).]
 - (f) Attachment 3 [See tabled paper no [3470](#).]

- (2)
 - (a) 6404 FTE (increase due to the 2017 machinery of Government – now Dept. of Justice)
 - (b) 1713 FTE
 - (c) Attachment 1 [See tabled paper no [3470](#).]
 - (d)–(e) Attachment 2 [See tabled paper no [3470](#).]
 - (f) Attachment 3 [See tabled paper no [3470](#).]
- (3)
 - (a) 6589 FTE
 - (b) 1700 FTE
 - (c) Attachment 1 [See tabled paper no [3470](#).]
 - (d)–(e) Attachment 2 [See tabled paper no [3470](#).]
 - (f) Attachment 3 [See tabled paper no [3470](#).]
- (4)
 - (a) 7139 FTE
 - (b) 1926 FTE
 - (c) Attachment 1 [See tabled paper no [3470](#).]
 - (d)–(e) Attachment 2 [See tabled paper no [3470](#).]
 - (f) Attachment 3 [See tabled paper no [3470](#).]

The Department of Fire and Emergency Services advises:

- (1)
 - (a) 1,626.5 FTE
 - (b) 233.0 FTE
 - (c)–(f) Attachment 4 [See tabled paper no [3470](#).]
- (2)
 - (a) 1,623.1 FTE
 - (b) 238.8 FTE
 - (c)–(f) Attachment 5 [See tabled paper no [3470](#).]
- (3)
 - (a) 1,612.2 FTE
 - (b) 249.5 FTE
 - (c)–(f) Attachment 6 [See tabled paper no [3470](#).]
- (4)
 - (a) 1,634.9 FTE
 - (b) 262.2 FTE
 - (c)–(f) Attachment 7 [See tabled paper no [3470](#).]

The Office of the Inspector of Custodial Services advises:

- (1)
 - (a) 20.
 - (b) Nil.
 - (c)–(f) Not applicable.
- (2)
 - (a) 19.
 - (b) Nil.
 - (c)–(f) Not applicable.
- (3)
 - (a) 19.
 - (b) Nil.
 - (c)–(f) Not applicable.
- (4)
 - (a) 18.
 - (b) Nil.
 - (c)–(f) Not applicable.

The Supervised Release Review Board advises:

The staff associated with the SRRB will be accounted for in the response provide by the Department of Justice. Staff of the department provide general support to the SRRB.

MINISTER FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT — PORTFOLIOS — STAFF

6139. Ms M.J. Davies to the Minister for Local Government; Heritage; Culture and the Arts:

- (1) For the date 13 March 2017, please provide the following staffing arrangements with regard to each of the Minister's departments and agencies:
 - (a) Total number of staff in the department or agency;
 - (b) Total number of staff who were based regionally per department or agency;
 - (c) Position title of each staff member based regionally;
 - (d) Employment level of each staff member based regionally; and
 - (e) Full time equivalent hours of each staff member based regionally;
 - (f) For each regionally based employee, please provide the geographic location of the office?
- (2) For the date 13 March 2018, please provide the following staffing arrangements with regard to each of the Minister's departments and agencies:
 - (a) Total number of staff in the department or agency;
 - (b) Total number of staff who were based regionally per department or agency;
 - (c) Position title of each staff member based regionally;
 - (d) Employment level of each staff member based regionally; and
 - (e) Full time equivalent hours of each staff member based regionally;
 - (f) For each regionally based employee, please provide the geographic location of the office?
- (3) For the date 13 March 2019, please provide the following staffing arrangements with regard to each of the Minister's departments and agencies:
 - (a) Total number of staff in the department or agency;
 - (b) Total number of staff who were based regionally per department or agency;
 - (c) Position title of each staff member based regionally;
 - (d) Employment level of each staff member based regionally; and
 - (e) Full time equivalent hours of each staff member based regionally;
 - (f) For each regionally based employee, please provide the geographic location of the office?
- (4) For the date 13 March 2020, please provide the following staffing arrangements with regard to each of the Minister's departments and agencies:
 - (a) Total number of staff in the department or agency;
 - (b) Total number of staff who were based regionally per department or agency;
 - (c) Position title of each staff member based regionally;
 - (d) Employment level of each staff member based regionally; and
 - (e) Full time equivalent hours of each staff member based regionally;
 - (f) For each regionally based employee, please provide the geographic location of the office?

Mr D.A. Templeman replied:

- (1)–(4) [See tabled paper no [3471](#).]

ATTORNEY GENERAL — PORTFOLIOS — STAFF

6140. Ms M.J. Davies to the Attorney General; Minister for Commerce:

- (1) For the date 13 March 2017, please provide the following staffing arrangements with regard to each of the Minister's departments and agencies:
 - (a) Total number of staff in the department or agency;
 - (b) Total number of staff who were based regionally per department or agency;
 - (c) Position title of each staff member based regionally;
 - (d) Employment level of each staff member based regionally; and
 - (e) Full time equivalent hours of each staff member based regionally;
 - (f) For each regionally based employee, please provide the geographic location of the office?

- (2) For the date 13 March 2018, please provide the following staffing arrangements with regard to each of the Minister's departments and agencies:
- Total number of staff in the department or agency;
 - Total number of staff who were based regionally per department or agency;
 - Position title of each staff member based regionally;
 - Employment level of each staff member based regionally; and
 - Full time equivalent hours of each staff member based regionally;
 - For each regionally based employee, please provide the geographic location of the office?
- (3) For the date 13 March 2019, please provide the following staffing arrangements with regard to each of the Minister's departments and agencies:
- Total number of staff in the department or agency;
 - Total number of staff who were based regionally per department or agency;
 - Position title of each staff member based regionally;
 - Employment level of each staff member based regionally; and
 - Full time equivalent hours of each staff member based regionally;
 - For each regionally based employee, please provide the geographic location of the office?
- (4) For the date 13 March 2020, please provide the following staffing arrangements with regard to each of the Minister's departments and agencies:
- Total number of staff in the department or agency;
 - Total number of staff who were based regionally per department or agency;
 - Position title of each staff member based regionally;
 - Employment level of each staff member based regionally; and
 - Full time equivalent hours of each staff member based regionally;
 - For each regionally based employee, please provide the geographic location of the office?

Mr J.R. Quigley replied:

Please note that all figures are recorded as full time equivalent.

The Corruption and Crime Commission

- 126.11
 - 0
 - (f) Not applicable.
- 127.72
 - 0
 - (f) Not applicable.
- 119.48
 - 0
 - (f) Not applicable.
- 127.57
 - 0
 - (f) Not applicable.

Department of Justice (Including the State Solicitors Office)

- 6383.72
 - 1650.17
 - (f) [See tabled paper no [3473.](#)]
- 6404.10
 - 1713.24
 - (f) [See tabled paper no [3473.](#)]

- (3) (a) 6589.21
- (b) 1700.48
- (c)–(f) [See tabled paper no [3473](#).]
- (4) (a) 7139.11
- (b) 1926.42
- (c)–(f) [See tabled paper no [3473](#).]

Department of Mines, Industry Regulation & Safety

Please refer to Legislative Assembly Question on Notice 6144.

Legal Practice Board

- (1) (a) 41.1
- (b) 0
- (c)–(f) Not applicable.
- (2) (a) 39.17
- (b) 0
- (c)–(f) Not applicable.
- (3) (a) 42.17
- (b) 0
- (c)–(f) Not applicable.
- (4) (a) 41.6
- (b) 0
- (c)–(f) Not applicable.

Legal Aid WA

(5)–(4) [See tabled paper no [3473](#).]

Office of the Commissioner for Children and Young People

- (1) (a) 13.88
- (b) 0
- (c)–(f) Not applicable.
- (2) (a) 13.43
- (b) 0
- (c)–(f) Not applicable.
- (3) (a) 15.20
- (b) 0
- (c)–(f) Not applicable.
- (4) (a) 15.20
- (b) 0
- (c)–(f) Not applicable.

Office of the Information Commissioner

- (1) (a) 11.4
- (b) 0
- (c)–(f) Not applicable.
- (2) (a) 10.2
- (b) 0
- (c)–(f) Not applicable.
- (3) (a) 12
- (b) 0
- (c)–(f) Not applicable.

- (4) (a) 10.2
- (b) 0
- (c)–(f) Not applicable.

Solicitor Generals Office

- (1) (a) 3
- (b) 0
- (c)–(f) Not applicable.
- (2) (a) 3
- (b) 0
- (c)–(f) Not applicable.
- (3) (a) 3
- (b) 0
- (c)–(f) Not applicable.
- (4) (a) 3
- (b) 0
- (c)–(f) Not applicable.

Office of the Director of Public Prosecution

- (1) (a) 224.98
- (b) 0
- (c)–(f) Not applicable.
- (2) (a) 242.87
- (b) 0
- (c)–(f) Not applicable.
- (3) (a) 249.12
- (b) 0
- (c)–(f) Not applicable.
- (4) (a) 265.6
- (b) 0
- (c)–(f) Not applicable.

MINISTER FOR SENIORS AND AGEING — PORTFOLIOS — STAFF

6141. Ms M.J. Davies to the Minister for Seniors and Ageing; Volunteering; Sport and Recreation:

- (1) For the date 13 March 2017, please provide the following staffing arrangements with regard to each of the Minister's departments and agencies:
 - (a) Total number of staff in the department or agency;
 - (b) Total number of staff who were based regionally per department or agency;
 - (c) Position title of each staff member based regionally;
 - (d) Employment level of each staff member based regionally; and
 - (e) Full time equivalent hours of each staff member based regionally;
 - (f) For each regionally based employee, please provide the geographic location of the office?
- (2) For the date 13 March 2018, please provide the following staffing arrangements with regard to each of the Minister's departments and agencies:
 - (a) Total number of staff in the department or agency;
 - (b) Total number of staff who were based regionally per department or agency;
 - (c) Position title of each staff member based regionally;

- (d) Employment level of each staff member based regionally; and
 - (e) Full time equivalent hours of each staff member based regionally;
 - (f) For each regionally based employee, please provide the geographic location of the office?
- (3) For the date 13 March 2019, please provide the following staffing arrangements with regard to each of the Minister's departments and agencies:
- (a) Total number of staff in the department or agency;
 - (b) Total number of staff who were based regionally per department or agency;
 - (c) Position title of each staff member based regionally;
 - (d) Employment level of each staff member based regionally; and
 - (e) Full time equivalent hours of each staff member based regionally;
 - (f) For each regionally based employee, please provide the geographic location of the office?
- (4) For the date 13 March 2020, please provide the following staffing arrangements with regard to each of the Minister's departments and agencies:
- (a) Total number of staff in the department or agency;
 - (b) Total number of staff who were based regionally per department or agency;
 - (c) Position title of each staff member based regionally;
 - (d) Employment level of each staff member based regionally; and
 - (e) Full time equivalent hours of each staff member based regionally;
 - (f) For each regionally based employee, please provide the geographic location of the office?

Mr M.P. Murray replied:Department of Communities

Please refer to Legislative Assembly Question on Notice No 6147.

Sport and Recreation (WA)

- (1) (a) 150.98
 (b) 23
 (c)–(f) [See tabled paper no [3474](#).]

(2)–(4) Please refer to Legislative Assembly Question on Notice No 6139.

POLICE — SLOW DOWN, MOVE OVER

6150. Mr P.A. Katsambanis to the Minister for Police; Road Safety:

I refer to the Slow Down, Move Over (SLOMO) laws introduced in early 2018, and ask:

- (a) Since the introduction of the SLOMO laws how many infringement notices were issued in 2018, 2019, and 2020 year to date?

Mrs M.H. Roberts replied:

- (a) The Slow Down Move Over (SLOMO) laws protect roadside emergency workers attending to roadside emergencies throughout our State. The Western Australian Police Force advise in 2018, 61 infringements; in 2019, 21; and from 1 January 2020 to 26 April 2020, 2.

POLICE — DRINK-DRIVING

6153. Mr P.A. Katsambanis to the Minister for Police; Road Safety:

I refer to drink driving statistics in Western Australia, and ask:

- (a) How many breath tests were conducted in 2019;
 (b) How many breath tests have been conducted to date in 2020?

Mrs M.H. Roberts replied:

The Western Australian Police Force advise:

- (a) 2 134 880.
 (b) To 31 May 2020, 485 065.

POLICE — ADDITIONAL OFFICERS

6158. Mr P.A. Katsambanis to the Minister for Police; Road Safety:

I refer to the Government's recent announcement of 150 extra Police Officers, and ask:

- (a) Will more vehicles than originally scheduled need to be added to the police fleet to accommodate the 150 extra Police Officers;
- (b) Of the current number of police vehicles, what is the actual number of vehicles and what is the authorised number of vehicles?

Mrs M.H. Roberts replied:

The Western Australian Police Force advise:

- (a) Yes.
- (b) There are 1 503 actual vehicles and 1 475 authorised vehicles.

POLICE — ADDITIONAL OFFICERS

6164. Mr P.A. Katsambanis to the Minister for Police; Road Safety:

I refer to the Government's announcement of an extra 150 Police Officers, and ask:

- (a) Of the extra 150 Police Officers, how many will be deployed to regional police stations; and
- (b) Will new vehicles be included in the \$73.4 million announcement;
- (c) Will new vehicles need to be allocated to the 150 extra officers?

Mrs M.H. Roberts replied:

- (a) The McGowan Government is delivering an extra 150 police officers to be deployed throughout the state. This takes the number of extra police officers provided by the McGowan Government to 298. The Western Australia Police Force advises that the allocation and deployment of police officers is considered on the basis of operational need and delivery of policing to the community.
- (b)–(c) Yes.

REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT — COUNTRY LOCAL GOVERNMENT FUND

6172. Mr I.C. Blayney to the Minister for Local Government:

I refer to the media release of Tuesday, 16 January 2018 titled 'Funding to build stronger regional communities', and I ask:

- (a) Please provide a table showing a list of the 70 grants awarded, the grant each local government received, and the amount of each grant?

Mr D.A. Templeman replied:

- (a) [See tabled paper no [3472](#).]
-

