



Parliamentary Debates

(HANSARD)

FORTIETH PARLIAMENT
FIRST SESSION
2017

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, 9 August 2017

Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, 9 August 2017

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

GOLDFIELDS ARTS CENTRE

Petition

MR K.M. O'DONNELL (Kalgoorlie) [12.01 pm]: I have a petition from 2 300 petitioners that has been certified by the Clerks and is in the following terms —

To the Honourable the Speaker and Members of the Legislative Assembly of the Parliament of Western Australia in Parliament assembled.

We, the undersigned, say that the decision to discontinue funding for the Goldfields Arts Centre (GAC) is detrimental to the Kalgoorlie-Boulder, and wider Goldfields community. The Goldfields Arts Centre is not only used by Kalgoorlie-Boulder residents, but by residents of the wider Goldfields area. The GAC isn't just a performing arts centre; it is an art gallery, local dance schools use it for their classes and end of year concerts; schools use it for assemblies, concerts and awards nights; NAIDOC week is celebrated from the GAC. Various other groups lease space within the building; artists exhibit in the gallery; expos for various industries use the space, including the annual Diggers and Dealers Forum. It is a true hub for arts and culture in the Goldfields. The community demands that the State Government continues to provide funding for the Goldfields Arts Centre on an equitable basis, similar to the Albany Arts Centre.

Now we ask the Legislative Assembly to immediately reinstate ongoing funding for the Goldfields Arts Centre to enable this critical community asset to operate with certainty into the future.

[See petition 12.]

PAPER TABLED

A paper was tabled and ordered to lie upon the table of the house.

FIND CANCER EARLY PROGRAM

Statement by Minister for Health

MR R.H. COOK (Kwinana — Minister for Health) [12.03 pm]: I rise to inform members of the house of the progression of yet another McGowan government election commitment. The McGowan government believes that detecting and managing health conditions early is imperative to managing chronic diseases, saving lives and reducing costs to the health system. In 2014, 12 364 new cases of cancer were recorded among Western Australians.

During the 2017 election, we committed \$1 585 000 over four years to extend the Find Cancer Early program to more country and regional areas. The objective of the program is to increase the awareness of people living in regional and remote areas to the signs and symptoms of cancer to ensure that they seek help from a doctor earlier. This commitment has now been progressed by a variation of an existing contract for cancer prevention and early detection work. Cancer Council Western Australia will deliver the Find Cancer Early program message through partnerships with community organisations, local media, paid radio and newspaper advertisement, presentations and campaign resources across seven regions—namely, the goldfields, the wheatbelt, the great southern, Pilbara, Kimberley, the midwest and the south west. Resources will also focus on hard-to-reach audiences, specifically remote people and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people. The McGowan government's expansion of the Find Cancer Early program to more regional areas will provide education about the early signs and symptoms of bowel, lung, prostate, breast and skin cancer to try to further reduce the poorer cancer outcomes experienced by rural and regional cancer patients in Western Australia.

STATE AND LOCAL PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENT

Statement by Minister for Local Government

MR D.A. TEMPLEMAN (Mandurah — Minister for Local Government) [12.05 pm]: Before I make my brief ministerial statement, on behalf of the member for Girrawheen I would like to acknowledge the students from Kingsway Christian College in the public gallery this morning.

I rise to inform the house of the fulfilment of a further commitment of the McGowan government, with the signing and commencement of the partnership agreement between the Western Australian Local Government Association, Local Government Professionals WA and the state government. The signing of the State and Local Partnership Agreement recognises that a robust partnership is built on trust and mutual respect—two essential requirements that cultivate good governance and better decision-making across both spheres of government. It also addresses

the state's responsibility to deliver services in a coordinated way, as well as the unique strengths of each sector: the state government, with its ability to set policy and implement programs; and the presence of the local government sector in all Western Australian communities. These complementary strengths, when combined, will allow us to be more equipped to confront the major challenges facing Western Australia, as well as everyday issues affecting local communities. The agreement outlines protocols for joint consideration and consultation time frames on strategic issues, and state government policy impacting the local government sector. The partnership agreement will facilitate a cooperative and consultative working relationship between the state and local governments to achieve better outcomes for communities. It is vital that state and local government works together to deliver the best possible outcomes for Western Australian communities. We do not have to agree on everything, but the basis of trust and mutual respect will keep the channels of communication open. Both the Premier and I have served in local government. We understand it takes substantial teamwork to deliver the demands of your communities. As Minister for Local Government, I intend to be a champion for the sector and work with local governments to assist them to confront the major challenges facing them and the communities they represent. This agreement signals a new era of collaboration between the state government and the local government sector in Western Australia.

WESTERN AUSTRALIAN PRESCRIBED BURNING FORUM 2017

Statement by Minister for Emergency Services

MR F.M. LOGAN (Cockburn — Minister for Emergency Services) [12.07 pm]: Today I had the privilege of speaking at the opening of the Western Australian Prescribed Burning Forum, called The Burning Question: Now & Beyond, held in Busselton. The forum is the first of its kind in Western Australia, and recognises the important role of prescribed burning in helping to protect our communities from bushfire. The forum brings together 120 leading prescribed burning specialists from not just around Western Australia but from around Australia and the world, to share their perspectives on improving prescribed burning programs across the state of WA. Over the coming days participants will have opportunity to visit Margaret River, Gracetown and Yallingup to observe best practice and study prescribed burning challenges in the south west. At the bushfire mitigation summit several key areas were identified that could be improved, including the effective use of resources, improving knowledge, prescribed burning targets and the need for other forms of mitigation. I am hopeful that this first-of-its-kind forum will help address what is an increasingly complicated challenge that is the shared responsibility of all Western Australians.

PILBARA ELECTRICITY GRID — REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

Statement by Minister for Energy

MR B.S. WYATT (Victoria Park — Minister for Energy) [12.08 pm]: I rise to inform the house of the McGowan government's commitment to establish a fit-for-purpose regulatory framework for the Pilbara electricity grid. The Pilbara region is a significant driver of the state's economic and export performance, yet it labours under an electricity system that is fragmented, high-cost and uncompetitive. As a result, Horizon Power is the primary electricity provider to businesses and households in the region, with its costs being subsidised by the government and electricity consumers in the south west interconnected system. Third party access to the network has been an issue for some time, with Alinta Energy submitting a coverage application under the Electricity Networks Access Code in 2014, which was subsequently withdrawn in the hope of a negotiated outcome with Horizon Power. Those negotiations have failed to produce a solution, and last week Alinta submitted a fresh application for coverage.

The McGowan government will address the ongoing uncertainty by designing an appropriate regulatory framework and system operator arrangements for the Pilbara's north west interconnected system. I have asked the Public Utilities Office within the Department of Treasury to begin work on the proposed design of a new regulatory framework and associated arrangements. I expect to be in a position to take a detailed reform proposal and implementation plan to cabinet by March 2018. In developing this reform proposal, the Public Utilities Office will consult with industry and other stakeholders on how a fit-for-purpose regulatory framework can deliver better outcomes for electricity consumers in the Pilbara region and help drive further regional development.

The objective of this work is to implement a light-handed regulatory regime that facilitates fair and reasonable access by third parties to Horizon Power's electricity network in the north west interconnected system. Facilitating more open access will likely affect Horizon Power's market share and profitability in the Pilbara, as electricity consumers in the region will be the ultimate beneficiaries of the additional consumer choice that this reform will introduce.

LANGUAGES WEEK

Statement by Minister for Citizenship and Multicultural Interests

MR P. PAPALIA (Warnbro — Minister for Citizenship and Multicultural Interests) [12.10 pm]: I inform the house that Western Australia's Languages Week is in full swing right now. Languages Week is the centrepiece of the year-long Languages in the Mainstream program run by the Modern Language Teachers' Association of

WA with support from the McGowan government through the Office of Multicultural Interests. The program supports the strategy to boost language education in government schools through the Department of Education, and has featured events throughout the past 12 months to promote language learning.

Languages Week 2017 is the culmination of this program, and I hope that it will be an annual event for many years to come. Currently, more than 270 languages and dialects, including Aboriginal languages and languages from all over the world, are spoken in Western Australia. The ability to speak a language other than English in this context and, indeed, in a global context, is of immense benefit to us as individuals, communities and the state as a whole. The Languages Week initiative gives everyone an opportunity to celebrate this amazing wealth of linguistic diversity, and to think about the many benefits of learning another language.

Learning a second or third language helps us broaden our personal, social, cultural and employment opportunities. In a modern economy, linguistic knowledge and the cultural competency that comes with this knowledge are increasingly recognised as key skills that provide an advantage in an increasingly competitive market. The McGowan government is proud to support WA Languages Week and is committed to enhancing language learning in both mainstream education and the community language schools sector. To support the sector, the community languages program administered by the Office of Multicultural Interests provides funding and support to community language schools and offers language teaching outside school hours to school-age students from kindergarten to year 12. Languages Week runs from 7 to 14 August 2017 and I encourage all members of the house to investigative activities being held in schools, workplaces and communities across the state.

MINISTERIAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON YOUTH — NOMINATIONS

Statement by Minister for Youth

MR P.C. TINLEY (Willagee — Minister for Youth) [12.13 pm]: I am pleased to announce the opening of nominations for a Ministerial Advisory Council on Youth. I cannot claim sole credit for this idea. Many members will remember and have helped with the YMCA Youth Parliament that occurred here recently. I was approached by five young people and asked how they can have a continuing voice with government. A great idea is a great idea, and I quickly put the wheels in motion. Any Western Australian between the ages of 15 and 25 is welcome to nominate. The advisory council will play an essential part in informing the development of Western Australia's first youth strategy. It would hardly make sense to try to develop a strategy without input from those who will be most affected.

The advisory council will be able to discuss the issues facing young Western Australians and possible solutions. There will be two sides to a McGowan government youth strategy. The first side is providing opportunities to young people to help them excel. This could be through skills and leadership development programs that will give young people a better chance to get a job. The second is to ensure that all young people have the same opportunities.

I refuse to accept that socioeconomic and environmental issues continue to be a barrier to accessing these opportunities. I hope to achieve these goals through the use of a variety of mechanisms, including mentoring programs, partnering with the private sector, men's sheds, veterans and even peer-to-peer engagement. I look forward to the rich discussions with the advisory council and to working with them to create a strategy that will make a difference to young Western Australians.

We will be looking for a group of approximately 10 participants who represent a diverse range of youth of different ages and backgrounds. Nominations are open until 27 August 2017. I call on everyone here in this house and everyone listening to the business of this house today to encourage the young people whom they know to nominate for the advisory council and help the McGowan government make a difference to all of Western Australia's youth.

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE ORDERS (NATIONAL RECOGNITION) BILL 2017

Statement by Speaker

THE SPEAKER (Mr P.B. Watson): Attorney General, I have been advised that, as you have a very sore leg, you wanted permission to sit. I have looked at the standing orders—and the sitting orders!—and the standing orders state that you can sit in your chair if you are inconvenienced.

MR J.R. QUIGLEY (Butler — Attorney General) [12.15 pm]: That will make me look a bit old, Mr Speaker, and we do not want that sort of look in the chamber! I left my Zimmer frame outside because I did not want to give the wrong impression!

The SPEAKER: Attorney General, you have asked for permission to sit. Do you want to sit or do you want to stand?

Mr J.R. QUIGLEY: Thank you very much for your consideration, Mr Speaker, but I feel comfortable. I thank the house.

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) [12.16 pm]: I move —

That the bill be now read a second time.

In December 2015, the Council of Australian Governments agreed to establish a national cross-recognition scheme for restraining orders that relate to family and domestic violence to be known as the National Domestic Violence Order Scheme, or NDVOS. The Domestic Violence Orders (National Recognition) Bill 2017 before us is to facilitate Western Australia's participation in the NDVOS.

Once established, the NDVOS will eliminate the need to register such orders across jurisdictional boundaries; an order made in one state or territory will automatically operate across Australia. This national scheme is intended to enhance victim safety and perpetrator accountability by providing consistent, instantaneous legal protection across jurisdictional boundaries. It is also intended to spare victims the perceived time and effort associated with the existing cross-border registration process. For those victims of family and domestic violence who find themselves having to move interstate to escape their perpetrators, this will provide them with seamless legal protection on the road to starting a new life in a new place.

The introduction of a national approach is emblematic of how this nation's perception of, and response to, family and domestic violence has changed for the better in recent times. Family violence was once a dark secret, albeit a poorly kept one. To the extent that victims were protected by the law, justice responses were uneven and often inadequate. Our project of improving these responses is a work in progress, but it is symbolic of how far we have come that the safety of victims and the accountability of perpetrators will soon be the subject of a cohesive national response, which was first endorsed by ministers through the COAG process and which shifts the burden of facilitating inter-jurisdictional law enforcement from the victim to the state. The NDVOS is a national response that befits the national significance of this issue. Without wishing to detract from these sentiments, I also note that there are grounds to temper our expectations for what the national scheme will achieve, at least in its initial form. A cross-recognition system such as this will only be as effective as the information-sharing arrangements that support it. This means giving police and courts ready access to accurate information about orders made in other jurisdictions.

The commonwealth is due to deliver a dedicated information-sharing platform in late 2019. Until then, the NDVOS will rely on an interim system that depends, in part, on manual information exchange. The full potential benefits of the NDVOS will be realised only once the final information-sharing system is in place. Although there are no specific grounds for concern, major IT projects are known to be susceptible to cost and scheduling overruns. I make these observations to underscore the point that the NDVOS is a complex, ambitious scheme, and that the work of bringing it to fruition will continue well after the legislative foundations are in place.

I am pleased to advise members that Western Australia is as well placed as any jurisdiction to make the scheme work on the ground. Our courts and police already exchange information about restraining orders via an automated system. This existing infrastructure provides an excellent platform for Western Australia's participation in the national scheme. Representatives from WA Police and the Department of Justice are actively collaborating at both the local and national levels to position WA to join the scheme in step with other jurisdictions.

The NDVOS was agreed by all leaders at the Council of Australian Governments in late 2015. It is due to commence nationally on 25 November 2017—that is, White Ribbon Day, the International Day for the Elimination of Violence Against Women. Unfortunately, Western Australia is lagging behind other jurisdictions in its legislative preparations. In fact, Western Australia is now the only jurisdiction that is yet to enact enabling legislation. Failure to join the NDVOS in step with other jurisdictions on 25 November would create practical issues for the victims who will rely on the NDVOS in WA, and would certainly cause significant reputational damage to the state. Given these time constraints and the importance of this legislation, the bill needs to be endorsed by both houses of Parliament as a matter of priority. Accordingly, the government in due course will seek to have this bill considered an urgent bill.

This brings me to the substance of the bill before us, the Domestic Violence Orders (National Recognition) Bill 2017. Like corresponding laws already enacted in other jurisdictions, the bill is modelled on a national model law framework. Developed through a collaborative national process, the model law framework reflects key policy parameters approved by COAG whilst affording jurisdictions flexibility to achieve consistency with local legislation and meet local operational requirements. The objective of the framework is to achieve national reciprocity, not complete uniformity.

In summary, the bill, in conjunction with the corresponding laws in other jurisdictions, defines which domestic violence orders are recognised under the NDVOS; sets out the consequences of national recognition, including in relation to enforcement, variation and cancellation; and authorises information sharing and establishes other practical measures to support the scheme. The bill is primarily concerned with the status of non-local domestic violence orders in WA and the functions and powers of local authorities. The capacity for WA orders to be enforced, varied and cancelled in other jurisdictions is established in the corresponding laws that have been enacted by other states and territories.

The first key thing the bill does is define what orders are recognised under the national scheme. Recognition is extended to local DVOs—that is, Western Australian restraining orders—interstate DVOs and registered foreign orders. Each of these terms is defined in the bill. The sum effect of these definitions and the regulations that will support them is that the scheme will apply to restraining orders that address family and domestic violence and are made by a court or police officer in a participating Australian jurisdiction or made by a New Zealand court and registered in an Australian jurisdiction. The recognition provisions contained in part 2 need to be read in conjunction with the transitional provisions in part 6, which, among other things, limit the recognition of WA orders to those orders made on or after the day that the act commences—see clause 33. Orders made prior to commencement will not be automatically recognised, but may be declared to be recognised on the application to a court—refer to clause 38. This is in line with the position taken by most other jurisdictions.

The second key thing the bill does is define the consequences of a domestic violence order being recognised under the national scheme. A key principle underpinning the NDVOS is that a recognised order operates in all participating jurisdictions irrespective of where it was made. The bill gives effect to this principle by providing that a recognised non-local DVO may be enforced in WA as if it is a local order—refer to clause 18; that a WA law that prohibits the granting of a licence or similar to a person subject to a restraining order applies to a person subject to a recognised non-local order—refer to clause 20; and that if a recognised non-local DVO disqualifies a person from holding a firearm licence, that disqualification applies in Western Australia—refer to clause 21. More broadly, any consequences under local law that flow from the existence of a local restraining order will now also apply if a recognised non-local order is in force. To illustrate how this principle will operate, if a person commits an assault in WA and in doing so breaches a recognised non-local order, the breach will constitute a circumstance of aggravation for the purposes of section 221 of the Criminal Code of WA as if the order breached were a local order. This is achieved by clause 19, which provides that a recognised non-local DVO has the same effect as a local DVO. This deeming clause avoids the need for consequential amendments to the numerous WA laws that make reference to restraining orders.

Another key principle of the NDVOS is that a recognised order may be varied or cancelled in any participating jurisdiction, but only by a court. The bill gives effect to this principle by empowering WA courts to vary or cancel a recognised non-local order as if it were a local order—refer to clause 24; and providing that a decision of a court in another jurisdiction to vary or cancel a recognised order has effect in WA—refer to clause 12. An application to vary or cancel a non-local order will be dealt with as if it were an application to vary or cancel a local order—refer to clause 25. The bill includes safeguards to preserve procedural fairness for parties who reside outside the jurisdiction in which the court proceeding is initiated—refer to clause 26.

The third key thing that the bill is supporting is the operationalisation of the scheme. As I have already touched on, the NDVOS will require extensive information sharing between jurisdictions. Part 4 of the bill facilitates this by authorising local authorities to exchange relevant information with police and courts in other jurisdictions. In addition, clause 31 authorises WA courts and police to exchange information with a “person or body prescribed in regulations”. In practice, this regulation-making power will be used to authorise information sharing with the Australian Criminal Intelligence Commission, the commonwealth agency that will operate the dedicated NDVOS information sharing platform. The bill includes a mechanism to enable jurisdictions to produce and obtain evidence that a recognised order has been properly served in the issuing jurisdiction—refer to clause 32. This is important because such notification is a prerequisite to the enforcement of an order—refer to clause 16.

The bill contains one substantive departure from the model law framework. The model law includes a provision that would prohibit a police officer from making a police order—a short-term restraining order used in emergency situations—if the officer is aware that a nationally recognised court order is already in force. This provision has not been adopted on the basis that it unjustifiably limits the protective options that are available to victims of family violence. In an emergency situation, a police officer may not be able to obtain the full terms of the interstate order. Until this information is obtained, the order is not practically enforceable. Alternatively, the protections contained in the interstate order may be outdated and inadequate in view of recently changed circumstances. In these scenarios, the making of a police order provides critical interim protection while the court order is being obtained or strengthened as required. This is particularly true in regional and remote Western Australia.

In view of these considerations, the bill does not prevent a police officer from making a police order when a recognised interstate order is in force. It does, however, provide that a later police order will not supersede—and therefore cancel—the earlier court order. The result is that both the earlier court order and the new police order operate in parallel. This replicates the existing position under WA’s local restraining orders legislation. I note that Western Australia is not alone in omitting this provision of the model law framework; Victoria and the Northern Territory have also done so on account of similar concerns.

The introduction of this legislation is symbolic of the priority that the Labor government is giving to the prevention of family and domestic violence. This government is proud to have appointed the state’s first Minister for the Prevention of Family and Domestic Violence, Hon Simone McGurk. With the support of her fellow ministers, Minister McGurk is leading a whole-of-government response to family and domestic violence that aims to better

integrate the range of justice protections and support services that the government can offer to victims of family violence. The government's action to position WA to join the National Domestic Violence Order Scheme at the earliest possible opportunity is an important element of this fresh, proactive approach.

I commend the bill to the house.

Debate adjourned, on motion by **Ms L. Mettam**.

JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE ON END-OF-LIFE CHOICES — ESTABLISHMENT

Standing Orders Suspension — Government Business — Motion

MR D.A. TEMPLEMAN (Mandurah — Leader of the House) [12.34 pm]: I move —

That so much of the standing orders be suspended as is necessary to enable the private members' business notice of motion relating to the Joint Select Committee on End-of-Life Choices to be moved and dealt with during the time when government business has precedence.

DR M.D. NAHAN (Riverton — Leader of the Opposition) [12.35 pm]: I would like to make a few comments on the motion to suspend standing orders. I understand that the government is seeking to suspend standing orders because it wants to use government time to debate a private member's bill. No doubt the issue to be examined by the proposed Joint Select Committee on End-of-Life Choices is vital. It will deal with issues of life and death—essentially humanity. I have a few questions. First, why is this not a government-led process? The bill is being led by the member for Morley, and that is perfectly her right, but the committee will be examining a legitimate issue, and the member for Morley is also the Parliamentary Secretary to the Premier and to cabinet. I assume that the matter has been discussed in cabinet, so I would like to know, if it has been discussed in cabinet, whether cabinet took a position on the substantive aspects of the terms of reference—in other words, is it a cabinet-led process?

Mr P. Papalia: Is this about the suspension, or isn't it?

Dr M.D. NAHAN: No, the suspension of standing orders motion arises solely because debate on a private member's bill will be taking place during government time. I am asking: why is this not part of the government process? I think that is a legitimate question.

Mr D.A. Templeman: I will answer it.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: I am sure the Leader of the House will answer that, particularly given the member for Morley's executive role, both as a Parliamentary Secretary to the Premier and as she sits in cabinet, obviously. I think that an issue of such importance, as this matter is, would need cabinet support.

Victoria has just gone through and finished a similar process. We are starting from a broader point, and I assume that we will address the same set of issues that were addressed in Victoria, but in Victoria it was a government-led process and there was a standing committee. I respect the need to have both houses involved and to therefore have a joint committee—that is the appropriate place—but I wanted to know why the government was not directing this. Why is it not the government, first, directing it and giving the terms of reference for a joint select committee? I would also like to know whether cabinet has taken a position on the matter? Has cabinet discussed the matter? Has cabinet given its imprimatur to the terms of reference?

We will participate in the process, and we will put forward some amendments, which we will address in the substantive debate after this motion to suspend standing orders. There are two sections and I ask members to consider those two sections. That is the major issue. The motion is to suspend standing orders so that we can debate a motion on a very relevant issue, but it has to be treated very carefully. I just want to make some comments. A lot of the legislation that we are going to debate after a six-week recess is not very heavyweight. It appears to me that the government has not put a very large legislative agenda in front of us to warrant five months' work after coming into government—but that is a side issue.

I would like to know, first, has cabinet discussed this issue; second, has cabinet been involved in the drafting of the terms of reference, the selection of the Labor members on it, which we have been provided; and, has the government considered setting up a joint select committee under the terms of reference provided by the government? In particular, given the member for Morley's executive role, I think that would have been the correct way to do it. If the government has not done that, why not?

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr R.S. Love): Just before the Leader of the House speaks, as he has moved this motion, him speaking will terminate the debate. Are there any other members who would like to speak to this motion?

MR P.A. KATSAMBANIS (Hillarys) [12.39 pm]: I also want to speak to this motion. I think it is highly unusual that, in government business time, it is being proposed that we debate a private members' motion that was moved by somebody who is effectively a member of the executive as well. It is important because we are dealing with an extraordinarily sensitive issue. As the Leader of the Opposition indicated, the opposition is keen to participate in this process, to participate in the proposed committee that would be set up under this motion, and to fully examine

all the issues relating to the possible introduction of euthanasia legislation in Western Australia. We want to look at the consequences and the potential impacts it will have on the community, and perhaps look at the sorts of safeguards that would need to be introduced, and also look at all the issues that are appearing in jurisdictions in which similar legislation has already been introduced. In some jurisdictions it has been in operation for enough time to be able to draw some conclusions. That would work best if it were to be done on a bipartisan and multi-party basis. It would work best if it were to be initiated by an actual private members' resolution, as has happened in many other states. The fact that the motion has been moved by the secretary to the cabinet, the member for Morley, and has been moved during government time, may indicate to the public and to the Parliament that this is a government proposal. There is nothing wrong with that; governments often refer matters to committees, but if the government is to establish a committee for this particular purpose, it is best to do it, from the outset, with absolute and utter clean hands and without prejudging the process.

We are not debating the merits of a committee at all, at this stage; we will do that at the appropriate time. We know that the government has an overwhelming majority and that, on the numbers, it can do this today; but we, as an opposition, are flagging caution around this sort of process. There are significant community concerns about the area that the proposed inquiry and committee will look into. There is no community unanimity; there is significant polarisation between areas of our community around this topic already, before the inquiry looks into it. We, as legislators, should be looking at bringing the community together, actually trying to avoid polarisation, having a mature discussion about things, and looking at all the issues.

In many ways, an ideal process for this would be if Parliament had jointly sponsored motions, to indicate that unanimity from the start, and to indicate the good faith and goodwill of the Parliament. Bringing this motion into the house in this way and then adopting it as government business risks—I say “risks”; I am not indicating that it is so—the perception that this is a government initiative. It risks the perception that the government has a clearly predetermined agenda on this topic. Even before the committee is established and the inquiry is on foot, there are question marks about the government's intention. If the government's intention is to introduce legislation in this area, it should do so. Government time is to introduce legislation and debate it. If that is the intention of the government, it should do so. It should not use the process of government business to somehow or other pretend that this is a genuine inquiry. Private members' business should be allowed to be dealt with in private members' business time and government time should be taken up by government time—government bills. The opposition seeks clarity here. We seek clarity whether this is government business or not. Parliament being asked to endorse a government initiative is a very different kettle from the Parliament itself using its own processes—which it has, and it uses from time to time—to establish a committee and commence an inquiry. They are two very different processes.

Clearly, if the government is embracing this, this is government business. This is a government motion brought on in government time to lead to a particular governmental policy outcome. The question is whether the government already has a policy position on this. If it has a policy position on this, it is certainly not a unanimous policy on government benches, and nor should it be. Governments are able to have internal debates and discussions—oppositions are too—but the government should not pretend that this is some sort of organically developed parliamentary inquiry. It has happened in other jurisdictions. Victoria is a classic example. Its crossbench introduced the motion to have an inquiry. There was an inquiry and then that process ended up going where it went in Victoria. That is clearly not the case here. This is not coming from the crossbench or from the opposition; this is coming from government. This is a government motion moved in government time. There is a clear perception—perception is nine-tenths of reality—that the government already has a policy in this area that effectively makes the inquiry either completely irrelevant and useless or, at very best, makes it narrow. If the government already has a policy position in this very vital and important area, all the committee will really be inquiring into is the nuts and bolts of how. The question whether we ought to go down this path seems to have already been answered in the eyes of the government. It should not hoodwink the public. What the government will do today—it has the numbers to do it—sends a very clear message that the government has already arrived at a policy position and is creating a parliamentary inquiry partly to give it the veneer of cross-party respectability and partly to inquire into the nuts and bolts of how best to go down this policy path that it has embarked upon. I tend to think that that is not a good thing. Others would probably use stronger language, but I do not think that that is a good thing for Parliament generally. It debases the role of Parliament and of parliamentary committees. I will have more to say on the substantive motion when we debate it. Couching the motion in these terms and bringing it in as government business is going down a preordained path; it is tying at least one hand of the Parliament behind its back. I am extraordinarily disappointed that that is happening because it is quite clear that some viewpoints are not welcome in this debate. Once again, the government is attempting to have half a debate in which the legitimate voices of those who may have concerns about the policy direction are silenced and any inquiry report will essentially be a whitewash to cover up the fact that the government has already determined a pathway it wants to go down, and the parliamentary inquiry is essentially a fig leaf covering up the fact that this is government policy. I urge the government to reconsider the way it is treating the parliamentary inquiry process. If the government wants to have a legitimate parliamentary inquiry that looks at all the options, it should move the motion outside government business time, which should be used to debate government legislation.

Mr D.A. Templeman: Do you want to give up all your opposition private members' time? Then you'll bellyache about that.

Mr P.A. KATSAMBANIS: If the government does not have any legislation, it should go and get some. There is plenty of urgent business to be done. That is all I will say on that. I urge the government to reconsider the process that it has gone down, because it is leaving a perception that the pathway is already preordained and that the findings of the inquiry already seem to be guided down one pathway. That is not open debate; that is not what parliamentary inquiries ought to be all about. Hopefully, we can step back for a moment and reconsider how we do that to send the right perception to the community that all viewpoints will be legitimately considered, and then we can have a mature debate about a topic that, as I said right from the outset, we as parliamentarians should be aiming to bring people together on, rather than precipitating the existing divisions in the community.

MR C.J. BARNETT (Cottesloe) [12.53 pm]: I have been here a long time. In the last year of the previous Parliament, the Labor Party in opposition was suspending standing orders once or twice a week. It was an abuse of the process, but that is history.

Mr F.M. Logan: What?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: It was; Labor suspended them all the time. Every week the opposition would suspend standing orders. Now it is in government. In a motion suspending standing orders for any significant issue—the issue of euthanasia is clearly significant in the community—for no government member to stand up and make the case for suspending standing orders is absolutely extraordinary. I have never seen anything like that in the 27 years I have been a member of Parliament. The Leader of the House simply stood up, read out the motion and sat down. No case has been made at all for why standing orders should be suspended. Is any member opposite actually going to stand up and make the case for suspending standing orders?

Mr D.A. Templeman: The Premier will.

Mr M. McGowan: I am happy to.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: Is the Premier going to do that? He was not in here.

Mr M. McGowan: You've got the call.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I know, and I am making my point.

Mr M. McGowan: Make your points.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I shall, because this is unprecedented. The member who moves the suspension of standing orders should always make the case, but he did not do it. The questions already raised by this side of the house are important. Did cabinet endorse this motion that has been moved by the member for Morley? No answer? Fair enough. Did cabinet discuss the motion moved by the member for Morley? No answer? Fair enough. Did cabinet select the names of the people nominated for it? No answer?

Ms R. Saffioti: We're not telling you anyway.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: There is a response: "I'm not telling you anyway." That is the response from a cabinet minister. She will not tell me anyway.

Ms R. Saffioti: You don't release business cases that were in cabinet five years ago.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: We are talking about euthanasia, which is a very important issue to many people in our community, and it does not deserve to be trivialised. I suspect from the silence opposite and from having been in this place for a long time that there would certainly have been a discussion in cabinet. There is nothing particularly wrong with that but the point that has been made by members before me is: what position has cabinet taken?

If the government were genuine in this, it would treat it as a private member's bill, as it was moved by the member for Morley. If it thinks that there will not be adequate time in private members' time to debate it, the appropriate motion would have been to extend private members' time so that it could genuinely be treated as a private member's bill. The government is confusing this issue and I put forward—I think this point has already been made—that, in effect, this is a de facto Labor Party bill. The government is not willing to tell the community that this is the Labor Party position. Maybe it is not a formally adopted position, but I suspect that the government has agreed that it wants to pursue the issue of euthanasia. It recognises that some members of the Labor Party would have a moral objection to that so it has given them an escape clause, which is, in a sense, appropriate. Liberal Party members do not need that because Liberal Party members always have the right to vote how they see an issue. The government should be honest with the electorate. If it wants to pursue euthanasia—many people in the community would support that—it should be honest; it has brought it in through a private member's bill. I know that the private member concerned is very committed to this cause. The government should treat this Parliament properly and, if it wants to do it, it should leave it as a private member's bill and extend or create additional hours of private members' time to treat it properly. It cannot do both; it cannot have a private member's bill that is effectively sponsored as a government bill.

Mr D.A. Templeman: It's a motion.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: The motion is to suspend standing orders and the government has not argued for that.

Mr D.A. Templeman: It's not a bill.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: No, it is a motion. But motions are the same thing in many respects.

Mr D.A. Templeman: No, they're not.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: Do not get into triviality.

Several members interjected.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: Euthanasia is important to the people of this state. Do not make fun of it.

Ms R. Saffioti: You are making a mockery of this.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: No, I am not.

The government has a responsibility for making a case for suspending standing orders. It brought it in as a private member's bill but now it is treating it as a pseudo government bill. It should make up its mind and treat the process properly. If the government expects us on this side to show good faith on what is an important social issue, it should show good faith in the way it deals with it. Is it government policy or is it a private member's solely created initiative?

Mr D.A. Templeman: Absolutely.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: It is government policy, is it?

Mr D.A. Templeman: No. It's a private member's motion.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: So why is it being done in government time if it is a private member's bill?

Mr D.A. Templeman: For the same reason that you allowed Graham Jacobs to bring in a motion of his willing.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: He brought it on in private members' time and we extended private members' time. Does this government see what it has done now? By this action it has immediately politicised the issue of euthanasia.

MR M. McGOWAN (Rockingham — Premier) [12.58 pm]: I am sorry that I was not here for the earlier part of this debate but I have just been briefed on what was said. I want to outline to members opposite what has occurred here. The member for Morley was in contact with the Leader of the Opposition in writing, as I understand it, in early July to propose a way forward on this issue. As I understand it, she has also had discussions with members of the Parliamentary Liberal Party and, I think, the Parliamentary National Party so that there would be a cooperative approach to setting up a committee to examine this issue, which I thought was the right way to go about this issue. She consulted me about that and I thought that was the right way to go about it. It is obviously a controversial issue; everyone here has their views. Some people, no doubt, are very fixed in their views. Other people may well be swayed by the debate or the nature of any bill should one subsequently come forward. The member for Morley was in contact before the parliamentary break on the basis that after the break a motion would be put forward to establish a select committee that would comprise members from across the parties and from both houses to examine the issues and listen to community feedback across Western Australia, and at the end of that process potentially come up with a bill that the Parliament could examine. Personally, I think that is the right way to go forward with this issue; I thought that was appropriate. I will run through the various points that I am advised were made by members of the Liberal Party. The first was: why did the member for Morley give notice to move a motion for the establishment of a joint select committee? She is a person who has served in both chambers. She understands the nuances of the upper house—many of us do not—and she has served in this chamber now for five months and so has that connection between both houses. She knows the people in the upper house and can work across the two houses. As we all know, sometimes members in this place do not know the people in the upper house particularly well and we do not understand the way that place works. I thought she was an appropriate person. She is not a minister, so she does not have that responsibility; however, she is a senior person in the Parliament in many ways, with her current responsibilities and the fact that she was in both houses.

The second point was: why is it being conducted now on Wednesday at midday? Again, that is because the government did not want to take up the opposition's time. I suspect that if we had come here at four o'clock today and next Wednesday and taken opposition time to deal with this issue, members opposite would be very angry—probably rightfully so—because they would want to raise whatever matters they see as issues they can take up against the government. We did not want to take their time. We thought it was appropriate that the opposition had its allocated time to raise the issues over which it wanted to prosecute the government politically and we did not take that away from them. I am a bit befuddled that the opposition is arguing now that we should take their time to do this. If they want us to take their time—if that is their argument—we are more than happy to adjourn the debate now and bring it back on at four o'clock. If they would like the house to sit until such time as the matter is dealt with tonight, I am more than happy to sit here until it is dealt with. All members opposite have to do at the end of my speech is to stand up and say that they want us to do that. We will adjourn the debate and move it to four o'clock today and sit tonight until whatever point in time it is finally decided.

In relation to the idea that this has never been done before, I point out that in the course of the last few years what is called government time was used—for new members, “government time” is now—to debate two private members’ bills, one introduced by Dr Graham Jacobs, the Limitation Amendment (Child Sexual Abuse Actions) Bill in 2015, and one introduced by Shane Love, the member for Moore, the Local Government Amendment (Regional Subsidiaries) Bill in 2014. Government time was used for two private members’ bills during the last four years.

They are the arguments. I know that people want to play politics with anything and everything. This issue is out there in the community. It has been raised with me, particularly by an older cohort of people who are concerned about their end-of-life choices. I personally agree with them; other people in my caucus do not. That is why we have a very fixed decision that they have a conscience vote on this issue and every person on this side of the house can make their own decision on how they want to vote. If they do not want to vote for the establishment of the committee, I suppose they will not. If a bill relating to end of life subsequently comes forward and they do not want to vote for it, they will not. I think that is a fair position; that is Labor’s position. The Liberal Party and National Party will probably end up with the same way forward because it is not really an issue that divides people ideologically in any way: it is an issue of people’s own morality and their views of life and death. It is entirely fair that we establish a committee so we get the points of view of the entire community and every member of Parliament so that the Parliament itself comes forward at the end of the day with legislation that may well have broad support. That is what I would like to occur.

I did not want the motion to end up this way with all of this debate. That was not the intention and I really do not understand it. I hoped that this might be an issue on which there was broad agreement; it is a matter of public importance and the Parliament should join forces to come up with a way forward. There will be Liberal Party members and National Party members on the committee. Who knows, there might be Pauline Hanson’s One Nation members and Greens members on the committee. I think that is entirely fair and reasonable. I really do not understand why this has happened. There is nothing more to it, but we are happy to move the motion to four o’clock today if that is what the opposition would like and we will sit tonight until the matter is resolved because that is what the member for Cottesloe, the most senior member of this Parliament, has just suggested. We are more than happy —

Mr C.J. Barnett: No I didn’t; I didn’t say that at all. I didn’t suggest we deal with it tonight. I didn’t suggest that at all.

Mr M. McGOWAN: I am more than happy to. Member for Cottesloe, we are not trying to undermine the Liberal Party, undermine you, or anything. All we are trying to do is deal with an issue that is out in the community. If the opposition does not want Parliament to deal with it, then it should say so, but I do not think that coming up with these arguments, which are clearly wrong, is a way to prosecute it.

MRS L.M. HARVEY (Scarborough — Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [1.05 pm]: I rise to clarify some of the opposition’s concerns with this process. To clarify what the member for Cottesloe said, if this is a government policy and it is a government-driven agenda, why is legislation not being drafted, brought to this place and referred to a parliamentary committee in the normal parliamentary process?

As a private member’s bill —

Several members interjected.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Can I finish my remarks? For the minister’s information, this is a particularly important issue for me and I would like to have my say.

Point of Order

Mr S.K. L’ESTRANGE: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition is on her feet trying to make her points and cabinet ministers on the front bench are interjecting.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr T.J. Healy): Yes. Thank you. Please allow the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to finish her remarks without interjections.

Debate Resumed

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: This is a really important issue that goes to the heart of the values of people in our community and, as such, I have no objection to a parliamentary committee examining it. The opposition is curious because the Premier has said in the community and the media that he supports voluntary euthanasia. Normally if the leader of the government supports a particular position, they will bring the position to cabinet and talk about bringing legislation to Parliament for debate. If the legislation needs referral to a standing committee of Parliament—many are already established—then that is the process. If it is a controversial issue, it may well go through that process; the legislation will be drafted, then debated in the chamber and referred to a standing committee of the Legislative Assembly. The legislation will then be referred to the Legislative Council where it will go through a similar process and come back to this place. The legislation will then either be passed or not.

That is the process. Ordinarily, if the leader of a state has a particular policy position on an issue, it will go through the cabinet process, and if cabinet agrees, the legislation will move from there. The opposition is curious about this process and my concern is that the community is very cynical about political processes. It deserves to be cynical because when a leader has a particular view about a divisive issue, the best thing to do as a politician is to pack it off to a committee and try to share the decision-making process with a cross-section of Parliament. This will take away an individual's decisiveness and mean their policy position does not starkly stand out to be criticised by the community. That is why we are dubious of this process.

It is the government's prerogative to suspend standing orders to debate this motion today. The government has the time and I do not have a problem with that process. It is appropriate to suspend standing orders to debate the establishment of a select committee. Ordinarily, a government-sponsored bill will consume government time and the government can say it will make time for private members' business to take precedence over government business to debate particular issues. However, as the member for Cottesloe said, if this motion is not a government-driven agenda, why not suspend standing orders to allow an extra hour or two hours for private members' business in addition to the time the opposition would ordinarily expect—three hours on Wednesday—to allow for this motion to be debated in an appropriate fashion in an extended private members' business? This is not a government-sponsored motion but a motion driven by a member in this place. As we have said, any member has the opportunity to bring these motions and bills forward in private members' time. We think it would be more appropriate to have a motion to suspend standing orders to extend private members' business and to allocate that time to the member for Morley to put her motion on establishing a select committee to this place. It is curious that we have a Premier with a view on this issue, a private member's motion that is being supported in government time, but the government does not appear to want to take ownership of the establishment of this select committee. That is the point that the opposition is making.

It is a really important issue and I would expect that if government-sponsored legislation to establish new laws around end-of-life choices was brought to this place, it would likely encounter vigorous debate and be referred to a standing committee of the Legislative Assembly and one in the other place. That is a general process. We are highlighting that this is a peculiar process and that other options were available to the government. Yes, when we were in government, we allowed debate on private members' bills in government time, but that was because the government had some sympathy with and, indeed, some support for the matters being debated. I was particularly proud to be part of a Parliament that allowed debate on the member for Kimberley's bill for the recognition of Indigenous people in the Constitution. That was a private member's bill. The government supported the intent of the bill and allocated government time to debate it. That is a different matter entirely. The government has not said whether it is supportive of new legislation on end-of-life choices—the Premier has; instead, it has decided to establish this joint select committee.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr T.J. Healy): Members!

Mr P. Papalia: Did you move this, Bill?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: It is a motion, member.

Mr P. Papalia: I was talking to Bill Marmion.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Warnbro! The Deputy Leader of the Opposition is giving her remarks. Member for Warnbro, if you wish to contribute afterwards, you will have the opportunity.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I will not labour the point. It is great to see government members in hysterics over a very serious issue.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members!

Mr P. Papalia interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Warnbro, I am going to call you to order for the first time. Can you please be quiet whilst the member is giving her contribution.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I have no further comments, except, in conclusion, to highlight that we believe it is a peculiar process around an important issue that the Premier is clearly passionate about. That is all I have to say. I think I have made my point quite clearly that there are other processes that the government could have put in place to allow for debate on the member for Morley's motion. The government chose a different path notwithstanding the Premier's clear view on this issue. We will move on. The Leader of the Opposition has some further comments—he cannot speak. On behalf the opposition I will conclude our remarks and we will move to debate the substantive motion.

MS R. SAFFIOTI (West Swan — Minister for Transport) [1.14 pm]: I had not intended to speak in this debate because I thought that there had been some discussions across the chamber and that a path forward had been agreed on in some form. We are asking what is the proposed way forward; that is, what proposal has been outlined by the opposition? I understand that discussions are being held now, but this was never meant to be a political debate; this is a procedural matter about establishing a committee to investigate a very serious issue in the community. Select committees have often been used for this purpose because these issues are very sensitive in the community and we want to make sure that there is broad representation and consultation. This is a serious procedural matter. We do not actually understand why the opposition has chosen about four different positions on this matter. It is obvious that we really do not know whom from the opposition we should negotiate with to get these matters sorted because it is obvious that the manager of opposition business is sometimes not consulted about the opposition's negotiating strategies.

We have brought forward a very clear matter. We believe that this is an issue of community concern and that community consultation is required. A select committee has often been used in the past to discuss matters of sensitivity and significant community interest. This was never intended to be a political debate. I am not sure why the other side chose to do this. We could have dealt with it by now and the process could be underway. My understanding from the Leader of the House is that there is now an agreed path forward.

Mr D.A. Templeman: We hope; it might change.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: We think there is because, again, we are not quite sure what happens on the other side of the house. I think the opposition is still trying to sort out who is doing what on its side. I understand that there is now an agreed way forward so I will let the Leader of the House deal with it.

MR D.A. TEMPLEMAN (Mandurah — Leader of the House) [1.16 pm] — in reply: For just on an hour we have debated a motion that was moved to suspend standing orders. I remind everyone in the house that notice of this motion has been on the books for some time; it has been on the notice paper for some time. This is nothing new. A motion for the establishment of a joint select committee on end-of-life choices has not been foisted on the Parliament. That is the first point.

The second point, as the Premier highlighted clearly, is that there is no conspiracy here. We want—that is, I think, all of us here—the opportunity to debate whether we should establish a committee to inquire into an issue that raises a range of views by many people in our community. The important thing is that it is done in a respectful way to allow us to have a debate. I have heard a number of comments from across the chamber about the member for Morley and whether this is a government bill; and, if so, whether that is why it is being debated in government time. There has also been discussion about consultations and comments. I remind members that the motion before us is to suspend standing orders to allow us to debate the setting up of a select committee. That select committee will have representation from the Legislative Assembly and the Legislative Council. In my view, we in Western Australia are in a new unique position to now look at this issue. We know that in other states of Australia the issue has been debated through a process similar to—in fact, almost exactly the same as the one that we are seeking to put forward to both chambers of Parliament. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition asked why we are not packing it off to a committee. That is actually what we are doing; that is what the motion says. It is the intention of the Parliament of Western Australia to establish a select committee that will inquire under the proposed terms of reference. There may be some discussion about the terms of reference, but that is exactly what we are doing.

Several members interjected.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: No, no.

In terms of packing it off to a committee, it is exactly what the motion reads, and we are doing exactly what the opposition is asking us to do. We are sending it to a committee. It is different from introducing legislation to this place up front. That is what happened when Hon Robin Chapple introduced legislation into the other place that never got here for debate. This chamber never had the opportunity to debate this very important issue, as highlighted by the member for Cottesloe and others. As a private member, not just a minister, I believe I should have that opportunity. That is what we are doing. We are proposing what the opposition wants to see achieved.

The other thing is that there was comment earlier about this somehow setting a precedent; that somehow only this government was introducing legislation or introducing a debate in government time from a private member. As the Premier highlighted very clearly, it already happened under the Barnett Liberal–National government. The former member for Roe, Graham Jacobs, had, again a very important bill that he championed called the Limitation Amendment (Child Sexual Abuse Actions) Bill 2015. He championed that bill because he was passionate about it. He negotiated with, I assume, the former Premier to ensure that that bill was debated during government time as a private member.

Mr C.J. Barnett: No, just listen to me for one second.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: Yes, but —

Mr C.J. Barnett: We approved Graham Jacobs to introduce his bill. He was given 15 minutes to do a second reading speech only, no debate on it.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: So it happened!

Mr C.J. Barnett: No, he just read it in. He —

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: Did the former government's cabinet discuss that? Did the former government's cabinet discuss that?

Mr C.J. Barnett: No, we allowed him time only to do his second reading speech. Only his second reading speech.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: What the member for Moore? The same —

Mr C.J. Barnett: Same thing: second reading speech only.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: The Local Government Amendment (Regional Subsidiaries) Bill 2014. And what have we done? We are putting forward a motion to establish a select committee. It is not legislation. It is not.

Mr P.A. Katsambanis: It is. You're debating and voting on it.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: It is not legislation, it is a motion, and I am sure we will have a debate about this.

Can we just be very clear: the member for Morley has every right to raise this. In fact, members who were here when she made her inaugural speech in this place in May will remember that she raised the issue. Because like many people in this place, and many, many people outside of this place, it is an issue that she feels passionately about. So she went to the caucus, as is the appropriate process for the Labor Party—I am sure the Liberal Party has a similar process—and that is where the decision was made to allow her to put forward a private member's motion; the caucus agreed to let her do it. Yes, we know that it is a sensitive issue in this community, but for goodness sake I think we have waited a long time for this opportunity. I think our community expects us to have this debate. That is why we are, in the words of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, packing it off to a select committee—a committee established by the Parliament with representation from the Legislative Assembly and the Legislative Council—to then conduct an inquiry under the terms of reference and report its findings to both chambers.

Several members interjected.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: That is what we are doing and that is what it is. I hope the opposition understands that to be the intent.

Question put and passed.

Amendment to Notice of Motion

MS A. SANDERSON (Morley — Parliamentary Secretary) [1.25 pm]: I seek leave to move my motion in amended form.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr T.J. Healy): Member for Morley, if you could please briefly explain what you will add.

Ms A. SANDERSON: Members, as discussed with both opposition parties, I will be adding membership to the committee through this amendment.

Leave granted.

Motion

Ms A. SANDERSON: I move —

- (1) That a joint select committee of the Legislative Assembly and Legislative Council on end-of-life choices be established.
- (2) That the committee inquire into and report on the need for laws in Western Australia to allow citizens to make informed decisions regarding their own end-of-life choices. In particular, the committee should —
 - (a) assess the practices currently being utilised within the medical community to assist a person to exercise their preferences for the way they want to manage their end of life, including the role of palliative care;
 - (b) review the current framework of legislation, proposed legislation and other relevant reports and materials in other Australian states and territories, and overseas jurisdictions; and
 - (c) consider what type of legislative change may be required, including an examination of any federal laws that may impact such legislation.

- (3) That the joint select committee consist of eight members, of whom —
 - (a) four will be members of the Assembly; and
 - (b) four will be members of the Council.
- (4) The standing orders of the Legislative Assembly relating to standing and select committees will be followed as far as they can be applied.
- (5) That the joint select committee report to both houses by 30 June 2018.
- (6) That the Legislative Council be requested to agree to a similar resolution.
- (7) That, subject to the Legislative Council agreeing to the above paragraphs, the following Legislative Assembly members be appointed —
 - (a) the member for Baldivis;
 - (b) the member for Morley;
 - (c) the member for Mount Lawley; and
 - (d) the member for South Perth.

I move this motion today to present the community and Parliament with a path forward on this very important issue. The issue of voluntary assisted dying is both difficult to deal with and deeply felt on both sides. Despite evidence of strong support in the community for legislation on voluntary assisted dying, there has been a deep reluctance of governments and Parliaments to tackle this issue that arises again and again. The community is demanding that we deal with this issue. The motion that I moved today proposes the establishment of a cross-party joint select committee that will look into not only the issue of voluntary assisted dying but also the role of palliative care.

My experience in the other place and my relatively short experience on committees have given me an understanding and appreciation of the value of the committee process, which is essentially the major gateway for the Parliament and the public to interact and for the public to give their views on important issues and for the Parliament to then consider them. That is why I have taken the approach of moving a motion to establish a joint select committee and not limited it to a standing committee of either house.

I understand from discussions behind the Chair that the opposition will be participating in the committee. I have taken a no-surprises approach to this issue because it is important. I have had discussions with the leaders of other parties in this place over the last six to eight weeks. The tactics demonstrated by the opposition today have come as a big surprise and I am disappointed. I genuinely hope that we can move forward in this debate in an open, honest and respectful manner.

Many in our community have been calling for a number of years for the WA Parliament to debate this issue. The loudest call to action recently came from Dr Clive Deverall, who ended his life on election day earlier this year. I want to acknowledge Clive's wife, Noreen Fynn, in the Speaker's gallery today. Clive was a highly respected veteran of Western Australia's healthcare sector. He was head of the Cancer Council Western Australia for more than 20 years, he established Palliative Care Western Australia and worked in cancer and health consumer advocacy roles for many years.

Clive was first diagnosed with cancer in 1994. Over more than 20 years, he had a number of cancer diagnoses and managed secondary health conditions as a result of these. A believer in and practitioner of palliative care, he truly understood the good that palliative care can do. Sadly, he was also a living example of its limitations. Noreen describes Clive's last months as a living hell, with uncontrollable neuropathic pain. Despite efforts to maintain his fitness and health, an adverse reaction to medication also left him with permanent lung damage, insomnia, crippling headaches and cramps and suffering from severe medication side effects. Clive ended his life on election day in a lonely and brutal way. It was a message to us. In the note he left, he said, "Suicide is legal; euthanasia is not." Clive, like many others before him who have taken similar drastic actions, wanted a choice. Committing suicide becomes a lonely but also public matter for something that could be a private and intimate event with the support of loved ones.

I did not know Clive, but I do not think that we, as parliamentarians, can ignore his message. Whether or not individuals support the substantive issue, we owe it to the community to, at the very least, explore the options to manage our end-of-life care. Our population is increasing and advances in medicine and technology mean that many more of us are living longer. Despite this, we are seeing increases in chronic and terminal illnesses.

There have been nearly 30 attempts to legislate for voluntary assisted dying in Australia since the Northern Territory passed its laws in 1994. In Tasmania in 2009 and 2013, private members' bills were defeated. More recently, in May the Tasmania Parliament debated the Voluntary Assisted Dying Bill. In New South Wales, there have been multiple attempts by members to legislate, with the first in 2001 and then six further attempts. Current proposed legislation before that Parliament has been steered by a cross-party working group, which is

currently taking submissions on a draft bill. South Australia has a long history of activism and legislative attempts, with 15 private members' bills since 1995. Most recently, a vote in November 2016 was defeated by a single vote when the Speaker of the house, Michael Atkinson, cast his vote with the noes. As most of us know, the Northern Territory legislated for voluntary euthanasia as far back as 1995, but it was ultimately overruled by federal legislation. As a result, territories are no longer to legislate on this matter. In Victoria, previous attempts at introducing private members' bills have also been unsuccessful. In 2015, the Legislative Council referred an inquiry to the Legal and Social Issues Committee. The Victorian government supported 44 of the 49 recommendations and identified a number that required further work. As such, it set up a ministerial advisory panel, which delivered its interim report in May this year. It also established End of Life Care Victoria as an entity. This approach has been by far the most considered and open process we have seen to date on this issue.

In Western Australia, six private members' bills have been defeated in Parliament, with the first in 1997 and the most recent in 2010. Currently in Western Australia, the Guardianship and Administration Act provides some clarification on whether a doctor can be held criminally liable for providing pain relief that hastens death. The act provides for advance health directives, as well as enduring powers of guardianship. These have been an important step in determining end-of-life care. However, the current legal framework in WA exposes healthcare professionals, families and carers to prosecution. Strong anecdotal evidence suggests that the practice of assisted dying for terminally ill patients is occurring in an unregulated environment. Late last year, an ABC Vote Compass found that there was 75 per cent support for voluntary assisted dying laws across the country. Interestingly, there was no pattern in age, gender, city, region or education level. Recent Newspoll results have support as high as 82 per cent. Despite this support and numerous failed attempts, politicians and Parliaments have been deeply reluctant to examine this issue further. In fact, if this motion is successful, it will be the first full examination in Western Australia of its kind. There are lots of reasons for this. It is a hard issue and a personal issue. For many people it is an issue about faith and ethical dilemmas, for grief and loss. But one of the main reasons is that it is divisive within the major political parties and therefore is seen as somewhere we just do not go. With this motion today, I propose we put that aside and we go there. We owe it to those medical practitioners, those suffering terminal illness—and those who will in the future—and their families to look closely at this issue and provide direction to Parliament and the community. History demonstrates that private members' bills lobbed into the Parliament without broad consultation are often deeply flawed and fail. I believe we owe the community and those who are suffering chronic and terminal illness the opportunity to contribute and engage in a process that will explore a range of views. With the very specific purpose of investigating end-of-life choices, this cross-party joint select committee will provide the greatest opportunity for all stakeholders to contribute to the inquiry. Although the committee will be cross-party by nature, it is also important that it be reflective of the composition of Parliament. An eight-member committee is a large committee and it is on this basis that the motion proposes three government members and one non-government member from the Assembly. The other place will make its own determination on composition, and the intention is to put forward one government member in the other place to accommodate a broader range of parties there.

We have seen cross-party select committees achieve great outcomes—most recently in the previous Parliament, with the recognition of Aboriginals in our Constitution. It was a genuine, functional and cooperative working group across the parties that had a fantastic outcome in the end. I genuinely hope for that in this process. Although views diverge on this issue, there are principles that we all share: respect for the rights and freedoms that our society provides us and the ability for us to hold fundamentally different views, and compassion for those who are nearing the end of their lives, particularly for those who have a medical condition that will shorten their lives and inflict significant suffering. It is with these principles of respect and compassion that I move this motion and seek the support of Parliament to establish this joint select committee.

MR J.E. McGRATH (South Perth) [1.37 pm]: I rise to make a few remarks as I have been nominated by my party to be a member of the Joint Select Committee on End-of-Life Choices. Clive Deverall's wife spoke to me last week; he was a constituent of mine. It was a very sad occasion on polling day when Clive took his life after a long battle with cancer. He wanted to send a message to the community that he felt was not getting through. I have agreed to be on this committee. I do not have any preconceived ideas one way or the other. I know the debate that has been out there. I have been on committees a number of times since I have been in this place, about 12 years, so I know a little about the committee process. My idea of the committee process is that a group of members of Parliament get together and work together to flesh out a situation or a problem and try to come up with an outcome or a solution that can be brought back to Parliament. That is the way that I will be approaching my contribution to this committee. I must admit that I have been a little concerned about the composition of the committee. To have just two Liberal members on the committee defeats what committee work is really all about, especially with something like this. At the end of the day, any decision on euthanasia will be made by all members of this Parliament, both in this chamber and in the upper house. It will not be decided on party lines; it will be decided by a conscience vote, as has been mentioned, on both sides. The government members will have a conscience vote, as will members of the opposition. For that reason, I am a little concerned that there is not a broad enough cross-section of the membership. There are four members from this chamber on the committee—

three from the government and one from the opposition. I know the membership from the Legislative Council is yet to be decided and voted on, but the indication is that there will be one Labor member, one Liberal member and another two spots. I would be very surprised if this committee went forward without Hon Robin Chapple being a member, considering the work he has done in the past, so I would say that the third member will be a Greens member. I am led to believe that the Nationals want to be involved in this debate, but there is only one spot left. What about the One Nation members? What about the member from the Liberal Democrats? I know this is difficult because we do not really want a committee of 10 or 12 people—the smaller the committee the better—but it needs to be looked at in this situation. In Victoria I believe the matter was raised by a crossbencher, and the upper house of the Victorian Parliament agreed for it to go to an existing standing committee on which there were three government members, three Liberal members, I think, a Greens member and a member from the Australian Sex Party, who I think put the motion forward. That was a standing committee and that is the way the matter was referred. The WA government has decided not to refer this matter to a standing committee and it has stated the reasons for that today. The matter could probably well have been referred to a standing committee and the member for Morley could have been co-opted to it. But this is the process that has been put in place and the opposition is saying that it supports debate on this issue.

I do not want to debate the pros and cons of euthanasia; today is not the day to do it. We are putting in place a process by which a committee will be formed and, hopefully, as a result of its work, it will come up with a recommendation that will lead to a better path forward on an issue that is of great concern throughout the community wherever we go as members. I am sure that any members of this place who speak to their constituents will find that there is support for euthanasia just as there is opposition from the right-to-life people. It is a very, very difficult subject. I think this is the most difficult subject that will be before this Parliament since before my days when the abortion debate was held. That was a very, very difficult debate. I supported the result of that debate, but I am told it was a very difficult time in this chamber because people from the same party came at it from very opposite sides and it caused divisions in the party. I think it is good that we are at least going forward on this issue. To be on this committee is not an easy decision to make. This is going to be a tough committee to serve on, because the views out there held by both sides of the debate are very strong. Among our constituents there will not be a 90 per cent to 10 per cent or 80 per cent to 20 per cent divide as we see in the polls; there will be a lot of different views. People have spoken to me, including Clive Deverall's wife. I told her I wanted her to give evidence before that committee. A lot of people will give evidence before this committee. In closing, that is the point I wanted to make. I see the numbers. I do not want to be seen as a committee member who rubberstamps something. I do not think that is what this is all about; it has to be about independent minds looking at the evidence and coming up with a well thought out recommendation to the Parliament.

MR R.R. WHITBY (Baldivis — Parliamentary Secretary) [1.45 pm]: I would like to speak in support of the motion to establish a joint select committee on end-of-life choices. I acknowledge from the start that this is a difficult and emotional issue, as evidenced by the debate in this place today. I would like to acknowledge Noreen, the widow of Clive Deverall. As a journalist of many years, I got the opportunity to speak to Clive on many occasions and interview him. He was a constant advocate for health and the fight against cancer. I welcome Noreen's presence here today.

It is important to respect both sides of the argument. People often hold strong religious or moral convictions, and so they should because the preservation of life is a core moral belief for all of us, I think. Many countries have tried and failed to bring legislation to this area. It is quite fraught. It is about trying to legislate to offer the option of an early death with safeguards to protect the patient from undue influence, coercion or pressure, either psychological, imagined or real.

Although I do not propose to go into precise proposals for Western Australia—that would be a matter for the committee to hear evidence from the community of Western Australia—I think it is worth giving a brief background to the issue on the experience that has occurred around Australia and overseas. A number of bills—all unsuccessful—have been introduced in Parliaments in this country. My research shows that there have been 50. I notice that the member for Morley said it was 30. In any case, there have been a large number of attempts to legislate in this area. The latest attempt in South Australia recently fell short by a single vote, and that was the casting vote of the Speaker. New Zealand and the United Kingdom are looking to reform. Canada only recently introduced its own law. The United States is a very interesting case to look at where there has been legislation. As we know, strong religious conservatism exists in that country. There is often a strong lobby against the issue that dominates public policy in that area. However, the state of Oregon has had assisted dying laws for 20 years. Oregon was joined by Washington State, Montana and Vermont—all small liberal progressive states, and usually controlled by the Democratic Party—which are states in the Pacific Northwest or New England. In June last year California became the latest US state to legislate in this area. It now means that one in six, or 52 million, Americans have access to assisted dying.

All these laws follow the same basic guidelines: one must be 18 years of age; one must be mentally competent to decide; one must have an incurable terminal condition, with intolerable suffering with no access to relief; and one must be in an advanced state of decline and close to death, which is often defined as having six months to live.

The process must be oversighted by two doctors with appropriate experience or training. There must be two witnesses to the process, with no right or benefit to the patient or state. The process must be initiated by the patient and the patient must agree to the process multiple times. The process must occur over a period of at least 15 days. In California, which has probably the most careful and stringent guidelines, it also requires the final, signed agreement by the patient at no more than 48 hours before the death. Finally, the lethal dose must be self-administered by the patient.

These provisions are very similar to the assisted dying law currently being considered in Victoria, which is the result of an inquiry that had 1 000 public submissions, 17 public hearings and 154 witnesses, and which concluded by recommending that the government of Victoria should approve in certain circumstances legalised assisted dying. That bill is currently being prepared in Victoria.

If we go back to the United States, what has been the experience after 20 years in Oregon? It is quite interesting to look at that. In that 20-year period, 1 327 prescriptions have been written for fatal dosage medications and 859 patients have actually ingested that medication and died. That is 859 patients over 20 years, and it averages at about 43 patients a year—that is, 43 patients out of Oregon’s population of just over 4 million people. The average patient in Oregon after 20 years is represented by the following: 97 per cent of the patients were white; 90 per cent of patients were enrolled in a hospice at the time the prescription was written and at the time of death; about 80 per cent were suffering from an aggressive cancer; 70 per cent were aged 65 and above; the median age was 71; a slight majority were male; and about half had a university education. In short, according to the literature on the Oregon experience, aid in dying was found to be safe, legal and rare, and accounted for less than half of one per cent of deaths. There were fears that uneducated minorities or those without health insurance would be more likely patients, but that has not turned out to be the case. The typical patient is white, has health insurance and is well educated. In fact, 35 per cent of patients in Oregon who were granted a lethal prescription actually died before they were able to take the dosage. The prescription appeared to give them comfort that they had an option that would relieve them of the stress of worrying about possible greater suffering.

I would like to go to the definition of “assisted dying” compared with “voluntary euthanasia”. It is taken to be, from the literature and research that I have seen, that voluntary euthanasia is when a doctor administers the lethal dosage, and assisted dying is when the patient takes the medication themselves.

Finally, I would like to offer a personal perspective on what is a very difficult and contentious matter. Having the right to choose the time of your death must surely be the ultimate expression of liberty and freedom of the individual. Those are values I hold dear and they are values that I hear defended around this chamber. Surely, only someone in the position of wanting this choice could really have insight into the issue. None of us wants to be in this position or to see our loved ones in this position, but we know that many Western Australians almost daily face the intolerable suffering of a terminal and aggressive condition that will eventually claim their lives. Having the right to choose the time of death or not in those circumstances is something that in the final analysis must be the sole right of the individual.

It may be that in Western Australia there is strong opposition to any move towards assisted dying. I can tell members, as a prospective member of this committee, that I will keep an open mind to all the evidence that comes before me. I do not think anyone can actually go into a committee on this issue without having a preconception or a view, but it is very important that one keeps an open mind, as far as possible, to hear all the evidence and all the views.

This is a conversation that the state needs to have. On a personal level, in my home there is an alternative view, held quite strongly by my wife, so I know it will be a debate that I will conduct both in this place and at home. I am sure there will be other people in this chamber who will have the same conversations on either side of the debate, both here and amongst their family and friends. As I said before, this is a debate in the community and around the world, and it is a conversation that we, as parliamentarians, owe it to the state to have.

MS M.J. DAVIES (Central Wheatbelt — Leader of the National Party) [1.55 pm]: I rise today on behalf of the National Party to support this motion and I thank the member for Morley for the discussions that she held with the Nationals on this very important matter. As members have already reflected upon, this is an issue that can be incredibly divisive within the community, and there are strong opinions held on all sides of the debate because it is very personal to everyone in the community. It is something that at some point, I have no doubt, everyone needs to come to terms with.

As a member of the other place, I have already participated in one such debate, so I am one of the members who have been through this already, albeit through a specific piece of legislation. I was a relatively new member at the time, so it was a baptism of fire, given some of the very emotive debates that came to our Parliament. On that occasion the bill was not successful because, at the end of the day, it probably did not reflect the desires of the community at that point in time. In our view, it did not deliver on the intent of those proposing it. Nonetheless, many views were canvassed, with great respect, in that place during the debate, and it certainly initiated a lot of conversations in the community. As we go through this process, members will no doubt have discussions with their constituents about this issue; it is an issue that certainly brings people forward in the electorates.

I agree that, as parliamentarians, we cannot shy away from legislating on some of these very difficult issues. We, as the National Party, have requested that there is representation from the National Party, and there has been agreement that there will be a representative in the other place to ensure that our views, as a party, and the views of the people who we represent, are included. We thank the member and the other people we have been dealing with for the opportunity to ensure that we have a representative in the other place.

It is important that we get this right. The committee process allows a proper process of engagement. When this matter comes back to Parliament, I say to members that the Nationals have a policy of making sure that each of our members will have the opportunity of a conscience vote, or a vote in the best interests of their electorates, on every matter that comes before this house. Whatever is brought back from the committee will certainly be a guiding document and a guiding recommendation, but at the end of the day, each National Party member will be able to vote on whatever is brought forward according to their conscience or the best interests of their electorates.

Thank you very much for the discussions we had leading into this debate; we appreciate the consideration of being able to have a representative from the party on the committee.

Mr D.A. Templeman: Have you got any more praise you can lavish on us?

Ms M.J. DAVIES: No more praise, member!

I can reflect on the fact that we had the previous debate in the other place in 2010. This is how heartfelt it is in the community: people are still pulling my debate out of *Hansard* to send to me to remind me of what I said during that debate, according to what their views were. Whatever is said in this place, however it is debated, everyone is watching because it is one of those things that everyone understands and has a very personal view on. For those members who are about to participate in this, be very conscious—I am sure they are—that there will be a very heightened level of understanding and passion in the community about what we are about to undertake. That puts some pressure on those sitting on the committee.

Debate interrupted, pursuant to standing orders.

[Continued on page 2563.]

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

PERTH STADIUM — NAMING RIGHTS

280. Ms L. METTAM to the Minister for Tourism:

Given the latest figures from Tourism Australia show that every international visitor delivers \$2 500 worth of benefit to the WA economy and given the proposed Chelsea football match at Perth Stadium will have a global reach of millions of viewers, why is the minister taking such a short-sighted approach to tourism by selling the naming rights to Perth Stadium, given we only need to attract an additional 1 000 international visitors to achieve the same financial outcome?

Mr P. PAPALIA replied:

I thank the member for her question. Unlike the previous government, we do not have the luxury of paying stadiums not to sell their naming rights. We do not have the luxury of assuming fluffy modelling of outcomes with respect to international television audiences. We need to identify the best way of using every single taxpayer dollar that we employ to attract people to this state. I can tell members now the most effective thing we can do with international visitors is focus on trying to achieve additional direct international flights to Perth, Western Australia. The greatest opportunity lies in the eastern seaboard of China, also in Japan, which has been sought after for more than a decade.

Ms L. Mettam interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Vasse!

Mr P. PAPALIA: I think we are at a perfect point in time to address the potential to get a direct flight from Japan. Amongst other things, the ambassador in Japan is a fine Western Australian, Richard Court. We should use his influence wherever we can to exploit the fact that we have a great product in Western Australia. We have a massive —

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members!

Mr P. PAPALIA: We have a very high quality hotel product and huge capacity on the market—an oversupply in fact, which is resulting in downward pressure on price. It makes Western Australia affordable and attractive.

Mr D.C. Nalder interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Bateman!

Mr P. PAPALIA: The greatest way we can grow international visitation is to get new flights flying directly here from destinations that have large populations with plenty of money to spend.

Mrs L.M. Harvey: And get the name out there!

Mr P. PAPALIA: No. Actually, the days of focusing on brand awareness and some fluffy return from a television audience of X hundred million in another place are over. We have to use every single dollar to the best effect. That is our responsibility.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members, the wall of noise is coming up. The member for Vasse asked a question; just listen to the answer, please.

Mr P. PAPALIA: In the event that we are able to secure one additional direct flight from an international destination seven days a week in the course of a year, 150 000 new travellers will visit Western Australia. That is the focus. That is where we will be putting our energy. That is where we will identify the opportunity to grow international visitation. It will not be in not getting money to try to pay off debt through not selling the stadium rights. That will not be what we do.

PERTH STADIUM — NAMING RIGHTS

281. Ms L. METTAM to the Minister for Tourism:

I have a supplementary question. Has the minister conducted financial analysis to support his decision; and, if not, why not? If he has conducted such analysis, will he immediately table it?

Mr P. PAPALIA replied:

As the member would be aware, it has been reported in the media that an analysis was done under the previous government, when, it must be acknowledged, there was apparently plenty of money to throw around on all manner of wasteful things, like paying \$1.5 million a year to not sell the naming rights of Perth Arena. In those days, an analysis was done at the behest of the government, funded by the government, with the intention of finding that it was a valuable thing to not sell the naming rights. I can understand how that might have occurred. I can understand how a consultant who has been paid by the minister who did not want to sell the naming rights would have made the finding, through an interesting modelling technique, that determined that an interesting television audience that cannot actually be determined somehow resulted in an interesting, extremely high return to the taxpayer, which is not real money. However, if we sell the naming rights, that is real money; that is actual dollars that go to help address the debt that the previous government laboured us with, and goes to help by not having to borrow more money. It goes to assist with not having to borrow \$1.5 million a year to not sell the naming rights to Perth Arena.

Mr C.J. Barnett interjected.

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

STATE ECONOMY

282. Ms S.E. WINTON to the Premier:

How is this government encouraging confidence in the economy and supporting the creation of jobs, something the previous Liberal–National government neglected to do?

Mr M. McGOWAN replied:

I thank the member for Wanneroo for the question. Under this government, I can smell confidence in the air across Western Australia. Now that we have a cohesive, collaborative government that wants to work with industry to achieve jobs and outcomes for Western Australia, we can sense that the mood in the community is very different from what it was under the dysfunctional ramshackle rabble that was running Western Australia last year. I am backed in this by the Reserve Bank quarterly analysis that states that economic conditions are starting to stabilise and improve in Western Australia. I am backed in this also by the Chamber of Commerce and Industry of Western Australia chief economist, who said that the CCI is seeing positive signs of recovery right across the Western Australian economy, showing that the worst is now behind us.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members, you might think you are funny, but you are cutting into your question time. If I keep having these interruptions, I will cut it short, so you will be the losers.

Mr M. McGOWAN: On the Friday just past, I participated in the cutting of the first steel for the Gruyere gold project in the eastern goldfields. The week before that I was in Ringers Soak for the launch of Northern Minerals' dysprosium project, which will create 95 jobs. I was there with the member for Kimberley. In recent weeks I have been in the Pilbara with both Rio Tinto and BHP, launching new apprenticeship programs. BHP is doubling the number of apprentices under our government. Rio Tinto is proceeding with a range of local content projects for

some of its equipment in Karratha. On top of that, I have met with a range of industry consortia, in a range of industries, seeking their advice and views, and proceeding forward with a range of those. Today—I am sure that the Minister for Defence Issues will talk about this shortly—I announced Western Australia’s defence advocate, so that we can overcome the deficit of the last eight and a half years, when there was no effort to attract defence jobs to Western Australia. We have been working very hard to ensure that there are jobs and opportunities for Western Australians in a broad array of industries, keeping our mining industries strong, but also making sure that other industries across Western Australia have their place in the sun.

REGIONAL SPONSORED MIGRATION SCHEME — INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS

283. Mr S.K. L’ESTRANGE to the Minister for Tourism:

I draw the minister’s attention to an article by Steven O’Neil, headed “McGowan ‘putting a wrecking ball’ through WA’s international student market”, which states that the Premier is —

... making it very clear that international students are not welcome in the state.

How does the minister justify his government’s changes to the regional sponsored migration scheme that have removed incentives for international students to study in Perth?

Mr P. PAPALIA replied:

I have no idea who the individual being quoted is. However, it is an interesting observation that suggests that somehow the current government and the Premier are putting a wrecking ball through international education. I note, of course, that anyone who is familiar with international education outcomes in Western Australia understands that this state for a very long time under the previous government has been massively underperforming. In fact, under the previous government —

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Vasse, I do not know what you got up to in your holidays, but since you have come back you just have not stopped talking. I call you to order for the first time.

Mr P. PAPALIA: It is very unkind; I did invite the member for Vasse to be in photos with me at the Margaret River Pro announcement.

Under the previous government our proportion of the overall number of international students who visit Australia fell from in excess of 12 per cent to about 7.9 per cent currently. That is the consequence of the previous government’s inadequacy and incapacity to focus on anything other than sitting back and letting the dollars roll in during the boom and its lack of attention to trying to diversify the economy.

Mrs L.M. Harvey interjected.

The SPEAKER: Deputy Leader of the Opposition!

Mr P. PAPALIA: The current government identified that flaw and failure almost a year before the election when we released “WA Labor Plan for Jobs”, a key element of which was pursuing a greater share of international students. We expect that at the very least we should get the same proportion as the per capita rate of population of Australia.

The SPEAKER: Leader of the Opposition!

Mr P. PAPALIA: We should get 12 per cent; that is what our aim should be. It is currently 7.9 per cent or thereabouts.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members on my left, this is not a debate. You have asked the question. Just let him give the answer. You might not like the answer but just listen to it. If you keep interjecting, I will call you to order.

Mr P. PAPALIA: The first trade delegation that the Premier will lead will be to China, with a focus on tourism and, as announced six months before the election, we will have a focus on international students with a view to growing our share, particularly of the Chinese market. That is where you should have been years ago, member for Cottesloe, instead of sitting on your backside benefiting from the revenue streams during the mining boom.

The SPEAKER: Minister, through the Chair.

Mr P. PAPALIA: There should have been some effort to grow our share of international students at that time. There will be a delegation going to China of all the universities collaboratively working with the StudyPerth organisation, which we have increased the funding to.

Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup interjected.

The SPEAKER: I call the member for Dawesville to order for the first time.

Mr P. PAPALIA: StudyPerth, which is the organisation responsible for drawing international students to Western Australia, has benefited from a 25 per cent increase to its budget annually under us. The opposition did not even respond; it did not even speak about international education during the last election. It is something it ignored.

Mrs L.M. Harvey interjected.

The SPEAKER: Deputy Leader of the Opposition, I call you to order for the first time. Can you wrap it up, minister?

Mr P. PAPALIA: I welcome the discussion about international education because it is one of our objectives to clean up the mess that the Liberal Party left us and to grow the share to at least achieve the proportion of international students that we should have.

REGIONAL SPONSORED MIGRATION SCHEME — INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS

284. **Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE to the Minister for Tourism:**

I have a supplementary question. Given that the government has changed the regional sponsored migration scheme—that is the issue here, minister, the changing of this scheme—what exactly will the government do to stem the flood of foreign students diverting to other states like South Australia?

Mr P. PAPALIA replied:

Extraordinary! Is the member suggesting that there will be an exodus of international students from Western Australia because we are not allowing bricklayers and welders to come to Western Australia? As far as I know, international students are international students. They are attracted to Australia and to Western Australia to study.

The objective is to grow the number of international students, not grow the number of welders and brickies because Western Australians are out of work.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: This is my last warning. If this continues, I will stop question time straightaway.

Mr P. PAPALIA: That was clearly the intent of the Premier's action. We made the commitment prior to the election. We kept the commitment and most people in Western Australia welcomed it.

REAR ADMIRAL GATES — DEFENCE ADVOCATE

285. **Mr T.J. HEALY to the Minister for Defence Issues:**

I refer to the appointment of Rear Admiral Raydon Gates as Western Australia's defence advocate.

- (1) What will be the role of the defence advocate?
- (2) How will the defence advocate help WA to secure more defence work and more defence jobs—work and jobs that the federal Liberal government is currently handing to South Australia?

Mr P. PAPALIA replied:

- (1)–(2) I thank the member for his interest in Western Australia's defence industry. As the member is fully aware, prior to the election, the current government made the observation that Western Australia's defence sector had been neglected for a great many years. Sadly, as a consequence of this neglect, we observed that Western Australia received a tiny proportion of billions and billions of dollars. The federal government, under previous Prime Minister Tony Abbott and subsequently Prime Minister Turnbull, announced \$89.5 billion worth of ship and submarine construction.

The SPEAKER: Member for South Perth.

Mr P. PAPALIA: I am sorry; I missed the member for Bateman's observations.

Mr D.C. Nalder: Stop admiring the problem. What are you doing?

Mr P. PAPALIA: I have no idea what the member is asking, but \$89.5 billion worth of ship and submarine construction was announced by the federal coalition government and \$86 billion is going to South Australia. It is undeniable that we were voiceless under the previous government. Western Australia, as a state, had no voice on the east coast, or in Canberra where decisions are made. The federal government ignored the previous government and took it for granted!

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members!

Mr P. PAPALIA: It took members opposite for granted. Inasmuch as it ever thought of them, it was only as an automatic teller machine for its political donations. That is the only thing the federal government thought of the former government. It came here and obliquely collided with the former government on the way through to Cottesloe for a fundraiser. That was it. It had no interest in the Western Australian Liberal Party beyond trying to get money out of its donors. As a consequence, the Western Australian defence sector was ignored. Like so many other sectors, no effort was made to diversify the economy. In opposition, we committed to creating a portfolio; we have done that. We committed to creating a Defence West office; we have done that. We committed to appointing a defence advocate—a renowned, esteemed, respected, defence player on the national and international stages; we did it today.

Mr P.A. Katsambanis: What target have you set?

Mr P. PAPALIA: A target for Western Australia is not very difficult! If we get any more than we get now, we will have had a huge win—if we get any more than the pittance that the opposition managed to achieve! The opposition was so convinced of the importance of defence, it appointed the former Attorney General to represent the interests of Western Australia on the national stage. That former minister was renowned for having the deepest and highest in-tray in government. It was extraordinary that the former government allowed him to be its advocate. Today, we followed through with our commitment to appoint a defence advocate by choosing Rear Admiral Raydon Gates. We are very —

Mr R.S. Love interjected.

Mr P. PAPALIA: This is a serious matter. If you really want a better share for Western Australia, you should join us in advocating for a better share.

The SPEAKER: Minister, will you talk through the Chair.

Mr P. PAPALIA: Rear Admiral Raydon Gates served in the Royal Australian Navy for 37 years, retiring in 2008. He headed Lockheed Martin for Australia and New Zealand, which is the world's biggest defence contractor.

He has deep connections—I beg your pardon?

Mr S.K. L'Estrange: What KPIs have you set him?

The SPEAKER: I am setting the manager of opposition business a key performance indicator. He is interjecting. I call the manager of opposition business to order. Minister, through the Chair, and wind it up, please.

Mr P. PAPALIA: Admiral Gates has deep connections around the world in the defence sector in the military, in the civilian defence sector, in particular, in the United States from his time as the Australian Defence Attaché in Washington. He is capable. I can tell members—I know this—he is well respected across the chamber in federal politics. He is well known and respected in military circles and in civilian Department of Defence circles. He will give us a presence in Canberra which we never had under the previous government. He will be our eyes, ears and voice, finally, in Canberra. We will get a better return from him in about a day than we ever got from the previous minister that was responsible in his entire eight and a half years.

ROYALTIES FOR REGIONS EXPENDITURE

286. Ms M.J. DAVIES to the Treasurer:

My question is about the budgeted \$872 million of royalties for regions funds for the 2016–17 financial year.

- (1) What was the actual royalties for regions funds expended in the 2016–17 financial year?
- (2) What was the actual 25 per cent of the state's mining and petroleum royalties for the 2016–17 financial year?
- (3) In light of the Treasurer's deferrals and cuts to royalties for regions programs since coming government in March, how much of the budgeted 25 per cent of royalties was returned to the consolidated fund due to the legislated \$1 billion fund cut?

Mr B.S. WYATT replied:

I thank the Leader of the National Party for the question and for the notice she has provided me.

- (1) Unsurprisingly, the actual royalties for regions funds expended in the 2016–17 financial year is still being finalised by the Department of Primary Industries and Regional Development. Like every other financial year, the September annual report will clarify that. I remind members that the reason there was a significant overspend provision was because of this very issue.
- (2) The actual 25 per cent of the state's mining and petroleum royalties for the 2016–17 budget included a forecast of \$3.8 billion in royalty revenue. At 25 per cent of royalties, royalties for regions funding in the budget would have been \$960.5 million. The final outcomes for royalties for 2016–17 will be finalised in the annual report.

- (3) In light of the deferrals and cuts to RforR that the Leader of the National Party alleges, the member wants to know how much has been returned to the consolidated account. The current royalties for regions funding arrangements established by the previous government appropriate only that portion of the 25 per cent funding to the royalties for regions fund that will maintain the balance below the legislated \$1 billion cap. The legislated funding cap on the royalties for regions fund balance has meant that a total of \$803.4 million, or 20.9 per cent of forecast royalties, was appropriated to royalties for regions in the 2016–17 budget. That equates to \$157.1 million less than the 25 per cent funding formula being retained in the consolidated account. As members know, because this process was set up by the previous government, that has been dependent on the total amount of royalties that are received each year. It depends on the actual percentage that goes into RforR fund. For example, two years ago, it was about 18 per cent of royalties that went into the royalties for regions account and the year before, it was up to 25 per cent. It has bounced around a bit. Hopefully, that has answered the Leader of the National Party's question.

ROYALTIES FOR REGIONS EXPENDITURE

287. Ms M.J. DAVIES to the Treasurer:

I have a supplementary question. No, Treasurer, it has not. We assume that there has been budget cut off and we did give the Treasurer notice, so he should be able to give an answer on the exact amount of royalties for regions funds that were expended in 2016–17. Has the Treasurer deliberately misled the people of Western Australia by stating before the election that he supported RforR, but after the election using it to boost the consolidated account?

Mr B.S. WYATT replied:

I thank the Leader of the National Party again. Does the Leader of the National Party recall the overprovisioning in the royalties for regions fund?

Ms M.J. Davies: Yes. Answer the question.

Mr B.S. WYATT: Just to remind members, including the former Minister for Regional Development, royalties for regions had a significant overprovision. Effectively, that is an allocation because so much money could not be spent each year, so it was overprovisioned. That is what the former government did.

Ms M.J. Davies: But there is a legislated cap.

Mr B.S. WYATT: I did not do that; the former government did that. That is what I have inherited. The overprovisioning means that come 30 June we do not know exactly how much has been spent. But by the time of annual report, usually in late September, from memory, it will be clarified. With regard to the 25 per cent, it was about 20.9 per cent.

Ms M.J. Davies: That's not true. That's got nothing to do with what you've actually spent.

Mr B.S. WYATT: The former government put the cap in, not me; we are not changing the legislation. The cap was a National Party–Liberal Party initiative. What that meant, depending on the total amount of royalties, is that less than 25 per cent would go in. The National Party did that! The National Party, not me. So what that meant in the current financial year —

Ms M.J. Davies interjected.

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

Mr B.S. WYATT: I have explained in this place before that because of the operations of the act, the money is borrowed on 1 July and put into what I used to call "Brendon's account"; it is no longer that of course. It used to be borrowed and put into that account. I think I said that is about 20.9 per cent for the 2016–17 financial year. From memory, the 2015–16 financial year was 25 per cent. The year before that it was just under 19 per cent because of the cap the National Party put in place. That is the result. I will tell the Leader of the National Party as soon as I know what the final spend is, but I dare say that would be fairly close to the annual report time for the 2016–17 financial year. That has not changed; it is exactly as the National Party used to do. It will probably be about late September this year.

WAGES POLICY — POLICE — COMMISSIONER OF POLICE'S COMMENTS

288. Mr P.A. KATSAMBANIS to the Premier:

I refer to revelations from the Commissioner of Police last night indicating that there will have to be cuts to frontline police, with a quantum, according to the commissioner, in the hundreds. In addition to the 100 proposed new officers for the meth border force, will the Premier provide a guarantee that the total number of frontline police will not decline under his government?

Mr M. McGOWAN replied:

I answered this question earlier today with the state's press. I indicated that in the budget the budget for police will increase. I also indicated that we will deliver on the election commitments we made, which were particularly around a meth border force, so we will have additional police made available to deal with that. We will provide for the additional opening hours for police stations and 24-hour police stations. The three we committed to during the course of the election campaign are all in place or about to be in place in Ellenbrook, Cockburn and —

Mrs M.H. Roberts: Armadale.

Mr M. McGOWAN: — Armadale. There will also be additional hours at a range of police stations; Belmont springs to mind, and a range of others. We will be delivering on those commitments.

WAGES POLICY — POLICE — COMMISSIONER OF POLICE'S COMMENTS

289. Mr P.A. KATSAMBANIS to the Premier:

I have a supplementary question. Premier, other than the meth border force, will the Premier provide an ironclad guarantee that the actual total frontline policing hours will not decline under his government?

Mr M. McGOWAN replied:

We will be ensuring that our police are well resourced, that the community across Western Australia has a police force it can continue to be proud of and confident in, and there will be additional police officers employed. The natural consequence of that is that under Labor there will be a stronger, better-resourced police force—police service—dealing with the issues that matter to the people of Western Australia. But just the broader issue, which I think the member is getting to, is that it is true that we have inherited a catastrophic financial situation because of the former Liberal–National government. Honestly —

Several members interjected.

Mr M. McGOWAN: — the member for Hillarys is relatively new to this place, but the reality is that in 2008 the state's debt was around \$3 billion. We inherited \$33 billion, climbing to \$42 billion. The member should think about that. The Liberal and National Parties in office increased the state's debt by nearly 1 000 per cent in eight years —

Several members interjected.

Mr M. McGOWAN: The member says, "Yes". Well, yes, the former government did, and the Liberal and National Parties of Western Australia should be ashamed of themselves.

Several members interjected.

Mr M. McGOWAN: They should be ashamed of themselves. The Liberal–National government —

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members!

Mr M. McGOWAN: — from 2008 to 2017 was the most catastrophic financial government in the history of this country.

Government members: Hear, hear!

Mr M. McGOWAN: That is what we now have to grapple with. The opposition sits there—I heard it from the National Party there and the Liberal Party now—pretending this all does not exist. The reality is that it does exist, and least now Western Australians can have confidence that they have a government that is getting on with the job of dealing with it.

ELLENBROOK BUS SERVICE

290. Ms J.J. SHAW to the Minister for Transport:

I refer to the new east-west bus service for my community of Ellenbrook. How will this improve travel times and help the commute for workers coming from Ellenbrook—people who were treated appallingly by the previous Liberal–National government?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI replied:

I thank the member for Swan Hills for the question. It is with great excitement that we announce the new east-west bus service for Ellenbrook. As the member for Swan Hills knows, people in the Ellenbrook corridor accessing services on the Joondalup line, such as the hospital, Edith Cowan University and other services, was a key issue raised by the public over many, many years. The new 355 service will connect Ellenbrook residents to the Joondalup train line. On top of this, we also have new connections from Ellenbrook to Midland. Again, that key issue was raised for many, many years. It also provides a new service for residents across that corridor covering

Madeley, Kingsley, Whitfords and Landsdale. This is great news for the people of our north-east and northern suburbs. We take issues in our suburbs very, very seriously. We take our election commitments seriously. This was a key election commitment we made to the public at the election, unlike the Liberal Party, which, as we know, hated Ellenbrook, did it not? It hated Ellenbrook.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The Liberal Party hated Ellenbrook and, as a result, residents were denied services. Many election commitments to the people of Ellenbrook were broken by the Liberal Party throughout its time in government. This new service will connect young people to jobs and older people to services, and will see a significant new east–west linkage —

Mr D.C. Nalder interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Bateman!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: This new east–west linkage has been called for by the public year upon year. I remember writing to former Ministers for Transport asking about that service and for more connections to Midland. They denied the residents those services. This is a huge commitment for the people of Ellenbrook and surrounds. They have welcomed the new service, which is part of our strategy of making sure that everyone in WA, in our regions and in the suburbs, is looked after, as opposed to opposition members, who are a rabble. Again, they demonstrate today that they have learned nothing from the last election. We will continue to deliver to the people of Western Australia.

The SPEAKER: Member for Pilbara, I messed it up before. You are next.

Mr D.T. Redman: So we are being penalised for being on the ball, Mr Speaker. Is that the case?

The SPEAKER: There is always a first for everything, member for Warren–Blackwood. It was my mistake.

SERVICES AND INFRASTRUCTURE — REMOTE COMMUNITIES

291. **Mr K.J.J. MICHEL to the Minister for Housing:**

Has the minister been able to reach an agreement with the federal government over the funding of vital services and infrastructure for remote communities; and, if not, why not?

Mr P.C. TINLEY replied:

I thank the member for Pilbara for the question. I am sorry to report to the member and to the house the significant risk around the issue of remote housing in Western Australia. By way of an update for members who are new to this place, I remind them of the Rudd–Gillard Labor government contribution of \$5.5 billion in Closing the Gap during its term, of which \$1.1 billion came to Western Australia to attend to remote housing needs. In successive years since the Rudd–Gillard Labor government we have seen the decline and deterioration of commonwealth participation in funding remote housing for some of the most vulnerable Western Australians, particularly in some of the communities within the desert lands of Western Australia. The state government takes responsibility for supporting over 165 remote communities. Under the previous Liberal–National government, all we saw was indifference and mismanagement. In 2015, when there was a unilateral decision—I will never forget this—by the federal Liberal coalition government to axe \$90 million from supporting remote communities' municipal services, the former government did absolutely nothing. The federal Liberal government unilaterally removed \$90 million from commonwealth spending on some of those vulnerable people in Western Australia, and where was the former government? It was on its back getting its tummy tickled. We once again saw members lolligagging on the former government's benches as it did nothing to support Western Australians who are in most need.

Members opposite sit there in silence. Regardless of whether they were directly or indirectly responsible for the negotiations, they should all take significant responsibility for leaving the black hole. The McGowan government has had to finally come in and stand in the breach between those people who are most vulnerable and those people who are holding at bay the necessary resources to support those people. It is a complete and absolute shame.

I would like also to report to the house and to the member for Pilbara, who takes a keen interest in these matters, that I finally met with the federal minister, Minister Scullion, last week. It was one of the most bizarre meetings I have ever had. There was a lot of talk and no action. There was no recognition of what it takes to deliver services to one-third of the continent of Australia and to communities as far out as the South Australian border. The commonwealth government needs to take a hard look at itself and decide whom it wants to support, whom it considers to be Australian and whom it considers to be vulnerable in our community and deserving of our full-throated support. We are getting well past June to have these bilateral negotiations with the commonwealth concluded. If we do not, we will end up with a \$100 million a year hole—another black hole—left to us as a gift from the former government for something that is completely unacceptable and happened on its watch. But do not worry; we have got it. We will fix it.

BUSSELTON AIRPORT PROJECT

292. Mr D.T. REDMAN to the Premier:

I refer to the previous Liberal–National government’s Busselton airport upgrade project.

- (1) Is the Premier aware that the Minister for Regional Development has initiated a value optimisation review of the Busselton airport project, seeking to make \$10 million of savings?
- (2) Is he also aware that such a compromise on the stated objectives of the project is causing hesitation from significant and new private investment interests in the region?
- (3) Will he now give private investors and the people of Busselton and surrounding shires a commitment that his government will fully fund the Busselton airport project?

Mr M. McGOWAN replied:

I thank the member for Warren–Blackwood. Just so I understand completely and can answer very fully, can the member advise me what the private investments are?

Mr D.T. Redman: There are two significant overseas interests in building hotels and accommodation on the Busselton foreshore.

Mr M. McGOWAN: Sorry; who are they?

Mr D.T. Redman: I’ve met with them, but I haven’t got their names here. Certainly, I’ve met with them. The point is that they’re alive and well.

Several members interjected.

Mr M. McGOWAN: Sure!

Ms L. Mettam interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Vasse!

Ms L. Mettam: He shouldn’t be answering the question.

The SPEAKER: Member for Vasse, every time I am on my feet and I talk, you get called to order once. That is three times. Do not push it.

Mr M. McGOWAN: As the member says, and I will quote him, he has met with them, but he cannot remember who they are.

- (1)–(3) The Busselton airport expansion project is proceeding. It will proceed. Both the Minister for Regional Development and the Minister for Transport have had some involvement in ensuring that Western Australian taxpayers get value for money. I know that value for money is a foreign concept to the National Party and I know that taxpayers being treated with respect and taxpayers’ money not being thrown around wildly is foreign to the National Party. The National Party, as most Liberal members of state and federal Parliaments will agree, is a menace to good government, taxpayers’ interests and good economic management. They all agree, and by their silence they are confirming it.

Several members interjected.

Mr V.A. Catania: Come on; answer the question.

The SPEAKER: I will answer your question. I call you to order for the first and second time.

Mr V.A. Catania interjected.

The SPEAKER: I call you for the third time.

Mr M. McGOWAN: A value optimisation review—in other words, value for money—is something that I support. The airport will proceed. If there are good ways of ensuring that taxpayers’ interests are protected, I fully support them.

BUSSELTON AIRPORT PROJECT

293. Mr D.T. REDMAN to the Premier:

I have a supplementary question. Does the Premier agree that his value optimisation review is also putting at risk nearly \$10 million of federal funds towards the project premised on the state government investment?

Mr M. McGOWAN replied:

The answer to that is no. I do not agree with that. I discussed the issue with the Prime Minister. I note the Prime Minister was on television that night. I did not see it, because I was in a meeting with him when it came on the television. I note he was on television saying that —

Ms L. Mettam interjected.

Mr M. McGOWAN: We did not have the TV on during the meeting, member for Vasse. There was not one in the corner that we were watching. But when we were having our meeting, he indicated that he wanted to raise that issue and I confirmed that the airport was proceeding. I note that when he was on television, he said that the state was pulling out its support for the project, so he was misled by one member over there in relation to that. At the end of the day, the taxpayers deserve to get value for money. The reason the state finances have been driven so far down is encapsulated in that question. Generations of Western Australians will have to pay the price for the hopeless government that members opposite ran for the last eight and a half years.

WHISTLEBLOWER WEBSITE

294. Mr S.A. MILLMAN to the Attorney General:

I refer to the amateur, insecure website that urges public servants to report incidents of corruption.

- (1) Are public servants legally protected if they make disclosures through this website?
- (2) What are the proper avenues available for public servants to report cases of corruption?

Mr J.R. QUIGLEY replied:

- (1)–(2) I thank the member for his question. The short answer is no, public servants who report allegations of misconduct to this website have no protection at all from criminal or civil liability. After this website was launched, I sought advice from the State Solicitor's Office about the status of complaints going to this website. I am advised that the problems are, firstly, that section 81 of the Criminal Code states that it is an offence for any public servant or contractor to disclose to a third party any information that came to them in the course of their employment. Secondly, it could also constitute an offence under section 9 of the Public Sector Management Act or the disciplinary sections under section 80 of the same legislation.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members!

Dr M.D. Nahan: Big Brother's looking.

Mr J.R. QUIGLEY: We will come to that in a moment. There are protections available to those who want to make disclosures under the Public Interest Disclosure Act 2003—legislation that was introduced by the Gallop government. But I wish to point out for anyone who is contacting the Liberal Party website, that the Liberal Party website solicited information that went beyond the information covered by section 3 of the Public Interest Disclosure Act and, moreover, any disclosure made under the Public Interest Disclosure Act has to be made to an appropriate authority. I can assure the chamber that the Liberal Party of Western Australia is not classified as an appropriate authority. None of the protections that are extended to bona fide complaints by public servants—that is, protections afforded by the Public Interest Disclosure Act—would apply to any public servant contacting the Liberal Party website and could leave them open to both criminal prosecution —

Dr M.D. Nahan interjected.

The SPEAKER: Leader of the Opposition, I call you to order for the first time.

Mr B.S. Wyatt: Can I help you up?

Mr J.R. QUIGLEY: No thank you, Mr Treasurer. Mr Treasurer was asking whether I needed assistance to get to my feet, not to answer this question, Mr Speaker!

There would be no protection from criminal prosecution, disciplinary prosecution or, more importantly, any defamation proceedings launched by anyone who was the subject of one of these complaints.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members!

Mr J.R. QUIGLEY: The second part of the question is: what are the appropriate authorities to which a public servant could make bona fide complaints about misconduct? Firstly, I just want to point out that there is the Corruption and Crime Commission. It was of course the member for Cottesloe as Premier who sought to gut the CCC legislation by taking from its purview all members of Parliament except for members of the executive. Of course, that was revealed in a front-page article under the by-line of Mr Dan Emerson, who was reporting on observations by the commissioner. Labor is going to correct that within two weeks. So, the first thing is to go to the CCC. Secondly, if it is an allegation of financial mismanagement, people can go to the Auditor General and they will be protected. Thirdly, if they have a problem with the conduct of anyone in this chamber or a public servant, they can go to you, Mr Speaker, to the privileges committee or to their local member of Parliament.

Dr M.D. Nahan interjected.

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

Mr J.R. QUIGLEY: This website is to be regarded as a dangerous stunt and could expose public servants who go to it to quite severe repercussions.

SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE

295. Mrs L.M. HARVEY to the Minister for Women's Interests:

After the McGowan government's recent changes to the senior executive service, can the minister please update the house on the percentage of women in SES positions and what she is doing to ensure appropriate diversity in the executive public service?

Ms S.F. McGURK replied:

I am incredibly proud of the record of this side of the chamber when it comes to representing women in this community.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members!

Ms S.F. McGURK: We only have to look around us to see that 15 women are sitting on the Labor Party side, and I can count two on the Liberal side and on the National side —

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Talk through the Chair please, minister.

Ms S.F. McGURK: Mr Speaker, I know that you are impressed to hear that on the Labor side we have 15 women representing the government.

Mrs L.M. Harvey interjected.

The SPEAKER: I know it is a women's question and women can interject, but I can still call you to order for the second time.

Ms S.F. McGURK: We have two women on the Liberal side—a paltry two women—and one on the National side.

Point of Order

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Mr Speaker, the question was about the changes to the senior executive service and the effect that has had on women in the senior executive service of the public sector. No member of this chamber is a member of the public sector.

The SPEAKER: Okay, you have made your point, sit down. Could you please get back to answering the question put to you, minister.

Questions without Notice Resumed

Ms S.F. McGURK: I am really confident that the machinery-of-government changes will be good for the WA public in particular. We went from 41 departments down to 25. When people hear that Victoria has seven departments and New South Wales has nine, I think it was an efficiency measure that had to occur.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members! Minister for Transport, your own member is on her feet and you are interjecting. I call you to order for the first time.

Ms S.F. McGURK: It was an efficiency measure that had to occur and I am particularly pleased in relation to the Department of Communities that that change will mean a much better client-focused approach to some of the more vulnerable people in our community. In regard to the changes that are happening and appointing women across the senior executive service and also on boards and committees, this government has taken a very firm position. We have appointed a good number of women—more women than men—particularly on boards and committees, since we have come to office. I have no hesitation at all in saying that Labor stands with a very good record of representing women in this place and in the community and forwarding the interests of gender equity. Our Parliament should look like our community. With Labor's affirmative action policy and the wide range of people that we have representing us both in this chamber and in the upper house, that is exactly what we are doing. We are a modern government; we reflect the community, unlike the member for Cottesloe, who is sitting up the back of the chamber yawning.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Do not wake up people in the chamber if they are asleep! Members, just keep it a little bit quiet. We are nearly at the end of question time.

SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE

296. Mrs L.M. HARVEY to the Minister for Women's Interests:

I have a supplementary question. Given that the minister is responsible for removing two women and replacing them with a man, can she please confirm whether women have been disproportionately impacted by recent senior executive service changes to the McGowan government?

Ms S.F. McGURK replied:

As I said, I have no hesitation in saying that this government has, to date, and will exceed —
Several members interjected.

Mr F.M. Logan: Hopefully you're going to get this.

The SPEAKER: I will get you in a minute. Members, do not talk across the chamber. A member is on her feet. You have the opportunity to get up and talk yourselves.

Ms S.F. McGURK: As I said, I have no hesitation at all in saying that, to date, in the five months we have been in office, we are doing a better job representing the interests of women in this community and promoting women's interests throughout the public sector than those opposite did in eight years.

OAKAJEE PORT AND RAIL PROJECT — FEDERAL FUNDING

297. Mr D.R. MICHAEL to the Treasurer:

I refer to the \$339 million sitting in the federal budget for the Oakajee Port and Rail project. Has the federal Treasurer agreed to release that funding; and, if not, what was his excuse?

Mr B.S. WYATT replied:

I thank the member for Balcatta for the question. It is a very, very good question. Not long after coming into government I was interested in the allocation of an equity injection of some \$339 million in the commonwealth budget. Noting the rapid clip within which the former government proceeded with Oakajee, I thought that I could reallocate that to other port infrastructure in light of the fact that clearly Oakajee is not going to happen—not any time soon. I thought I would write to the Treasurer. We are having conversations around GST and the massive subsidy that Western Australia pays to the commonwealth. I was very pleased to see the member for Moore's media statement when all federal ministers were in town just the other week. They met with Minister Chester. I say to the Minister for Transport that Minister Chester has been a particularly cooperative federal minister. He has been a good minister to deal with. He was obviously in the member for Moore's electorate because the member put out a fairly hairy-chested media statement, saying —

“The original Commonwealth funding was flagged for investment in the Mid West to deliver a much-needed boost to the region's economy,” Mr Love said.

“I emphasised to the Minister that this funding should again be allocated to priority projects in the Mid West not to Perth-based projects.

I am glad the member for Moore emphasised that. I also note that the member for Durack, Melissa Price, in the media said —

“In the meantime, I have argued that the \$339 million, in the forward estimates, could be invested in other projects in WA, particularly in the Mid West like at the Geraldton Port or to support the development of tourism infrastructure on locations such as the Abrolhos Islands, together with the support of the State Government.”

Although I am delighted that the member for Moore emphasised to the minister the importance of that money staying in Western Australia, unfortunately, yet again, WA stands to be duded by the federal government. I have received correspondence from the federal Treasurer confirming that the government will not be proceeding with that money, so it will not be allocated for Western Australians' use for port infrastructure. My view was that it should probably be used for port infrastructure; it was highlighted for that purpose. Despite the good emphasising that the member for Moore gave the minister, unfortunately that is not the case. I hope that all my colleagues in the Liberal and National Parties, with the member for Moore's colleagues in the federal government, can at least assist to give them all a good emphasising to ensure that the federal Treasurer, Scott Morrison, changes his mind and that that \$339 million, which has gone now, comes back to Western Australia.

The SPEAKER: Member for Dawesville, two in a row.

AUSTRALIAN BUREAU OF STATISTICS DATA

298. Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP to the Premier:

You are very kind, Mr Speaker.

Dr M.D. Nahan: Don't wake up the people at home!

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: That is right.

I refer to the Premier's comments on 6PR to Gareth Parker on 2 August, questioning the quality of Australian Bureau of Statistics census data. Does he have any evidence to support his wild accusations?

Mr M. McGOWAN replied:

I thank the member for Dawesville, and I am pleased that he has found his voice. Ordinarily, I am signing off on some of the most ludicrous questions ever asked in any Parliament in the Westminster system that are being put forward by the member for Dawesville and his merry team of Young Liberals in the Dawesville electorate office. They all get down there on the weekend and drink chardonnay.

The SPEAKER: Premier, can you get back to the question, please.

Mr M. McGOWAN: They catch their Uber down there, drink their Leeuwin Estate and sit there thinking about how to ask questions about how many pens, pencils and highlighters the government is using, what colour the highlighters are and how often the Premier has used a highlighter in question. That is where the member for Dawesville is at. I realise he is a young man, but one day, hopefully, he will grow up!

In relation to—what was the question again?

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: I should not have allowed that last question.

Mr M. McGOWAN: The evidence for why the census was so flawed is that the state has just lost \$1.9 billion. The GST system that the federal government failed to do anything about means that we have lost \$1.9 billion.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members, please! We are nearly at the end.

Mr M. McGOWAN: Obviously, the state opposition supports the decision to take \$1.9 billion away from Western Australia. That is the natural conclusion we can draw from the way it is behaving.

Mr D.C. Nalder interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Bateman!

Mr M. McGOWAN: The census essentially found that between March and June this year, our population had declined, according to a comparison between the two figures, by 60 000 people. That has culminated in a consequential loss of around \$1.9 billion over the next four years in GST revenue.

Mr D.C. Nalder interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Bateman!

Mr M. McGOWAN: I do not know about you, Mr Speaker, but I remember the census last year, and it was a complete dog's breakfast. It was a catastrophe. The Liberal Party might justify it. It is now justifying the loss of GST to Western Australia. It was a flawed census last year, but my colleagues and I are standing up for our state, unlike the Liberal Party.

AUSTRALIAN BUREAU OF STATISTICS DATA

299. Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP to the Premier:

I have a supplementary question. Is there any other ABS data the Premier believes is not correct, and will he be requiring that state government agencies undertake separate data investigations aside from flawed census data?

Mr M. McGOWAN replied:

I mean —

The SPEAKER: I do not think that was a supplementary, Premier.

Mr M. McGOWAN: Dawesville was the one that got away, was it not?

Several members interjected.

Mr M. McGOWAN: It was that close.

Mr D.A. Templeman: I should have rung my mum!

Mr M. McGOWAN: It was that close, and every government agency would have been far happier.

The fact of the matter remains that the census, as we all recall—I do not know if you recall doing it, Mr Speaker—was a flawed system and there was national consternation about it. The fact that it has reduced our population by 60 000 people in a few months indicates how bad it was. In a state like Western Australia —

Dr M.D. Nahan: Just because you are used to using bogus data does not mean anything.

Mr M. McGOWAN: The Leader of the Opposition clearly supports the GST cut. That is where the Liberal Party is at.

Dr M.D. Nahan: I am glad you came on board with the GST and our position.

Mr M. McGOWAN: That is a false statement.

The SPEAKER: Leader of the Opposition, you did not learn yesterday. I call you to order for the third time.

Mr M. McGOWAN: Leader of the Opposition, whilst you are in that position, please try to act in the state's interests, because some people might take notice of you.

I understand, on good authority, that the federal Liberal Party does not have much time for the Leader of the Opposition. In any event, he should act in the state's interests —

Dr M.D. Nahan interjected.

The SPEAKER: Leader of the Opposition, you are on three and a half, all right? I do not care; he has his right to speak, you have your right to speak, but when he is on his feet, he has more of a right to speak than you have.

Mr M. McGOWAN: Whilst the Leader of the Opposition is in that position, and the member for Dawesville, they should act in the state's interests, support us in our campaign to get a better share out of the commonwealth government, and stop running the state down.

The SPEAKER: That is the end of question time.

“DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT ANNUAL REPORT 2015–16”

Correction — Statement by Speaker

THE SPEAKER (Mr P.B. Watson): I have received a letter dated 7 August 2017 from the Minister for Regional Development, requesting that an erratum be added to the “Department of Regional Development Annual Report 2015–16”, tabled in the previous Parliament on 22 September 2016. Page 82 of the report incorrectly lists the department's cap of FTEs as 154. The erratum clarifies that the correct cap of FTEs is 180. Under the provisions of standing order 156, I authorise the necessary erratum to be attached to the tabled paper.

[See paper 509.]

JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE ON END-OF-LIFE CHOICES — ESTABLISHMENT

Motion

Resumed from an earlier stage of the sitting.

MRS L.M. HARVEY (Scarborough — Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [3.02 pm]: I rise to contribute to the debate around the establishment of a joint select committee on end-of-life choices. Once again I will put on the record the opposition's curiosity about this motion being moved by a government member and not being a government-sponsored motion. However, we moved past that during the debate on the suspension of standing orders, and I will now go to the substantive motion on the establishment of a joint select committee on end-of-life choices.

The opposition will move some amendments to the motion for the establishment of this committee. Those amendments come from an examination of this issue in our party room and contributions from a number of our members to ensure that, for an issue as important as the examination of end-of-life choices—and, potentially, if the Premier has his way, the introduction of voluntary euthanasia legislation in this state—a range of issues that could impact upon the decision-making of individuals considering these matters be considered as part of the committee process.

I have had some personal experience with some of these matters and feel very strongly about them. The opposition will ask the Parliament to consider, via amendment, an inclusion to the terms of reference to allow us to look at practices currently utilised within the medical community to include the role of palliative care and, specifically, the management of chronic and terminal illnesses.

I have an association with Palliative Care WA. The management of chronic and terminal illnesses is something at the forefront of its considerations and, indeed, something that the members of that association feel very strongly about. After reviewing legislation, proposed legislation and other relevant reports, I find it somewhat interesting that, notwithstanding the member for Morley and others saying there needs to be a reconsideration of this issue in this Parliament, they cited in excess of 50 examples of legislation of this nature being brought before Parliaments in this country and failing, for various different reasons. I believe that the legislation that came before the Northern Territory Parliament in Darwin is now no longer relevant because of some issues that occurred as a result of the exercising of citizens' rights in the Northern Territory. It is important that we engage in these discussions. Our constituents want us to engage in matters such as this. They look to us as elected members to represent their views in this place. I hope that all views will be considered through this parliamentary committee process. We have heard from members of the committee that has been proposed by the government. It sounds as though some strong views are heading down a particular path. I hope that all matters brought before this committee will be viewed on their merits without any biased thinking and opinions being brought by committee members to this examination process.

One area that the Liberal Party is particularly passionate about is the examination of the risks of introducing voluntary euthanasia legislation and the impact it may have on suicide prevention strategies. Suicide prevention has obviously been at the forefront of government consideration in this state, certainly during the eight years of the Barnett Liberal–National government. A number of suicide prevention strategies were put in place. We examined the issue. There are suicide prevention plans specific to particular communities across the broad depth and geographical spread of Western Australia. That is appropriate because different communities have different stresses on them, and different communities need locally driven initiatives to try to have an impact in the area of suicide prevention. The Liberal Party believes it is appropriate to have suicide prevention as a specific consideration when looking at a joint select committee on end-of-life choices. Obviously suicide is an end-of-life choice that some individuals make. Those individuals may be impacted by mental health issues. A range of issues may result in a person making an end-of-life choice, and that end-of-life choice is to take their own life. I feel that the examination of that particular issue is absolutely essential to this joint select committee's deliberations.

I would hope that in the interest of bipartisanship with respect to the establishment of this committee, the government would consider taking on and agreeing to the amendments that we have proposed. These are not controversial amendments. They are amendments that have been well thought out and have been given a great deal of consideration by members of the Liberal Party and indeed members of the National Party.

Point of Order

Ms A. SANDERSON: I was out of the chamber, but it is not my understanding that the amendments have been moved.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms J.M. Freeman): No amendments have been moved. The member is speaking to the motion.

Ms A. SANDERSON: So the member is speaking to the motion, not the substantive amendments that are intended by the opposition?

The ACTING SPEAKER: No; the member is speaking to the motion.

Debate Resumed

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: That is correct. I am speaking about the issue with respect to this motion. I have flagged that I will move some amendments to the motion. I am sorry the member was out of the chamber for that.

The other area that I am particularly passionate about—this has come from not only my personal experience but also my association with Palliative Care WA—is the examination in these end-of-life choices of other instruments that are available to individuals in our community at this time. For example, the role of advance health directives. To me, advance health directives are a really important instrument. I have put one in place. That advance health directive gives specific direction to the person I have appointed as my enduring power of attorney and enduring power of guardianship. If I suffer a series of catastrophic occurrences that render me incapacitated to a degree, it lets them know the level of medical intervention I choose or the level of medical intervention I choose not to have. For example, if I suffer a catastrophic stroke and need to be kept alive via a respirator, I can indicate in an advance health directive that I do not want artificial respiration to allow me to breathe. Should I not be able to swallow, and I am in an incapacitated state, I can choose not to have the intervention of a nasogastric tube to feed me while I am unconscious. If I have an advance health directive, and I am in that state, I can choose not to have the intervention of antibiotics; or I can also choose to have chemotherapy, radiotherapy or other pain-relieving methodologies to ensure that I have no pain and suffering while I am in that state. These are very important considerations. They are very confronting considerations for individuals and families. In having this conversation with family members, many of them were quite confronted at the concept of me being so precise and specific about these sorts of matters. But it is important to have those kinds of considerations and discussions with family members so that families understand that when a person is in those circumstances, and family members are gathered around trying to make a decision about what to do, the advance health directive can provide some guidance on what the person's wishes are.

Other legislative instruments available to people are enduring powers of attorney and enduring powers of guardianship. I think it is appropriate that these three instruments be examined as part of the discussion by the committee on end-of-life choices. It is incredibly important to have an enduring power of attorney for every individual in this place and in the community, because should we get to the point of incapacitation whoever is appointed as enduring power of attorney then has the ability to operate bank accounts, run households and pay living expenses—to take on all those activities in a seamless fashion. Under an enduring power of guardianship, the holder of that power can determine where we live if we are incapacitated. They determine who cares for us. They determine what level of care we receive. Should we get to the point of incapacitation, either physically or mentally, that enduring power of guardianship document is very important.

Examining the role of advance health directive, enduring power of attorney and enduring power of guardianship laws, and the implications for individuals covered by any of these instruments of any proposed legislation, should

be integral to the committee's deliberations. That is why the opposition believes that these amendments should be taken in good faith by the government and by the member for Morley, who is the sponsor of this motion, so that all existing laws can be examined in the context of any new legislation that could be introduced. As an example, what would be the interaction between voluntary euthanasia legislation and an enduring power of attorney or enduring power of guardianship when a person subsequently loses their capacity to make that decision? Does the guardian then act in the interests of the individual who has a document about voluntary euthanasia? Do they exercise that right on behalf of the individual they are caring for? These vexing legal issues need to be examined by this committee, should it be looking at introducing a new legislative instrument. We feel it is a very important to specify that these matters be taken into consideration by the committee.

As a member of Palliative Care WA, I have not put my name forward to be part of this committee because I have strong views about these matters, based on personal experience, and experience I have had with my constituents, my family, and a range of other people in the community with whom I communicate regularly. I and other members on this side of the house feel it is very important that we look at this issue in its entirety, and not just through the narrow lens of the introduction of a new piece of legislation, be it for voluntary euthanasia or whatever else may be proposed, that has a narrow focus. My concern, and the concern of others on this side, is that when we start to hear strong opinions coming forward during the debate from committee members who will be considering these matters, we do not want there to be a question of impartiality about these deliberations hanging like a cloud over the recommendations of a joint select committee of this Parliament. It is particularly troubling for me to hear the leader of the state come out with a very firm view on this issue when a committee is being established and a number of members of his government will be on that committee. I hope that those members will act independently and make decisions based on the evidence that comes before them and not act according to the view or the opinion held by their leader.

Dr A.D. Buti: We have a conscience vote on this issue.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I am not referring to that, member.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members!

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: When the leader of the government or the leader of a party comes out with a very strong view on something, that influences other members of that party and other members of the government.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Shush! Hey!

[Quorum formed.]

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I am very pleased to see some more members come into the chamber to listen to the debate on this important issue. As I was saying, one of the issues around voluntary euthanasia that I have always found quite troubling is the interaction of the introduction of such legislation with individuals who cannot speak for themselves. That is why I think it is important that the terms of reference cover off on how any new legislation will fit in with the existing instruments of the enduring power of attorney and the enduring power of guardianship. They are documents that give another individual rights over decisions about interventions or non-interventions by the medical fraternity. Those documents give the guardian power to make decisions about where an individual lives, who cares for that individual and who can visit that individual. Enduring powers of attorney give the person who holds that power over an individual who can no longer think or make decisions or speak for themselves the ability to distribute their entire wealth, if that is what the guardian chooses. They are very important documents and I feel that they and the legislation already available to people in this state should be specifically considered as part of the terms of reference of this committee with it being established.

The other area that I hope the committee will look into is to have a really good look at tracking the mental health and, if you like, the journeys of individuals who have chronic illness and terminal illness. I can tell members from the very close personal experience that I have had with this is that for individuals in that phase of their life when they have chronic illness there are many ups and downs. There are times when the treatment regime for chemotherapy and radiation therapy, for example, might appear so onerous and so insurmountable that the individual feels: "This is a cliff. This is a hill I just can't climb." For carers who are supporting that individual, the temptation is always there to say, "If you don't want to climb that hill, we won't make you climb that hill." But what I have seen and what I have experienced from not only the experience with my husband, but also with other people who are in chemotherapy wards and hospital wards throughout that entire experience, was that they climb that hill and get over that hill. On the other side of that hill is a broad range of wonderful experiences that one can have with family. At that point when they are over the hill, having come through the critical part of a medical crisis that made one think: "I've had enough", all of a sudden, a new world opens up.

[Member's time extended.]

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: They have a breakthrough and then an ability to contemplate the wide range of opportunities, possibilities and experiences that are available to them. There is a mental health component for people who have chronic and terminal illnesses. We cannot underestimate the impact of a chronic setback in a treatment program for somebody with a chronic or terminal illness. A catastrophic setback can make an individual spiral into a depressive illness and, at that point when everything seems lost, what are the considerations for the treatment cycle? The person knows they have a terminal illness that will finish at some point and that there are ups and downs along the way. This is the vexing issue that I hope the committee will examine. That will be easy if a range of palliative care specialists is brought before the committee to give evidence. Palliative care specialists deal with this issue day in, day out. They work on advance health directives for individuals who are ill, put in place enduring powers of attorney and enduring powers of guardianship, and help people to construct their wills. They help people to understand the quality-of-life choices they want to make while they fight a terminal illness and at what point they want further intervention or no further intervention. They map the progress of individuals who they care for, including their ups and downs in mental health and crossovers with medical crises that individuals meet along the way. I think it is really important that the committee, in its deliberations, bring in a wide range of palliative care professionals. I can tell members from personal experience that when my husband and I were fighting pancreatic cancer, when the palliative care specialist stepped in—this is why I am so passionate about it—all of a sudden, we had a completely different focus on a treatment cycle, a quality-of-life outcome and a direction for the way forward. Palliative care specialists are passionate about what they do. They work with families and carers.

I think a risk with voluntary euthanasia includes the influences on a person's decision-making process. I hope the committee will examine these influences so we have evidence before us to help make decisions as part of the deliberation process should there be a recommendation to this Parliament, for example, and legislation come forward. What different pathways have people chosen? What different choices were made available to people? How have people been managed through that cycle? In my experience, I have met people who have been terribly mismanaged through their treatment cycle. Once a palliative care specialist has intervened to look at an individual and their carers, all of a sudden, the treatment program changes and their entire view of the world can change. The impact that a properly qualified healthcare professional can have on the process is quite incredible.

I have always had difficulty with this legislation because, in my experience, I saw loads of patients with terminal illnesses who were hanging on to the cliff face by their fingernails just trying to keep going and trying to stay alive but their carers were standing outside their rooms saying, "This is too hard; I want this to end." The experience of carers is really important. At some point in their treatment cycle, an individual can say that they are a proponent of voluntary euthanasia and they have a contract, and a bunch of carers may not be receiving the kind of support that they need to support that individual to end of life. We are all going to die; it is the one thing that everyone has in common. What often happens in families is that discussions do not take place and carers are ill prepared for what is ahead of them. A bunch of carers who have enduring power of attorney might be standing outside the room of a patient who is hanging on by their fingernails, saying, "No, I want to stay. I'm still fighting". How does that interact with the decision-making? That is one of the issues that this committee will need to examine closely. I encourage the committee to bring in people from Carers WA and individuals who have had close personal contact caring for loved ones with not only a terminal illness, but also a long-term chronic illness to find out about their experiences and ask them whether voluntary euthanasia legislation is the answer. Perhaps the answer is more readily available grief counselling or more readily available counselling around the ups and downs and intricacies of being a carer, the burden that that brings and, indeed, the effect it has on the health and mental health of the individual in that carer's role. That should be examined by the committee because that will have an influence over the decision-making should any voluntary euthanasia legislation be brought in.

I think I have established that this is a very complex area. Legislative instruments that are available to every individual in this state are massively under-utilised. If I asked every individual in this chamber—I will not ask members to respond—whether they have in place an advance health directive, an enduring power of attorney, an enduring power of guardianship or even a will, I am sure that members would be surprised to learn that many of the lawmakers, the people who decide legislation in this state, have not taken those steps because it is too confronting to have those conversations with loved ones and it is too confronting to consider. We need a higher level of maturity in our thinking and our conversations if we are to get to a point at which we introduce legislation to expand the remit of the end-of-life choices currently available to individuals in our community. Indeed, we must look at some of the underlying issues that sit as a massive dysfunction in some families, such as elder abuse and elder financial abuse. Sometimes carers think that it would be easier if the patient just went. We do not necessarily want to make that decision for the carer; we want that decision to be made in the interests of the patient, including a patient receiving treatment for a chronic or terminal illness who has been assessed and is not in a part of the cycle of the treatment process in which they are experiencing a mental health crisis. It is an incredibly difficult area. I think members can hear my passion for the wider use of the instruments already available in our community before we start to consider introducing additional options, and that is a consideration.

The opposition will be moving two amendments to this motion. The first amendment, which I will move, relates to the inclusion of additional considerations for the committee. Should that amendment fail, the Leader of the Opposition will move the second amendment, which relates to the committee's reporting time frame. When the committee was first proposed, the reporting date was June 2018. However, we believe that the committee should be given 12 months from the date of its formation before it reports back to Parliament to allow it a fair and reasonable time frame to consider the various different nuances of this particularly vexed issue.

Amendment to Motion

MRS L.M. HARVEY: In doing so, I move —

To delete subparagraphs (a), (b) and (c) in paragraph 2 and substitute the following —

- (a) assess the practices currently being utilised within the medical community to manage chronic illnesses and terminal illnesses, including the role of palliative care;
- (b) review the current framework of legislation, proposed legislation and other relevant reports and materials in other Australian states and territories and overseas jurisdictions;
- (c) consider what type of legislative change may be required, including an examination of any federal laws that may impact such legislation;
- (d) examine the risks of introducing voluntary euthanasia, including the impact on suicide prevention; and
- (e) examine the role of advanced health directives, enduring power of attorney and enduring power of guardianship laws and the implications for individuals covered by these instruments in any proposed legislation.

MS A. SANDERSON (Morley — Parliamentary Secretary) [3.30 pm]: I appreciate members' contributions to the debate on this motion. I particularly appreciate the contribution of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. Obviously she has a lived experience of this issue, as do other members in this chamber who have been less vocal. I think it is important that we hear those experiences and that they are well canvassed in this debate. As I said in my speech in debate on the substantive motion, I have taken a no-surprises approach to this issue. I have been honest with the electorate about my position. I was honest with the Parliament about my position in my inaugural speech in this chamber. I was open and up-front with the Leader of the National Party and the Leader of the Opposition in my approach to this matter, as I have been with members in the other place, too. I have been having those discussions, and around six to eight weeks ago the terms of reference were circulated with the proposed committee make-up. I have attempted to continue those discussions. Disappointingly, I was given a copy of this amendment 10 minutes before the beginning of the debate. In my view, that is not a good-faith way to approach this debate. In fact, I was told that I was not going to see a copy of the amendment until it was tabled in Parliament. I do not think that is an appropriate approach if members opposite are genuine about making amendments to this motion. I opened the opportunity to have discussions behind the Chair to make those amendments. I opened that opportunity, and that opportunity was declined. Instead, we have seen an attempt to hijack the process with the earlier debate about the suspension of private members' business.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members!

Ms A. SANDERSON: From my point of view, we have seen a last-minute attempt to amend the terms of reference. I am deeply disappointed that the opposition is taking that approach.

Mr C.J. Barnett interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Cottesloe!

Ms A. SANDERSON: It is not the approach that I have attempted to take, at all. I have been very open for a number of weeks, so it is disappointing. I want to go through the amendment and why I think it substantively changes —

Mr A. Krsticevic: There's not one minister here. Can you believe that—not one minister?

Ms A. SANDERSON: It is not a ministerial bill.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members, this is a private member's motion and the member is on her feet responding to your amendment.

Mrs L.M. Harvey interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member, would you like to be called? Let us all settle down and listen.

Mrs L.M. Harvey: I was very distracted.

Point of Order

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: Madam Acting Speaker, this is actually government business time and the suspension of standing orders was led by the government for this private member's motion to be brought on. The point was being made that in government time, when a suspension of standing orders —

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms J.M. Freeman): Thank you for your direction of my speaking. I do not see that there is a point of order, but, yes, we can continue to listen. I appreciate your help.

Debate Resumed

Ms A. SANDERSON: It is disappointing because that is genuinely not the approach I have taken. I want to run through some of the amendments that I have not had a long time to consider. Paragraph (a) currently states —

... assist a person to exercise their preferences for the way they want to manage their end of life ...

The amendment simply reads —

... manage chronic illnesses and terminal illnesses, including the role of palliative care;

“Including the role of palliative care” is contained in the proposed terms of reference. This amendment would remove end-of-life choices from the terms of reference, which is the intent of my motion. These amendments seek to substantially change the intent of this motion and inquiry, which is a very narrow examination. That is the intent I took to members of the opposition weeks ago. It is a narrow inquiry. It is about legislation, the legislative framework we operate under now and the legislative framework we may operate under in the future. It will not be a broad-ranging inquiry; that was not my intent in moving this motion.

Proposed amended paragraph (d) would read —

examine the risks of introducing voluntary euthanasia, including the impact on suicide prevention; and

That is implicit in the existing terms of reference. I totally agree with the Deputy Leader of the Opposition about the fluid nature of end of life in terms of mental health, physical health and the impact that can have on people's decision-making abilities. That is why the motion includes the words “including the role of palliative care”, because that is a very central part of managing people's end-of-life care. That is managing their sense of wellbeing and how they cope at the end. It is absolutely right that there needs to be safeguards around people hitting a wall and feeling that that is absolutely it, and that not being the only option for them. I totally agree with that. I do not think this amendment does that because I see these two issues as suicide prevention and people with a terminal illness having another choice at the end of their lives when they are imminently about to leave this world as two fundamentally different things. Managing the mental health of people experiencing terminal illness and who are about to leave us is a palliative care issue; it is not a suicide prevention issue. That is why I do not support that amendment.

Proposed amended paragraph (e) reads —

examine the role of advanced health directives, enduring power of attorney ...

That is implicit in paragraph (b). We absolutely should examine that existing framework, but this is not a broad inquiry. I do not intend this to be a broad inquiry into how they operate and have been operating quite well for a number of years. They will be examined as part of the review. Paragraph (b) reads —

review the current framework of legislation, proposed legislation and other relevant reports ...

People have all those mechanisms, if you like, available to them now and they absolutely will be under review by the committee. That is not a necessary amendment. I have said that a better way of approaching this would have been to engage in those discussions behind the Chair, which I had attempted for weeks.

Mrs L.M. Harvey: Can I explain that, member? When we went into the winter recess, a lot of our members were away. We have all come together pretty much over the last three days, which is why this has come to you now. We had a member from the other place who returned only yesterday because that house does not reconvene until next week, so that has been our issue. This is not a stunt and none of this takes away from what you are trying to do.

Ms A. SANDERSON: Member, I am sympathetic but people still work over the winter recess. And we did not have only the winter recess; we had the weeks before the winter recess when I had raised this.

Mrs L.M. Harvey: You can talk. Don't go there.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member, that is unnecessary.

Ms A. SANDERSON: I fear that has not been the approach that has been taken to these amendments. I have outlined that I am open to supporting, I think, the time frame, but that has not yet been moved. But that is not the approach that has been taken to these amendments, so as the mover of the motion I do not support them.

DR M.D. NAHAN (Riverton — Leader of the Opposition) [3.40 pm]: It is important that we show goodwill. Why did we bring this debate to the house, rather than debate it behind the Chair? It is because this is an issue of parliamentary concern. This is setting up a joint parliamentary inquiry. The debate will be recorded in *Hansard* and we have time to deliberate and discuss it. We do this with bills all the time. A minister will eventually be across consideration in detail and the opposition will put amendments to them. That is how we work in this chamber and in Parliament. This motion is being debated in Parliament because we have the backup of parliamentary process and procedures and *Hansard* to vet these things. We are utilising the processes that the member offered to establish a joint parliamentary committee into end-of-life choices. One of the purposes of this amendment is to establish: What does end of life mean? Does it simply mean getting old? I think we need to home in much more closely on what is the central issue. What are we talking about here? It is voluntary euthanasia, amongst other issues such as palliative care. Palliative care is included in the motion. There is a range of issues that we could go on about forever. It is already there and, of course, it is part of the process.

The public is coming to me as the local member for Riverton and asking me what my stance is on voluntary euthanasia. I accept that it is not in the committee title because it has to be kept broad. There has to be a homing in on the essential nature of the issue here—that is, voluntary euthanasia. It will come down to the committee's review of the 50-plus reports around Australia and all the other experiences, and that is why we put it in the amendment. Yes, obviously, the committee would have considered it. Committee members and our member, John McGrath, would have ensured that that issue was considered. But good process requires that if we are talking about a specific thing and that is the major focus of the inquiry, we put it in the terms of reference. That is why we added paragraph (d). We need to home in on the issue of voluntary euthanasia so that we are not dealing with people who are not ill. If it is assisted suicide, we are not interested and the government is not either. We are not interested. I can give members stories of when I have been lobbied by constituents who are actually arguing for, in the name of voluntary euthanasia, assisted suicide when they were not dying. We all have these stories and I will not go into that.

When managing chronic pain and terminal illness, it is the terminal nature of the illness and the chronic pain in that process that are crucial. The committee will also explore the degree and extent of personal choice. That is why we put those issues in the amendment to the motion. We did not do it to thwart the issue. The member for Morley is doing us a favour by bringing this issue forward because, in my view, it needs to be addressed and debated. Despite the well intent of the member for Morley and the member for Baldivis, I was concerned when the member for Baldivis said that we have tried so many times and failed. Yes, that is all true. But those were deliberations of various Parliaments that came to conclusions against voluntary euthanasia. This cannot be perceived or pushed to be a *fait accompli*, because it might not come out that way. I do not know. If we present it as we need to do this to finally achieve a long-term objective that we may have—the member for Morley has a valid objective—we do not want this committee for that. This is an issue we have to get right so we have sat down and thought about how we can add value. One way is to focus on voluntary euthanasia because this is what the story is all about. We need to not only look at all sorts of issues with end of life—of which there are many—and managing that, but home in on managing chronic illness, terminal illness and chronic pain. That is the story. That is the focus. The member would have known that naturally; I accept that she would have done that. I have listened to what she said. I am sure that John McGrath would have done that and I am sure that her colleagues would have done that. That is why we have put forward the amendment. Under subparagraph (e), the committee would look at issues which the member says are important and she would look at anyway, but which she says there is no need to add.

We are not trying to score points against the member. That is not what we are trying to do. That is not the point. We have put this amendment in good faith. Yes, it will take more time than the member wishes and the process will be more complicated, but I can say that it has been a long journey for many people on this issue and it has probably not ended yet. Parliament is messy. It is essential, but messy. I would like the member to consider the amendment. I will sit down and maybe somebody else can talk for a few minutes, unless the member wants to respond, and then I want to put forward the amendment on timing.

MR W.R. MARMION (Nedlands) [3.45 pm]: I want to emphasise what the Leader of the Opposition has just said. I am looking at it purely from the point of view of the terms of reference. These subparagraphs are additions and will not take away what the member for Morley personally wants to achieve. I think we should be aiming for what Parliament wants to achieve, not what the member personally wants to achieve. I know she is upset that this does not follow her process or what she personally wants to achieve, but I believe that the issues in subparagraph (a), which would broaden the terms of reference a little further, would have been looked at anyway. I think that the committee should look at managing chronic and terminal illnesses. It would just broaden the terms of reference. I cannot see why the member cannot accept that. This is the Parliament's decision. It is not a big deal. The amendment will just broaden what the committee looks at so that when there is an outcome, we can claim that the committee has looked at more issues and there will be a better outcome by the committee. Under subparagraphs (d) and (e), the committee would examine two areas. The member suggested that the committee would probably examine those areas anyway. I am just an engineer, but I cannot see why it is a problem if we lock in two areas to examine in the terms of reference. This is fairly basic and simple to me. If I were sitting on the other side, I would accept the amendment.

MR P.A. KATSAMBANIS (Hillarys) [3.47 pm]: I rise to speak on only the amendment at this stage. I think the points have been made very well by other speakers, but there is another issue to this and that is that we are seeking to establish a parliamentary committee to examine these issues. We are trying to get broad support in both Parliament and the community for a course of action that may or may not be undertaken. Unlike legislation that is proposed by the government—it is the government’s legislation—if we are looking at getting broad support and broad acceptance of the process that we are going to embark on, perhaps, as I said in the debate on the suspension of standing orders, it is better to get more opinions right from the outset and perhaps on the drafting of the wording.

As the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and the Leader of the Opposition have said, people in the community do not talk about end-of-life choices. I have never had anyone talk to me about end-of-life choices. I have regularly had people talk to me about voluntary euthanasia. Some people are in favour of it and some people are vehemently in favour of it; some are opposed to it and some are vehemently opposed to it. Others just ask questions and want to know more. I suggest that a large chunk—I do not know whether it is a majority—of the population sit in the middle and ask lots of questions about whether it is a good idea. That is what we have been talking about as a community until now. Most of those reports and previous failed legislative schemes that we have heard about have also been outlining that. To start introducing much broader terms into the debate risks more alienation, and people will feel uncomfortable about the direction we take this process. In the last 30 years at least that I have been following this debate relatively closely, it has always been about managing chronic illness and terminal illness. That is what it has been about. It has not been about end-of-life choices, and I do not really know what end-of-life choices really means. It could even mean the choices people have about accommodation or the provision of general health services. It is a very, very broad area. Yes, I heard from the mover of the motion that this is the sort of area we will look at anyway. If this is the sort of area we are going to look at, why not put a ring fence around it? What is it about the proposed terms “manage chronic illnesses” and “terminal illnesses” that causes consternation? Can we expand on that and further amend it to include any other things that are needed? That is the sort of thing that a parliamentary process should tease out, as the Deputy Leader of the Opposition clearly said. The right place to do this is Parliament. If this is a committee created by parliamentarians rather than a committee created by the executive or by political parties, this is the right place to do it.

The examination of risks of introducing voluntary euthanasia, including the impact on suicide prevention—proposed paragraph (d) of this motion—is essential because the drafting of (2)(c) in the original motion reads —

consider what type of legislative change may be required, including an examination of any federal laws that may impact such legislation.

It is almost saying without highlighting it, as I said in my contribution to the suspension motion, that this committee will look into what type of legislation and how we create it, rather than whether we should do it and then how to do it. If this is genuinely a committee that will examine both parts—whether we do this, and if we do this, how we do this—proposed paragraph (d) is absolutely essential, because right now, without that paragraph, my reading of this motion indicates a path down one track only and that is the “how” and “what type of legislation”. It does not say whether legislation is required and what type of legislation it is. It states “what type of legislation may be required”. That is important because even if that is not the intention, that is how it can be read by significant groups in the community that need to be brought with Parliament in any debate, not alienated from the debate. Proposed paragraph (d) in the amendment is provided in good faith, and it should be looked at in that good faith. Again, perhaps the wording of (2)(c) in the motion can be changed to make the proposed new paragraph (d) unnecessary, but do not dismiss it out of hand, because if the government is trying to bring the community together on this matter rather than divide it—there will be some division at the edges, but we need to keep as many people inside the tent as possible—do not just dismiss it out of hand but seriously consider it. If the government has any alternative words, we would be happy to consider those. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition, who moved this amendment, explained the position very well. A number of legal avenues are currently available to people in Western Australia to provide others—third parties, trusted family members or trusted people—with strong instructions about what happens to them and their health care at times when they may not be in a position to communicate those decisions themselves. The people who choose to avail themselves of these options are not people who make a decision on the run, let me tell you. I have some legal experience in this area and, as the Leader of the Opposition made clear, very few people consider these options—too few people do in my opinion. But those who do, do it having given deep thought to the issues they are confronting. They have thought about it or weighed up the consequences and then proceeded to make advance health directives and give enduring powers of attorney and guardianship. They have made the decision after having given deep thought to those issues. Having done that, they would have an expectation that any changes to the legal framework would not impinge on their own free will and the choices that they have communicated.

Yes, I hear from the mover of the motion that these things would probably be looked at—the terms of reference are wide enough to look at them—but why not include a provision that expressly indicates that the group in our community that has most considered these issues already will not either be disenfranchised, excluded or have some sort of necessary and unavoidable consequences come into play as a result of new legislation? Why not give them the comfort that their choices will be considered and that the instruments that they have already chosen to use will

not be disregarded? Remember, as I said at the outset, these are people who have turned their minds most to this issue, so they are the ones who should be patted on the back and not disenfranchised at all. I stress that I have only spoken at this stage to the amendments being proposed. I commend them to the house and I commend them to the mover. If this particular wording is not good enough, let us continue to work on it and get it right. By showing good faith, by showing good spirit right from the outset, we will be able to bring more of the community with us as we embark on what we know is going to be a difficult, contentious and highly public process over the next year or so.

MR R.R. WHITBY (Baldivis — Parliamentary Secretary) [3.58 pm]: I would like to speak to this amendment. I think I heard from the member for Hillarys that there was good faith, which I am glad to hear, because we are prepared to negotiate on this matter in good faith. This is an important issue for the Western Australian community. I make the point: what is wrong with the conversation? We have proposed that in paragraph (a) of the proposed amendments we insert a reference to end-of-life choices. That might not be a term that the member for Hillarys has heard, but around the world it is the way this issue is described. Around the world various jurisdictions have addressed this issue of giving an end-of-life choice to end pain and suffering when death is inevitable, when death is imminent, when intolerable suffering occurs and when there is no alternative choice than to live with that pain and suffering in the last months or days of life. We think it is an important issue to insert in that section of the amendment. We are prepared to accept the amendment with that inclusion of end-of-life choices. If we are being fair and reasonable and acting in good faith, we would include the opposition's suggestions. In turn, we ask the opposition to include ours.

Paragraph (e) of the amendment states —

examine the role of advanced health directives, enduring power of attorney and enduring power of guardianship laws and the implications for individuals covered by these instruments in any proposed legislation.

We are prepared to accept that. We think that is fair enough. Paragraph (d) states —

examine the risks of introducing voluntary euthanasia, including the impact on suicide prevention; and

Those issues will be discussed.

Debate adjourned, pursuant to standing orders.

STATE ECONOMY

Motion

MR D.C. NALDER (Bateman) [4.01 pm]: I move —

That this house notes the constant negative commentary by the Premier and members of his government about Western Australia's economy, which is hurting consumer and business confidence, and calls on the state government to take a more considered approach to the economic narrative.

There is no question that we are starting to see signs of recovery within the economy and that there are green shoots, which is fantastic. However, it is important to understand that our economic conditions are still very fragile. Although we are starting to see shoots of renewal, particularly in the mining sector, where we have seen the resurgence of iron ore prices, which flows right through and is fantastic, other elements of our economy are still struggling. A lot of the commentary that is coming from the Premier and the Treasurer with some of the issues that they have been floating, including new taxes and charges and so forth in the upcoming budget, have negative consequences throughout the broader economy. It is important for the government to understand that it has to be much broader and deeper and understand the consequences of its commentary on the economy that it is providing for the people of Western Australia.

Today I will attempt to frame what the government has been saying and the consequences of that commentary on the people of Western Australia and small businesses in Western Australia. The current government has focused too much on political pointscore and not enough on governing and understanding the consequences of the commentary it is making. In my observations and commentary, I need to start at the election and what we witnessed, saw and heard from the then opposition before coming to government. Less than six months ago, the McGowan government promised \$5 billion in additional spending for Labor commitments to return the budget to surplus by 2019–20 and to pay down state debt slowly like a house. At the time we were really concerned because we could not see how all these things could be brought together. It did not add up. Furthermore, it is interesting to hear the rhetoric from the current government, and prior to that when it was in opposition, about being a more transparent government than the previous one. Yet it is the first government in the last three terms, and I do not know how long before that, that would not submit its commitments to Treasury for analysis and for an understanding of the impact on the budget during the election. We would say that that is a deliberate strategy to try to form government but it has been done so quite mischievously.

As I go through this there will be no question that members will be able to see the impact that has had. Before members listen to the government's rhetoric about the impact of net debt, look at the Treasury costings for the

Labor Party at the 2008 and 2013 elections. They were pretty much in line with what the then government took to those elections. The biggest variation between the two parties was at the 2017 election. The Labor Party's spending commitments were more than double what the Liberal Party took to the election, yet the Labor Party would not have its commitments costed. Although it has been in government for several months, the Labor government still has not had its commitments costed and has not been transparent about the impact its election campaign commitments will have on the Western Australian community.

During the election campaign the Labor Party said that it would return the budget to a surplus by 2019–20 and pay down state debt slowly, like a house, whilst committing to spend \$5 billion. If those outcomes are to be achieved, something will have to give. What we have heard since the election is the potential for a raft of new taxes. We have seen a dramatic increase in the cost of household fees and expenses, and that has drained Western Australians' confidence in WA's economic outlook and in what they believe they can spend and what they need to do, which ultimately affects the GST and the state's economy.

I would also like to talk explicitly about the promises the Premier made during the election. He said that he would not impose any new taxes or increase any existing taxes. I quote —

“There will be no new taxes on West Australians, full stop. If we are elected, there will be no new taxes on West Australians or increases in taxes on Western Australians if we are elected, full stop,” ...

He also said that, if elected, he would not sell public assets, except the TAB, and he would not sell Western Power or other core monopoly assets in a bid to solve the financial problems. He also stated —

“Under no circumstances will we sell Western Power, Water Corporation or Fremantle Port,” he said.

“That is a core, iron-clad, non-negotiable commitment.

He also said that he would not impact frontline service delivery of agencies. He stated —

“There will be savings over time, we haven't put a figure on it but there will be significant savings generated,” ...

We now know that he later said that there would be savings of \$750 million through public sector changes by 2020.

On 1 August 2017, Premier McGowan claimed that the budget to be unveiled by the Treasurer on 7 September would be the best in living memory, but for households it is not expected to be without pain. On 22 June, the government announced that in 2017–18 the total expenditure on the representative household of government goods and services is forecast to increase by \$438, or 7.7 per cent, per household from 2016–17 levels. It is important to look at what this comprises. The fixed charge for electricity supplied to all households will increase by \$169 a year. That represents an increase of 10.9 per cent on the average household bill. Water, sewerage and drainage fees will increase by six per cent, or \$97 a year; public transport fares for the average household will increase by 11 per cent, or \$132.60. That includes a 17 per cent increase in student fares. Motor vehicle fees will increase by \$30.85, or 3.85 per cent, and the emergency services levy will increase by \$9, or 3.3 per cent. The McGowan government is also attacking households that hold a WA Seniors Card by capping rebates at \$100 respectively for water service charges, local government rates and the underground electricity connection charge as at 1 July 2017. This measure is anticipated to save an estimated \$84 million across the forward estimates.

We acknowledge that this will deliver a saving for the government, but I fear that the government will go through this process and will present a budget for the Western Australian people on 7 September that will not take into consideration the flow-on effect on the economy. We know Western Australia has been hurting as a result of the dramatic decline in iron ore prices and the subsequent shift from construction to production which was, in essence, the perfect storm for our economy. Since that point in time it has been tough in our economy, and this is where governments need to be sensitive to what the broader community can tolerate when looking at setting budgets for the future.

This is what the former government did, and why we did not put through what was in the forward estimates for household charges like electricity prices. Seven per cent was in our forward estimates for around four years, yet we never actually saw seven per cent allocated in any given budget year because we took into consideration the impact it would have on the broader community. When we had a three per cent power price rise last year, the then Leader of the Opposition, now Premier, considered that the then government was being mean-spirited because that was hurting households, yet he was quite happy to oversee a 10.9 per cent increase in power charges this year.

The point I keep coming back to is: what will be the consequences for our economy of putting this pain on households? This is what the opposition calls on the government to become more aware of and to become more sensitive about when it is talking about the economy and making flippant comments about the current financial position of Western Australia. There are consequences as a result of that.

The McGowan government has already announced a number of measures to share this burden including, as I said, the \$750 million in savings that will result from a 40 per cent reduction in the number of government departments,

and a service priority review to find ways to make the public sector more efficient. We have also heard about the four-year pay freeze for members of Parliament and the state's highest-paid bureaucrats; a tighter wages policy across the public sector, with increases capped at \$1 000; increases in port charges on the state's largest miners; and removal of the \$5 000 first home buyers' grant boost. The decision was taken by the former government last December to create a boost for the housing sector because the sector is in the doldrums and we were trying to assist it through some pretty tough times. That boost, which was put in place for 12 months, was reduced by the new government to a six-month period to end on 30 June. At the time of announcing that reduction, the Treasurer said that nobody was taking it up and that it added no value. If it added no value, why did the government need to remove it? When that bill comes to the house, the opposition will demonstrate the actual impact it was having and what has subsequently happened in the housing industry as a result of removing that boost as at 30 June.

Again, I am talking about the consequences of decisions that the government is making. It is very easy for it to sit there and say, "We need to make this decision because of the impact on the budget", but unless it understands the intricacies of those decisions on the economy, the consequences could be much harsher and greater than the benefit we receive from the decisions it has taken.

Another thing that has occurred over the last two months is speculation over a number of new taxes the government is considering and has refused to rule out at this time. Despite going to the last election saying, "We will not introduce new taxes nor see tax increases", we have heard announcement after announcement in which consideration has been given. These include cashing out the iron ore miners' lease rental fee; increasing royalty rates; introducing a new tax on individual households that utilise the Uber service; a \$270 water levy on Western Australian homes; using Lotterywest grants to fund election commitments; and, most recently, a new tax on banks and their customers. The difficulty is that although a number of these are being considered, businesses out there in the community are being left wondering, "What is going to happen?" We know it is tough, but when we hear this type of conversation going on all the time, people start to take their hands out of their pockets and stop spending.

It is great to see signs of recovery, but they are very green, early shoots. They are not in all aspects of our economy. We are definitely seeing it in the mining side, driven by increases in drilling and exploration, which is fantastic. From talking to people organising the Diggers and Dealers Mining Forum in Kalgoorlie, there was a great turnout this year, which is fantastic. The uncertainty that is created does not afford any confidence in other parts of our economy to move forward at this point. I am really concerned about that. That is where the pain is. That is why there were reactions during tough economic times. The former government stepped in to underpin the housing sector to ensure it could do its bit to soften the situation it found itself in. Coupled with this, the Premier has continued to talk down the economy by using unnecessary hyperbole—making comparisons with the Great Depression, flippantly referring to the state's finances as diabolical and suggesting we could become an economic basket case.

Ms J.J. Shaw: We would have if you had stayed in government!

Mr D.C. NALDER: You are not that impressive, for an educated person.

My point is that the Premier's commentary in no way provides confidence to the marketplace that it can feel assured that the government knows what it is doing and is putting in place the right sorts of mechanisms to create financial prosperity for all Western Australians. Consumer confidence has just started to recover although it remains very fragile. Twenty-nine per cent of consumers believe the WA economy will strengthen in the medium term—12 months—up by three per cent from the previous quarter. However, underlying this headline number are a number of measures that show the fragility of consumer confidence. Overall, 60 per cent of consumers are optimistic that the economy will remain the same or improve over the medium term. That is down from 64 per cent in the previous quarter. Around 62 per cent of consumers believe the economy will remain the same or grow stronger in the short term—three months—down by five per cent from the previous quarter. Living costs continue to play a major part in determining consumer confidence, with more than 64 per cent of consumers highlighting it as a concern. It remains the second most influential factor. Domestic economic news is a growing priority, with more than 63 per cent of consumers stating domestic economic news impacted their perception of the economy. That highlights the point I am trying to make. We talk about the importance of governing for Western Australia and the decisions that we make. My point to the government in today's speech is to highlight the fact that there are consequences to the political slanging that the government has been undertaking in trying to put down the previous administration. That has negative consequences on the broader economy and people's perception of an economy that the government would want to recover.

Consumer confidence in personal finances dropped three per cent in the June quarter. The level of confidence is one per cent higher than the six-year low from the June quarter of 2016. Around 39 per cent of consumers reported that their financial situation had deteriorated since the last quarter, compared with 16 per cent who indicated that it had improved. Concerns regarding employment conditions have increased since the previous quarter, with 31 per cent of consumers reporting their employment situation had worsened since the last quarter. Only nine per cent of consumers believed their job prospects had improved since the last quarter.

I am sharing a lot of statistics to raise the point that although more broadly we are seeing signs of economic recovery, we need to be very careful and be cognisant that that is not flying through to all aspects of the economy. Sure, the Western Australian economy has relied heavily, some would argue too heavily, on mining, but we are seeing elements of recovery in the mining sector. Those elements will flow through to the broader economy; there is no question about that, but it will take time. However, in that process, we do not need to beat up the rest of the state and make it too difficult for the economy to function as family units and businesses. I continue to reiterate that overall our economy continues to remain fragile. Some economic indicators lend support to the notion of the economy recovering, but a number of indicators show that sectors of the economy remain weak.

I want to talk about the sectors of our economy that remain weak. The trend for building approvals increased by 1.7 per cent in May, but there was a fall of 19.2 per cent in annual average terms. Housing finance commitments decreased by 0.6 per cent in May, and fell 10.6 per cent in 2016–17. The latest Master Builders Association industry forecast for Western Australia in June 2017 states —

The latest data shows prospects in the housing market continue to get worse, with a moderate fall in activity in 2015–16 to be followed this year by a crash of around 21.8 per cent—wiping around \$2 billion out of the State economy in the process.

The seasonally adjusted unemployment rate in Western Australia, which is significantly better than we were witnessing towards the end of last year, increased between May and June from 5.5 per cent to 5.6 per cent. This is one of the questions I look forward to analysing within the budget in September. It was interesting to note the commentary that the Treasurer put out in the Twitter space that he does not want to book revenues unless they are real. However, a lot of our forward estimates are actually forecast through Treasury, so they are forecast assessments rather than money that is actually flowing into coffers. I thought, we are seeing unemployment drop, which should mean that we begin to see increased projections in payroll tax revenue through Treasury. I look forward to seeing how the unemployment level, dropping the way it has over the past year, will flow through into the budget, unless we start to see standard operating procedure number one of a new government—wanting to make our financial position look worse than it really is, to set itself up for future budgets. If the government were to do that, I would caution it that in so doing it could damage a very fragile economy. I urge the government not to think about it too politically, in the sense of trying to paint a picture that our financial position is worse than it is, by leaving out forecasts of potential revenue growth while trying to maximise expenditure growth in its first budget. Seasonally adjusted employment increased by 0.5 per cent to 1.367 million during June. This was an increase of 7 074 full-time jobs, while part-time employment decreased by 107. The seasonally adjusted participation rate increased to 68 per cent in June 2017 from 67.6 per cent in May.

Going back over the points I wanted to make to the house today, we are seeing signs of recovery in our economy, which is fantastic for Western Australia. It is something that we should all be excited about, and hopeful that it will continue to improve. However, the flowthrough effects on where we are seeing those signs of recovery need to be fostered and allowed to grow. If things are done in the budget that penalise jobs and the opportunities for businesses to grow, this will only have a negative effect and will fulfil some of the projections the government may portray in the budget. On 2 August, the Chamber of Commerce and Industry of Western Australia issued a warning to the government in its pre-budget submission that new or increased taxes, fees and charges would cost jobs. It also said —

CCI Chief Economist Rick Newnham says any job losses as a result of the state budget will be in direct conflict with the McGowan Government's election mandate to boost employment in WA's private sector.

...

He says four out of five WA jobs are in the private sector and businesses must feel certain and confident in the economic environment to maintain staffing levels and create new jobs.

My point is that the opposition understands the challenge that the government has. We talked about the GST issue for years but the then shadow Treasurer commented that the GST issue was well known and that the GST was not the issue. All of a sudden, the GST is now the issue. We understand the financial pain that the state has been in for the last two to three years, but we urge caution. The government should understand the consequences on the broader economy of the decisions that it makes. I fear that it is looking too closely at the points of decisions that it is making without understanding the far-reaching impacts that they will have on the broader economy.

In looking at where Western Australia is going, I have heard successive federal and state governments of both persuasions talk about the need to broaden our economic base. What fascinates me about that is that over the last two or three decades I have heard continual rhetoric that we must broaden our base. If members look back to the 1950s and 1960s, they will see that our economy lived off the sheep's back. During the Korean War, wool prices went up to £1 for a pound and farmers were very successful. There was talk back then that we were living off the sheep's back and that we needed to broaden and diversify the economy. We are lucky in Western Australia in that we did broaden and diversify our economy through the 1970s, particularly during the Charlie Court era; we saw real attempts to get the mining sector going in Western Australia and there have been fantastic consequences. But

we have become too reliant on mining. We hear again the rhetoric that we must broaden the economy, but what we do not hear enough of in this place is governments talking about how. When he came into office, Premier McGowan said that we needed to broaden the economy and that we needed to do it with the agriculture and tourism industries. My question is: how? We are often good at talking about what needs to happen, but we have not been very good at understanding how—that is, what needs to happen, when it needs to happen, who will make it happen and when it will happen. We need to see change management within those areas and decide how that change will be delivered. Creating additional bureaucratic processes is not a way of broadening an economy. Creating additional resources in bureaucratic jobs does not broaden the economy. We have to understand the market opportunities and the value and supply chains within those industries and look at where the gaps are in those areas. We have to understand whether it is the government or the private sector that needs to contribute and support policies to ensure that those things happen to broaden the economy. These are longer term plays that will underpin the future prosperity of Western Australia and something that we need to continue to work on.

In wrapping up today, I reiterate that for the last two to three years, Western Australia has been through some economic tough times. Commodity prices have fallen dramatically and there has been a flow-on effect on royalties received by the state. We have seen the impact of the GST lag effect whereby royalties fall through the floor, yet the GST does not recover for a three-year period and we have seen the flow-on effect that has had on state finances. It creates an unfair environment for Western Australia. We argued that for a number of years and we were criticised in past times for focusing on that, but the government is now waking up to it. We encourage the government to support the notion that a bipartisan approach is needed at both a state and federal level to solve the issue. The only way we can get a true position on this from our federal colleagues is if both Bill Shorten and Malcolm Turnbull agree that it needs to be fixed. Otherwise, politics will play out, and as a state with a small populace that does not have the political influence in Canberra that other states have, we will miss out again. We call on the McGowan government to work with us and lobby Bill Shorten—we will lobby the Prime Minister—and make sure that both parties come to the table to agree to a solution.

In the interim, I reiterate that it is important for the government to understand the consequences of its decision, which are more far wide-reaching than just a line in the budget. The government has to understand the flowthrough effect on the economy and the impact it will have on other industries in Western Australia. To date, the rhetoric we have heard from the Premier and the ideas that were floated by the Treasurer and the Premier have created confusion for people about the economy and concern that things will get only worse. The statistics I read out recently point that out. I hope some points I made will resonate with the government and members will take them into consideration. I look forward to seeing what the government puts out on 7 September, and I look forward to our time to analyse it. I am a little bit confused about what might be in the budget because of the number of balloons that have been floated. I hope that the government does not go overboard to paint as bleak a picture as it can in its first budget to try to buy itself space in future budgets to prove it has improved the state's financial situation. That action could have serious negative consequences for our fragile economy.

DR M.D. NAHAN (Riverton — Leader of the Opposition) [4.32 pm]: I would like to contribute to this debate. It is essentially about this: we have a very fragile economy. Some green shoots are appearing, particularly in the mining and agricultural sectors, but other sectors of the economy are dead flat to remaining negative. As my colleague the member for Bateman outlined, the government was elected on a program that was essentially impossible to meet. It was to reduce debt over time, reduce the deficit, introduce no new taxes or increase taxes, make moderate increases in fees and charges, and \$5 billion worth of expenditure. It just does not add up. The government knew it at the time, but the program was successful for the Labor Party because it was elected in a landslide. I guess it had the politics right. One thing that reappears for this government is that it had a very good plan to win government, but it had very little, except thought bubbles, to govern. That is essentially what we are here for today. The government successfully won the election. The reasons it won were manifold but, essentially, it was that household finances and confidences were shot. If members look through the data, household expenditure in Western Australia over the last 12 months is by far the lowest in the nation. House prices have been stagnant to declining. House sales have been difficult to make. Housing starts have deteriorated. What underlies all household budgets is a person's biggest asset—the house. It has what we call a wealth effect. A person's confidence is largely determined not so much by their income stream, but by their wealth and asset base, and these are mostly in the house. Of course, many people now have superannuation, but not so much in Western Australia because most superannuation money is invested nationally. There are very, very low returns on superannuation.

Households were extremely concerned, particularly relative to the boom times. Households were struggling with income; employment was uncertain; wages, when received, were flat or declining; there was risk about future employment and difficulty getting two income streams into households; major assets, whether superannuation or most importantly houses, were declining in value or stagnant; and people generally lacked confidence in the economy. That is the main reason the Labor Party won the election. The Labor Party also verbally addressed some of the issues people had with jobs and expressed but did not detail some 200 good ideas about its vision for the future, so it won the election in a landslide. The Labor Party gave people confidence that it had a plan that would not adversely impact the economy. I am afraid the Labor Party's plan would never add up, so it had to concoct

another one. The government's plan, which is very common and many governments have done so in the past, was to look at the books and say, "Woe is me, the books are worse than we thought; we will have to do all sorts of drastic things." That has been the rhetoric since 11 March: "Woe is us, the books are worse than we thought; we will have to do drastic things."

The government is quite clearly meeting its spending commitments. Today, it was ironic that we had a lecture by the Premier about how bad the finances are—which was caused by us—and then the Minister for Transport stood up and proclaimed that she is spending more money on another transport system to Ellenbrook. It appears that all roads and trains lead to Ellenbrook. The government does not see the irony in complaining about the woeful expenditure of the former government and then announcing new additional spending to one suburb. Soon after the election the Premier said his classic "Woe is us, we are a financial basket case and the economy is the worst since the Great Depression." People listened to that. People listen because he is the Premier and he has access to the books. People assume that he knows what he is talking about and that generally leaders do not talk down the economy; they talk it up. The problem with saying that the economy is as bad as during the Great Depression is that the Great Depression was a pretty difficult time in Western Australia, with 30 per cent-plus unemployment and the state unable to borrow. That is a drastic statement. I guarantee members that when we see the Western Australian Treasury Corporation data, we will see an increase in spreads after that little outburst from the Premier. We look forward to exploring that in the estimates process, because that is what is going to happen.

Again, I go back to households. One of the real issues that we explored in question time was the Premier's decision to slam down on immigration. He did it in three ways. First of all, he changed the status of Perth from a regional centre to a capital city. Under regional centre status, migrants get more points for migrating to and living in Western Australia than they do for going to a capital city like Melbourne, Brisbane or Sydney. Secondly, the Premier said that the first thing he did was to limit the number of categories suitable for state migration from 178 to 18. Those 18 categories are essentially for people with specialist medical skills, such as surgeons and other specialist medical practitioners. That change eliminated categories such as chefs, grain and livestock farmers, welders—all sorts of things. It will have a profound impact on our economy. What drives housing? Population growth. Melbourne and Sydney are two booming economies, but the growth is coming primarily from population growth. Over the last 12 months, 148 000 migrants have moved to Melbourne. What is our population growth? It is close to negative. The latest data, which is about, I think, three months old, shows that the annualised growth in the Western Australian population was 0.6 per cent—the lowest in at least 35 years. If the trend continues—it is almost in freefall—we will see, for the first time in living memory, negative population growth in Western Australia. I know the real estate people know this; I do not know whether the government does. But that should send shivers down the Treasurer's back. If population growth is going into the negative, that means the demand for housing, retail services, recreation, whitegoods and almost all household consumables will be negligible to negative.

How do we get population growth up? After the boom, people came to build the assets that we had invested in and, understandably, some people are going back to where they came from. Many young Western Australians are leaving for better-paying jobs and more income interstate. We cannot do too much about that—there is a free choice about where we live—but we can do a couple of things. We can talk it up and allow and encourage migrants to come here, and encourage foreign students to come here. It is a well-tested methodology, and it is actually the lifeblood of the booming state of Victoria. But to get people to come here, they have to be allowed to do it. If a government clamps down and shuts almost all categories of migration, do not be surprised if people do not come, and that is what is happening.

One of the major areas of growth of population in recent years has been international students. Western Australia was highly successful—particularly Curtin University—for decade after decade. In many ways it and RMIT University were the starters of the international student growth, which now is, I think, between the third and fifth largest export industry in Australia. During the boom times here the international student population stagnated and declined for a few years, although 2016 was a good year. The reason was that Western Australia rightly got a reputation for being a high-cost place to live. We have good universities, but it was just too costly to live. Jobs were good, but it was too costly to live. Now that the costs of living are coming down, the options for doubling the number of international students in Western Australia—mainly in Perth—is there for the taking.

So what did the government do? It went out, slammed down on population growth, and clearly the Minister for Tourism, amongst others, does not have a clue. He said, "How is that going to impact on foreign students?"

Anybody with a remote knowledge of international students knows that one of the main reasons Australia has been very successful in attracting international students is that it welcomes them eventually, if they want to, as migrants. South Australia and Tasmania, which are regional centres, know this and are advertising in their recruitment that Western Australia is now not a place where students can stay after they finish their education. I do not think the government had any idea of the impact this made. Yes, during the election it was popular to say, "We're shutting down competition for jobs by reducing immigration. We are eliminating all these categories, and the only ones who can emigrate here are in fact surgeons." But the spin-off consequences of this will be that we will get

substantially fewer migrants, substantially smaller population growth, and an absolute collapse of one of our largest export services in Western Australia and one that has the potential to double in size—that is, international students. The government did not think through these decisions at all.

We know what the government is up to. The government made an offer to the public, which it bought in large numbers, but it will never be deliverable. As the member for Bateman pointed out, the government is telling the public, “Woe is us. The books are much worse than we thought. It’s terrible; it’s diabolical. It’s all the previous government’s fault.” The government is also trying to come up with a budget in which it does everything so that it can blame it on us and hope that the people who pay for it forget about it in four years. It is a well-trodden path.

The consequences will hit the economy of Western Australia hard, particularly if the government follows through with the raft of tax increases that it has floated. One of those taxes is, indeed, a tax on foreign investors. During the election campaign, the details that were enunciated included that foreign investors were coming in and buying apartments and flats here and pushing up the prices. Yes, they were, but they were not doing so in large numbers relative to other states and they are not now. Pushing up the price in a decreasing market is not a bad idea. Our problem is lack of demand, not too much demand. We do not live in Victoria or New South Wales where there is probably too much demand. We have a lack of customers; ask the real estate agents. By the way, from the state’s perspective, demand is not too bad because a major source of income is land tax and stamp duty. Therefore, it is good to have some demand for property.

The government will put a tax on foreign investors. Again, I go back to the topic of international students. International students come here for a variety of reasons, such as good universities and also an option to live here. Their parents—as members who have had any interaction with them will know—often buy flats and apartments in this state. That is the cornerstone of the expansion of the Melbourne inner-city housing market. The largest industry in Melbourne is international students, which has spin-offs through not only demand and paying tuition, but also creating living space in Melbourne. The government’s decision on immigration is excessive. If I were in Melbourne, I would worry about the growth in demand through population growth, but Perth is at the opposite end of the spectrum. The government’s decision to support populist policies to slam down on immigration will decimate one of our two largest industries. One is international students. Talk to the universities—they can see it coming—or the TAFEs or the many, many people who work in that industry. I believe that about 10 000 people work in the industry.

Then we look at the various people who are building apartments here, which not only employs people, but encourages the infill development of our city. Without foreign investment in that, through demand from both investors and purchasers, we will not have that. I do not know exactly what Treasury is using now, but in the past it used 1.9 per cent average standard population growth to forecast demand for infrastructure. On this basis, we can forget about that. Metronet is not going to have the people to demand it, unless we do something about this matter. Clamping down on immigration is the opposite of what is needed, and jacking up all sorts of taxes is not needed. We will not need Metronet because we are not going to have anywhere near the population growth being forecast—if the government has any business case for Metronet.

As the member for Bateman pointed out, another issue with household expenditure is that each year we subsidise electricity quite sharply. We put seven per cent in our forward estimates. We never went through it in the last term of government. The reason that we put in seven per cent is that we needed to bring down the subsidy to as close to zero as possible. But to avoid increases that would kick household budgets, we drove efficiencies in Synergy and Horizon Power. We tried to lower costs rather than raise prices, and we did that. Last year we increased it by three per cent, which was a difficult decision. As the member for Bateman pointed out, the now Premier decried it as heartless.

The government went too hard with its rate increases this time and it did that for political purposes. Yes, over time prices have to be increased to reduce the subsidy. Yes, the focus on the up-front charge for electricity versus the variable charge was the right move. However, the government went too hard too quickly and it did that for political purposes. It did that to get everything over with now so that it could blame it on us and then hope that people forget about it in four years’ time. It kicked the economy in the groin. It is going to hurt householders, particularly those on modest incomes and particularly at this stage when people are struggling and budgets are tough. The government has substantially increased charges and householders are going to look at this and say, “I’m out of here”, “I can’t spend anything” or “We’re struggling.”

[Member’s time extended.]

Dr M.D. NAHAN: The government’s tactic will be to do as much as possible to blame it on us. That is the key game; we see it in question time every day: blame it on us. The reality is that the government knew what it was. Things probably have deteriorated a bit since the election, and I will wait to see exactly how much it has deteriorated. The GST share is up because we put in a floor of \$220 million. There is no doubt that there has been a reduction in the population. When I was Treasurer, I struggled through about three or four of those reductions. The government knew what the budget was at the time. Its real problem is that it is choosing to fund its election commitments, which were excessive—they were not double ours; they were triple. We went into that campaign

with extremely modest increases in both operating and capital expenditure over the forward estimates. I might be wrong on this, but I think our commitments to an increase in operating expenditure amounted to less than \$300 million over four years. That is by far the lowest of any government promise I can remember. Of course, we also had the sale of Western Power, which, judging from the New South Wales result, would not have given us \$11 billion; it would have given us \$14 billion. It would have paid off debt. We forecast that it would reduce debt to \$28 billion, not \$42 billion. Depending on what we did with the additional money, it would have been closer to \$25 billion. We had a plan, but the people voted for the Labor Party. It told the people that it had a plan and that it would not kick household budgets in the groin, but that is what it is doing, and it does not need to.

If the government is worried about cutting costs, it should not build more lines to Ellenbrook. This was always important when I was Treasurer, especially at budget time. The shadow Treasurer would hop up and rib me and tear me apart for our debt level, our excessive expenditure and our high deficit, while everybody else around him would jump up and say, "Spend more; spend more." The member for Bateman once commented on it, and that was when we had a very large deficit; I think it was about \$1.4 billion. How much was it?

Mr D.C. Nalder: I think it was about \$7.5 billion.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: It was \$7.5 billion, with additional demands. It is a good thing we did not listen to members opposite. They are happy now that we did not listen to them.

The simple fact is that the government is spending money on things that it has chosen to spend money on. Yes, it made commitments, but I want to highlight the education assistants. I know that members opposite will say that I am picking on education assistants. I have a very public school intensive electorate and a lot of education assistants there do great work. The reality is that we have the highest ratio of education assistants of any state. We have 30 per cent more than the average of other states and up to 50 per cent more than some other states. The Barnett government added 2 000 education assistants during its term of government. We reduced the number of assistants for peanut allergy issues by 300, but we more than replaced those with the additional ones in the public sector. It is true that the Labor Party promised 300 more education assistants during the election campaign. It is going to cost the government \$40 million over the forward estimates. It met that commitment. But if the government says that the finances it inherited were so large, why did it not skip that and break that promise, rather than break the promises on electricity, water, apparently on taxes and on pay rises for police? The government chose to meet one of its spending promises rather than its revenue-raising promises, or its promise to police. Those are the choices it made.

Let me emphasise the promise about education assistants. I suspect the reason the government made that promise is that it is a government controlled more than most by one union—United Voice. Most, if not all, education assistants, and the police of course, are members of United Voice, which is not only affiliated with the Labor Party, but is also one of its largest funders. It has one of the most powerful factions in this place and in the upper house, and is the party that the government relies on for control. The government chose to increase the number of education assistants to address the concerns of its largest funder and promoter, United Voice, rather than assess the need for them. So far, the government went out and said, "Aren't education assistants good?" but it has never put together a case for the need for additional education assistants in a tough economic environment. The Labor Party did it in the campaign but it has never come forward with the case for more education assistants, except to say that education assistants are good. But we know why the government has promised it and done it—it wanted to address the demands of United Voice.

Now the government will have to pay for those 400 assistants and it will have to pay for them by not agreeing to the promises it made about wages for police—renegeing on the police deal—or in fact by raising more taxes. That will hit households. I do not go around my electorate and hear huge demands for more education assistants. What I hear over and over again is that they are struggling out there. Their household budgets are tight; they are worried about jobs and about income growth and employment. The government knew that. The Labor Party knew that and won the election on that basis but it is not going at it. I plead for the government to be a government and stop being an opposition. In opposition, no-one listens to us because we do not control the powers of government and we do not control the budget. In opposition, the Labor Party made all sorts of predictable comments that the GST was not the source of the government's fiscal problems. Members in opposition, and every economic shadow minister said over and over again that the GST was not the source of the government's fiscal problem—it is spending. If, in fact, that applied to us six months ago, it applies to the government now. The Labor Party made those claims in opposition, but now it is in government. I know it has the political desire to talk down the economy, to convince the people that it has to make tough decisions and to try to blame it on the previous government and to take drastic action now. But if the government does so, it will harm the economy of Western Australia irrevocably.

I plead with the government to look at some of the policies it made during the last campaign that should simply be rejected. Firstly, as I indicated, is its decision to stop migration. That is what it has done. It will have a significantly deleterious effect on one of Western Australia's largest export services—education. It is already having that effect. People make the decision to go to university for four years and they are making that decision now. Talk to anybody in the industry and they will say there will be a 35 per cent reduction of foreign students in this state over the next year.

Mr P. Papalia: Who in the industry did you talk to?

Dr M.D. NAHAN: The universities—all of them—the TAFEs and the agents. The minister has not talked to any of them. He does not know the impact of demand for immigration of students because he has not sat down and talked to the interest groups.

Mr P. Papalia interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order, Minister for Tourism!

Dr M.D. NAHAN: The minister should just watch. He made his claim today. He does not see the relationship between access to immigration and foreign students. He should just wait six months. We will point it out when it collapses. I know the minister tried to explain things, but anybody who is remotely knowledgeable and has spent any time discussing the issue with the universities knows this to be the case.

Mr P. Papalia interjected.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: We will see. There is a key performance indicator out there. The minister made his position clear and we have recorded it. When the demand collapses, we will see whether the minister remains the minister.

Mining is doing extremely well. We are seeing growth in iron ore come back, both in investment and jobs, which is good. It is all price driven. We see improvements in gold and lithium mining. When we left government, we had a whole raft of lithium projects going on. The trouble is that mining does not employ that many people; it is not a big absorber. But then again, what has the government done in mining? It has mentioned uranium. That has the potential for large growth if there is an improvement in or expansion of the nuclear industry, which there is in China, and maybe there will be some day in Japan if it opens up those nuclear plants, but this government has abandoned uranium mining and there is a moratorium on fracking. Fracking has occurred on Barrow Island for 60 years. There will be a real debate with the findings of the Productivity Commission. I believe it will essentially find that the states that lock away their mineral resources should not be compensated by states that do not. That has been us. The Productivity Commission will say, “Western Australia, you have done a good job to date but now you are locking away your resources. Bad luck, what are you whingeing about?” Other states like New South Wales and Victoria are locking away coal seam gas because they do not like fracking and Western Australia is doing the same thing. Victoria has done it. When the Labor government was elected, it said that it was interested in creating jobs and recognised the pain households were going through. It said it had a strategy to fix the budget, but it had a plan to win government, not run it.

MS L. METTAM (Vasse) [5.02 pm]: I would also like to contribute to this debate on the motion, which states —

That this house notes the constant negative commentary by the Premier and members of his government regarding Western Australia’s economy, which is hurting consumer and business confidence, and calls on the state government to take a more considered approach to the economic narrative.

I would like to specifically focus on issues relating to the tourism portfolio and small business. Those things are largely concerned with international education. I was at an event yesterday launching a project entitled “Bigger and Better Beyond the Boom”, undertaken by the Committee for Perth. A discussion panel of tourism leaders talked about what was important to them for growing Perth and Western Australia as tourism destinations and Kate Lamont put it down to three words—staff, events and aviation. That pretty well sums up the concerns and issues facing the tourism sector at the moment.

To start with I would like to focus on international education. This sector has played a significant role in the Australian and Western Australian economies and it offers much potential for growth. I acknowledge that, from a Western Australian perspective, this area has suffered as a result of the high cost of student accommodation and the high cost of living in WA that we experienced during those heightened years of a relatively booming economy for some of our industries. Accommodation was particularly expensive, pricing out students. International education brings \$22.4 billion to the nation and \$1.55 billion to WA. It is recognised as the third largest export sector for Australia after iron ore and coal. A report released last year by the John Curtin Institute of Public Policy recognised that higher education students in WA spend about \$882 million, which is more than three times that of vocational education and training students. It is obviously a significant part of our economic future.

The flow-on effects of international education are significant. I regularly hear of the value of this sector—that is, what the students bring to this state—when I speak to different tourism leaders. It is understood that one student equals five international visits. It is also recognised that three students effectively represents one Western Australian job. These are compelling figures. As I said before, as a platform for going into the election, there was a lot of focus in this area, understandably for the reasons I previously explained. We had not grown, as a state, by the same proportion. Our growth was 6.8 per cent as opposed to the average of 10 per cent, which we would expect as a market share of the national economy.

The reason I raise these issues about international education under this motion is that this motion is not only related to the value of our economy or to the contributions that the current government is making to the economy, but it

is also about the signals that this government is sending. Despite the platitudes that were made on the importance of international education during the election campaign, we have since seen policy decisions that deliberately work against this important sector of our economy. One of the very first actions of the McGowan government, once elected, was to remove Perth from the regional sponsored migration scheme, reducing the number of occupations on the skilled migration list from 178 to 18—the lowest of any state. By comparison, South Australia has 150 on its list, Tasmania has 160 and Queensland has 45. By reducing the number of occupations on the skilled migration list to 18, the McGowan government has lost the opportunity to attract international students wanting to migrate to this state. It has sent a very strong message to students, who are effectively making choices on which state to go to, to basically bypass WA. That is the commentary we are hearing. Foreign students are effectively going to South Australia and Tasmania, which offer five regional study points, as opposed to Western Australia. I quote a migration lawyer who said that there has been an estimated 32 per cent drop since March when the newly-elected McGowan government withdrew from a bonus points system under the federal regional sponsored migration scheme—or RSMS—which would lead to a loss of about \$30 million for every 100 overseas students who leave the state. Marion Fulker from the Committee for Perth has said that word of mouth has driven decisions, as has connection to friends and family, reputation, cost and connectivity. In this respect, the decisions of the McGowan government have sent a very strong message about why people should not visit Perth and have made other states more attractive.

In the 2017 QS Best Student Cities survey, Perth slumped 15 places to fiftieth on the international ranking, below any other Australian city, including Canberra and Adelaide. The full impact of that will take time to filter through to the economy, and the statistics on the export income from international education are yet to be seen and completely realised. However, what we know is that an impact is already being felt. When we compare the recent statistics on commencements for April 2017 with April 2016, we see a drop in key international education markets. When we compare the WA top 50 markets and commencements of April last year with April this year, we see a 15 per cent reduction in Indian students, 10 per cent reduction in Chinese students, two per cent reduction in Hong Kong students and a 20 per cent reduction in Brazilian students—they are choosing to go to other states. There has also been a 13 per cent reduction in students from the United States and a 10 per cent reduction in students from the United Kingdom.

As I stated earlier, this is all about the message that is being sent out. We know that international students are very astute when making decisions in this regard.

Mr P. Papalia: With respect to those statistics, what is the source of information?

Ms L. METTAM: It is from StudyPerth; it is from the Austrade online data, Canberra. I understand more compelling statistics are coming out.

Mr P. Papalia: Is the data regarding international students from Austrade?

Ms L. METTAM: It is prepared by StudyPerth, from Austrade online data. It is data it has paid for and collected.

Mr P. Papalia: Where is it published?

Ms L. METTAM: It is on the Austrade website, but a subscription has to be paid.

Mr P. Papalia: Is the StudyPerth data published on the Austrade web site?

Ms L. METTAM: No. StudyPerth has purchased this data, because these are very detailed statistics, but it is on the Austrade website. You have to be a subscriber to get this level of detail. Commencements are important because they define where people are going and how people and students are making those decisions. This is based upon the April figures. I understand that the May figures are coming out shortly, and they are not flash either.

Mr P. Papalia: But those drops occurred under your government. That's what you're talking about if they're April figures.

Ms L. METTAM: No, this is in April and this —

Mr P. Papalia: The election was in March. Are you blaming us for the three months —

Ms L. METTAM: I know when the election was, but as I have been advised by people in the sector, students have since —

Mr P. Papalia: Is that April 12 months to April 12 months? Is that what you're talking about?

Ms L. METTAM: No.

Mr P. Papalia: Are you saying the drop happened in the three weeks post the election?

Ms L. METTAM: Absolutely.

Mr P. Papalia: Is that really what you're saying?

Several members interjected.

Ms L. METTAM: Let me clarify. I am saying that the policy the Labor Party brought to the election sent a very strong signal to students contemplating moving to Western Australia. The Labor Party ran on a platform of —

Ms S.F. McGurk: Encouraging overseas students.

Ms L. METTAM: Yes.

Mr P. Papalia: We increased the budget for StudyPerth by 25 per cent annually. That was our commitment in the election.

Ms L. METTAM: In the lead-up to the election, the WA Labor Party acknowledged the value of international students and the importance of sending a message about how welcoming we should be to students coming to Western Australia. At the same time, it delivered a policy that effectively creates a disincentive for students —

Mr P. Papalia: In what way?

Ms L. METTAM: Because it is based on a points system.

Dr A.D. Buti: With regard to students or with regard to certain occupations?

Ms L. METTAM: With regard to students and the future that they can have —

Mr P. Papalia: So you're saying that 35 per cent of our international students weren't genuine students; they were here fraudulently?

Several members interjected.

Ms L. METTAM: No. Speak to the industry. That is absolute rubbish. Speak to the sector.

Mr P. Papalia: I'm asking about the detail of these claims that you're making.

Ms L. METTAM: International students make a decision —

Mr P. Papalia: The drop-off happened under your government! Twelve months—11 months and one week—were under your government!

Ms L. METTAM: I will just keep going.

The figures are a comparison between April 2016 and March 2017.

Mr P. Papalia: Who was in government then?

Ms L. METTAM: We are talking about the commencement rate.

Mr P. Papalia: Who was the government? Who was the minister? The minister is sitting at the back of the room over there. Did you ever meet with StudyPerth? Did you ever go to their board as Minister for Tourism? Did you once meet with StudyPerth?

Ms L. METTAM: I will quote Steven O'Neill of ISCAH Australian Migration Consultants, from an opinion piece he wrote for WAtoday that appeared on 26 June 2017 —

Students are not stupid, they read the headlines and make careful decisions where to study, who really wants them. All these announcements do is completely turn off prospective students from choosing WA as the place to study.

They will simply move elsewhere.

Other states know the economic spin off from the international student market and Queensland, Tasmania, NT, ACT, South Australia and Victoria all offer incentives in terms of state sponsorship for students who choose their state to study in. Western Australia offers absolutely nothing.

The growth in the estimated resident population for WA is also a consideration in this area. It has fallen dramatically to 0.64 per cent. The last peak was in 2012, at 3.15 per cent. Gross state product per capita in Western Australia is at -6.4 per cent, trending downwards. These two statistics combined do not paint a very good picture, but at a time when our economy needs every boost it can get, the deterrence of international students does not help.

I have heard significant concerns from the hotel and hospitality sector also, relating to the ability of hotel owners and small business operators to choose the highly skilled staff they want. I go back to the commentary made yesterday at the Committee for Perth event where it was said the challenges facing the sector relate to staff, aviation and events.

[Member's time extended.]

Ms L. METTAM: This is a significant area of concern. We need to ensure that our local business operators have the means to compete in a challenging market. We want to open up the state and create increasing demand for international tourism. It is important that we also meet the expectations of the luxury market. That is an important

and growing area of demand for visitors to Western Australia, particularly given we are also seeing the expansion of the Chinese and Asian middle class. We need to ensure that our local business operators have the means to compete, and appropriately skilled staff is key to doing that. It is also important to recognise that these businesses are able to attract and retain the staff of their choosing.

My final point relates to penalising foreign investment. I refer to the residential property tax. At the same time as the McGowan government is telling international students to come to Western Australia, it is telling them that they will not have the prospect of further work and a future in Western Australia. These families are also being given the signal that they will face a four per cent property tax surcharge on any residential property purchased in Western Australia. The impact of penalising foreign investment needs a rethink given the signals it sends about Western Australia to the broader international community. It creates a new disincentive for foreign students to come to Perth, again because of the message it sends —

Mr P. Papalia: Which state can they go to where they will not get taxed?

Ms L. METTAM: In other states where the tax exists, there is a pretty hot property market. Western Australia is not experiencing the same heat. I would argue —

Mr P. Papalia: Yes—so we are still cheaper generally!

Ms L. METTAM: I would argue that we —

Several members interjected.

Ms L. METTAM: Can members imagine Perth and Western Australia without foreign investment? Can members imagine what this state would be like, even in relation to student accommodation, without that level of foreign investment? Can members imagine what the range of delivery of services and experiences would be like for the tourism market without highly qualified and well-skilled staff from other countries? It is not something we should penalise; it is an instrument and a tool that we should use to support our small businesses.

Many people in the tourism sector have told me that one of their biggest and most frustrating concerns is the fact their hands are tied in not being able to employ the staff they would like to employ. Of course they would always prefer the choice and would always like the opportunity—in fact, it is a lot cheaper—to employ local staff; that is, people who reside in and are now citizens of Western Australia. Further to that, it is often a case of last resort that employers go down the path of investing in a skilled migrant. We cannot stop the delivery of high-quality hospitality services just because of a parochial response to concerns raised in the community. We need an educated response that does not have a significant impact on the economy.

Lino Iacomella, Western Australian executive director of the Property Council of Australia—members will be familiar with his comments—states —

“We have the lowest level of foreign investment in property in Australia, and putting an extra tax on foreign buyers will make it much harder to get the investment we need to grow the state,” ...

John Gelavis, Western Australian executive director of the Housing Industry Association, said —

“Right now in the current property cycle, Western Australia needs to be open for business and encourage foreign investment in order to not only stimulate building supply but assist in rebuilding the state economy and delivering an increased level of investor confidence.”

These concerns are raised by small businesses, and people in the education sector, which has been identified as a growing area of opportunity for Western Australia. Significant concerns have also been raised by the tourism industry, which both sides of politics went to the election with very strong views on. It is essential to growing Western Australia in the future. To that extent, the Labor government needs to take heed of the concerns of these sectors and rethink its current policy.

I have six more minutes, so I may as well use up the time. In relation to the tourism portfolio, I have some concerns about recent decisions. The first is about the government commitment on the Abrolhos Islands. That was not an election commitment, but it was a commitment and a cabinet decision made by the former government. In relation to the future of the Margaret River Gourmet Escape, there are outstanding concerns about what will happen to that event after this year. As the minister is aware, I have heard concerns raised in the local community about a potential rethink on the future of that event. I take the opportunity to encourage the McGowan government to support that event, given its 40 million-person reach. I also encourage the McGowan government to support the access of cruise ships, particularly into Broome port, as a priority, given the impact that has already had on cruise ships coming into Fremantle port, which has an impact on the whole \$275 million sector. That is all I have to say for now.

MR I.C. BLAYNEY (Geraldton) [5.29 pm]: I feel that it is important that we be positive in Western Australia.

Dr A.D. Buti: The contribution from the member for Vasse wasn't very positive.

Mr I.C. BLAYNEY: Thank you, member for Armadale.

Western Australia has always been an optimistic state. As far as I am concerned, where my state goes is where my local economy in Geraldton goes because we are dependent upon resources. A lot of the drive in the Western Australian economy comes from the resources industry. At the moment we have really only one bright spot—that is, a few of the minerals apart from iron ore. We are high-cost producers of iron ore. Our break-even price to put it on a ship is \$60 a tonne, whereas BHP and Rio Tinto can do that for about \$15 a tonne. Unfortunately, the Minister for Environment is not in this house, but I will say that we are waiting for an approval at the moment that will be worth a couple of hundred jobs in my region and the member for Moore's electorate. Some of it, of course, floats down to Geraldton. We are waiting for an approval and I would be very keen if the minister did that.

The Karara magnetite mine, which is also in the member for Moore's electorate, appears to still be losing money. It is one of Western Power's biggest customers and provides 600 jobs. It puts eight million tonnes through Geraldton port, which is now about half of Geraldton port's trade, and is worth about 90 jobs in the port. I put in a plea to the government to please talk to Karara and support it where it can, as the previous government did.

Cropping is not a good story in the north this year. My estimate is that if Geraldton port zone loses one and a half million tonnes, that will be about \$500 million out of our local economy. That will hit us hard. It is good to see that stock prices are good. Crayfishing, of course, has come off its highs, but it is totally reliant on the Chinese market now. The Geraldton Fishermen's Co-operative has invested a lot of money. The other day I went with the Minister for Fisheries to the opening of the new facility for live crayfish in Welshpool, and it has an equivalent facility in Shanghai. It really has a dilemma and it is wondering about this itself. Is it okay to be totally dependent on one market, especially China, which can fluctuate? Of course, China is the best payer.

The aquaculture zone in the Abrolhos Islands got environmental approval the other day. I am very excited about the potential for that. Aquaculture is an area that has almost limitless potential in Western Australia. I ask the government to remember that and not to focus entirely on negatives. We can develop new industries in Western Australia, which is where our future jobs and prosperity will come from. The toughest part of my local economy at the moment is the building industry. I make the point to the government that a new hospital project would be very handy in that area.

I recently spent 10 days in the Kimberley looking at agriculture. One of the great things about a winter break is that we can get out to the regions of Western Australia and see what people are doing and thinking about. I mostly focused on agriculture, but I looked at a couple of mines. The number one issue in the Kimberley is a project that Sheffield Resources is trying to get up; people everywhere were talking about it. It is a mineral sands project between Broome and Derby. There is a problem with approvals and I got the feeling in the Kimberley that this is a litmus test project because everyone is watching it. As far as mining goes in Western Australia, I consider this to be a model project. There will be no fly in, fly out workers, 30 per cent of the workers on the mine will be Aboriginal, and the product will be split between the ports of Derby and Broome. I ask the government to get involved in this project and get it up.

It is interesting to look at the cattle industry in the Kimberley. When I looked at it as a student quite a few years ago—more than I care to remember—the point was made to us that in the Kimberley they needed to pay for quality. All the things that were talked about in the Kimberley 30 years ago have now come to pass. It was good to have a look at a brand-new abattoir, which is situated between Broome and Derby. It is a state-of-the-art facility that produces a top quality product and is focused on Asian markets. That is everything that we want to be happening in that area.

I would also make a plea for the government to give favourable consideration to allowing people who want to do agriculture along the Fitzroy River to draw some water from the river. If members look at the amount of water that goes through the Fitzroy River out into King Sound, they will see that it is the biggest river in Australia. When over 98 per cent of the water goes straight out into the sea, I do not see why agriculture cannot be allowed to take a portion of it. It will have absolutely zero environmental impact. Like everyone else who stood on the wharf at Derby to watch the tide, I was there at nine o'clock in the morning to see the low tide and then six hours later, at three o'clock in the afternoon, to see the high tide—11 metres of tide. If we cannot do something with that tide to use it to create energy, we really are quite hopeless and we might as well give up the game and go away.

In Kununurra, I was very excited to see crops being grown for the Ord stage 2 scheme. Developers have to invest a heap more money in it but they are concerned about security. They talked about two small pieces of land. A machinery dealership is being built on one and they want to build a grain cleaner on the other, but they have stopped the grain-cleaning project, which is quite important for the area. There are two small blocks and it appears to me that the developers were promised freehold land. Again, I ask the government to please get involved with this and fix it. The feeling I got from the locals in Kununurra was that they want to be positive and they seek a positive message from the government.

I have a question for the Treasurer, and he is here, so I will ask it. When the worst deals from WA Inc washed into the state's debt, does the Treasurer know the proportion of debt relative to the size of the state economy in terms of what it is now?

Mr B.S. Wyatt: I don't know. I can find out, but I don't know.

Mr I.C. BLAYNEY: I suspect it was a bit higher than it is now.

Mr B.S. Wyatt: As a percentage of GST?

Mr I.C. BLAYNEY: As a percentage of the economy, I suspect it was higher.

Ms S.F. McGurk: That is a very rigorous analysis!

Mr I.C. BLAYNEY: I saw the figure about a year ago. At that time, Carmen Lawrence was Premier and state debt was at a higher proportion than it is now. I think we can, dare I say it, overstate this debt. I worry that we are becoming obsessed about it and we are not thinking about growing Western Australia and growing jobs.

The number of people who moved to Western Australia in the last 10 years is equivalent to the population of Tasmania. Every student had a teacher in a classroom. We manned and built a heap of new hospitals. Our police system coped beautifully. Our roads system coped. The government coped. The fact is that we coped. The equivalent of the population of Tasmania moved to this state and we coped with it. That was quite an achievement.

We have come off the boom but the way we coped was incredible. If members read the Economics and Industry Standing Committee's report on innovation from the previous Parliament, they will pick up that Western Australia can do smart manufacturing. We can do a heap of things. I encourage anybody with an interest in that, which should be everybody, to read it. As I said, we have vast potential in aquaculture. I came across an amazing figure the other day. I went to a function run by the Confucius Institute at the University of Western Australia. By 2030, the middle class population of China will be 850 million people. They will want quality food. They will be keen to travel. They will also be keen to study overseas. If Western Australians cannot get really excited about that figure, I do not think they are engaged in the real world. As I said, do not get obsessive about this debt. Look for growth. If members are worried about state debt, I will give them a tip. They can sell or lease over 100 per cent of Western Power. Prices are legislated. That will cover at least half the state debt and it is more likely to cover two-thirds of it.

The government's couple of thousand union buddies who encouraged it into this place then told it that the cost of getting Labor into government is that it is not allowed to privatise Western Power. I remind government members that we once had a Prime Minister named Paul Keating who said that the trickiest but most valuable thing to do in politics was a triple backward somersault with pike. I suggest the government does a triple backward somersault with pike and sell a lease over 100 per cent of Western Power.

The government needs to remember the regions because Western Australia has to become more decentralised. One disappointment that I have as a regional member is that the former government spent record amounts of money in the regions, but the population did not follow the money. We have to try to find a way to get more Western Australians to live in the regions. I remind the Minister for Local Government of the promise that he took to the 2013 election, which I think is still a good idea, to move the Department of Local Government, Sport and Cultural Industries to Albany.

Mr D.A. Templeman: No; if it's going anywhere, it's going to Mandurah, which is the largest regional city in Western Australia.

Mr I.C. BLAYNEY: Are we going to get into that same argument about whether Mandurah is part of the regions?

I raise a small issue from my electorate. Since 1957 governments have promised to seal the road between Meekatharra and Wiluna, which is not in my electorate; it is in North West Central. We thought we had done that, but I am told that it looks like it has fallen over. I hope the government will go back and have a look at it.

On GST, in the first instance, get Bill Shorten and your federal Labor representatives from Western Australia to support the government's case because, from what I have seen, Western Australian Labor representatives in Canberra have not supported the case for Western Australia to get more GST.

The government should go and talk to its colleagues in South Australia about uranium mining because they know that it is good to get on with it. I think the government should allow uranium mining. Okay, we have to have another inquiry on fracking to have a look at science. I think it is a waste of time, as I have no doubt that fracking will be allowed. Remember that WA is an optimistic state. I have given the government a few examples of where it can help remove some of the blockages and hold-ups, and fix them. It can then stand aside and the debt will take care of itself.

MR S.K. L'ESTRANGE (Churchlands) [5.42 pm]: I have a few comments to make on this motion. I too am concerned about the constant negative commentary coming from members of the new government of Western Australia. It is not so new, members; we are almost six months into this term. The government should have hit its straps and be rolling down that hill quite fluidly now. All the systems in their ministerial offices should be up and running and we would expect everything to be running like a well-oiled machine, but I worry that that is not the case. We know that Premiers and ministers come into government and are hard on issues such as law

and order and crime to show themselves to be strong leaders. But we are seeing that this government has kind of missed that piece of the Premier-leadership puzzle and it has decided with its rhetoric to be hard on the economy, consumers and businesses, which does not support growth for Western Australia. The government is more interested in putting down the economy than it is in supporting and motivating people to feel confident about using some of their savings to go out and buy new products—new cars and whitegoods—to encourage spending in the economy that can support small businesses. Moreover, if the government talked up the economy, it could get more investment coming into the big projects in Western Australia. We need big private sector capital investments in the mining community and the defence industry sector, just to name two, but there are many more, including agriculture and ecotourism. Obviously we have fisheries that we could open up as well. A fair bit of investment could be going on if the government sold this state as a positive place to come and invest money to grow jobs.

Mr W.R. Marmion: There's mining exploration.

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: Correct, there is mining exploration—just to name some.

But not so long ago the Premier came out and said that the economy is really bad—it is like the Great Depression. Those types of phrases were coming from a state leader. These comments are picked up by not only local and international investors but also consumers. Consumers start to think: it is really, really bad and things are really dire. They are not motivated or encouraged to get out there and push the envelope to find new opportunities for markets for their goods and services. I think that really lets us down.

Furthermore, although we know the economy has gone through a tough time, particularly after the mining construction boom—it was a construction boom—we also had very high commodity prices at the time, people on very high wages and people doing exceedingly well. There was a fair bit of consumption spending going on. But of course once that construction sector slowed and moved to production, the double hit of that and those commodity prices taking a massive slump put a huge impact on Western Australia because it is still a relatively small population compared with other major centres around the world, certainly around Australia. It was difficult for us to be able to diversify the economy because labour was crowded out into the mine sector at the time of those booming conditions. To try to divert it back into something else when suddenly consumption spending dropped pretty rapidly was very hard to do as well. So we do not need a Premier to come out and be negative. We need a Premier to come out and set the goal for the future so that people can be encouraged.

I have with me an article from WAtoday that states that 60 per cent of household finances are so fragile that they would struggle if living costs went up just five per cent, and only 38 per cent of people thought they were better off than five years ago. That comment tells us that if the government is trying to encourage economic growth and diversity, the last thing it wants to tell people is, “Hey, we're going to increase your taxes and charges and actually whack you with these really big increases because we are in the Depression.” How is that going to get the state to move forward under this new government? As I say, I worry very much about the rhetoric because it does not paint a positive picture.

For members who look at history, I will mention a piece from the ABC news that tried to define what the Depression was compared with now in Western Australia because the Premier was saying it is like we are in the Great Depression. To let members know, unemployment peaked in Western Australia at 6.9 per cent in November last year. In August 1992 it was 11.2 per cent. During the Great Depression it was 32 per cent. So I think to say this is like the Great Depression is ridiculous. Yes, we are doing it tough. We all know that, because we have come off those boom conditions and consumption spending has dropped. So, yes, times are tough. But it is not time to throw in the towel. That is the message that has been coming out of the leadership of this government—“Throw in the towel. It's all too hard. This is like the Great Depression. We haven't got a plan to fix it because it's worse than we ever expected.” Absolute rubbish!

We know the reasons for the structural deficit are pretty simple. We have a highly paid public sector workforce, we know that, and sure we need wages constraint in that area. We have argued that case, and that is why we committed to 1.5 per cent. No secrets there. But we also know that the structural component of that deficit is heavily weighed because the revenue streams, particularly the goods and services tax grants, are not there. But this is not a time to kick the consumers—the people of Western Australia—in the guts when they are trying to have a go and trying to lift. We should not say, “Don't bother lifting. It's all terrible. You've got no chance of success in the Western Australian economy.” The Premier is saying that. This is not what we should be communicating to the people of Western Australia.

There are signs of some economic recovery and it is important to acknowledge that. The ABC news, again in one of its commentaries, has stated that in the last six months there has been an improvement in the unemployment rate in Western Australia. It has fallen from 6.5 per cent in trend terms, down to 5.6 per cent. That was in the “State of the States” report of the ABC.

There are some positive signs of a stabilisation of the Western Australian economy so that we are ready to launch and get involved in other ventures. I think that is a positive thing. It is not the time to talk it down. The Chamber

of Commerce and Industry acknowledges this. In an article in the *Business News* dated 20 July 2017, the CCI chief economist, Rick Newnham, said —

... for WA to have a fighting chance at recovery, the state government must not increase the rate of taxes, fees and levies applied to the business community in the upcoming budget.

The state government announced last month it would lift an array of fees and charges in the next state budget in order to reduce the state's net debt position by about \$238 million over four years.

“Business investment is a critical driver of economic prosperity; when business investment grows, it creates a domino effect throughout the economy, where more big construction projects come on line, more money comes into the economy and more jobs are created for WA workers,” Mr Newnham said.

It is obvious to all of us that talking down the economy and at the same time whacking people with the threat and fear of increased fees and charges in the upcoming budget is no way to boost or manage the economy of Western Australia. It is no way to encourage growth.

I decided to look at the “WA Labor Plan for Jobs”, which is quite a thick document that the Labor Party put out in the lead-up to the last election. I went through it and highlighted things, and I thought: let us see how the government is tracking. It is six months in so it is probably a good time to see how the government is going. One of the initiatives I highlighted was Infrastructure WA. But I am yet to see how this has been created, what it is doing and its objectives. Where is it? I have not seen that one. Another initiative in the plan was a local content aspect. Interestingly enough, on 7 July 2017 Hon Alannah MacTiernan, MLC, referenced that aspect and put out a media statement on new dedicated local content officers in regional development commissions. But again, I am yet to see any changes to how the state government will handle local content laws and regulations, and commitments it has with the commonwealth and other states and with trading partners on free trade agreements. I am uncertain how this local content aspect of improving jobs is going, because we have not seen any structural change in that space.

I went further through the document and read about the WA industry participation plan act. I thought: how is that going? But six months in I have not seen a bill brought to Parliament yet. Jobs was a key focus of this government, but I have not seen anything about that. The Labor Party also committed to the Skilled Local Jobs Bill. The Labor government referred to it in an announcement on 11 May 2017. It was linked to congratulating Rio Tinto on a new local procurement program. The media statement states —

As part of the Government's Plan for Jobs, a Skilled Local Jobs Bill will be introduced into State Parliament to encourage more local jobs on big resources projects.

Great. Where is it? Six months in, where is that bill? No worries; we have not seen that. It is okay; we will wait for that one. The fifth item I came across was a State Training Board revamp. Again, nothing. There is no evidence of a revamp as per the “WA Labor Plan for Jobs”. I wonder when the minister is going to inform us about that, maybe in a ministerial statement, and let us know how the situation with the training board has improved. Another initiative is the Priority Start building policy. This one is fascinating because in 2015 Hon Liza Harvey and the Liberal-National government created a policy to replace the Priority Start program. It looks as though the Labor government is going backwards. It is going back to an old program that it had once before, but again we have not seen it. We do not know what it will do or what changes it is making there.

Another initiative I have noticed that is linked to all this is a new research innovation fund. I refer to a media release by Hon Roger Cook on 3 July. One of his quotes states —

“The McGowan Government has committed to a \$1 billion Future Health Research and Innovation Fund to drive medical research and innovation ...

Given the state of the finances, I would like to know where the \$1 billion is going to come from. I would also be interested to know how that fund is going to work and how it is going to grow jobs. So far, for all the things that I looked for in the “Plan for Jobs”, the scorecard is zero. It is a thick document and there was a lot on offer to go to the election with. There were a lot of commitments: “Vote for us. This is going to be great for the people of Western Australia.” Mark McGowan states —

Our Jobs Plan — the Right Choice for You

I am proud to present WA Labor's Plan for Jobs.

It is a plan that will create a more vibrant and diversified economy with a broader range of industries and jobs.

We will deliver a government focused on the long term needs of our people. A government that is prepared to make decisions which will create a stronger State and opportunities for all.

Then there are all those ideas. Nothing has been done yet. Six months in and nothing has been done. I thought that, as it has been six months, surely the government would have made a start on some of this stuff, but, unfortunately,

it has not. Let us have a look at what it has been focused on. I am not saying that the things it has been focused on are not important. Let us not forget that the Labor Party went to the election saying that it would create jobs and that its main focus was jobs for Western Australians, even though it talked down the economy and knew that the economy was doing it tough and that mums and dads and workers were struggling to find the incomes that they were used to at the mine sites during the construction boom. It focused on the debt issue; we know that and we have talked about that, but it also focused on jobs. How many bills linked to jobs have been introduced? We have on the notice paper the Child Support (Adoption of Laws) Amendment Bill; the Constitution Amendment (Demise of the Crown) Bill; the Coroners Amendment Bill, which is yet to be started but is on its way; and the Criminal Code Amendment (Industrial Manslaughter) Bill. There is also the First Home Owner Grant Amendment Bill, which is yet to be debated but is coming on. That bill will go against jobs, because the government is basically saying that it will stop an effort to help the multiplier in that industry and will stop the tradies from getting extra jobs from people who can get the \$5 000 bonus, but that is another debate. There is also the Loan Bill obviously; the Local Government Amendment (Auditing) Bill; the Misuse of Drugs Amendment (Methylamphetamine Offences) Bill; the Petroleum Legislation Amendment Bill, which will come on in the next few weeks; the Pilbara Port Assets (Disposal) Repeal Bill; the Port Kennedy Development Bill; the Sentence Administration Amendment Bill; the Statutes (Minor Amendments) Bill; and the Supply Bill. So far, I have found that only one of those bills is linked to jobs, and it will send jobs in the wrong direction; it will stop jobs growth. I am curious to know what the new government and the new Premier—although they are not so new; it has been six months now—who are so interested in and focused on jobs growth, are doing. What have they been doing?

Mr J.R. Quigley: Metronet.

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: Where is it? Show us that one. Where is the bill? There is nothing there either. That is a good point, Attorney General. Where is the Metronet plan? What is happening? A lot of people are keen to get those jobs.

Mr J.R. Quigley interjected.

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: The government has the money. What is it going to do with it? It will probably put \$1 billion into that research fund!

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members!

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: I hope the government does create some jobs. When it is out there creating jobs, can it let Parliament know what it is doing, because we are not seeing it? Can it let us know how it is creating these jobs? Can it tell us, against its policy platform, which policies it is going to implement? Can it put out some press releases and show us what it is doing? That would be good.

I do not want to harp on the next point, but I will make it, members. The Labor Party is in government now, but it was in opposition for eight and a half years. I sat in this place for half of that time and I remember looking at some highly motivated backbenchers, like Dr Buti, the member for Armadale. He was highly motivated and keen and enthusiastic.

[Member's time extended.]

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: When he was in opposition, he was a hardworking local member and a hardworking shadow minister.

Dr A.D. Buti: No, never a shadow minister.

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: He was never a shadow minister. Sorry, member. He was the most highly qualified, highly capable backbencher in this place who was never brought to the front bench to share his skills with Parliament. The member for Armadale can interject in a moment if he likes, but let me get my point out first. After eight and a half years in opposition, the Labor Party suddenly got into government and within two months all the ministers took off around the world. They vacated the economic space of Western Australia. The Premier took two weeks-plus off, the Minister for Corrective Services took three weeks off, the Minister for Tourism; Defence Issues; Small Business went off for two weeks, the Minister for Planning; Transport took three weeks and the Minister for Innovation and ICT; Science took two weeks off. We would think that after eight and a half years in opposition, they would not be interested in leave and would be saying, "Let's implement our jobs plan! Let's actually get this economy of Western Australia back on track like we said we would!"

Point of Order

Mr J.R. QUIGLEY: I spent the whole of that recess trying to empty Hon Michael Mischin's in-tray and the member is trying to tell me that I was overseas. What a joke!

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr S.J. Price): Members!

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: It is good to see the Attorney General has returned with a sense of humour.

The ACTING SPEAKER: I would ask the manager of opposition business to perhaps correct the record and point out that the Attorney General was apparently in the state during the break.

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: I did not mention him.

Mr J.R. Quigley: He said all of them had gone.

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: No, I named them.

Debate Resumed

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: I know it is a sensitive issue.

Ms S. Winton interjected.

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: Good on you, member for Wanneroo. You point and point; good on you. Let me finish. I will tell the member for Wanneroo what she did not have to put up with for eight and a half years: sitting as an opposition member on the backbench working very, very hard, like the member for Armadale, to hold the government of the day to account. He worked tirelessly on that. I would be surprised if he disagrees with me. If the member for Armadale were made a minister, he would have got on with the job. He would have pulled his sleeves up, got in there and got on with the job.

Dr A.D. Buti: I am working hard now!

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: I know the member is. But I am saying in cabinet, member.

The members opposite who had to sit through eight and a half years of opposition watched their ministers vacate the space at a time that they said we were in a great depression and it was all doom and gloom. Before these senior ministers took off on holidays, on their big international trips having fun, they told the people of Western Australia, "During a great depression we're going to slug you with increased fees and charges. We're going on holiday. See you later! Off we go on holiday." I will tell members what I observed. There was one minister from this mob —

Mr B. Urban: There were two.

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: There were a few. There were quite a few who did not do what I just said, but there was one in particular who took four days' leave over the winter recess. That was Hon Alannah MacTiernan. The Minister for Regional Development took four days' leave. She was there. Obviously, Hon Roger Cook, the Deputy Premier, took only six days' leave. Those two people carried the load. Whether or not members support Hon Alannah MacTiernan, she was carrying the load for planning, transport and infrastructure development in this state for the government while the other ministers were off looking for sunshine. While the ministers were off looking for the sunshine, she was here during the rain, hail and hard, long winter days. She was working hard. Where was the Minister for Transport; Planning? She vacated the space and left it all to MacTiernan, who did the job. I think Hon Alannah MacTiernan would make an excellent Minister for Transport; Planning, because she understands that when the party gets into power, it does not vacate the space. The government stays in the space, dominates the space and implements its policies that it promised to the people of Western Australia.

Mr P. Papalia: Are you saying that the mother of three children shouldn't have taken some leave with her kids?

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: I am not saying that they should not take leave.

Mr P. Papalia interjected.

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: No, do not try to be smart, minister.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members!

Mr P. Papalia: That is what you're saying.

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: No, it is not what I am saying at all.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members, the interjections are getting a bit too loud. Will the member for Churchlands address his comments through me, please.

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: I am not denying the need for anybody—mother, father, uncle, aunt, husband or wife —

Mr P. Papalia interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Minister for Tourism!

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: I am not saying that nobody should have some downtime, but if any other person picks up a brand-new job in this state, I will tell members what: they do not go to their boss within eight weeks and say that they want three weeks' leave.

Mr P. Papalia interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Minister for Tourism, I am going to call you to order for the second time.

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: I did say that I did not want harp on about this point, but the minister is very excited about it. The point I am making is that if someone is enthusiastic and dinkum about supporting the people of Western Australia, and if they are really motivated, they get a new job and they get into it; they really work. They work as hard as they can to implement those jobs policies that were promised to the people of Western Australia and they show them what they are doing. We have not seen anything.

Ms J.J. Shaw interjected.

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: Member for Swan Hills, I am not talking about an individual minister; I am talking about the collective group of frontbenchers who exited the space of Western Australia at a critical time to implement this plan of the government, which I cannot see. I would welcome the member for Swan Hills standing on her feet at some point and telling us about this plan, what the government is doing with it and how it is progressing. I will tell the member for Swan Hills that she probably has more capacity to tell us about how this could be implemented than her frontbenchers, because we are not hearing from them. I encourage her to tap her Premier on the shoulder and say, “Hey, Premier, what about giving me a go, because I can do the job?” I think the member for Swan Hills should give it a good crack, because I think she would be fantastic at it.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Thank you, members!

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: The member for Swan Hills has the knowledge and she is enthusiastic. If she was tapped on the shoulder and told, “Hey, look, we want you to become a minister of the Crown. By the way, can you please try to get this jobs plan in place by August? I know you might want to take one, two or three weeks’ leave, but can you hold off?”, do members think she would say, “No, bugger off. I’m going to take three weeks’ leave”? Do members think she would do that? The member for Swan Hills knows that she would not. If she started a new corporate job—brand-new in a job, two months in—she would not go to her boss and say, “Hey, I just want to go off for three weeks.”

Ms J.J. Shaw: I might do!

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: I doubt it very much, member; I doubt it very much indeed.

I want to wrap up with some things I have been concerned about. We know that the government has a jobs plan, but things that are already in play need to be supported. Some of them have been highlighted already. One that is close to my heart is the exploration incentive scheme. Hon Bill Marmion, the member for Nedlands, is a former mines minister, and he understands the importance and significance of the exploration incentive scheme. We very much hope that the government sees it as a way of growing the economy by encouraging exploration in Western Australia and that it does not cut this program in its upcoming budget to try to acquiesce to some of its election promises in other areas.

Mr W.R. Marmion: It is value for money.

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: It is high value for money; we know it is a 10 to one—plus return on every dollar spent. I was concerned because a letter to the editor in the *Kalgoorlie Miner* refers to the Minister for Mines and Petroleum, Hon Bill Johnston. It states —

WA Mines and Petroleum Minister Bill Johnston MLC has cast doubt on the enduring and successful Exploration Incentive Scheme, which has contributed greatly to the growth of jobs and to boosting royalty income for the State Government.

That letter to the editor is in a paper dated 5 August 2017. Given that a goldfields newspaper is worried about losing the exploration incentive scheme, what message is the government sending to that industry that makes it scared it will lose such a vital scheme?

Mr W.R. Marmion: Did he go on leave after saying that?

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: I am not sure.

This does concern me. That is one area that we do not get into.

There was another issue that the mines minister got stuck into. In one of his media releases dated 21 August, the first bullet point states —

The Government has announced a ban on future uranium mining leases

He immediately wiped out that sector of the mines industry, saying, “Don’t do any exploration in that space, don’t do any development—nothing. Stop it.”

Mr W.R. Marmion interjected.

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: That is correct.

The government cast doubt over what was already done of course. That is a concern.

We also have the issue of education, which was picked up by the member for Vasse. I will finish with this point. There is an article in *The Australian* dated 31 July by Victoria Laurie and Paige Taylor entitled “Education answer to fill mining boom void”. The opening paragraph states —

Perth must do more to attract international students as it adjusts to the end of the construction phase of a phenomenal resources boom, an organisation of business and community leaders warned.

They highlight the point in that article. It goes on to state —

... there had been an estimated 32 per cent drop since March when the newly-elected McGowan government withdrew from a bonus points system under the Federal Regional Sponsored Migration Scheme.

I encourage the Minister for Small Business; Defence Issues and other things, who answered the question in question time today, to look at the data. He highlighted the need to look at the data in this space.

Mr P. Papalia: Did you go on leave in July last year?

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: I cannot recall. I would have to check.

Mr P. Papalia: You became a minister in March. Did you go on leave in July last year?

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: I would have to check but I probably would have. I might have taken one week.

I do not want to harp on this point. I was a minister in a government at its eight-and-a-half-year point. I was not a minister in a government that just got into office and told the people that we were in another Great Depression and that we were going to increase fees and charges. The context is different. I probably took one week, not two or three weeks. It is a bit different.

The minister is diverting me from this very important issue. He needs to look at the impact of the bonus points system under the federal regional sponsored migration scheme and the impact on international students as a result of the government changing the status in Western Australia. The feedback I am getting is that it is sending those students to Adelaide. The government needs to be serious about focusing on jobs and talking up the economy of Western Australia and it needs to be focused on looking after the consumers of Western Australia, the householders, and keeping fees and charges down in the next budget.

MR C.J. BARNETT (Cottesloe) [6.13 pm]: I want to make a couple of comments. Having been here for quite a while —

Mr J.R. Quigley: Too long.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: Yes, probably too long; that is what my wife says, and some of my constituents too, particularly potential candidates for Cottesloe.

However, in the time I have been here, I have seen governments of both persuasions come and go. The Labor Party won the election in March. It won it convincingly. It has a lot of new members. I would have thought that the overriding ethos of this Labor government would be positive and enthusiastic, with a willingness to get on with it. The Labor Party has been in government for less than six months. It has to face the reality that government is not easy. I suspect that some ministers are starting to learn that. They are a bit too cocky for my liking. The government has done some things around some election commitments that were made. Let us face it, it is early days. It has yet to achieve anything major. It is yet to have a big achievement. I hope it gets some, for the sake of the state, but it has not done that yet and it should not be boasting until it gets to that point.

To be honest, I am not criticising the government for this—in fact, I am glad the government is doing it—but I find it curious that a new government that had waited eight years in opposition, which is hard work, has spent the first six months and probably more just focusing on the past. We sit in here every day absolutely bemused, asking why the Labor government would criticise the former government, which lost office, and would harp on about individuals and what went wrong, by saying, “You did this and you are the worst that, and we have got a depression condition.” Why do that after eight years of waiting to get into government? The government is absolutely squandering its honeymoon period, which is always short-lived in politics. Today we have been debating an important issue in the community. The government is now heading down the path of debating euthanasia. It is a complex issue. It will consume this Parliament for a period of time—no doubt about it—just as gay marriage is consuming federal politics and just as abortion consumed politics in this place for two months in the 1990s. The government has also set up the Langoullant commission of inquiry into the previous government. There goes 12 months. If the government thinks that it is going to be over and done with within a few weeks, get real! Why do things like that?

Ms J.J. Shaw: It is a society, not just an economy.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: The member for Swan Hills can speak and raise those issues. That is important; that is okay. But why waste this so-called honeymoon period?

Ms J.J. Shaw: It is not wasting.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: Get up and speak—that is fine. I think the government is wasting this time. To be honest, I do not think it has a major achievement in sight. I really do not see one.

Ms S. Winton interjected.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: That is not a major achievement. It is not what builds this great state of Western Australia. The member for Wanneroo does not get it. As a new member, the member for Wanneroo should be sitting back and listening and learning, like we all did when we came into this place, instead of chirping on all the time. However, I am addressing the Chair.

Mr Acting Speaker, history will judge things as they are. The government thinks it is very superior. It might be a superior government, but it is not there yet. I remind the government that I am not going to try to defend the last eight years, but I will make a couple of observations. During the eight years that the Liberal–National government was in power, the power supply stayed on, the water supply stayed on, every year there was a teacher in front of every class, and there was expenditure on welfare and mental health, there was education reform, new hospitals were built, the Kimberley was protected and so on.

Mr T.J. Healy: The children’s hospital.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: And the children’s hospital—thank you for that interjection, because by an independent assessment —

Mr T.J. Healy: How’s that going?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: British medical specialists who visited about a year ago said that the children’s hospital was arguably the best hospital in the world.

Ms S.E. Winton: And the water?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: The member for Wanneroo raises that matter. Yes, there is a plumbing problem. Would we not think that the contractors would get the plumbing right? The Labor Party blamed the then government. How can the government be blamed for the plumbing not being fixed? I have never been more frustrated about any other issue than that. I will tell members one thing, as they have raised the Perth Children’s Hospital: you have to be proud in government and proud of the state, particularly for a state that is the most export intensive of any Australian state and almost any regional economy in the world. It is critical how the state is seen from the outside. This government is looking backwards and making negative announcements. It is far easier to stop something than to do something. Doing things is what government is really about. This government is not doing that.

The children’s hospital is one thing, but another example that members opposite might think is trivial and funny is the naming of the stadium. The naming of the stadium is important because it will promote Western Australia. It will give a sense of pride and fulfilment to the people of this state. During the so-called mining boom, one of the things I was determined about was that there would be tangible benefits for the people Western Australia. The stadium was one of them, and Elizabeth Quay and the children’s hospital made up the three. There was something to be seen in that unique period. This government will sell the name of the stadium and that will squander an immense opportunity. I hope—I will touch wood—that the government is not considering selling the name of the children’s hospital. I hope the government is not thinking about that.

Several members interjected.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I will give government members a tip: do not giggle about it! I am not the sort of person who is flippant with the comments I make.

We will see. During the time of the last government, the economy grew in real terms by 40 per cent. If this government matches that, good on it. I will congratulate it. I do not think it will.

Ms C.M. Rowe: What have you got to show for it?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: What have we got to show for it? That is the problem. Members are not seeing the hospitals that have been built right around the state, the new schools and protection of the Kimberley. All of it is there.

Ms S.E. Winton interjected.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: The member reckons the community does not love the idea of a new children’s hospital? She reckons the millions of people who go to Elizabeth Quay and the stadium will not say “Good on you” for that? Of course they will.

The government has spent its time looking back and trying to denigrate everything that has happened over the previous eight years.

Mr D.J. Kelly: It's not hard.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: The minister says that, but when I became Premier nearly nine years ago, I did not waste a minute thinking about the Gallop–Carpenter government. We did not waste a minute on that. We got straight on with it. We did not do what the government is doing; we did not do that at all.

Several members interjected.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: Members can laugh, but we did not do it.

Mr P. Papalia: I sat there and had you abuse us!

Mr C.J. BARNETT: Find me the quotes, mate. Anyway, I am going to keep quiet.

Several members interjected.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: Okay, members laugh, but they are wasting their opportunity.

There is one more point I want to make, and that is about the cycle. At the time we came in, I was very conscious of the emergence of modern China. I am a bit of a student of the economic history of this state —

Mr D.J. Kelly: Oh, yeah.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: Oh, yes. We have had three periods of extraordinary growth: the gold rush of the 1890s; the reconstruction of Japan and its effect on our economy in the 1960s, with the development of the Pilbara; and the third one—I saw it coming in the 1990s—was the development and growth of modern China. The government will not get a China; there is not one out there. It is not going to get that. These events are probably 50 years apart, and it will not happen in India. There will be opportunities and new markets, and probably a pretty attractive international economy, but it is not going to get that once-in-a-50-year opportunity, which we grabbed. When we grabbed it, members might remember me saying repeatedly, “We’ve got to ride the Asian tiger; it’s going to be a bumpy ride, but we’ve got to ride it”, and that is what we did. There were costs to that. About a week after we first came to power, we had the global financial crisis. That is probably still regarded as the most severe international economic crisis since the Depression, although nowhere near the scale of the Depression. What did we do? Fortunately, I got on quite well with Kevin Rudd.

Several members interjected.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I did; we got on well.

Mr D.J. Kelly: He gave you buckets of money!

Mr C.J. BARNETT: He contributed —

Mr D.J. Kelly: You never gave him any credit for it!

Mr C.J. BARNETT: Yes, I did. Do not be ridiculous.

Mr D.J. Kelly: You made an art of slagging off the federal Labor government.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: On GST I slagged off every government, including the current one!

We entered into a very expensive program of capital works—hospitals, schools, sporting facilities, police stations, courts, roadworks and the like. These were big capital works programs. There was regional development. Things happened in country towns where nothing had happened for many years. We got on with it very quickly because I and others were fearful that we could have a real crisis because we were exposed internationally and exposed to the GST. Do members know what? We got the state through that. Western Australia did not suffer the adverse consequences that everyone forecasted in 2008. We got through.

Mr D.J. Kelly: Because of you?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: No; we got through because of a whole range of factors, but we got through it. There was a legacy—a negative legacy—because the state wore most of the financial burden of that period. Private industry went into its shell all over the place. It was the state government, with the support of the commonwealth government, that largely kept Western Australia going through that process. We then had what has been described as the perfect storm. The Labor Party had full GST under the Gallop government; that is years ago, so forget it, but GST fell dramatically. Then around 2014–15 we had the fall in commodity prices. As the government will see in around a month’s time when its budget comes down, and as I have said, given the fall in GST and —

Several members interjected.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: Mr Acting Speaker, I am trying to make a speech here.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr I.C. Blayney): I would like to hear the member for Cottesloe out and I would appreciate it if there were fewer interjections, thanks.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: The current GST situation is 34c in the dollar and the economy is improving. It started to improve around October last year. It is gaining a bit of momentum, which is good. That probably takes a bit of pressure out. Given the GST situation, unless there is some stellar rise in commodity prices—which will not happen—there is absolutely no circumstance at all under which a significant deficit can be avoided; therefore, there is no circumstance at all under which debt will not rise. That is the reality that members will see on 7 September when the Treasurer produces his first budget. It will show a significant deficit. Who will the government blame for that—the previous government?

Mr D.J. Kelly: You!

Mr C.J. BARNETT: It can try, but does it think constituents are that stupid that they will accept a large deficit for the 2017–18 year and blame a government that has been, by then, out of power for seven or eight months? They are not going to. This government will not be able to avoid that. All through the Labor Party's years in opposition it tried to blame Richard Court or Colin Barnett or anyone it could for the GST situation. This government is now going to own that situation, and it has no answer for it. The answer promoted by the now Leader of the Opposition was the part sale of Western Power. There is a downside in that. I remind members that during the eight years of the previous government, the net assets of the government of Western Australia increased by \$70 billion! Yes, debt was up to around \$30 billion by the time of the mid-financial year. We need to reduce it. Yes, it is too high; it needs to come down, but it is not out of control.

Point of Order

Mr T.J. HEALY: The member for Cottesloe is embarrassing the opposition.

Several members interjected.

Debate Resumed

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I tell you, my friend, you just embarrassed yourself. You came over like a fool!

Mr T.J. Healy: I withdraw; my apologies.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: There are no apologies. You can be a fool any time you want to be!

I conclude: we cannot have it all. If we were going to ride through a turbulent period of a global financial crisis, a super cycle, up and then down, in commodity prices—which Australia has never seen and hopefully never will, and WA is the most exposed—it has to be dealt with and something has to give. Yes, selling an asset has happened; it happened in the 1990s. It did not happen under the Gallop government—a few assets were sold along the way but nothing significant. Some hard decisions have to be made, but the government does not have a plan. It does not have a way to deal with the inevitability of large deficits and further rises in debt. It cannot blame the past. The government can say it, but no-one out there will hear it or listen to it. It will have to come up with an alternative or, come 7 September, every dollar of debt is this government's debt.

Mr B.S. WYATT (Victoria Park — Treasurer) [6.27 pm]: A range of opposition members gave an interesting performance tonight, but I suspect we are in a scenario now in which you guys are going to need some sort of fiscal equivalent of no body, no parole. Until the Liberal Party wears responsibility for the past, it will not be forgiven.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr I.C. Blayney): Leader of the Opposition, as I recall —

Dr M.D. Nahan: Zero!

The ACTING SPEAKER: I thought you were on three! I will call you next time.

Mr B.S. WYATT: Mr Acting Speaker might note that for the last two and a half hours while listening to the opposition I did not make one interjection. Unsurprisingly, the former Premier, the member for Cottesloe, has now gone! I know the Liberal Party would like us to forget about the past, but the reality is that every single day I am dealing with the mess that it left us with. I cannot escape the debt and deficit that the former government left us with and that the former Premier does not want us to talk about. I understand the Liberal Party does not want us to talk about it, but until it wears ownership of the mess it left us with, it will not be forgiven. That is the reality. I was stunned to sit here and listen to the Leader of the Opposition, the shadow Treasurer and the member for Churchlands complain about the Premier using the comparison with the Great Depression! The Leader of the Opposition said that leaders do not use that sort of language. Let me take members through five occasions on which the Leader of the Opposition used that language when he was Treasurer. The first occasion was at the time of the midyear review in December 2015. He said —

Put that into context, that's the biggest revenue shock government, state or federal, has experienced in Australia since the Great Depression ...

The second occasion was on 8 April 2016, when he said —

The West Australian Government has seen the largest collapse of revenue ... since the Great Depression ...

On the third occasion he said —

We have experienced the biggest hit since the Great Depression.

On the fourth occasion he said —

This Loan Bill is necessary to meet the revenue problems the government has, which are real and unpredictable, and have had the largest impact on any government since the Great Depression ...

The best one for me, is when the then Treasurer said —

The quality of management is determined by what we do in difficult times, and this is the most difficult time this state has ever faced, at least since the Great Depression.

I have not once made a comparison to the Great Depression, but in a quick Google search, I found five references to the Great Depression from the former Treasurer, not just in reference to fiscal decline, but in terms of the economic performance of the state. The Leader of the Opposition is obsessed with the Great Depression.

The member for Churchlands was going through an article from the ABC online, but he did not actually quote the parts where I was making positive commentary about the economy. Let me be crystal clear: I will be talking about the mess the previous government left us, and I will continue to do so, because it has an impact on every aspect of government now. The debt and deficit of the previous government is so dramatic that it has an impact at every level of government. It does not help when the opposition, in the upper house, votes out savings measures from its own budget. That does not help things along in the slightest. I will be reminding members opposite of what they did. The Leader of the Opposition might like to pretend that his parliamentary career started on 9 March, but it did not. He is responsible for the circumstances. The member for Cottesloe is right—we will see debt and deficits in the budget.

Dr M.D. Nahan: You are responsible for \$5 billion in extra expenditure.

Mr B.S. WYATT: The member says \$5 billion; that is his figure, and I do not understand where he gets it from. The Leader of the Opposition can reflect on that as much as he likes; I do not mind, because it is his figure and he will get to explain it in due course. I want to go through a couple of the extremely positive times of the former Liberal government, and how it was mature and positive in selling its message. I have referred to the five references by the then Treasurer to the Great Depression. I think one of the strongest performances, and a highlight for me, of selling the state and the strong financial management under the former Liberal government was a wonderful opinion piece by the now shadow Treasurer, the member for Bateman, in *The West Australian* on 19 September 2016, titled “Barnett leadership a roadblock to growth”. It states —

The economic times have significantly changed: our political and economic strategy has not.

...

I told the Premier that the community would turn against us if we simply continued along the same path we have travelled for the past seven years while ignoring the changed economic circumstances that impact on their jobs and lives.

The community is clearly rattled by the pace and impact of the post-mining boom downturn.

...

The task is made harder by the extraordinary level of State debt that will be part of the Premier’s legacy.

He went on to critique the then Premier’s increasingly erratic decision-making. The incapacity of the previous government to deal with the spin off into lack of control in its last two years in particular is what will perhaps haunt it the most. I recall when the previous government won the 2013 election handsomely. Then, what did we hear from the government in that year? We heard silence. It had its opportunities. The greatest opportunity it had in its eight and a half years was the year after it won the 2013 election, and it did not do a thing. A Liberal agenda was not even implemented when it had the majority versus the ratbags of financial management—the members of the National Party. The previous government did not stand up to them at all; it kept throwing more and more money at them. It was not until the bitter end that it started to stand up to them.

The member for Cottesloe talked about the wonderful mining sector that we have, but even when the National Party, as it sat in the previous government’s cabinet, went after the mining sector all guns blazing, the silence from the Liberal Party was deafening. The Liberal Party was absolutely silent. When National Party members were critiquing the mining sector up hill and down dale, not a word was said by the Liberal Party. That is the Liberal Party’s reality. It might like to think for a minute that it can come in here and say, “Don’t talk about the past.” I understand the past

is awkward for members opposite. Believe me, if I were them, I would find that awkward too, particularly for members of a Liberal Party that prides itself, theoretically, on strong financial management. But it did not deliver that, in particular in its first term. Not only did it have billions of dollars of revenue write-ups in its first term, but it also increased net debt by 500 per cent. It was the first term that really killed it off—absolutely. The net debt increased on billions of dollars of revenue write-ups, and what the previous government did with recurrent spending is something that I will continue to remind it of—don't you worry about that.

I emphasise that things are, as I have said time and again, getting better, and I will go through those in a minute. I want to reflect on where we were when we came into government. I will not read through the *Pre-election Financial Projections Statement*, which highlights the debt problem that the previous government created and left for the incoming government. We came into a scenario of having had five years of state final demand contraction. I have made the point that the domestic state economy had effectively been in recession. In 2013–14, state final demand was minus 1.5 per cent, in 2014–15 it was minus 2.8 per cent, in 2015–16 it was minus 3.9 per cent, in 2016–17 it was minus 6.75 per cent—that was the forecast from the *Pre-election Financial Projections Statement*—and in 2017–18, at the time of the *Pre-election Financial Projections Statement*, it was minus 1.25 per cent. WA is the only state or territory with a declining state final demand; that is what the Liberal Party left us. The state had held a AAA credit rating for 15 years but it was lost under the former Liberal government. WA debt is now rated as the riskiest, equal to South Australia and the Northern Territory. That is what the Liberal Party left us with. However, I have said time and again that things are getting better—despite the nightmare left to us by the former Liberal government. The member for Churchlands quoted an article from 24 June 2017 about the CommSec report. He went through it, but he did not finish off with my quotes, so I will finish that off for him. It states —

WA Treasurer Ben Wyatt said he was not surprised WA continued to hold the bottom ranking, but was also upbeat.

“I am very very positive about the years ahead,” Mr Wyatt said.

“The early signs around unemployment, the early signs around confidence in both retail and business are very good and I think we have at the very least troughed through the worst times.”

I think we have. I am not saying that we are about to surge back to the sort of growth that the previous government enjoyed, but I think we have troughed. Time and again, I have made positive commentary. In an article on 3 June 2017 referring to treasurers in general, I stated —

“I think I have some of the bigger challenges [of the nation's treasurers], absolutely, but I still think Western Australia has troughed,” he tells *AFR Weekend* ... “I honestly think the early indicators are that we are through the worst in terms of the performance of the economy.”

I have said that time and again. I am particularly pleased to see the housing sector start to show some early signs of more positive territory. I think that the validation of the decision —

Dr M.D. Nahan: Watch this territory.

Mr B.S. WYATT: That is why I made the point that things are still uncertain.

Dr M.D. Nahan: You watch.

Mr B.S. WYATT: “You watch”, the interjection is. That is the Liberal Party's legacy, as I warned time and again when I sat on that side of the house, that it left by exposing the state to such weakness and by not preparing Western Australia for the inevitable downtown and come-off in revenue growth that we all knew was going to happen. I will accept that it came off quicker than we expected, but the Leader of the Opposition as Treasurer and the member for Cottesloe as Premier did not care about exposure for future governments; they did not care. I am stunned that the former Premier, the member for Cottesloe, said as he stormed out, “You cannot have it all!”, but that is what the Liberal Party did. It gave it all to everybody. That has been the history of the Liberal Party in this state since at least 2005 and the member for Cottesloe, as I watched Parliament today, continues to have this Parliamentary Liberal Party in his stranglehold. Every time—in 2005, 2008, 2013 and now with the Leader of the Opposition—the Liberal Party throws money as soon as there is the whiff of buckshot for pay and negotiations. That has been the WA Liberal Party strategy since at least 2005. It could get away with it when its revenue from budget to midyear review revenue write-ups was in the order of billions, but we cannot get away with it now. The opposition has a moral responsibility to assist the government in this task—it absolutely does. I will continue to make positive commentary because I am positive about the state—I am. If the opposition in this place started to take a more mature approach to politics and, as I said, did not vote in the upper house against its own budget saving measures, that would assist. The shadow Treasurer posed the question: why are we so fragile? It is because of the opposition's eight and a half years in power. That is why we are so fragile. Our balance sheet is exposed to the downturn in the economy and the downturn in revenue growth. The opposition created that fragility in the state balance sheet by loading it with debt and operating deficits. I will continue to remind it of this; the opposition may not like it and it may be awkward.

I want to make a couple of points about the interest in business and consumer confidence. The irony is, of course, that since the Labor Party won the election in March, both business and consumer confidence are up. They are up. I think they got over the Leader of the Opposition's three increases in land tax. If we talk about hitting a sector when it could not take it on, the Leader of the Opposition was the master at that game. Land tax was increased not once or twice, but three times in 18 months, at a time of increasing vacancies, both residential and commercial, and an inability to pass on those sorts of increases in tax. The former Premier, the member for Cottesloe, sat here and said they were all large landowners who could just sell and restructure et cetera. Many people who came to my electorate office—no doubt to all members' offices—were self-funded retirees who really copped the brunt. It was on the back of basically no growth in the value of their properties and up to 100 per cent increases in their land tax liability. That is what the Liberal Party did. It caused that hit to business and consumer confidence, which is now coming back since it was defeated from government.

The "NAB Quarterly Business Survey: June 2017" was referred to tonight. It showed that confidence in WA has improved significantly since late 2016. Of course the Chamber of Commerce and Industry of Western Australia was also referred to—I think one member said that the government had been warned. To be frank, I have been incredibly disappointed in the Chamber of Commerce and Industry. By and large, it was silent during eight and a half years while the debt and deficit racked up. It was silent. In most cases, the CCI did not utter a word about recurrent spending growth, which it eviscerated the Gallop government over. Now I do not know whether the CCI is Arthur or Martha! During the election campaign, I listened to it and watched as its chief economist attacked me quite strongly for the idea that debt cannot simply be reduced overnight; it has to be paid off over time. He went after me time and again in a way that I was quite surprised about because he used the sort of language and approach that I have not seen previously from the CCI. Apparently, during the election campaign, the debt was all my problem—not the Labor Party's, but Ben Wyatt's problem.

He suggested that the idea of paying off debt over time was a ridiculous statement, and we must sell Western Power to resolve the debt problem overnight. That was despite the fact that the former government was selling off everything. When I got a copy of the Chamber of Commerce and Industry of Western Australia's 2017 "WA Election Campaign Strategy", I was not surprised that it started off with —

As CCI's strategy is not to change Government from the Liberal–National Alliance, our campaign tactics will focus instead on: ...

It is quite a lengthy document that goes through how the CCI was going to be campaigning quite strongly for the Liberal–National alliance's re-election. I was not surprised by the CCI's rhetoric during the election campaign—I am the lead speaker on this motion, so I think I have another three hours or something. Now that I have seen that document, I am not surprised by the sort of rhetoric that I received from the CCI during that election campaign. Anyway, we move on and I hope that the CCI is genuine in its commitment to the finances of this state, as it once was some 10 to 15 years ago.

I want to go through one other document. As I said, when we came to government it was not as though we had made up this issue of debt and deficits; that was a direct result of decisions made by the former government. An early document that we saw is from the Centre for Independent Studies, which is an organisation that does a lot of work across the spectrum on economic and social policy analysis. It has also done a lot of work in Aboriginal affairs over the last 20 years that I have been very impressed with. In February this year, during the election campaign, Robert Carling put out the "Report Card on State Finances". Just so we all know that it is not just me saying this, it is not just Treasury in the *Pre-election Financial Projections Statement*, and it is not just every commentator in Australia saying how bad the former Liberal government was, I will go through this scorecard. It scores out of 10 for all the states, which are marked by little crosses and ticks. I will take colleagues through it. If they like, I will email a copy to everyone. The trend measures include —

1. General government net operating result has improved

For WA—no.

2. General government fiscal balance has improved

For WA—no.

3. General government net debt as % of operating revenue has fallen

For WA—no.

4. General government net financial liabilities as % of operating revenue has fallen

No.

5. Non-financial public sector net debt as % of operating revenue has fallen

No.

6. Non-financial public sector net financial worth as % of operating revenue has increased ...

No. And on it goes. WA scored an impressive one out of 10.

Dr A.D. Buti: What was the one for?

Mr B.S. WYATT: The one was for —

Number of state public sector employees per capita has been flat or falling

Some effort went into that from the Leader of the Opposition, and he got a tick for that at number 8. WA was one out of 10 and the next worst states—South Australia, Tasmania and Victoria—were six out of 10. May I say by way of aside to all my colleagues in this place, we are running an operating surplus in WA—unfortunately, we are running an operating surplus in Tasmania—but that is okay, because I am sure that budget will come back for us in due course.

The point I make is: yes, I agree. I have been very mindful of my rhetoric as Treasurer, because it surprised me early on that many people are interested in what I have to say. For eight and a half years in opposition no-one cared what I said, but suddenly they did and I am very mindful of the rhetoric that I use. Unlike the former Treasurer, I have not once made the comparison, both fiscal and economic, of WA with the Great Depression—not once. That was the former Treasurer, the Leader of the Opposition, who did that time and again. He talked down the state and highlighted the problems with the economy that he thought were so dramatic that they reflected the Great Depression of the 1930s. That was him, not me. I guarantee members that I will remind the Leader of the Opposition every day about the mess he left because it is something we cannot divorce from our current decisions. We cannot divorce the straightjacket we find ourselves in from what the former government left us and from the decisions it made, particularly during that first term of the Barnett Liberal government when its average recurrent spending growth was around 10 per cent.

In its first year in government, there was 13.5 per cent recurrent growth. The former government came into power, and instead of reprioritising the state balance sheet to accommodate its own priorities it just added it all on top. As I said, when the ratbags, the National Party, came in, at no point did the Liberal Party try to constrain the impact the National Party was having on the finances of the state—and the Liberal Party knew it! It was not until the end that the former government started to try to pull the National Party in. All the National Party was doing was building infrastructure and then handing off the cost of that infrastructure to the consolidated account. Is it any wonder the National Party was having such a bad impact on the state's finances? Now, the National Party is just looking around, like my kids on a sugar high, for the next hit: "Let's just increase taxes on that sector and this sector, and we won't need to put up this and we won't need to do that"! You guys have to control them! I get that they are not the Liberal Party's problem at the moment, but they will be again when the Liberal Party eventually forms government as the coalition that they are. But that is for the Liberal Party to manage. The Liberal Party has always been expected to be the grown-up in that coalition, but it let the National Party run wild with the finances of the state.

I have had to come in and unpick what was, effectively, two budget processes in the former government—the Liberal Party budget process and then the National Party budget process. I was always intrigued by what Terry Redman, the member for Warren–Blackwood, would say when he was Leader of the National Party. When I asked him, he would say, "It's gone through the cabinet", and then I understood! I was stunned that the Liberal Party would tick off on some of these things, and then I understood. What would happen is that the National Party would come in holus-bolus with its \$1 billion: "There it is. Oh, that's it. Just stick it in the books." There was no analysis of what it was being spent on, no concern about what that was doing to the recurrent spend of government and what impact it was having on the consolidated account. It was treated as a separate budget, not as a funding source. That is the problem we are trying to unpick now. The National Party will lose its mind, I am sure, when it sees the budget because it is not exactly as it wants it to be. But that is the reality we find ourselves in now.

I will continue to talk up the finances and the state. The member for Cottesloe told us he is a student of economic history in Western Australia. He just did not learn anything from it. That is all. He was student, but he was just incapable of learning. He would have known, if he was a student, that booms always end. What did he do to prepare the state for the inevitable end of the boom? He made sure debt was at a record high and that we have the largest operating deficits the state has ever seen. That is how that student of economic history in WA treated the finances of the state.

So, yes, we are, I think, facing better economic times. I think that over the longer term we will see better financial management. But even if the former government had sold Western Power, the reality is—I have said this to everybody; I have said it publicly and to everyone who wants to listen—that we would need to have a couple of terms of tight recurrent spending growth. Until we get into a situation of regular reasonable operating surpluses, we will not make a huge impact on debt. Once we get to an operating surplus position and hold it, and grow it, preferably, we will start to make a more dramatic impact on the net debt position of the state. It is not rocket science; that is just the reality. Anyone who is spinning an easy solution and saying that we do not have to worry about any of that, as the National Party does and the Liberal Party now alludes to—that is, "We've got the solution; it's a great new tax that will resolve the problem and we don't have to worry about all these other more difficult

decisions around pay restraint, the energy system or anything else; we've got this whole new wonderful revenue source"—is spinning a myth. The whole idea of selling Western Power to somehow create a fiscal solution to the problem that the former government created is also a myth. That is the simple reality.

We will talk up the state. Of course we will, because we are all positive about the state. The budget will show that even in straitened financial times, budgets are still big beasts and governments are still big beasts that do what government does. We will have a plan for the state that underwrites jobs, because that is what we are all committed to on this side of the house. The government is committed to ensuring that we are underwriting those jobs at a time when, as I said, the economy is troughing. But I will also be letting all opposition members know that the former government is responsible for the fiscal times we face. They did it, not me. I will remind everyone that the decisions that I am now making are a direct result of the Liberal–National government's last eight and a half years in power.

MR A. KRSTICEVIC (Carine) [6.55 pm]: I would like to add some commentary to this debate in the last five minutes. The motion states —

That this house notes the constant negative commentary by the Premier and members of his government about Western Australia's economy, which is hurting consumer and business confidence, and calls on the state government to take a more considered approach to the economic narrative.

It was heartening to listen to the Treasurer say that he is not referring to the state as being in a Great Depression. But, unfortunately, the Premier has done that on many occasions and he continues to talk as though we are in a depression. I have never lived through a depression, but I have seen videos and movies and heard commentary about the Depression and it does not look anything like what this state looks like. Australians are very positive, hardworking and innovative. It does not help when the narrative that we in this Parliament are selling to people in the media and the newspapers is all about doom and gloom and blaming someone else for our problems. Australians are not those sorts of people. We do not blame other people. We pick ourselves up, dust ourselves off and start working to try to improve our situation and our lot in life.

The commentary in the media is one thing, but if the Western Australian public was to tune in to Parliament and show an active interest in the debates and the discussions that go on in here, they might pay attention to how much time we in this Parliament spend filibustering and talking about nothing, rather than investing our time in talking about things that are going to create jobs and introducing legislation that is going to be more positive for this state. We all know that it happens. We all know that we are tapped on the shoulder and told, "Look, we need to fill in a couple of hours because we've got nothing else to do. We can't go home early because it won't look good to the public, so can you guys just get up and fill in a bit of time. It doesn't matter what you talk about; just take as much time as you like." That is what happens all the time, rather than focusing our energies on trying to be more constructive and more positive and working more collaboratively within this Parliament to try to find positive solutions. There are a lot of people in here with a lot of ideas, not only the member for Armadale, who people keep pointing to all the time. Other members in here are very capable in their particular areas. Maybe they are not as highly credentialed as the member for Armadale, but we all have something to contribute.

I have no doubt that one day many members in here will leave their mark on this state. Unfortunately, a lot of the ministers now are too busy focusing on the negative, rather than trying to look for opportunities to grow and diversify the economy and take on the challenges that need to be taken on to try to fix the situation we find ourselves in. We find ourselves in that situation for many different reasons. It may be due to lack of support from the federal government. It may be due to the fall in commodity prices on the world market. It may be due to the world's economic and geopolitical situations. We can point to lots of things to show why we are making the decisions that we are making.

In the last eight and a half years, a lot of good things have happened in this state. A lot of great infrastructure has been built, which the people of Western Australia need. When we talk to people inside and outside this place about where the money has gone, we ask them, "What wouldn't you build? What hospital wouldn't you build? Which school wouldn't you build? Which police station wouldn't you build? Which sewerage or electricity infrastructure wouldn't you build?" Of course, people cannot point to anything. They say, "Well, we need all that." Whether we can afford to have it with the economic circumstances as they changed is another factor. Maybe we should have said, "No, we can't have that." Instead of having 30-odd children per classroom, maybe we need a few more. At the same time, now that the Labor Party is in government, it needs to be tighter in the things that it is doing. On the one hand, when it suits the government, it delivers on its election promises. When it suits its supporters, it gives them what they want. For everybody else, there is a reason that they cannot get it. The government should be consistent and tell everyone the same message—it is tough.

Debate adjourned, pursuant to standing orders.

House adjourned at 7.00 pm

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Questions and answers are as supplied to Hansard.

MINISTER FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT — STAFF — UNITED VOICE**647. Dr M.D. Nahan to the Minister for Local Government; Heritage; Culture and the Arts:**

- (1) Are any Ministerial staff current members of United Voice:
 - (a) if yes, what are the names and positions of the staff?
- (2) Have any Ministerial staff been previous members of United Voice:
 - (a) if yes, what are the names and positions of the staff?

Mr D.A. Templeman replied:

- (1)–(2) Please refer to Legislative Assembly Question on Notice 654.

MINISTER FOR POLICE — STAFF — UNITED VOICE**650. Dr M.D. Nahan to the Minister for Police; Road Safety:**

- (1) Are any Ministerial staff current members of United Voice:
 - (a) if yes, what are the names and positions of the staff?
- (2) Have any Ministerial staff been previous members of United Voice:
 - (a) if yes, what are the names and positions of the staff?

Mrs M.H. Roberts replied:

- (1)–(2) Not that I am aware of.

MINISTER FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT — STAFF — FAMILY RELATIONS**664. Dr M.D. Nahan to the Minister for Local Government; Heritage; Culture and the Arts:**

Are any Ministerial staff related to any Members of Parliament in either House and if yes:

- (a) what are the names of the staff;
- (b) what are the names of the related Members of Parliament; and
- (c) what is the relationship between the staff member and the Member of Parliament?

Mr D.A. Templeman replied:

No current ministerial staff are related to Members of the 40th Parliament.

MINISTER FOR WATER — PORTFOLIOS — DOMAIN NAMES**697. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Minister for Water; Fisheries; Forestry; Innovation and ICT; Science:**

- (1) In relation to your portfolio areas, how many “.com.au” domains have been purchased, as at 7 June 2017:
 - (a) what is the domain;
 - (b) who was it purchased through;
 - (c) when was it purchased;
 - (d) what was the upfront cost of purchase; and
 - (e) what is the annual recurrent cost of purchase?
- (2) how many “.com” domains have been purchased:
 - (a) what is the domain;
 - (b) who was it purchased through;
 - (c) when was it purchased;
 - (d) what was the upfront cost of purchase; and
 - (e) what is the annual recurrent cost of purchase?
- (3) Is the Minister aware that the Auditor General recommends the consistency of “.wa.gov.au” domains for all government agencies and if so, why was it considered necessary to purchase each “.com.au” and “.com” domain?

Mr D.J. Kelly replied:Aqwest

- (1) 2 domains
 - (a) aqwest.com.au
 - (b) Domain Registration Services
 - (c) 24/09/2012
 - (d) \$139.70
 - (e) \$80.00 per year
 - (a) waterdetectives.com.au
 - (b) Netregistry
 - (c) 07/10/2008
 - (d) \$124.40
 - (e) \$80.00 per year
- (2) Nil.
- (3) Yes. It is understood that as per Public Sector Commissioner's Circular 2009–02: Website Governance Framework, agencies are required to comply with the Website Governance Framework (WGF), which includes a requirement for consistency of ".wa.gov.au" domains. As a Schedule 1 entity, Aqwest is not required to comply with the WGF.

Busselton Water

- (1) One
 - (a) busseltonwater.com.au
 - (b) Melbourne IT
 - (c) 2010
 - (d) \$99.00
 - (e) \$76.99/annum
- (2) Nil.
 - (a)–(e) Not applicable.
- (3) Yes. Busselton Water purchased the busseltonwater.com.au domain and holds it to prevent cybersquatting and fraudulent appropriation of our identity.

ChemCentre

- (1) Zero
 - (a)–(e) Not applicable.
- (2) One
 - (a) Chemcentreopenday.com
 - (b) Adobe Business Catalyst
 - (c) August 2013
 - (d) \$0
 - (e) Domain registration: \$20 per year
Hosting: \$180 per year
- (3) Yes. Domain was used to promote ChemCentre Open Day event only. Value has been reassessed: domain registration and hosting will be allowed to lapse in August 2017 and all Open Day communications will happen through chemcentre.wa.gov.au.

Department of Fisheries

- (1) Two
 - (a) Sharksmart.com.au and fisheries-esd.com.au
 - (b) Purchased through Hatch'd and Netregistry respectively
 - (c) Initially purchased in 2013 and 2001 respectively

- (d) The upfront cost for the Sharksmart.com.au site was \$33.90. The upfront cost for the fisheries-esd.com.au site is not known due to the time elapsed, however it is expected to be in line with current market pricing.
- (e) Recurrent cost is \$38.95 for two years.
- (2) Nil.
 - (a)–(e) Not applicable.
- (3) The fisheries-esd.com.au website was established as part of a national project which was fully funded by the Fisheries Research and Development Corporation to house the considerable set of materials that were developed to assist all Australian fisheries jurisdictions implement the principles of Ecologically Sustainable Development.

The sharksmart.com.au domain was purchased on the basis that it would provide better access to information for users including those undertaking internet searches.

Department of Water

- (1) Nil.
 - (a)–(e) Not applicable.
- (2) Nil.
 - (a)–(e) Not applicable.
- (3) Yes

Forest Products Commission

- (1) One
 - (a) forestry.com.au
 - (b) AussieHQ
 - (c) 3 October 2012
 - (d) No upfront costs
 - (e) Annual subscription of \$15 (including GST).
- (2) Nil.
- (3) Yes. The Forest Products Commission purchased additional domain names to protect its brand and provide opportunities to market its commercial products.

Office of Science

- (1) Nil.
 - (a)–(e) Not applicable.
- (2) Nil.
 - (a)–(e) Not applicable.
- (3) Yes

Office of the Government Chief Information Officer

- (1) Nil.
 - (a)–(e) Not applicable.
- (2) Nil.
 - (a)–(e) Not applicable.
- (3) Yes.

Water Corporation

- (1) (a)–(e) [See tabled paper no 508.]
- (2) Nil.
 - (a)–(e) Not applicable.
- (3) Yes. It is understood that as per Public Sector Commissioner’s Circular 2009–02: Website Governance Framework, agencies are required to comply with the Website Governance Framework (WGF), which includes a requirement for consistency of “.wa.gov.au” domains. As a Schedule 1 entity, Water Corporation is not required to comply with the WGF.

MINISTER FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT — PORTFOLIOS — DOMAIN NAMES

706. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Minister for Local Government; Heritage; Culture and the Arts:

- (1) In relation to your portfolio areas, how many “.com.au” domains have been purchased, as at 7 June 2017:
- what is the domain;
 - who was it purchased through;
 - when was it purchased;
 - what was the upfront cost of purchase; and
 - what is the annual recurrent cost of purchase?
- (2) how many “.com” domains have been purchased:
- what is the domain;
 - who was it purchased through;
 - when was it purchased;
 - what was the upfront cost of purchase; and
 - what is the annual recurrent cost of purchase?
- (3) Is the Minister aware that the Auditor General recommends the consistency of “.wa.gov.au” domains for all government agencies and if so, why was it considered necessary to purchase each “.com.au” and “.com” domain?

Mr D.A. Templeman replied:Culture and Arts Portfolio

(1)

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e) AUD GST inc
subiacoartscentre.com.au	Netregistry	25 May 2006	Not available	\$19.48
better-beginnings.com.au	GoDaddy	2008	Not available	\$16.99
statetheatrecentrewa.com.au	Netregistry	16 June 2009	Not available	\$19.48
barreloungecafe.com.au	Netregistry	17 October 2012	Not available	\$19.48
stcwa.com.au	Netregistry	26 October 2012	Not available	\$19.48
heathledgertheatre.com.au	Netregistry	26 October 2012	Not available	\$19.48
desertriversea.com.au	Netregistry	10 January 2013	Not available	\$19.48

(2)

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d) AUD	(e) AUD
desertriversea.com	GoDaddy	28 July 2014	\$58.75	-

- (3) Yes. In relation to Perth Theatre Trust domain names, they were originally registered and managed by AEG Ogden Pty Ltd under its venue management contract with the Perth Theatre Trust. AEG, as a non-Government entity, registered the “.com.au” domains. They have been retained to ensure consistency of contact details for the venues.

In relation to the Better Beginnings domain name, it is retained as the program has been known nationally and internationally for almost 10 years; the intent is to provide an easily findable domain name.

In relation to the Desert River Sea domain names were purchased as part of the agreement between the project partners, the Art Gallery of Western Australia and Rio Tinto. The intention is to provide easily findable domain names

Local Government Portfolio

- (1) Nil.
 (2) Nil.
 (3) Not Applicable.

Heritage Portfolio

(Fremantle Prison)

(1)

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e) AUD GST inc
fremantleprison.com.au	Melbourne IT	Not available ¹	Not available	\$76.99

(2)

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d) AUD	(e) AUD
fremantleprison.com	Melbourne IT	Not available ¹	Not available	\$47.40

¹Domains were transferred to the State Heritage Office in June 2015. Information relating to the purchase dates and upfront costs are unavailable.

- (3) Yes. The domains were purchased to promote visitation and support the delivery of tourism-related services, which is essential to generating revenue to contribute to the conservation and presentation of the World Heritage-listed site.

(National Trust)

As a statutory authority, the National Trust is not eligible to use the “.wa.gov.au” domain.

MINISTER FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT — CABINET HANDBOOK

723. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Minister for Local Government; Heritage; Culture and the Arts:

- (1) Is the Minister aware of 2017 Cabinet Handbook guidelines with respect to the handling of Cabinet in Confidence (CiC) information?
- (2) Since 17 March 2017 has the Minister or their staff transmitted CiC information via text message, iMessage or WhatsApp, and if yes:
- what service was used and to whom was that information conveyed;
 - as per the Cabinet handbook was the information marked “Not to be Copied”;
 - can the Minister rule out that CiC information was not stored on a third party server; and
 - has the Minister sought approval for use of this service by the Cabinet Secretariat?
- (3) Since 17 March 2017 has the Minister or their staff transmitted CiC information via fax, and if yes:
- to whom was that information conveyed; and
 - as per the Cabinet Handbook was the document destroyed after it’s use?

Mr D.A. Templeman replied:

- (1)–(3) Please refer to Legislative Assembly Question on Notice 730

MINISTER FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT — PORTRAIT

740. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Minister for Local Government; Heritage; Culture and the Arts:

I refer to recent portrait photos taken of Minister in March:

- what date(s) was the Ministers portrait photo taken;
- what was the cost of the photo shoot;
- who was the photographer;
- will these photos be digitally enhanced or edited in any way:
 - if so, what is the cost of that editing;
- who or what agency is the ultimate owner of the photo;
- what copyright will be attached to the photo (Creative Commons etc.); and
- can the photo be used for any political campaign purposes?

Mr D.A. Templeman replied:

- (a)–(g) Please refer to Legislative Assembly Question on Notice 747

MINISTER FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT — PORTFOLIOS — STAFF — CLIENT SERVICE ROLES

800. Mr A. Krsticevic to the Minister for Local Government; Heritage; Culture and the Arts:

For each department, agency and Government trading enterprise within the Minister’s portfolio of responsibilities, can the Minister please advise:

- how many FTE are employed in client facing or client service roles; and
- of those staff referred to in (a), how many FTE:
 - are competent in a language other than English;
 - are competent in which language/s;
 - have been specifically employed for their language skills; and
 - are officially qualified or accredited as interpreters?

Mr D.A. Templeman replied:

- (a)–(b) Please refer to Legislative Assembly Question on Notice 807

MINISTER FOR POLICE — PORTFOLIOS — STAFF — CLIENT SERVICE ROLES

803. Mr A. Krsticevic to the Minister for Police; Road Safety:

For each department, agency and Government trading enterprise within the Minister's portfolio of responsibilities, can the Minister please advise:

- (a) how many FTE are employed in client facing or client service roles; and
- (b) of those staff referred to in (a), how many FTE:
 - (i) are competent in a language other than English;
 - (ii) are competent in which language/s;
 - (iii) have been specifically employed for their language skills; and
 - (iv) are officially qualified or accredited as interpreters?

Mrs M.H. Roberts replied:

This information isn't ready available, and would require the considerable diversion of Police and Road Safety resources to attempt to provide the information that the member has requested. If the member has a more specific concern that he thinks warrants the diversion of Police and Road Safety resources to attempt to provide the information that the member has requested., I would ask him to put that specific question on notice.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT — MYCOUNCIL WEBSITE

815. Mr A. Krsticevic to the Minister for Local Government:

I refer to the comments made by the Minister during the Assembly Estimates on 26 May 2016, that some councils, including his, had raised concerns about the MyCouncil website:

- (a) which councils have raised concerns regarding the MyCouncil website;
- (b) what concerns have been raised by which council/s; and
- (c) will the Minister undertake to update the MyCouncil website to respond to these concerns?

Mr D.A. Templeman replied:

- (a)–(c) A number of local governments were concerned that data they supplied to the Department of Local Government and Communities contained errors. Once correct data was supplied, the data was amended. Some local governments were also concerned that different methods used by local governments to calculate financial and asset data limited the capacity to make meaningful one to one comparisons. The Department met with these local governments to discuss their concerns and explain the rationale of MyCouncil as a place to view, compare and ask questions about data that is already in the public domain.

MINISTER FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT — PORTFOLIOS — LANGUAGE SERVICE DELIVERY

825. Mr A. Krsticevic to the Minister for Local Government; Heritage; Culture and the Arts:

For each department, agency and government trading enterprise within the Minister's portfolio of responsibilities, can the Minister please advise how much money is allocated in the agency's budget for language service delivery, in the following financial years:

- (a) 2012/13;
- (b) 2013/14;
- (c) 2014/15;
- (d) 2015/16; and
- (e) 2016/17?

Mr D.A. Templeman replied:

	(a) 2012/13	(b) 2013/14	(c) 2014/15	(d) 2015/16	(e) 2016/17
Department of Local Government and Communities	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil
Metropolitan Cemeteries Board	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil
State Heritage Office	Nil	Nil	Nil	\$28,000.00	\$28,000.00

National Trust	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil
Department of Culture and the Arts	Nil	\$300.00	Nil	Nil	Nil
Art Gallery of Western Australia	Nil	Nil	\$207.90	Nil	Nil
Perth Theatre Trust	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil
Screenwest	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil
State Library of Western Australia	\$451,102.00	\$353,335.00	\$362,448.00	\$337,607.00	\$389,690.00
State Records Office	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil
Western Australian Museum	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil

HERITAGE — LOCAL GOVERNMENTS — BUILDING INVENTORY COMPLIANCE

833. Mr A. Krsticevic to the Minister for Heritage:

- (1) What was the rate of compliance by Local Governments with section 45 of the *Heritage Act 1990*, as at:
 - (a) 30 June 2014;
 - (b) 30 June 2015;
 - (c) 30 June 2016; and
 - (d) 14 June 2017?
- (2) Which councils were not compliant as at 14 June 2017?
- (3) What work has the State Heritage Office and/or Heritage Council undertaken with non-compliant councils?
- (4) By what date will all Local Government councils be compliant with section 45?

Mr D.A. Templeman replied:

- (1) (a)–(d) Section 45 of the *Heritage of Western Australia Act 1990* (the Act) requires local governments to:
 - compile an inventory of heritage places within four years of the commencement of the Act (section 45(2));
 - update the inventory annually (section 45(2)(a)); and
 - review the inventory every four years (s.45(2)(b)).

Advice provided by the Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage (the Department) is that 98 percent of local governments (136 out of 138) have compiled a heritage inventory. The Department continues to provide assistance to the two remaining local governments in the development of their inventories.

As at 14 June 2017, approximately 47 percent of local governments had reviewed their inventory at least once since adoption. This has been gradually increasing since 30 June 2014 (33 percent).

No local government has achieved full compliance with regards to section 45(2) of the Act, for each of the years outlined in (a) to (d).
- (2) See response to (1).
- (3) The Heritage Council of Western Australia engages with local governments and the WA Local Government Association (WALGA) to encourage greater compliance with the Act and promote its heritage inventory guidelines such as 'Basic Principles for Local Government Inventories' and 'Criteria for the Assessment of Local Heritage Places and Areas'.

The Department, in partnership with WALGA, has also established a preferred supplier panel operated by WALGA to provide access for local governments to engage qualified professional heritage consultants to assist with inventory reviews.

- (4) The Heritage Council and the Department will continue working with local governments to encourage compliance with the Act.

CULTURE AND THE ARTS — CREATIVE MUSIC DEVELOPMENT FUND

835. Mr A. Krsticevic to the Minister for Culture and the Arts:

I refer to the Labor election commitment to establish a \$3 million Creative Music Development Fund, and ask:

- (a) when will the Fund be available;
- (b) how will the Fund be administered;
- (c) what is the criteria for accessing the Fund;
- (d) will additional funding be provided to the Department of Culture and the Arts to support this initiative; and
- (e) if no to (d), what programs will be cut to establish this Fund?

Mr D.A. Templeman replied:

(a)–(e) No decision has been made about the establishment of the Fund.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT — ROUND TABLE SUMMIT

836. Mr A. Krsticevic to the Minister for Local Government:

I refer to the local government round-table summit held in early May and ask:

- (a) when and where was it held;
- (b) who was invited;
- (c) who attended;
- (d) what was the meeting agenda; and
- (e) what were the outcomes of the meeting?

Mr D.A. Templeman replied:

I am not aware of any local government round-table summit held in early May. However, I did convene a meeting with the Public Sector Commission, Crime and Corruption Commission, Western Australian Local Government Association, Local Government Professionals WA and the Department of Local Government and Communities and myself to discuss concerns regarding governance, accountability and transparency in the local government sector.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT — SHIRE OF NANNUP

837. Mr A. Krsticevic to the Minister for Local Government:

I refer to the comments made by Cr Tony Dean, President of the Shire of Nannup, that the Shire is struggling to raise money for economic development due to limited revenue from rates and a lack of State Government support and ask:

- (a) is the Minister aware of the issues at the Shire of Nannup;
- (b) what support is the Department of Local Government and Communities providing to the Shire; and
- (c) will the Minister ensure that adequate support is provided to the Shire?

Mr D.A. Templeman replied:

- (a) Like all local governments, the Shire of Nannup must make decisions with regard to revenue raising, resource allocation and service provision for, and on behalf of, its community. I am not aware of any particular financial difficulties the Shire is facing, that are not faced by other local government of a comparable size. The Shire of Nannup has not contacted my office or the Department of Local Government and Communities with these concerns.
- (b) The Department of Local Government and Communities provides advice and support to local governments, including the Shire of Nannup. This includes the Department's Local Government Capacity Building Program for country local governments which assists country local governments to build their capacity in key strategic and operational areas
- (c) The Department will continue to provide advice and support.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT — LOCAL COUNCILS — RISK ASSESSMENT

838. Mr A. Krsticevic to the Minister for Local Government:

- (1) Can the Minister please provide details of which local government councils were classified as low, medium and high risk by the Department of Local Government and Communities, as at:
 - (a) 30 June 2013;
 - (b) 30 June 2014;

- (c) 30 June 2015;
 - (d) 30 June 2016; and
 - (e) 14 June 2017?
- (2) For each council classified as high risk in the response to (1)(e), what actions have/are the Department of Local Government and Communities taking to mitigate those risks?

Mr D.A. Templeman replied:

- (1) As part of its monitoring of local governments, the Department adopts a risk-based approach to compliance, which targets limited compliance and capacity building resources towards local governments that are viewed as presenting the highest risk.

The risk assessment is based on an evaluation of complex financial and compliance data combined with qualitative evaluation of a range of other factors, such as the level of concern raised with the Department by external parties about governance and probity issues at each local government. It also incorporates the Department's judgement of risk relativities, which take into account factors like the size and/or strategic significance of each local government.

This is the sixth year in which the Risk Profile has been undertaken.

- (a)–(d) [See tabled paper no 505.]
- (e) As the former Department of Local Government and Communities prepared its risk analysis based on the previous year's financial reporting, the 2018 risk analysis (for 2016–17) is not yet complete.
- (2) While the 2018 risk analysis is not yet complete, the Department of Local Government and Communities has commenced talks with the Western Australian Local Government Association and the Local Government Professionals WA to work together to approach high risk local government authorities with offers of mentoring and other forms of assistance to reduce the risk rating.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT — SHIRE OF EXMOUTH

839. Mr A. Krsticevic to the Minister for Local Government:

I refer to the Corruption and Crime Commission "Report on the Matters of Serious Misconduct in the Shire of Exmouth" and ask:

- (a) have you had any conversations with the Minister for Police or the Attorney General regarding the need to consider the prosecution of Mr Bill Price and/or Mr Andrew Forte:
- (i) if yes to (a), what was the outcome of those discussions; and
 - (ii) if no to (a), why not?

Mr D.A. Templeman replied:

- (a) No. At the conclusion of its investigation, the Corruption and Crime Commission (CCC) will form opinions and make recommendations. Any referrals to other agencies for further inquiry and/or prosecution is the responsibility of the CCC.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT — COMPLAINTS

840. Mr A. Krsticevic to the Minister for Local Government:

- (1) How many Local Governments have been the subject of a complaint, allegation or other such report being made to the Corruption and Crime Commission ("CCC") in the period 1 January 2013 to date?
- (2) Please provide details of those Local governments referred to in (1), as follows:
- (a) the name of the Local Government;
 - (b) the nature of each report made to the CCC;
 - (c) what action, if any, has been taken by the CCC; and
 - (d) what action, if any, has been taken by the Department of Local Government and Communities?

Mr D.A. Templeman replied:

- (1)–(2) The Department of Local Government and Communities does not have access to the requested information.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT — COMPULSORY TRAINING

841. Mr A. Krsticevic to the Minister for Local Government:

I refer to the Corruption and Crime Commission “Report on the Matters of Serious Misconduct in the Shire of Exmouth” and ask, will the Minister put in place compulsory training for Local Councils, to ensure there is a proper understanding of their roles, duties, ethical standards and compliance with the *Local Government Act 1995*:

- (a) if yes, when will this commence and how much funding will be allocated; and
- (b) if no, why not?

Mr D.A. Templeman replied:

- (a) The matter will be considered as part of the review of the *Local Government Act 1995*.
- (b) Not applicable.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT — PUPPY FARMING

842. Mr A. Krsticevic to the Minister for Local Government:

I refer to Labor’s election commitment to stop puppy farming and the Minister’s comments that he will establish an advisory panel to oversee this policy and ask:

- (a) has the Minister established this advisory panel:
 - (i) if yes, who are the members of the panel; and
 - (ii) if no, when will the panel be established and how will the panel members be selected; and
- (b) how much will it cost to establish and run the panel?

Mr D.A. Templeman replied:

- (a) (i)–(ii) A series of workshops is about to be commenced with key stakeholders to inform the development of policy papers that will propose various options to stop puppy farming in Western Australia.

It is anticipated that a Stop Puppy Farming Implementation Working Group will be formed in the near future.

Membership of the advisory panel will be drawn from workshop participants.

- (b) Any costs associated with the conduct of meetings will be borne by the Department of Local Government, Sport and Cultural Industries as part of normal operations.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT — MYCOUNCIL WEBSITE AND KNOW YOUR COUNCIL WEBSITE

843. Mr A. Krsticevic to the Minister for Local Government:

I refer to the Minister’s comments made at Western Australian Local Government Association (WALGA’s) AGM on 3 August 2016, that there are two different sets of figures between the Department for Local Government and Communities “MyCouncil” website and WALGA’s “Know your Council” website, and ask:

- (a) What is the reason for the differentiation in these figures; and
- (b) Does the Minister intend to overhaul the MyCouncil website to ensure consistency in data for users?

Mr D.A. Templeman replied:

- (a) Data on MyCouncil is drawn primarily from local government audited financial statements, local government submissions to the Local Government Grants Commission and the Australian Bureau of Statistics. These are the most accurate datasets available. The Department is not aware of the data sources used to populate WALGA’s website.

- (b) No.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT — MYCOUNCIL WEBSITE

844. Mr A. Krsticevic to the Minister for Local Government:

I refer to the Minister’s comments made at Western Australian Local Government Association’s AGM on 3 August 2016 regarding the Department of Local Government and Communities’ “MyCouncil” website, that Labor wants a clear, unequivocal website that gives accurate and real information to ratepayers and stakeholders about their rates history, calculations and how rates are spent and on what priorities, and ask:

- (a) can the Minister please outline his concerns with the MyCouncil website;
- (b) will the Minister please advise what information on the MyCouncil website he believes is unclear or inaccurate; and
- (c) does the Minister intend to scrap the MyCouncil website?

Mr D.A. Templeman replied:

- (a)–(b) The MyCouncil website is limited to presenting information that is already provided by local governments under the *Local Government Act 1995* and information supplied to the Western Australian Local Government Grants Commission. Future revisions may enable additional information to be presented that will continue to improve transparency and accountability.
- (c) No.

ART GALLERY OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA — SECURITY

845. Mr A. Krsticevic to the Minister for Culture and the Arts:

I refer to the ABC news article published on 31 March 2017 outlining issues with the security at the Art Gallery of WA, including security staff being paid cash in hand, an external door being found unlocked and a set of keys being missing for weeks, and ask:

- (a) is the Minister aware of these issues;
- (b) given that security procedures were not being followed, has the Minister sought to have the security contract with Business Risks International (“BRI”) terminated:
 - (i) if not, why not;
- (c) has the employee survey by BRI been completed;
- (d) if yes to , will the Minister table a copy of the survey results;
- (e) given the serious allegations about the conduct of BRI staff, why was the employee survey not undertaken by an independent third party;
- (f) has an independent, external review been undertaken into these issues;
- (g) if yes to (f), will the Minister table a copy of the findings; and
- (h) if no to (f), why not?

Mr D.A. Templeman replied:

- (a) Yes.
- (b) No.
- (i) Security procedures have been followed. Claims of potential security weaknesses made in the media have been investigated and were all found to relate to minor incidents which had been reported to AGWA. The media claim of an unlocked external door was a minor incident reported to AGWA in August 2014 when an Administration Building external door with keypad access did not have the after-hours bolts in place in the evening. Administration staff were still onsite at the time of the incident, the area is monitored by security cameras and the normal after hours lock up check resulted in the bolts being secured. The missing set of keys were duplicate keys for office areas which had been misplaced. There was no security risk as offices and buildings are locked and secured during routine night time lockup procedures.
- (c) No.
- (d) Not applicable.
- (e) The planned employee survey did not go ahead because an independent investigation by the Fair Work Ombudsman was initiated and is ongoing.
- (f) The Fair Work Ombudsman is carrying out an independent investigation of work practices which has included interviews with BRI staff. The Fair Work Ombudsman has not indicated when the investigation will be completed.
- (g) Once the investigation is complete the finds will be available through the Fair Work Ombudsman website. <https://www.fairwork.gov.au/about-us/access-accountability-and-reporting/inquiry-reports>
- (h) Not applicable.

CULTURE AND THE ARTS — FELLOWSHIP DEFERRALS

846. Mr A. Krsticevic to the Minister for Culture and the Arts:

I refer to the deferral of the 2017 Young People and the Arts Fellowships, Aboriginal Arts Forward Fellowship, Performing Arts Mid-Career Fellowship, Visual Arts and Craft Mid-Career Fellowships and Creative Development Fellowships and ask:

- (a) why have these fellowships been deferred;
- (b) what is the value of each fellowship; and
- (c) when will each fellowship be reinstated?

Mr D.A. Templeman replied:

(a) The allocation of funding from Lotterywest to Department of Culture and the Arts is in accordance with the *Lotteries Commission Act 1990* has fallen by \$1,965,00 or 12 per cent from the original 2016/17 State Budget estimates.

(b)

Maximum of two Young People & Arts Fellowships at \$20,000	\$40,000
Maximum of two Creative Development Fellowships at \$60,000	\$120,000
Maximum of two Visual Arts and Craft Mid-Career Fellowships at \$35,000	\$70,000
Maximum of one Aboriginal Arts Forward Fellowship	\$35,000
Maximum of one Performing Arts Mid-Career Fellowship	\$35,000
Total	\$300,000

(c) The DCA is reviewing the impact of the current and potential further decline in Lotterywest funding. The DCA will consider the reinstatement of the fellowships following the State Budget to be handed down later this year.

LOTTERYWEST — FUNDING

847. Mr A. Krsticevic to the Minister for Culture and the Arts:

I refer to the decline in Lotterywest funding and the announcement by the Department of Culture and the Arts (“DCA”) that funding programs will be put on hold, and ask:

(a) how much Lotterywest funding was provided to the DCA in the financial years ending:

- (i) 30 June 2014;
- (ii) 30 June 2015;
- (iii) 30 June 2016; and
- (iv) 30 June 2017;

(b) which funding programs will be put on hold as a result of the decline in funding;

(c) what is the value of each of those programs referred to in part (b); and

(d) how long will the funding hold be in place?

Mr D.A. Templeman replied:

- (a) (i) \$14,800,000
- (ii) \$15,456,000
- (iii) \$16,300,000
- (iv) \$15,000,000

(b)–(c)

Maximum of two Young People & Arts Fellowships at \$20,000	\$40,000
Maximum of two Creative Development Fellowships at \$60,000	\$120,000
Maximum of two Visual Arts and Craft Mid-Career Fellowships at \$35,000	\$70,000
Maximum of one Aboriginal Arts Forward Fellowship	\$35,000
Maximum of one Performing Arts Mid-Career Fellowship	\$35,000
Total	\$300,000

(d) The DCA is reviewing the impact of the current and potential further decline in Lotterywest funding. The DCA will consider the reinstatement of the fellowships following the State Budget to be handed down later this year.

MINISTER FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT — ELECTRONIC MEDIA SUBSCRIPTION SERVICES

858. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Minister for Local Government; Heritage; Culture and the Arts:

I refer to Ministerial office expenditure and ask, since 17 March 2017 has any money been spent on the purchase of electronic media subscription services:

- (a) If yes, what service or outlet has been subscribed to;
- (b) How many subscriptions have been purchased;
- (c) How much does each subscription cost; and
- (d) How long is that subscription valid for?

Mr D.A. Templeman replied:

No.

(a)–(d) Not applicable.

MINISTER FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT — COFFEE MACHINES

875. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Minister for Local Government; Heritage; Culture and the Arts:

I refer to questions in relation to Ministerial office expenditure and ask, since 17 March 2017 has the Minister's office purchased any coffee machines:

- (a) If yes, what was the machine purchased and how much did it cost; and
- (b) If yes, are there any associated maintenance costs and what are they?

Mr D.A. Templeman replied:

No.

MINISTER FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT — PERDAMAN INDUSTRIES — CONTACT

893. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Minister for Local Government; Heritage; Culture and the Arts:

Has the Minister or Ministerial staff met or had any contact with any representatives of Perdaman Industries, and if so:

- (a) What are the dates for each meeting or contact;
- (b) Who was contacted;
- (c) Who made the contact;
- (d) What was the nature of the contact;
- (e) Where was each meeting held;
- (f) Who was present at each meeting; and
- (g) What was discussed at each meeting?

Mr D.A. Templeman replied:

As at 22 June 2017, neither the Minister or his current ministerial staff have met with representatives of Perdaman Industries.

The Minister and his ministerial staff may have had contact for administrative purposes or may have had incidental or irregular social contact in which case this is not included.

MINISTER FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT — LABOR BUSINESS ROUNDTABLE ATTENDANCE

910. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Minister for Local Government; Heritage; Culture and the Arts:

Did the Minister attend the Labor Business Roundtable on 8 June 2017 and, if so:

- (a) What individuals or organisations did the Minister meet with at this event and was was discussed at this meeting?

Mr D.A. Templeman replied:

No.

MINISTER FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT — LABOR BUSINESS ROUNDTABLE ATTENDANCE

927. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Minister for Local Government; Heritage; Culture and the Arts:

I refer to the Labor Business Roundtable held on 8 June 2017 and ask did the Minister attend the roundtable event, and if so:

- (a) Did any Ministerial staff accompany the Minister, if so who attended;
- (b) Did the Minister's office submit a "Driver Request Form" in order to attend or be picked up from this event, if so when was this form submitted; and
- (c) Did the Minister attend or get picked up from this event by a government owned or leased vehicle driven by an Executive Transport Officer or staffer?

Mr D.A. Templeman replied:

No.

(a)–(c) Not applicable.

MINISTER FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT — PORTFOLIOS — TWITTER

946. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Minister for Local Government; Heritage; Culture and the Arts:

In respect of the Minister's portfolio responsibilities since 17 March 2017 for departments, agencies, boards or publicly owned corporations, does the agency operate any Twitter account and, if so:

- (a) What is the Twitter account handle; and
- (b) Are there any 'tailored audiences' attached to that Twitter account:
 - (i) Will the Minister table an export of the Twitter handles contained within these tailored audiences or if not, why not?

Mr D.A. Templeman replied:

- (a)–(b) Please refer to Legislative Assembly Question on Notice 953

MINISTER FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT — REQUEST TO ATTEND EVENT FORMS

965. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Minister for Local Government; Heritage; Culture and the Arts:

As at 20 June 2017 have any "Request to Attend Event" forms been submitted by Ministerial staff (at or above PSGA Level 5 or equivalent) and if so:

- (a) Have these forms been submitted to the DPC Integrity Unit:
 - (i) If not, why not;
- (b) What was the event the staffer attended;
- (c) What date was the event held; and
- (d) When was the "Request to Attend Event" form submitted to the DPC Integrity Unit?

Mr D.A. Templeman replied:

- (a) Yes.
 - (i) Not applicable.
- (b) Two Black Swan Theatre Company Performances.
- (c) 24 June 2017 and 22 July 2017.
- (d) 2 June 2017 and 21 June 2017.

MINISTER FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT — PORTFOLIOS — PRIVATE DINING ROOM HIRE

982. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Minister for Local Government; Heritage; Culture and the Arts:

In respect of the Minister's portfolio responsibilities since 17 March 2017 for departments, agencies, boards or publicly owned corporations, has any money been spent on the hire or usage of private dining rooms, and if so:

- (a) What date was the room hired or used;
- (b) At what facility or restaurant was the private dining room hired or used;
- (c) How much money was spent in the hire or usage of the private dining room;
- (d) What was the occasion that warranted the hire or usage of the private dining room;
- (e) What individuals and / or organisations were present in the private dining room; and
- (f) Was any alcohol consumed and if so, how much was spent on alcohol?

Mr D.A. Templeman replied:

As at 22 June 2017 no money has been spent on the hire or usage of private dining room.

- (a)–(f) Not applicable.

MINISTER FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT — PORTFOLIOS — GIFTS

999. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Minister for Local Government; Heritage; Culture and the Arts:

In respect of the Minister's portfolio responsibilities since 17 March 2017 for departments, agencies, boards or publicly owned corporations:

- (a) How many gifts have been received by officers at or above PSGA level 9 (or equivalent);
- (b) What was the gift and what is its estimated value; and
- (c) What individual or organisation provided the gifts and on what date was the gift provided?

Mr D.A. Templeman replied:Department of Local Government and Communities

- (a) Eight.
- (b)–(c) [See tabled paper no 506.]

Metropolitan Cemeteries Board

- (a) Six.
- (b)–(c) [See tabled paper no 506.]

State Heritage Office

- (a) Nil.
- (b)–(c) Not applicable.

National Trust

- (a) Nil.
- (b)–(c) Not applicable.

Department of Culture and the Arts

- (a) 39.
- (b)–(c) [See tabled paper no 506.]

Art Gallery of Western Australia

- (a) One.
- (b)–(c) [See tabled paper no 506.]

Perth Theatre Trust

- (a) Five.
- (b)–(c) [See tabled paper no 506.]

Screenwest

- (a) 15.
- (b)–(c) [See tabled paper no 506.]

State Library of Western Australia

- (a) One.
- (b)–(c) [See tabled paper no 506.]

State Records Office

- (a) Nil.
- (b)–(c) Not applicable.

Western Australian Museum

- (a) Three.
- (b)–(c) [See tabled paper no 506.]

MINISTER FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT — CONFLICT OF INTEREST – GIFT FORMS

1016. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Minister for Local Government; Heritage; Culture and the Arts:

- (1) As at 20 June 2017 have any “Conflict of Interest – Gift” forms been submitted by Ministerial staff:
 - (a) Have these forms been submitted to the DPC Integrity Unit:
 - (i) If not, why not;
 - (b) How many gifts have been received;
 - (c) What is the total estimated overall value of those gifts; and
 - (d) Who provided the gifts?
- (2) As at 20 June 2017 how many gifts have been received by the Minister:
 - (a) How many gifts have been received;
 - (b) What is the total estimated overall value of those gifts; and
 - (c) Who provided the gifts?

Mr D.A. Templeman replied:

- (1) No.
 - (a)–(c) Not applicable.
- (2) (a) Two.
 - (b) \$150.00
 - (c) Founding Director of Sculpture by the Sea and Virgin Airline Club.

MINISTER FOR REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT — CONFLICT OF INTEREST – GIFT FORMS

1018. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the minister representing the Minister for Regional Development; Agriculture and Food; Minister Assisting the Minister for State Development, Jobs and Trade:

- (1) As at 20 June 2017 have any “Conflict of Interest – Gift” forms been submitted by Ministerial staff:
 - (a) Have these forms been submitted to the DPC Integrity Unit:
 - (i) If not, why not;
 - (b) How many gifts have been received;
 - (c) What is the total estimated overall value of those gifts; and
 - (d) Who provided the gifts?
- (2) As at 20 June 2017 how many gifts have been received by the Minister:
 - (a) How many gifts have been received;
 - (b) What is the total estimated overall value of those gifts; and
 - (c) Who provided the gifts?

Mr M. McGowan replied:

- (1) No
 - (a) No
 - (i) N/A
 - (b) Nil.
 - (c)–(d) N/A
- (2) (a) In respect of gifts required to be declared under the Members of Parliament (Finance Interests) Act 1992 guidelines – one. From time to time I received gifts of oranges, apples, honey etc which are gratefully consumed but are below the declaration threshold.
 - (b) \$200
 - (c) Hyogo Prefecture

MINISTER FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT — PORTFOLIOS — MEDIA MONITORING SERVICES

1033. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Minister for Local Government; Heritage; Culture and the Arts:

I refer to media monitoring services engaged by the Minister’s departments, agencies, boards or publicly owned corporations and ask:

- (a) What company is engaged to provide the service;
- (b) Is the service engaged on an ad-hoc (keyword, topic etc.) basis or on continual subscription:
 - (i) If engaged on an ad-hoc basis, what are the keywords or topics which are monitored by the service;
- (c) What media outlets are monitored; and
- (d) What officers receive the media monitoring results and on what frequency?

Mr D.A. Templeman replied:

- (a) As at 22 June 2017, iSentia is engaged by Department of Local Government and Communities, State Heritage Office including Heritage Council and by the Department of Culture and the Arts including the Art Gallery of Western Australia, Screenwest, Perth Theatre Trust, State Records Office, State Library of Western Australia and the Western Australian Museum.
- (b)–(d) Please refer to Legislative Assembly Question on Notice 1040

MINISTER FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT — AGENCY — MASTERS OF CEREMONIES

1053. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Minister for Local Government; Heritage; Culture and the Arts:

For events, meetings, conferences and seminars held by the agency since 1 January 2017, have any Master of Ceremonies been engaged:

- (a) If yes, what was the event, meeting, conference or seminar;
- (b) If yes, where was the event, meeting, conference or seminar held; and
- (c) If yes, what organisation was engaged and how much was that organisation paid?

Mr D.A. Templeman replied:

- (a)–(c) Please refer to Legislative Assembly Question on Notice 1060

MINISTER FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT — ALCOHOL EXPENDITURE

1073. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Minister for Local Government; Heritage; Culture and the Arts:

I refer to questions in relation to Ministerial office expenditure and ask, since 17 March 2017 how much has been spent on the purchase of alcohol?

Mr D.A. Templeman replied:

Nil.

MINISTER FOR REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT — ALCOHOL EXPENDITURE

1075. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the minister representing the Minister for Regional Development; Agriculture and Food; Minister Assisting the Minister for State Development, Jobs and Trade:

I refer to questions in relation to Ministerial office expenditure and ask, since 17 March 2017 how much has been spent on the purchase of alcohol?

Mr M. McGowan replied:

Alcohol has been purchased for three events: Dairy Farmers Round Table, Northern Research Round Table and Kim Chance condolence – total cost \$524.40

MINISTER FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT — LILY INVESTMENTS PTY LTD — CONTACT

1090. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Minister for Local Government; Heritage; Culture and the Arts:

Has the Minister or Ministerial staff met or had any contact with any representative of Lily Investments Pty Ltd, and if so:

- (a) What are the dates for each meeting or contact;
- (b) Who was contacted;
- (c) Who made the contact;
- (d) What was the nature of the contact;
- (e) Where was each meeting held;
- (f) Who was present at each meeting; and
- (g) What was discussed at each meeting?

Mr D.A. Templeman replied:

As at 22 June 2017, neither the Minister or his current ministerial staff have met with representatives of Lily Investments Pty Ltd.

The Minister and his ministerial staff may have had contact for administrative purposes or may have had incidental or irregular social contact in which case this is not included.

MINISTER FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT — DAWSON HARRIS PTY LTD — CONTACT

1107. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Minister for Local Government; Heritage; Culture and the Arts:

Has the Minister or Ministerial staff met or had any contact with any representative of Dawson Harris Pty Ltd, and if so:

- (a) What are the dates for each meeting or contact;
- (b) Who was contacted;
- (c) Who made the contact;

- (d) What was the nature of the contact;
- (e) Where was each meeting held;
- (f) Who was present at each meeting; and
- (g) What was discussed at each meeting?

Mr D.A. Templeman replied:

As at 22 June 2017, neither the Minister or his current ministerial staff have met with representatives of Dawson Harris Pty Ltd.

The Minister and his ministerial staff may have had contact for administrative purposes or may have had incidental or irregular social contact in which case this is not included.

MINISTER FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT — MIRVAC GROUP — CONTACT

1124. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Minister for Local Government; Heritage; Culture and the Arts:

Has the Minister or Ministerial staff met or had any contact with any representative of Mirvac Group, and if so:

- (a) What are the dates for each meeting or contact;
- (b) Who was contacted;
- (c) Who made the contact;
- (d) What was the nature of the contact;
- (e) Where was each meeting held;
- (f) Who was present at each meeting; and
- (g) What was discussed at each meeting?

Mr D.A. Templeman replied:

As at 22 June 2017, neither the Minister or his current ministerial staff have met with representatives of Mirvac Group.

The Minister and his ministerial staff may have had contact for administrative purposes or may have had incidental or irregular social contact in which case this is not included.

MINISTER FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT — CEDAR WOODS — CONTACT

1141. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Minister for Local Government; Heritage; Culture and the Arts:

Has the Minister or Ministerial staff met or had any contact with any representative of Cedar Woods, and if so:

- (a) What are the dates for each meeting or contact;
- (b) Who was contacted;
- (c) Who made the contact;
- (d) What was the nature of the contact;
- (e) Where was each meeting held;
- (f) Who was present at each meeting; and
- (g) What was discussed at each meeting?

Mr D.A. Templeman replied:

As at 22 June 2017, neither the Minister or his current ministerial staff have met with representatives of Cedar Woods.

The Minister and his ministerial staff may have had contact for administrative purposes or may have had incidental or irregular social contact in which case this is not included.

MINISTER FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT — SATTERLEY PROPERTY GROUP — CONTACT

1158. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Minister for Local Government; Heritage; Culture and the Arts:

Has the Minister or Ministerial staff met or had any contact with any representative of the Satterley Property Group, and if so:

- (a) What are the dates for each meeting or contact;
- (b) Who was contacted;

- (c) Who made the contact;
- (d) What was the nature of the contact;
- (e) Where was each meeting held;
- (f) Who was present at each meeting; and
- (g) What was discussed at each meeting?

Mr D.A. Templeman replied:

As at 22 June 2017, neither the Minister or his current ministerial staff have met with representatives of the Satterley Property Group.

The Minister and his ministerial staff may have had contact for administrative purposes or may have had incidental or irregular social contact in which case this is not included.

MINISTER FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT — CONTACT BANS

1176. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Minister for Local Government; Heritage; Culture and the Arts:

I refer to the ban on contact with Mr Julian Grill and Mr Brian Burke:

- (a) Has the Minister banned their staff from having contact with any other individuals;
- (b) If yes, who are those individuals; and
- (c) If yes, what advice, direction or instruction has been given to staff in relation to this ban?

Mr D.A. Templeman replied:

No further instruction has been given to current ministerial staff regarding individuals to avoid contact with. However, ministerial staff are expected to follow Public Sector Commission's Code of Ethics and the Department of the Premier and Cabinet's Code of Conduct.

MINISTER FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT — AGENCY — WELCOME TO COUNTRY CEREMONIES

1193. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Minister for Local Government; Heritage; Culture and the Arts:

For events, meetings, conferences and seminars held by the agency since 1 January 2017, have there been any "Welcome to Country" ceremony or acknowledgements paid for by the agency:

- (a) If yes, what was the event, meeting, conference or seminar;
- (b) If yes, where was the event, meeting, conference or seminar held; and
- (c) If yes, what organisation conducted the Welcome to Country and how much was that organisation paid?

Mr D.A. Templeman replied:

(a)–(c) Please refer to Legislative Assembly Question on Notice 1200

MINISTER FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT — PORTFOLIOS — ONLINE PAYMENT SYSTEMS

1208. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Minister for Local Government; Heritage; Culture and the Arts:

Do any of the Minister's portfolio responsibility Departments, Boards, Agencies or corporations operate an online payment system, and if so:

- (a) What is the URL used to access this payment system;
- (b) What is the system used for;
- (c) Since 1 January 2017 have there been any reported online attacks or breaches of these systems;
- (d) Does the online payment system store any personal data of those who use it:
 - (i) If so, what data is stored and for how long; and
 - (ii) If so, is that data encrypted;
- (e) Are there any maintenance costs associated with the online payment system:
 - (i) if so, what is the annual maintenance cost;
- (f) Are there any people dedicated to the administration of the online payment system:
 - (i) If so, what is the job title of those people and their associated salary and entitlements; and
- (g) How many people have used the system since 1 January 2017?

Mr D.A. Templeman replied:

Yes, the State Heritage Office and the Department of Culture and the Arts operate an online payment system.

State Heritage Office

- (a) <https://www.bpoint.com.au/payments/dotsho>
- (b) Payment of invoices.
- (c) No.
- (d) No personal data is stored.
 - (i)–(ii) Not applicable.
- (e) Yes.
 - (i) \$474
- (f) No.
 - (i) Not applicable.
- (g) 17

Department of Culture and the Arts

- (a) <https://www.eway.com.au/> is the application; the public access to this online payment system is through an online booking system URL on the Department's website <https://dca.rezdy.com/index>.
- (b) Processing of all credit card payments for bookings for meeting rooms and studios at King Street Arts Centre.
- (c) No.
- (d) Yes. Eway advise that all data processed through this payment system is encrypted.
 - (i) E-way advise that all transactional data is stored indefinitely.
 - (ii) Yes. E-way has confirmed all data is encrypted.
- (e) The Eway payment gateway applies a 1.9 per cent fee, plus 20 cents, on each transaction. No Amex or Diners cards are processed. There is a monthly subscription charge for the online booking system, which includes online maintenance/application support when required.
 - (i) There is no annual maintenance cost for Eway (payment gateway). However, the Rezdy booking system has a monthly subscription of \$139.00.
- (f) Yes.
 - (i) Property and Contracts Coordinator, Culture and Arts (WA) level 3 PSGOGA position, five per cent of duties is equivalent to \$4,901 (including on-cost allowance) per annum.
- (g) The majority of users are repeat hirers. In total, 50 individuals/organisations have used the system since 1 January 2017.

MINISTER FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT — PORTFOLIOS — ONLINE MERCHANISE STORES

1225. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Minister for Local Government; Heritage; Culture and the Arts:

Do any of the Minister's portfolio responsibility Departments, Boards, Agencies or corporations operate an online merchandise store, and if so:

- (a) What is the URL used to access this store;
- (b) What products are sold on the store;
- (c) Since 1 January 2017 have there been any reported online attacks or breaches of these systems;
- (d) For customers who use the system, is any personal data stored:
 - (i) If so, what data is stored and for how long; and
 - (ii) If so, is that data encrypted;
- (e) Are there any maintenance costs associated with the online store:
 - (i) if so, what is the annual maintenance cost;
- (f) Are there any people dedicated to the administration of the online store:
 - (i) If so, what is the job title of those people and their associated salary and entitlements; and
- (g) How many people have used the store since 1 January 2017?

Mr D.A. Templeman replied:Western Australian Museum

- (a) <http://museum.wa.gov.au/store/>
- (b) Museum books, books and DVDs, toys, gifts, jewellery.
- (c) No.
- (d) Yes.
 - (i) Name, email, address, telephone numbers stored indefinitely.
 - (ii) Passwords are encrypted, although the site is not. Credit card transactions occur via an external supplier and are encrypted.
- (e) \$18.18 a month and 0.09c per transaction.
 - (i) Nil.
- (f) No.
 - (i) Not applicable.
- (g) 61 transactions.

MINISTER FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT — PORTFOLIOS — CARBON EMISSIONS OFFSET

1264. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Minister for Local Government; Heritage; Culture and the Arts:

In respect of the Minister's portfolio departments, agencies, boards or publicly owned corporations, since 1 January 2017 has any money been spent to offset carbon emissions, and if so:

- (a) How much money has been spent;
- (b) What organisations have been engaged to offset carbon emissions; and
- (c) What is the total number of carbon emissions which have been offset?

Mr D.A. Templeman replied:

- (a)–(c) Please refer to Legislative Assembly Question on Notice 1271

MINISTER FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT — PORTFOLIOS — PODCAST ADVERTISING

1281. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Minister for Local Government; Heritage; Culture and the Arts:

In respect of the Minister's portfolio responsibilities since 1 January 2017 for departments, agencies, boards or publicly owned corporations:

- (a) Has any advertising campaigns taken place on a podcast, and if so:
 - (i) How much money has been spent on podcast advertising;
 - (ii) On what podcast (outlet and episode) did the advertising take place;
 - (iii) What advertising campaign was published on the podcast; and
 - (iv) Has any review been undertaken as to the effectiveness of podcast advertising:
 - (A) If so, will the Minister table that review?

Mr D.A. Templeman replied:

- (a) Please refer to Legislative Assembly Question on Notice 1288

PLAN FOR PEEL — PEEL DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION — STAFF

1299. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the minister representing the Minister for Regional Development:

I refer to the Labor "Plan for Peel" and ask:

- (a) Does the Government still intend on "Employing an officer at the Peel Development Commission to drive the process of rehabilitation of the Peel Harvey estuary":
 - (i) If yes, when will the officer be employed and what is the salary and entitlements attached to that officer;
 - (ii) If yes, has the Minister or any representative of the Minister's office, departments or agencies met with the Peel Development Commission to discuss the rollout of this commitment;
 - (iii) If yes, what will the functions and KPIs of the officer be; and
 - (iv) If no, why not?

Mr M. McGowan replied:

- (a) Yes
- (iv) The administrative arrangements will be determined as part of the 2017–18 budget process in September.

PLAN FOR PEEL — AGED CARE FACILITY DEVELOPMENT

1341. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Minister for Local Government:

I refer to the Labor “Plan for Peel” and ask:

- (a) Does the Government still intend to make it easier for aged care providers in the Peel Region to develop new facilities by identifying suitable land and removing existing planning and local government impediments:
- (i) If yes, what steps have been taken by the Government to identify suitable land and has any land been identified:
- (A) If yes, will the Minister provide details (title or details) of the land which has been identified; and
- (ii) If yes, what steps have been taken by the by the Government to remove existing planning and local government impediments; and
- (b) If no, why not?

Mr D.A. Templeman replied:

- (a)–(b) Please refer to Legislative Assembly Question on Notice 1340

MINISTER FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT — PORTFOLIOS — UBER

1375. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Minister for Local Government; Heritage; Culture and the Arts:

For each Department and Agency under the Minister’s control, do they currently operate an Uber account, and if so:

- (a) Since 1 January 2017 how much money has been charged to the account;
- (b) Since 1 January 2017 how many trips have been charged to the account; and
- (c) Since 1 January 2017 what is the most expensive trip which has been charged to the account?

Mr D.A. Templeman replied:

- (a)–(c) Please refer to Legislative Assembly Question on Notice 1382

MINISTER FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT — PORTFOLIOS — CAB CHARGE

1392. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Minister for Local Government; Heritage; Culture and the Arts:

For each Department and Agency under the Minister’s control, do they currently operate a Cab Charge account, and if so:

- (a) Since 1 January 2017 how much money has been charged to the account;
- (b) Since 1 January 2017 how many trips have been charged to the account; and
- (c) Since 1 January 2017 what is the most expensive trip which has been charged to the account?

Mr D.A. Templeman replied:

- (a)–(c) Please refer to Legislative Assembly Question on Notice 1399

MINISTER FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT — PORTFOLIOS — STAFF — WORKERS’ COMPENSATION

1409. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Minister for Local Government; Heritage; Culture and the Arts:

For each Department and Agency under the Minister’s control, including the Ministerial office as at 21 June 2017, how many employees, both permanent and non-permanent, are currently on workers compensation as a result of a workplace injury?

Mr D.A. Templeman replied:

	Number of employees on workers compensation
Ministerial Office	Nil
Department of Local Government and Communities	Nil
Metropolitan Cemeteries Board	2

State Heritage Office	Nil
National Trust	Nil
Department of Culture and the Arts (including State Records Office)	Nil
Art Gallery of Western Australia	3
Perth Theatre Trust	8
Screenwest	Nil
State Library of Western Australia	5
Western Australian Museum	3

MINISTER FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT — PORTFOLIOS — CREDITORS

1426. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Minister for Local Government; Heritage; Culture and the Arts:

For each Department and Agency within the Minister's portfolio, are there any creditors which have been outstanding for greater than 120 days as at 21 June 2017, and if so:

- (a) What is the number of creditors outstanding; and
- (b) What is the total amount owed to those creditors?

Mr D.A. Templeman replied:

Department of Local Government and Communities

- (a) Nil.
- (b) Not applicable.

Metropolitan Cemeteries Board

- (a) Two.
- (b) \$71,966.55

State Heritage Office

- (a) Nil.
- (b) Not applicable.

National Trust

- (a) Nil.
- (b) Not applicable.

Department of Culture and the Arts

- (a) Nil.
- (b) Not applicable.

Art Gallery of Western Australia

- (a) Nil.
- (b) Not applicable.

Perth Theatre Trust

- (a) One.
- (b) \$235.20

State Library of Western Australia

- (a) Three.
- (b) \$21,169.25

Western Australian Museum

- (a) One.
- (b) \$1,075.03

Screenwest

- (a) Nil.
- (b) Not applicable.

MINISTER FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT — PROJECTS —
MANDURAH, MURRAY–WELLINGTON AND DAWESVILLE

1444. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Minister for Local Government; Heritage; Culture and the Arts:

Can the Minister advise what funds have been specifically allocated to be spent by the Minister's portfolio departments and agencies on projects and works since 1 January 2017 in the electorates of Mandurah, Murray–Wellington and Dawesville?

Mr D.A. Templeman replied:

Please refer to Legislative Assembly Question on Notice 1451

MINISTER FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT — SHAREHOLDING DIVESTMENT

1475. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Minister for Local Government; Heritage; Culture and the Arts:

As a requirement of the McGowan State Government's Ministerial Code of Conduct has the Minister divested or are they in the process of divesting any shareholdings in any company and interests in partnerships and trusts, by virtue of which a conflict exists, or could reasonably be expected to exist, with their portfolio responsibilities:

- (a) If yes, what was divested or is in the process of being divested;
- (b) If yes, on what date was the divestment initiated; and
- (c) If yes, on what date was the divestment completed?

Mr D.A. Templeman replied:

(a)–(c) Please refer to Legislative Assembly Question on Notice 1482

MINISTER FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT — PORTFOLIOS — SWIMMING POOLS, SPAS AND SAUNAS

1492. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Minister for Local Government; Heritage; Culture and the Arts:

In respect of the Minister's portfolio responsibilities for any of their departments, agencies, government trading enterprises or boards I ask:

- (a) Do any of these entities operate a swimming pool, spa or sauna? and if so:
 - (i) How much does it cost per financial year to operate the swimming pool, spa or sauna;
 - (ii) How many people have access to the swimming pool, spa or sauna;
 - (iii) What does it cost an individual to use the swimming pool, spa or sauna; and
 - (iv) How many people have used the swimming pool, spa or sauna in the last financial year; and
- (b) Do any of the entities have a financial relationship with a third party swimming pool, spa or sauna provider:
 - (i) If so, what is the nature of that financial relationship (cost to the taxpayer, number of entity memberships etc); and
 - (ii) If so, when did the entity enter into this relationship?

Mr D.A. Templeman replied:

(a)–(b) Please refer to Legislative Assembly Question on Notice 1499

MINISTER FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT — PORTFOLIOS — GYMS

1509. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Minister for Local Government; Heritage; Culture and the Arts:

In respect of the Minister's portfolio responsibilities for any of their departments, agencies, government trading enterprises or boards I ask:

- (a) Do any of these entities operate a gym? and if so:
 - (i) How much does it cost per financial year to operate the gym;
 - (ii) How many people have access to the gym;
 - (iii) What does it cost an individual to use the gym; and
 - (iv) How many people have used the gym in the last financial year; and
- (b) Do any of the entities have a financial relationship with a third party gym or health club provider:
 - (i) If so, what is the nature of that financial relationship (cost to the taxpayer, number of entity memberships etc); and
 - (ii) If so, when did the entity enter into this relationship?

Mr D.A. Templeman replied:

(a)–(b) Please refer to Legislative Assembly Question on Notice 1559.

MINISTER FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT — MINISTERIAL CODE OF CONDUCT — RESIGNATIONS

1520. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Minister for Local Government; Heritage; Culture and the Arts:

As a requirement of the McGowan State Government's Ministerial Code of Conduct, has the Minister resigned from any positions held in business or professional associations and trade unions, and if so:

- (a) From what position(s) did you resign;
- (b) On what date did you resign; and
- (c) Will you table a copy of the resignation letter:
 - (i) If not, why not?

Mr D.A. Templeman replied:

- (a)–(c) Please refer to Legislative Assembly Question on Notice 1527

MINISTER FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT — PORTFOLIOS — EVENT ATTENDANCE

1538. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Minister for Local Government; Heritage; Culture and the Arts:

Since 17 March 2017, have any officers or board members of a department, agency, Commission or Government Trading Enterprise (GTE) within the Minister's portfolio of responsibilities attended a conference, seminar or workshop organised by a private organisation for which attendance was paid for by the department, agency, Commission or GTE, and if yes:

- (a) What was the name of the event attended by the officer or board member;
- (b) On what date was the event;
- (c) Where was the event held;
- (d) How many officers or board members attended;
- (e) What is the name of the organiser or facilitator of the event; and
- (f) What was the ticket or entry cost of attendance for each officer or board member, and what was the cost of any travel or accommodation as part of the officer or board member's attendance?

Mr D.A. Templeman replied:

- (a)–(f) [See tabled paper no 507.]

OUTDOOR ADVERTISEMENTS — METROPOLITAN CEMETERIES BOARD

1591. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Minister for Local Government:

How many "Out-of-Home" advertisements were approved for display on the Metropolitan Cemeteries Board's property for the calendar month of April 2017:

- (a) Will you table a copy of each advertisement:
 - (i) If yes, when; and
 - (ii) If no, why not?

Mr D.A. Templeman replied:

- (a) Please refer to Legislative Assembly Question on Notice 1573

OUTDOOR ADVERTISEMENTS — DEPARTMENT OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND COMMUNITIES

1606. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Minister for Local Government:

How many "Out-of-Home" advertisements were approved for display on the Department of Local Government and Communities property for the calendar month of April 2017:

- (a) Will you table a copy of each advertisement:
 - (i) If yes, when; and
 - (ii) If no, why not?

Mr D.A. Templeman replied:

- (a) Please refer to Legislative Assembly Question on Notice 1573.

OUTDOOR ADVERTISEMENTS — STATE HERITAGE OFFICE

1611. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Minister for Heritage:

How many “Out-of-Home” advertisements were approved for display on the State Heritage Office’s property for the calendar month of April 2017:

- (a) Will you table a copy of each advertisement:
 - (i) If yes, when; and
 - (ii) If no, why not?

Mr D.A. Templeman replied:

- (a) Please refer to Legislative Assembly Question on Notice 1573

OUTDOOR ADVERTISEMENTS — NATIONAL TRUST OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA

1612. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Minister for Heritage:

How many “Out-of-Home” advertisements were approved for display on the National Trust of Australia’s (WA) property for the calendar month of April 2017:

- (a) Will you table a copy of each advertisement:
 - (i) If yes, when; and
 - (ii) If no, why not?

Mr D.A. Templeman replied:

- (a) Please refer to Legislative Assembly Question on Notice 1573

OUTDOOR ADVERTISEMENTS — HERITAGE COUNCIL

1613. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Minister for Heritage:

How many “Out-of-Home” advertisements were approved for display on the Heritage Council of Western Australia’s property for the calendar month of April 2017:

- (a) Will you table a copy of each advertisement:
 - (i) If yes, when; and
 - (ii) If no, why not?

Mr D.A. Templeman replied:

- (a) Please refer to Legislative Assembly Question on Notice 1573

OUTDOOR ADVERTISEMENTS — DEPARTMENT OF CULTURE AND THE ARTS

1636. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Minister for Culture and the Arts:

How many “Out-of-Home” advertisements were approved for display on the Department of Culture and the Arts property for the calendar month of April 2017:

- (a) Will you table a copy of each advertisement:
 - (i) If yes, when; and
 - (ii) If no, why not?

Mr D.A. Templeman replied:

- (a) Please refer to Legislative Assembly Question on Notice 1573.
-

