

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

Motion

Resumed from 17 May on the following motion moved by Ms J.J. Shaw —

That the following Address-in-Reply to Her Excellency's speech be agreed to —

To Her Excellency the Honourable Kerry Sanderson, AC, Governor of the State of Western Australia.

May it please Your Excellency —

We, the Legislative Assembly of the Parliament of the State of Western Australia in Parliament assembled, beg to express loyalty to our Most Gracious Sovereign and to thank Your Excellency for the speech you have been pleased to address to Parliament.

MRS J.M.C. STOJKOVSKI (Kingsley) [9.16 am]: Mr Speaker, may I congratulate you on your election to the role of Speaker. I would like to acknowledge the traditional owners of the land on which we meet, the Whadjuk people of the Noongar nation, and may I pay my respects to elders past, present and emerging. I would like to thank the former member for Kingsley, Andrea Mitchell, for her service to the people of Kingsley for the last eight and a half years. I am proud to follow her as the fourth member for Kingsley, all of whom, since the creation of the electorate in 1989, have been women. I thank the people of Kingsley for their faith in me and I am humbled to stand in this place as their local member. I will endeavour to represent them to the best of my ability and be a strong local voice for local issues.

I start by acknowledging friends and family in the gallery today, particularly my husband, Siljan, my children, Nadija and Kristijan, my parents, Bernadette and Tony O'Gorman, my in-laws Zivka and Blagoja Stojkovski, my brother, Charlie, and his wife, Rachel Colombera, my sister, Samantha McMullen, and my aunt and uncle, Myra and David Browne. It is my firm belief that a number of people saw my path to this place at my feet long before I did. However, I am not sure that many would have predicted it would happen so soon. I am filled with pride to stand in this spot to address you today as it is almost 16 years to the day that my dad, Tony O'Gorman, former member for Joondalup, stood in relatively the same spot to make his inaugural speech. My parents raised my brother, Charlie, sister, Samantha, and I with some very strong values—Labor values—particularly related to one's ability and, in fact, one's responsibility to speak up and stand up for those who cannot speak up and stand up for themselves in our community. These values can best be summed up by this saying, "If you are more fortunate than others, it is better to build a longer table than a higher fence."

From an early age I became aware that just one person standing up for what they believe in can make a difference. Although it is true that one person cannot change the world on their own, they can change their own world and have an effect on those around them. My first political act that I can remember was at the ripe old age of 10. Being a big fan, as most 10-year-old girls are, of cartwheels, handstands and hanging upside down from the monkey bars, I was unhappy that the boys at my primary school were allowed to wear shorts while the girls were forced to wear skirts. Not happy with the hand I had been dealt just because I was a girl, I decided I would reshuffle the deck. I saw the principal, Mr McFarlane, who told me I would need to show that I had the support of others for my request that girls be allowed to wear shorts. I spoke to some of my friends and we put together a petition of the names of all the students who supported our request. I will not pretend that it was easy and I vividly remember a number of the older students laughing at us and teasing us because we wanted to wear shorts, but we persevered and finally presented the petition to Mr McFarlane. The staff and parents acknowledged the request of the students and the following year a trial of what we call skorts was offered as part of the girls' uniform in addition to the traditional skirt. I graduated from Eddystone Primary School in Heathridge 24 years ago, but on my recent visit to the school I was filled with immense pride to see that although it had undergone some amendments and updating over the years, the skort that my friends and I petitioned for is still available and worn by female students at the school. This event showed me that with the right tools and determination things that seem impossible and improbable when you start can be achieved.

I took this knowledge and determination with me into adulthood and I used them to help me work for and deliver in my various communities. In 2010, shortly after having my first child, Nadija, I realised that the subdivision I was living in, in Landsdale, did not have any connecting footpaths, which meant that I was cut off from the shops, the child health nurse and community facilities. As a mum pushing a pram, this was very important. If I was cut off, then other people would be too. Together with the member for West Swan, Rita Saffioti, who was my local member at the time, we reformed the Landsdale Residents Association and began campaigning to have a connecting footpath built. After we were successful at having the footpath built, the residents' association turned its attention to other issues within the community that we felt should be addressed. And so began my role in community activism, fighting for what I believed in and for those in my community.

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Thursday, 18 May 2017]

p272c-306a

Mrs Jessica Stojkovski; Mr David Michael; Dr Mike Nahan; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr Peter Katsambanis; Mr Terry Redman; Mr Tony Krsticevic

As a mum with a daughter now in primary school and an 18-month-old who will start attending school in a few short years, education was a strong driver of my decision to stand for election. I was dismayed and appalled when the former government cut funding to education assistants in our school. This was a harsh attack on some of the most vulnerable people in our community—our children. Having been in my daughter's class as a parent helper on a number of occasions, I have seen just how much work and value those education assistants contribute to our classrooms and how much support they offer the school, the students and the teachers. The focus of this Labor government on education will have long-lasting effects. Putting education assistants back into the classrooms will ease some of the pressure on our teachers who are increasingly dealing with more than just education issues. Investing in and nurturing and mentoring new teachers and providing personal development opportunities to all teachers will allow for personal and professional growth. These types of investments have positive impacts on teachers, which in turn impacts on the students' quality of education.

Encouraging and facilitating science and coding in primary schools is going to be vitally important for our children as they move towards adulthood and future employment opportunities. Labor understands that we need to prepare our children for jobs that have not even been invented yet and that the promotion of critical thinking and collaborative behaviour, which is evident in scientific teaching, will equip our children with the skills they need to thrive in this ever changing technological world we find ourselves in.

My passion for education will naturally translate to the schools in the Kingsley electorate. I look forward to working with them and advocating on their behalf to ensure that Kingsley schools are not forgotten or neglected, as many of them feel they have been for the last number of years. Moving to Woodvale to be closer to our daughter's school, I was struck by the beauty of the area. The electorate of Kingsley comprises the suburbs of Woodvale, Kingsley, Greenwood and Warwick. There are numerous bushlands, parks and wetland systems that are very close to the heart of the local communities. This is evident by the number of "friends of" community groups such as the Friends of Yellagonga Regional Park, Friends of Shepherd Bush Park and Friends of Warwick Bushland. One needs only to take a ride or walk around Lake Goollelal in the morning or evening and see the number of people out enjoying the picturesque setting to understand the connection many local residents have to these wonderful assets. However, the wetlands do have drawbacks, primarily, the presence of midges and mosquitos and their impact on the surrounding residential development. As the local member, I am dedicated to working with the two local governments—the Cities of Joondalup and Wanneroo—and the various Labor ministers to find a holistic and appropriate solution that not only reduces the midge and mosquito population, but also addresses the root cause of these issues.

I believe that the people of Kingsley took their decision on 11 March very seriously, and this is reflected in the close result in the Kingsley seat. The fact that I stand here today as the Labor member for Kingsley shows that they carefully considered the former government's record and found it wanting. While the electorate of Kingsley is predominantly residential, there are areas of local small businesses that are genuinely concerned about their ability to trade and employ Western Australians. I congratulate the Premier, the cabinet and my Labor colleagues for the sensible and, frankly, overdue policy that will level the playing field for businesses in Kingsley, allowing them to competitively trade for government contracts by encouraging local content and local jobs.

We are very lucky in Kingsley that we are bound by the Joondalup train line to our west so residents have access to the public transport system. However, utilisation of this public transport system requires patrons to feel safe. It is for this reason that I campaigned for extra closed-circuit television and lighting at Greenwood train station, and I am proud that we will be delivering on this important issue.

My professional background is in town planning. As a town planner, I understand that fast and easily accessible feeder bus services are essential to allowing increased patronage. In the electorate of Kingsley, east to west bus services connecting to the train line will provide the trigger for behavioural changes and attitudes towards public transport. I am very pleased that feeder bus services will be reviewed as part of Metronet.

The people of Western Australia look to this government for strong leadership, and now is our time to be brave. We as a state, nation and, indeed, global community are facing tough and uncertain times with rapidly changing landscapes and technological advances that create new and vibrant industries while at the same time rendering other industries obsolete. The management of this requires delicate balance and finesse that harnesses these new industries, enabling diversification of our economy whilst sensitively progressing the transition of workers out of other industries.

It could be observed that I came to the planning sphere by accident but for me it was a happy accident. In 2010, as a new mother with a five-month-old baby, I returned to work out of necessity, leaving my beautiful baby girl at home with my mum and mother-in-law. It was a guilt-ridden and testing time for me but I was also very grateful as this was the catalyst for me to return to university as a mature age student. Working in an administration role for a government relations firm, I was inspired by the genuine and real effect policy could have on people's

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Thursday, 18 May 2017]

p272c-306a

Mrs Jessica Stojkovski; Mr David Michael; Dr Mike Nahan; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr Peter Katsambanis; Mr Terry Redman; Mr Tony Krsticevic

day-to-day lives. I enrolled in a Bachelor of Planning at Edith Cowan University, majoring in policy and governance. It was one of the best decisions of my life. At this point, I would like to thank my course coordinator, Tim Perkins, who is in the public gallery today, and senior lecturer Edward Andrea, who both offered me support and guidance through my four-year degree. Both these men have a passion for planning and encouraged and pushed me to extend my learning, including supervising my parliamentary internship and nominating me for domestic and international study tours. It was the culmination of these planning experiences that shaped my strong views on the holistic requirements for successful planning outcomes. I would also like to thank my former employers—the City of Wanneroo and the city growth team, in particular, Mark Dickson and Nick Stawarz, who took a chance on a mature age planning student with a child and were always supportive, especially when I found out that I was pregnant a week after starting there. I am sure the experience and lessons learnt at the City of Wanneroo will serve me well in this place and I hope my contribution to policy in general and planning policy specifically will reflect those teachings.

[Member's time extended.]

Mrs J.M.C. STOJKOVSKI: The planning of this great state needs to be considered and it should incorporate land use, transport and planning. Only when these three important pieces of the puzzle are considered together will we see the cohesive and holistic planning we aspire to. The last piece of that puzzle needs to be a strategic focus on sustainability across government. To ensure our children inherit a better world than we did, we need to manage our impact on the environment in a variety of sectors. I will advocate for strong action on sustainability, including the exploration and commercialisation of renewable energy innovations, such as solar, wind and wave energy production, the banning of single-use plastic bags and the introduction of a container deposit scheme.

The electorate of Kingsley comprises 10 per cent of people who were either born in Ireland or claim Irish ancestry. There is a long, proud history of Western Australian Irish parliamentarians with 30 being born in Ireland and many more claiming Irish ancestry. I am the daughter of Irish immigrants who, like many before them and since, came to Australia seeking a different life from the one they knew in their homeland. In 1981, recently married and expecting their first child—me—my parents, only 22 and 23 years old, arrived in Perth. At that time, no-one could have foretold the life that they would be able to build for themselves and their family here in Western Australia. For a mechanical fitter and a recently qualified teacher, Australia was a land of opportunity and hope, although not everything was smooth sailing. Overwhelming homesickness saw them return to Ireland only to realise that their hearts were in Australia, resulting in journeys across the world and back. My parents, like many other migrants to this country, assimilated and contributed to the community of their new home. Both my parents were heavily involved in the local residents associations, our school parents and citizens associations and other organisations, such as the 1st Joondalup Scout Group. This community involvement and genuine concern for the welfare of others shaped our lives and contributed to the understanding of our social responsibility. My parents thrived on the multicultural nature of Western Australian society and the concept of many cultures combining to create one culture.

Those of you with a keen eye or ear for names will have noticed that Stojkovski is not an Irish name. As I am the daughter of Irish immigrant parents, my husband, Siljan, is the son of Macedonian immigrant parents. It is my understanding that I am the first female Macedonian-named Western Australian parliamentarian. This is an honour I will wear with pride. The Macedonian community in Perth is strong and passionate and I know I carry with me the hopes and expectations of many in this community. I hope I will work with the Macedonian community to fully represent them in this place. One of their hopes is that Australia will acknowledge Macedonia as the Republic of Macedonia and not the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. This is something very close to my family's heart and I will engage and work with my federal colleagues to progress the discussion about this very important issue.

Having created our culturally blended family, it is no surprise that a number of our friends are also from a variety of cultures being immigrants or first-generation Australians from immigrant parents. They come from Italy, Spain, India, Singapore, England, Germany, Romania, Vietnam, Greece and Russia. I find that the multicultural nature of our circle of friends enriches our social lives with food, dancing, customs and festivals, and teaches our children to celebrate things that make us culturally unique and connect over things that we have in common. So, it was with great sadness that I recently sat with a friend of mine as she told us that her and her husband were going to be pulling their children out of school because they were being bullied. I believe that any time a child is bullied, whether at school, in sports or in the playground, it is a failing of our society. However, when my beautiful Indian friend relayed to us that the bullying was racially motivated, I was simultaneously heartbroken and furious. I cannot believe that in Western Australia in 2017 a child would face such bullying because of the colour of their skin. As I look around at my Labor colleagues and see the diversity of culture, ancestry, sexuality, religion, gender, marital and family status, I hope that we can bring all those things that make us unique to this place so that we can

Mrs Jessica Stojkovski; Mr David Michael; Dr Mike Nahan; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr Peter Katsambanis; Mr Terry Redman; Mr Tony Krsticevic

represent the people of Western Australia and consider them in all the decisions that we make that impact on their lives.

As many of my fellow members have spoken to in this chamber, there is a group of people who work tirelessly for the community and for the benefit of others in the community. I am talking of course about the union movement. Although many people have their first interaction with the union movement in their early 20s when they start working or attend university, I was much younger. My most vivid memory of unions is when my dad, who had been working for many years as a mechanical fitter, began having issues with his supervisor. Essentially, they had a personality clash. These issues continued on until one day my father's supervisor attempted to fire him. The Australian Manufacturing Workers' Union stepped in and protected his job. In fact, the AMWU organiser who assisted that day now sits in this place as the member for Fremantle. So, growing up my knowledge of unions was that they protect people's jobs and protect people when they are on the job. I find it very fitting now that much of the recent visible union work has been around protecting jobs—Western Power jobs. It is with much gratitude and pride that I worked with the Australian Manufacturing Workers' Union, the Australian Services Union and the Electrical Trades Union throughout the election campaign to protect the jobs of Western Power workers in Kingsley and across the state.

My journey to this place was not a solitary one and there are many people to thank. To my volunteers, you are a small but mighty band. You were also positive in the face of our Herculean task and often it was your kind and encouraging words that gave me the drive to continue our campaign when I was feeling down. To AMWU secretary, Steve McCartney, who is an old friend of my dad's, who protected me, promoted me and encouraged me more like an uncle, I thank you for your support and that of the AMWU. I would also like to thank Wayne Wood and the members of the ASU, and Les McLaughlan and the ETU members for the early-morning wobbleboarding on the side of Wanneroo Road. I would like to thank Rob Knox, who is here in the gallery today, who had the unenviable task of managing both Burns Beach and Kingsley. I appreciate the time and effort you put in for me. I would like to thank Patrick Gorman and Lenda Oshalem. In my 21 years of election campaigning, I have never seen such a professional and supportive campaign for all electorates, including Kingsley. To my electorate staff, Ashley Buck and Karen Mann, thank you for the professional and efficient way you have set up our electorate office. I am so grateful to you looking after me, so that I can look after the people of Kingsley.

I am fortunate to have so many strong female role models in my life and it is with their help and support that I have arrived at this place. First, Hon Sally Talbot, a constant friend and mentor who gave so much of her time to a nervous would-be candidate and talked through the possible consequences for a mum with a young child and new baby. To Dr Anne Aly; Hon Alanna Clohesy; Hon Alannah MacTiernan; Hon Laine McDonald; member for Girrawheen, Margaret Quirk; member for Mirrabooka, Janine Freeman; member for West Swan, Rita Saffioti: you have provided me with advice and support on how to be a member of Parliament, how to be a female member of Parliament and how to be a mum in Parliament. Your advice and support is much appreciated.

To my EMILY's List mentor, Liddy Clarke: thank you for being the voice on the other end of the phone. You were a calming and wise voice during a hectic and emotional time. Even though we have never met in person, your exuberance and excitement at my unexpected win was truly appreciated.

To Senator Louise Pratt: what can I say about you? You are a strong, proud, trailblazing woman of indomitable spirit. I have seen you suffer professional and personal setbacks over the years, but you have always held yourself up with grace and determination. You are my mentor, but more importantly you are my friend and I thank you for that. Thank you also to Bec, Amy, Ellie and Jon in your office who were always there with words of encouragement and direction.

I think all members would agree that none of us could have achieved our success and sit in this place without our families. To my brother, Charlie, and his wife, Rachel; my sister, Samantha, and her husband, Michael; my in-laws Blagoja, Zivka, Lubica, Goran, Gordana and Vince; and my Uncle David and Aunt Myra: you have all contributed to my life, making me the person I am today. You all also contributed to my campaign, from making Australian Labor Party-themed cupcakes for fundraisers and election day, to spending countless hours, with young children in tow, putting together election material, and of course working on polling booths and emotionally supporting me.

To my sister, Samantha: you have always had unwavering confidence in me. You are my best friend, and I could not ask for a better sister.

To my mum, Bernadette, you often say to me that I am the strongest woman you know; well, I say to you here today that you are in fact the strongest woman I know. While raising Sam and me with dad, in the face of some criticism of working mothers at the time, you pursued your passion for teaching. Knowing that although we were never well-off or wealthy, you opened your heart and our home to numerous foster children. For that I thank you.

Mrs Jessica Stojkovski; Mr David Michael; Dr Mike Nahan; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr Peter Katsambanis; Mr Terry Redman; Mr Tony Krsticevic

Because of that I have a brother; a brother who is kind, funny and an essential part of our lives. Charlie, I thank you for being my big brother and always backing me.

To my dad, Tony: when you sat in this place as member for Joondalup for 12 years, you inspired me. I saw the impact one dedicated and passionate member could have on a community. Even when you were no longer a member of this place you took that dedication and passion to your new adventures. I only hope I can be even half the member you were.

My dearest children, Nadija and Kristijan: you are my inspiration and my driving force, and I am a better person for being your mum. I stand here in this place today because of you—because of my need to see a better world for you. Nadija, you are my little ray of sunshine, always with a smile on your face and a spring in your step. I urge you to follow your dreams, wherever they may take you. Kristijan, you are much too young today to understand what is going on; however, you are a gift we hoped for and thought would never come. I am eternally thankful for your cheeky disposition and the rock star welcome I get every time I pick you up from day care.

Lastly, to my wonderful husband: Siljan, you are my steadying hand and my rock. We have been through some joyous highs and crashing lows, but always come through with smiles on our faces and closer than ever. I thank you for supporting me in achieving my dreams, including supporting me financially and emotionally through university and then through this tiring election campaign. I hope I can make you proud in my new role as the member for Kingsley.

[Applause.]

MR D.R. MICHAEL (Balcatta) [9.44 am]: I would like to firstly acknowledge the traditional owners of the land on which this house stands and I pay my respects to their elders, both past and present. The name “Balcatta” was actually a local Aboriginal name for the northern part of Careniup Lake and wetlands, being derived from the words “bal”, meaning “his”, and “katta”, meaning “hill”. Can I also congratulate you, Mr Speaker, on your well-deserved elevation. It is wonderful to see a fellow Claremont supporter in the chair!

I am so humbled by the support I received from my local community, and before I say another word, I would like to thank them and promise to fight for their interests always. That is what I have seen in the members of Parliament I have looked up to—people who, no matter what, will always stand up for their community. I am excited by this because my community is one that I have lived in all my life and one that I care deeply about.

My mum and dad, Leena and David Sr, moved into Lawley Street, Tuart Hill, in 1980. I still live in the old fibro house 37 years later. One of the reasons they moved there was so that I could go to school at the two great schools my dad went to. Although I went to kindy and primary school at Tuart Hill Primary School, Tuart Hill Senior High School became Tuart College, so I attended Servite College, which also was only a few streets away.

At 13 my mum migrated to Australia from Finland with her four brothers and sisters and her parents, Eino Petteri and Mirja Liisa Tiainen. They came here in 1969 under the Australian government’s Special Passage Assistance Programme, looking for work and a better life. After some time spent in Cabramatta and Launceston, they made their way to Perth. My grandfather grew up in a place called Sortavala, in Finland’s far east, surviving the Winter War and the Continuation War with the Soviet Union that raged around him and his family. After the Second World War, they had days to evacuate behind the newly negotiated Finnish–Soviet border. His family was resettled by the Finnish government and he met Mirja Liisa, who was from a small town, Lapua, in western Finland, before coming to Australia. I never learnt Finnish, and was never able to talk much to my Finnish grandparents. My mum, though, would always tell me how proud they were of me—being Labor voters—when I started getting involved in the Labor Party and fighting for an Australian republic.

My dad was born in Subiaco to my grandfather, Kevin Michael, and my nan, Valma. Kevin was from Manly in New South Wales and served in the Australian Army in Korea, Malaya and Borneo in the 1950s. Tragically, he lost his life to cancer before his thirtieth birthday, leaving my nan and her five young children. Nan came home to her parents, Hugh and Esther Winning, at the Winning family headquarters on Hooley Road in Midvale. Nan will often recount the experience of getting off the train at Midland Junction railway station, having just lost her husband, with few or no possessions and five children in tow.

A few years later, nan married Robert Augustin, my grandad—a lifelong hardworking carpet layer and Claremont supporter! Nan and grandad were wonderful grandparents to my cousins Gabi, Jesse, Kristian and me. Again, both were lifelong Labor voters, always willing help others in need, even when they did not have enough for themselves. I miss my grandparents, especially my nan, Valma, who lived down the street from me until she passed away earlier this year, just months away from being able to vote for me.

Growing up, I can never remember going without, but I know that my family struggled. My dad worked in a textile warehouse and mum worked as a dressmaker. They were always there for me, and they still are. My whole family have always been quite close. Thank you all for your lifetime of love and support—dad, mum, uncles Kim, Tony,

Mrs Jessica Stojkovski; Mr David Michael; Dr Mike Nahan; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr Peter Katsambanis; Mr Terry Redman; Mr Tony Krsticevic

Martti, and Gerard, and aunties Did, Lisa and Mary. Thank you for all your work, especially over the last 12 months. I thank mum and dad for the sacrifices they made to give me the best start in life, supporting me at school, with sport and through university.

I joined the Australian Labor Party at the University of Western Australia O-Day in early 1998, spurred on by the third wave dispute, continued old-growth logging, and the Howard government's regressive policies, especially in education. Having studied economics, in 2002 I applied for a job with my two local MPs—Bob Kucera, the then member for Yokine, and Graham Giffard, then a member for North Metropolitan Region. I will always be indebted to these fine former members for giving me a start and for all that they have taught me, and for their support of my campaign.

I worked for Bob—and Susan—Kucera for several years and I consider them family. I miss our little office with my then colleague Rosa, Vegemite on crackers, and the senior singalongs; and of course, Bob, the orange couch that we found during the 2005 campaign, but I will save that story for another day.

I was then fortunate enough to work for Hon Kate Doust. Kate is an intelligent, compassionate and hardworking member for her region, and a tireless advocate for workers in Western Australia. She would be an exceptional President of the other place, and I will be so proud for her should that occur. Thank you to Helen Bissett and Julian Hilton, whom I worked with in those four years, for continuing to support me and for your friendship.

Then there is the member for Willagee, Peter Tinley, who, like a few members in this place, is serving his community again after a long and distinguished a career in the Army. Mate, we have been through a bit together since the 2007 Stirling campaign. You have always got my back, and always put our party and our state first. It is an honour to be in this chamber with you. Thank you also to Deputy Mayor Peter Feasey for tolerating me in the electorate office and for his help and encouragement.

I decided to run for Balcatta as I thought my area had been neglected by the state government. This was confirmed at so many doorsteps as I walked the length and breadth of the seat throughout the campaign. Tuart Hill and Joondanna have been the densest suburbs of Western Australia for several years now, with older homes like mine making way for villas, units and apartments. Unfortunately, poor planning decisions by the Western Australian Planning Commission continue to see these areas turn into low-rise, multi-unit, concrete jungles. I want to see improved standards for these types of developments and planning schemes that instead encourage higher densities around public transport routes, as well as greater provision of trees, green spaces and community gardens.

Over the road from Balcatta is Osborne Park, a local employment hub where the industrial area meets the Main Street retail area. This suburb is where the small business community of the Balcatta electorate was forged. Hard work on the market garden has turned into entrepreneurship and myriad small businesses. I will do my bit to make sure the Main Street businesses are supported and that Robinson Reserve is upgraded so that we will turn this area into a bustling, vibrant hub of activity and create further employment. What I love about Main Street and many other areas of the electorate is the olive trees on the verges and median strips. At the cusp of winter we can catch local nonnas coming out to pick the produce for pickling.

My electorate also has Osborne Park Hospital. For over 50 years, the hospital has serviced people in and around the northern suburbs and electorates. The hospital is vital for many Balcatta residents and is well run by fantastic health professionals. However, it does need some government attention so that it can increase services, and to plan for the future. I will never shy away from fighting for this community asset.

While I am on the important issue of health, I am convinced, having doorknocked many thousands of people, that asbestos disease will not end with Wittenoom. We will have a second wave of asbestos disease from older homes, fences and buildings. This Parliament needs to do more to support medical research, strengthen compensation legislation and support groups like the Asbestos Diseases Society in Osborne Park, which, thanks to Rose Marie and Robert Vojakovic, continues to do incredible work.

Members: Hear, hear!

Mr D.R. MICHAEL: To the north of the electorate is Hamersley, a suburb with many ex-service personnel still living in former Defence Housing Australia homes. In me, the Hamersley community has its strongest ally in the fight to move the communication tower. I will not let the federal member off lightly. The tower has well and truly worn out its welcome. I will also support the great Hamersley Habitat Community Garden, and local schools. I am also advocating for a review of the bus routes that have been cancelled or reduced in the last four years.

In Balcatta and Stirling, which are two suburbs built upon the hard work of pioneers in the area, mostly new Australians working these former swamplands, there is now a need to upgrade local infrastructure to support the increasing population of these areas due to infill housing. I will fight to make sure these suburbs are looked after by upgrading Balcatta Senior High School and dealing with traffic congestion and dangerous intersections like the one at Boya Way–Erindale Road.

Mrs Jessica Stojkovski; Mr David Michael; Dr Mike Nahan; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr Peter Katsambanis; Mr Terry Redman; Mr Tony Krsticevic

The south-western end of Stirling is also the location of the future Stirling city centre, which will bring together the existing residential areas and under-utilised private and government landholdings, along with better road and rail connections. This project will not only significantly reduce traffic congestion on Cedric Street and Karrinyup Road, but also be a new community in itself, with thousands of new residents living, working and recreating in and around a Metrohub at Stirling train station. This project has been well planned and once enjoyed bipartisan support, with input from the City of Stirling and several state departments. That support waned under the previous government but I am proud that WA Labor committed to this project during the recent campaign. I call on the federal government to follow suit, to help get a shovel in the ground and help create local jobs.

Migrants built much of the Balcatta electorate. They endured racism, poor services and marginal land. They worked hard and prospered. The Italian, Macedonian and Croatian communities built their own prosperity from market gardens to building and construction and now small business. This has continued in more recent decades, with many Vietnamese, Chinese and Indian migrants building a life in our local area.

There are two pillars of the Balcatta electorate, the Italian community and the Macedonian community. I want to place on record my gratitude to the Italian community and the Tuscany, Sicilian and Vasto community cultural clubs. Thank you to the club committees who have kept these clubs running, hosting events and keeping their culture alive with the younger generation. Balcatta FC started life with an Italian foundation as the Balcatta Etna Soccer Club. With their home ground at Grindleford Reserve, this club has successful senior teams and competes in the National Premier League. It has hundreds and hundreds of local children on the field each week. This is a testament to it being a well-run family club, with an active committee headed by Peter Carlino and a committed network of sponsors, normally rounded up by the ever-present Pat Luca.

The Macedonian community keep their culture and traditions alive with the Macedonian Community of WA, which is in North Perth, but also at Macedonia Park, Balcatta, and the Macedonian Cultural Centre “Ilinden”, which is next to Grindleford Reserve. These clubs, along with the Stirling Lions senior and junior football club, have been for decades the centre of our local Macedonian community. They were built up literally brick by brick by stalwarts such as Paul Temov, Jordan Bukowski and local legend Vic Radis. Listening to and learning from Vic is a rite of passage for a Labor member for Balcatta, and it is from Vic that I have learnt the history of the Macedonian community and where that community has been let down too often by Australian governments. To the community, I pledge my support to always fight for the recognition of the self-determined name of your homeland, the Republic of Macedonia. Australia should join over 130 other countries to do so. I am proud to have done what I could in my capacity as a councillor for the City of Stirling and candidate to support these local cultural clubs, along with the Chung Wah Cultural Centre and the Stirling Adriatic Club. As the local member, I will do my best to continue this work.

It has also been my pleasure to work with the Osborne Park RSL, the Osborne Park Bowling Club, the Tuart Hill Swimming Club and, of course, the Osborne Park Agricultural Society, and I pay tribute to their members and volunteers for the work they do in our community. I believe in strong local communities, communities that look out for each other and share in each other's success. I believe in strong local clubs and organisations.

I am a life member of the Tuart Hill Cricket Club. Since my first game at 14, I have played 251 games. Given these words will last in *Hansard* forever, I must mention a notable and historic day for the club at Yuluma Reserve, Innaloo, in 2004, where I took a legendary seven for seven!

[Applause.]

Mr D.R. MICHAEL: I am certain that if it was not for my time and experience as club secretary, president and more recently treasurer, I would not be standing in this place today. It was at this club that I saw firsthand the value of volunteers at community organisations—people like David Griffiths, Tammy and Graeme Doyle, Neil Rankin, Phil Davies, Andy Stimpson and many more who have helped keep the club running since 1948. Over the past decade, I have seen many local sporting and cultural clubs experience a decline in membership and a crisis in volunteering. The world is changing—fast. Generally, people are not joining clubs in the numbers they have in the past, and when they do, the time they spend at their club and their capacity to volunteer are also declining. The benefit to our communities of well run, strong and vibrant clubs is so important. To lose our clubs would be devastating on the physical and mental health of so many in our community, many of whom are already being isolated and marginalised by the modern age. To this end, peak bodies and all tiers of government must do more to foster strong clubs, whether it is Cricket Australia and the WACA, ensuring more resources flow to community cricket or simply local government, reducing regulations, fees and barriers to local clubs.

It was actually my time as an office bearer at my cricket club, and with the support of my mates, that led me to run, in May 2005, for the City of Stirling's Osborne ward. I ran so that I could fix up the parkland, the clubrooms and the community hall at Grenville Reserve in Tuart Hill. I was fortunate enough to win that election and became the youngest councillor elected to the city at the age of 25. I served nearly 12 years as a councillor, including two

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Thursday, 18 May 2017]

p272c-306a

Mrs Jessica Stojkovski; Mr David Michael; Dr Mike Nahan; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr Peter Katsambanis; Mr Terry Redman; Mr Tony Krsticevic

as deputy mayor. In the early days I was taught the ropes by then CEO Lindsay Delahaunty, the city's current freeman, and by committed and hardworking officers like Trevor Holland and, more recently, CEO Stuart Jardine. In my time at the city, I am proud of what we embarked on. The city has retrofitted suburbs with footpaths where there were none, it has undertaken the mass planting of street trees as our green canopy was disappearing, and it has implemented a modern recycling system as well as more accessible, quality community facilities, including at Grenville Reserve. I have had the honour to serve my local community with a mostly fantastic bunch of community-minded councillors of all political colours, especially in the Osborne ward where, for the past decade or so, Mayor Giovanni Italiano and his partner, Anne, have given me an incredible amount of friendship and support. To Giovanni and Anne, the council and officers—thank you.

Local government can make an enormous difference to the lives of everyday Western Australians. Having said this, local government is not perfect and does not get everything right. To achieve sustainability in local government, we need reform—reform that is led by the community and involves the sector in a genuine way.

[Member's time extended.]

Mr D.R. MICHAEL: I would also like to mention three bigger issues that I have always found important to me: an Australian republic; animal welfare; and the labour movement. I was the state secretary of the Australian Republican Movement in 1999 and the sadness of the referendum result and of that particular deception of the Australian people has never left me. I have always found it unacceptable that Australia's head of state lives in another country, and that this current arrangement devalues and demeans our nation on the world stage. I believe that even the idea of a constitutional monarchy based not on merit or achievement but on the archaic, old-world notion of birthright does not suit any country, especially not a modern Australia built on equality, mateship and egalitarianism. I believe in a great Australian republic, with a head of state that is one of us. It is my hope that this is achieved for our state and country whilst I am not only alive, but also while I am a member of this place.

My mum and my family have always been animal lovers. I was always taught to respect animals, treat them well and to fight cruelty whenever I can. Animal welfare has gone backwards in this state over the past eight years, despite the efforts of some members from both sides of this house. We still have too many cases of animal cruelty. In 2016 in the electorate of Balcatta the RSPCA investigated nearly 100 cases of animal cruelty. That is too many. We have too many weak, self-regulated standards in industry, racing and intensive farming. Western Australia needs a new, strong animal welfare strategy and we must continue to support organisations such as the Dogs' Refuge Home, the Cat Haven and especially the RSPCA, rather than the disgraceful attack launched on that well-respected organisation by the former government in recent years. One industry continues to fail the animal welfare expectations of the community. It is an industry that excels in the inhumane treatment of animals and one that increasingly wants to export Western Australian jobs overseas. Live export is a sunset industry that deserves shutting down. For the sake of animal welfare and local jobs, we must transition from the live export trade to domestic processing for local consumption and the chilled and frozen meat trade.

I mentioned my great-grandfather Hugh Winning. Hugh was born in Glasgow, arriving in Fremantle with his family, who became orchardists in Bedforddale. Hugh enlisted with his brothers in the Great War and served on the Western Front. After the war, as well as meeting Esther, my great-grandmother, and having 14 children, he became a guard on the WA government railways where he remained for the rest of his working life. Hugh was a trade unionist and, for a time in the 1940s, secretary of the Midland Junction branch of the Communist Party—according to his Australian Security Intelligence Organisation record anyway!—but was mainly a Labor man, getting his family to help on campaigns and telling one and all to always put the Liberals last. One of my most cherished possessions is his branch delegate certificate from the West Australian Amalgamated Society of Railway Employees' Union of Workers. Like Hugh, I believe in trade unions. I believe they have had, and continue to have, an overwhelming, positive impact on Western Australian society, our economy and the standard of living of everyday people. Through their advocacy and action around workplace safety, trade unions have saved so many workers from injury and death, and continue to do so. They also fight for those who need it most, like low-paid retail and hospitality workers, who are having their penalty rates cut, or truck drivers, who endure low rates of pay, long, unsafe hours and sometimes poor truck maintenance. I thank the union movement for its enduring efforts in protecting workers in this state.

I would also like to personally thank Tim Dawson at the Transport Workers' Union of Australia; Peter O'Keeffe and Ben Harris at the Shop, Distributive and Allied Employees Association of WA; as well as the Australian Workers' Union; United Voice; the Maritime Union of Australia; the Construction, Forestry, Mining and Energy Union; and the Australian Manufacturing Workers' Union. Thank you to the Electrical Trades Union and Australian Services Union for their Use Your Power campaign and thank you to Meredith Hammat, Owen Whittle and UnionsWA for always fighting the good fight.

Mrs Jessica Stojkovski; Mr David Michael; Dr Mike Nahan; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr Peter Katsambanis; Mr Terry Redman; Mr Tony Krsticevic

I would like to say thank you to my mates who endured fundraisers and events, and who regularly attended Wildcats games in my red T-shirts without me! Thank you to all the friends and supporters who donated time and money to our campaign to win back the seat of Balcatta for Labor. I had the best bunch of volunteers as part of the Balcatta community action network, who braved hot days doorknocking or my messy house phoning into the night. I will always be indebted to you. Thank you to our super callers, Mary and Pauline, who made well over 700 calls each in the last few weeks of the campaign. Thank you to Henry, David, Nathan, Tim, Matthew and Michael, who doorknocked almost every weekend in the lead-up to election day. Thank you to Georgia Tree and the members of Young Labor. A big thankyou goes to the mighty Balcatta branch stalwarts Kath, Wally and Anne, Lida, Ken, Rosie, Chum, Matt, Dan and Anne-Marie. You are all Labor legends! We had a merry band of volunteers helping out at events, driving trailers around and fixing my signs and posters. Thank you to Leo, Tony, Kim, Don and Steve. As well as Bob Kucera and Graham Giffard, thank you for the wise counsel and support of former members of Parliament, including John Kobelke, who was so sorely missed in the electorate over the past four years, Nick Catania, Jann McFarlane and Graham Edwards. I hope I can continue your legacy in this area.

I would also like to express my gratitude to Patrick Gorman, Guy Houston, Jo Gaines and the team at WA Labor central headquarters, the now Premier, Mark McGowan, the members for Girrawheen, Mirrabooka and Cannington, Margaret Quirk, Janine Freeman and Bill Johnston, as well as Minister Alannah MacTiernan.

I am also lucky to know some hardworking federal MPs: Madeleine King, Josh Wilson, Matt Keogh, Tim Hammond and Senator Glenn Sterle, who were always generous with advice, their time and support. I would also like to particularly single out Fiona Sterle, the “senatoress” and my former work colleague, for always believing in me.

Thank you to my campaign team, including Andrew, Mel, Frank, Lisa and, straight from Copenhagen, Dan, and also one of my best mates, the recently engaged Chris Davis, for flying from Hong Kong for election day. To my campaign manager, Andrew O'Donnell, and field organiser, Magenta Wilders, thank you so much for the time and effort you put into my campaign, especially given I am normally a campaign manager or director myself and not used to taking orders on where to doorknock or how the material should look! I am so lucky to have you both in my electorate office.

To my twin government Whip and my campaign director, Hon Martin Pritchard, MLC, and his wife, Gina, you were so incredibly generous with your time, support and friendship. I do not know how I will ever repay you both, but know I will always work hard in this place and in the Balcatta electorate.

Now I know she has been mentioned by nearly everyone on this side of the house this week, but for me it is different. Firstly, as a campaigner and then candidate, can I say the sheer hard work and determination that Lenda Oshalem has given to the party has been second to none. Bringing the Community Action Network to WA has transformed the way we campaign forever, and for the better. Thanking her for her role as assistant state secretary of Labor though is obviously not enough for me. I need to thank her for being my best friend and the love of my life. Thank you for your support in the ups and downs of politics and life. Thank you for sticking by my side along with two very, very lucky stray cats—our old grey rug, Jack, and little Maxie—and the rest of the neighbourhood's drop-in strays and ibis. Lenda, thank you again for everything and I love you.

[Applause.]

DR M.D. NAHAN (Riverton — Leader of the Opposition) [10.11 am]: I would like to make some comments on the Governor's speech, but first I congratulate the member for Rockingham for his ascendancy to the Premier of Western Australia, and his ministers. It is an honour, as he knows. I wish him well, and I say that honestly. I also acknowledge all members on both sides of the house and give condolences to many members who left this house, particularly those who lost an election. We as politicians know politics is a tough game. We give it our heart and soul, as do our and families and friends, and we often end up heartbroken. It is a tough gig and I acknowledge them.

Second, I acknowledge the member for Cottesloe. He led the Liberal Party for eight and a half years. He has served this Parliament for nearly 27 years and, of course, he has served Western Australia greatly during that time and even before that. History will remember him well. People will know that he rebuilt this state and transformed the economy. Western Australia has become one of the centres for resources around the world, which successive governments had fought for and dreamed of for decades. Of course, one thing that the member for Cottesloe does not get enough credit for is that he was a true social reformer.

We are few in number on this side of the house. Clearly, we lost and we lost big. It is incumbent first to acknowledge the loss and to congratulate the victors. That is the great aspect of democracy. But as a party we also have to recognise why we lost, to understand it, to admit it, and to address it. There are all sorts of reasons why we lost, but one is that we lost touch with our constituency. Seventy-five years ago next Monday, Menzies, the

Mrs Jessica Stojkovski; Mr David Michael; Dr Mike Nahan; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr Peter Katsambanis; Mr Terry Redman; Mr Tony Krsticevic

founder of our party, gave a very famous speech. It was “The Forgotten People” speech, in which he began the formation and definition of the constituency of the Liberal Party; he defined them. Every Liberal government since then has kept true to that constituency and, if anything, they are larger in number now than they were 75 years ago. They have been called many things, such as “Howard’s battlers” or “Tony’s tradies”, but they told us in that election that we forgot about them. We need to remember them. They are the shopkeepers, tradies, independent contractors, self-funded retirees, professionals, builders, entrepreneurs, real estate agents et cetera. These people have certain characteristics. They are self-sufficient, or they try to be. They are aspirational to the hilt. They are family-focused. They are the people whom we represent on a daily basis. Their home is their castle and major asset. They are lifters. They are net contributors to the public purse. They pay taxes. They participate in the community; in fact, they run the sports programs, the RSLs, the Rotary clubs. They are very strongly community-oriented, but they are not organised politically, except to our party. They are not members of a union. They are not represented by various vocal community lobby groups. They are not members of the Conservation Council of Western Australia, GetUp! or other organisations. They are not wealthy enough themselves to have their voice heard. They looked to us, and we did not hear them, at least in the way that they needed to be heard. We have to listen to them and represent them in this house. They went to the Labor Party this election, clearly in large numbers, but it is an uncomfortable fit. They will come back if we listen to them and respond to their issues in this house and outside in the community.

What did we do wrong? This question is important. We spent beyond our means. Yes, we spent big—there is no doubt about that—on not only capital, but also recurrent and frontline services. Did we need to? Absolutely right, we did. We had to rebuild every aspect of this state. We rebuilt every economy, every structure and every institution.

Several members interjected.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: We rebuilt the electricity system.

Point of Order

Mr W.R. MARMION: There are interjections and it is the Address-in-Reply debate. Every other member has been able to deliver their Address-in-Reply speech without interjection.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr S.J. Price): Yes.

Debate Resumed

Dr M.D. NAHAN: We rebuilt the electricity system, water system, schools, hospitals, roads, cities—Perth and Karratha. We rebuilt every aspect, and we had to because we had the largest investment in this nation’s history—\$600 billion was invested in private investment in this state. It transformed the state for good. Also, of course, 450 000 people migrated to Western Australia to call it home—the largest migration to Western Australia since the 1950s—and we had to accommodate those people. They transformed our state.

We also had the movement to this state of every major oil and gas, and mining head office in the nation. They service not only the nation, but also the region and the world. We transformed the state, but we spent capital to do it. What is less recognised is that we spent hugely in the context of reform on frontline services—education, child protection, mental health and health. Expenditure on every one of those frontline social services grew on average by 70 per cent on our watch—this is an issue that the Labor Party is going to struggle with—but we did so beyond our means. I am not running away from our expenditure on capital or on frontline services; I am claiming it for us—the Labor government inherited our means. In the second term, in particular, when our means started decreasing for a variety of reasons—iron ore prices, GST and a slowing economy—we struggled. We also did not do enough to enhance those means. On our watch the GST share to WA decreased from about 90 per cent to 29 per cent. The member for Cottesloe and I, and members on this side did a lot. We made sure the GST issue was known in every household in this state. We also raised it to be a top issue in Canberra. The Liberal Party did that; the Labor Party sat on its haunches and did nothing. We achieved some initial important changes.

First, we received a commitment to a floor in the goods and services tax of 37.6c in the dollar. Under our watch, \$1 billion flowed to the state from that, and on the present government’s watch, \$226 million is flowing this year. We also have a Liberal–National government in Canberra committed to reform of the GST—the first time a government has ever done that. The federal government committed to a floor, but more recently it has committed to a Productivity Commission inquiry. However, the people of Western Australia said that ain’t good enough; we have to do more. Second, in 2012–13 it was becoming clear that our means were shrinking relative to what they were in our previous term, and we had commitments to large amounts of capital and frontline services. We responded by finding sources of funds other than borrowing and taxation. I refer specifically to asset recycling.

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Thursday, 18 May 2017]

p272c-306a

Mrs Jessica Stojkovski; Mr David Michael; Dr Mike Nahan; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr Peter Katsambanis; Mr Terry Redman; Mr Tony Krsticevic

Asset recycling is simply a normal process of government in every other state around Australia, Labor or Liberal. We should have responded much more quickly, adroitly and transparently to provide sources of capital to fund the necessary investments to rebuild the state, and to fund other aspects, but we did not do so. As a result, that went too high, the deficit grew and expanded, and taxes were increased, by me—*mea culpa*.

We also did not adequately vocalise the real fiscal stress households were going through, particularly the people we represent. They are lifters, strivers and investors, and they pay tax. They took advantage of, and in fact created, the boom that we went through. We experienced the largest boom in this nation's history that led to not only huge amounts of investment in large resource projects, but also the people we represent investing in a range of infrastructure to facilitate that. They started the businesses for contracting; they built housing; and they started to get into businesses servicing the mining sector. They invested heavily to facilitate the boom. Investment was always going to come off, and it was going to be painful, but when it came off and moved to the production phase, they got hit with the mother of all squeezes by the mining, oil and gas sectors because of commodity prices. They got a double whammy. Investment came off, the production phase did not come on and they were hurting, as a study by the Committee for Perth indicated the day before yesterday. Forty per cent of Western Australian households were negatively impacted by that. There is excess capacity. All businesses are competitive. There is stagnation in asset values, including house values. It is tough. Unemployment went up; people struggled to get jobs, so part-time employment grew. They were now struggling in the aftermath of the boom of a few years ago. Costs that were inflated during the boom did not come down. That is a picture of real fiscal stress in our constituencies, and we did not adequately recognise it, let alone address it. We need to do so.

Importantly, although we did a lot and the fruits are coming through now, we did not articulate clearly enough a vision for a post-boom Western Australia. In truth, we know where our strengths are; we all do. They are in tourism, educational services, agriculture and defence. They are increasingly into new types of manufacturing. In all those sectors we did a lot, particularly in agriculture and tourism. We made huge investments in those areas, but we did not sell it or articulate it. More importantly, we did not package it into a vision for the future. Labor put together a haphazard one, but in the absence of one from us, it went with its own.

One of the major factors that is going through a change—another disruption—is that we are seeing all sorts of disruptive industries. The most visible and vocal one has been taxis and the ridesharing revolution, but there is also Airbnb, media changes, new manufacturing, contracting out around the world and the fragmentation of supply chains. Those pressures are increasingly having an impact, particularly on our constituency, because they are the small businesses, the entrepreneurs and investors. Those trends, though, are growing and will be increasingly important into the future. My young new colleague, the member for Dawesville, raised this issue.

I turn to regulation. One of the first things that we did as a government was issue a red tape review. We had a whole range of other reviews periodically through our eight years. One of the limits of our constituency is that we did not do enough and that we need, now in opposition, to focus and go into that with a kneejerk reaction to say no to regulation rather than to say yes. This is in planning, hospitality and social regulations.

What do we do? First and foremost, the responsibility of an opposition is, to quote, “Keep the bastards honest.” That is what we do. But in doing so we need to represent the interests, desires and expectations of the forgotten people; they are our constituency. We need to reclaim them in this house and outside this house. That is what we commit to doing.

Let me go through some issues with Labor's mandate. The key issue in the campaign was debt and deficit. After all, it is the judge of how much a government can spend and how much the taxes are. The issues were plainly apparent to the opposition prior to the election. There has been nothing new since then. Labor came into that knowing what they were. On election day wrap displays read “debt and deficits”, and big yellow signs reading “\$40 billion deficit” and “\$30 billion deficit” were everywhere. We knew. Labor sold the public an impossible set of promises that it will not be able to keep. It is impossible. Labor promised to balance the budget over its term. It promised to stabilise and pay down debt like a mortgage over time. “No new taxes.” Labor also promised, particularly in the context of the debate over privatisation, to keep electricity prices and others stable and low—and lower than ours. On top of that, it promised a massive \$5 billion spending spree. It does not add up! It did not add up then; it does not add up now. Labor will not be able to do it. It got away with it, in part, because it avoided scrutiny. Labor refused to submit its costings to Treasury. The reason, of course, is that it knew the costings did not add up and that Treasury would have exposed them. Labor also would have known—this is a key issue of the scrutiny —

A member interjected.

Point of Order

Mrs Jessica Stojkovski; Mr David Michael; Dr Mike Nahan; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr Peter Katsambanis; Mr Terry Redman; Mr Tony Krsticevic

Dr A.D. BUTI: I think that the member for Vasse has been in this house long enough to know that if she wishes to interject or yell out, she should be in her own seat.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Yes, that is correct.

Debate Resumed

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Something has got to give. We will hold them to this impossible set of promises, but our concern, our priority, will be to address it from the perspective of our constituency. Something has got to give. I suspect it is going to be tax. In fact, from what I read in the paper today, it will be. We will represent our constituents. The government will have to make choices about what will give. Something is going to have to. We will defend our constituents on the basis of tax. First, I will give some facts. The Labor Party knew what state the books were in. Nothing has changed since then. In fact, the other day they got a lift—the GST share is actually going to be higher than Labor thought it was going to be, thanks to the Liberal government in Canberra. In other words, the level of debt that is forecast now was forecast before the election and was forecast by Treasury during the election—it was known. The increase in debt from 30 June 2017 from \$33.2 billion to about \$41 billion—it varies—is the government's debt: it inherited it, it knew what it was, it took it on. Labor went into the election with no debt reduction strategy. Well, it had one, but it lasted a day. It was a program tying debt repayment to the share of GST, but it was a con. It lasted a day. That has gone. Labor had no other. Labor went into that election saying, "We're happy with the debt going where it is. We're going to pile more debt on with \$5 billion worth of expenditure." The Treasurer tried to avoid this the other day when he talked about the Loan Bill, and we will have a debate on that in this house, but we went into the election with a clear program of reducing debt—no doubt about it. It was audited by Treasury. Labor's was hidden from Treasury; ours was audited, approved and confirmed by Treasury. Our debt would have gone down from today's level of \$33.2 billion to \$29 billion. Our debt would have been reduced. As such, the future debt—the Loan Bill that the government is going to bring down with the \$11 billion—is the government's debt.

Several members interjected.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: It is the government's debt. It was its choice. Labor had a choice during the election. Labor had a choice, we had a choice. We chose a perspective, an attack, to do the tough thing to lower our debt, and Labor chose debt.

Several members interjected.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Another mandate was no new taxes—I heard it say that. The Premier, in the campaign, first put a couple of taxes on foreign investors—he has a mandate to do that. He will wear the consequences, of course. Also, after that he repeatedly said that there would be no new taxes on Western Australians. We will hold him to that.

The rhetoric of Labor in opposition and in the campaign was that the Liberal government had slashed essential services, but that was false. We spent more on education, health, mental health and child protection than any state government in history and more than any other state in the nation. It was a huge investment. One of their chosen ones, of course, because of its affiliation with United Voice, was education assistants. Under our watch we increased the number of education assistants by 2 000. The number of education assistants per student in Western Australia is 50 per cent higher than the national average. Expenditure in our public schools per student is 35 per cent higher in Western Australia than in Victoria, and in secondary schools it is 35 per cent higher than the national average, yet Labor went out and convinced the public and convinced its constituency that we were doing the opposite—that we were slashing. For instance, the child protection union—I am not sure which one it is—put out a vigorous campaign claiming that we were increasing workloads for and reducing the number of child protection workers. The reality is that in Western Australia, under the Liberal–National government, child protection workers had the lowest case load not just in the nation—in the world. The Labor government inherited the highest funding of essential services in the nation. The data is all there; look at the "Report on Government Services" by the Productivity Commission.

Mr W.J. Johnston: Show us.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: It is a public document. Members know what it is. But the government has inherited it and it does not have a mandate to cut essential services. The government has a mandate to enhance them and we will be holding it to account for that.

Mr F.M. Logan: You'll be gone as leader by December.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: You'll be gone as a member by a couple of months! You might be in jail!

Mrs Jessica Stojkovski; Mr David Michael; Dr Mike Nahan; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr Peter Katsambanis; Mr Terry Redman; Mr Tony Krsticevic

This is a government that likes key performance indicators. Its key KPI is 50 000 jobs. The Labor Party's mantra was "50 000 new jobs". That is what it committed to. Targeting jobs was correct and it is the correct KPI, but the government has some trouble here. Its first moves have been anything but creating jobs. We worked with the housing industry—I think it is our largest industry, by the way—which was going through what it called the valley of death. Housing starts had grown to 30 000 after averaging about 15 000 for many years and there was a massive growth in demand and population growth. Everybody in the industry tooled up for this large growth in housing starts but then demand started going down and population growth slowed.

Mr B. Urban: On your watch.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Yes; on our watch it started going down. The concerns were that not only were there high rates of bankruptcy in the various businesses that supplied the housing industry, but also demand would go down in overreaction. These things are cyclical, and the industry was going back to 15 000 to 16 000 housing starts. The industry needed some assistance to support it and avoid what it calls the valley of death—that is, the valley that is part of the cycle but when we go into it, we destroy the industry. Therefore, we worked with the industry to do two things. The first was to re-alter and put back Keystart conditions, which we took away some years before at the peak of the boom, to allow greater eligibility for Keystart. We were able to do that because we sold some of Keystart's books—in other words, we reformed it—and therefore we had the capacity to do that without additional borrowing. That was good reform. The opposition belatedly supported that. Then in January we came out and increased the first home owner grant for new houses from \$10 000 to \$15 000. At the time the opposition said, "Good idea; we support it." We had to do it then because it was a new calendar year; the industry had to tool up to go out and sell the product and encourage the builders and the retailers of housing to put it out into the market and get it going. It was going to take a while; it was basically a one-year program to sustain jobs. It would not only, conservatively, according to Treasury, create about 2 000 new jobs, but also avoid a precipitated drop that would have had people leaving the housing industry, including, I might add, many apprentices. They would have been forced out of the industry at this time of a major structural adjustment of the economy, which I referred to before. The government has cut the first home owner grant. It promised to sustain it, it promised to do it, but it has cut it. This is the government that is committed to jobs. Yes, it costs money—yes, it does. In this crucial time of a structural adjustment of the economy, the government has cut a grant in our largest industry, which employs thousands of people and is probably the largest employer of apprentices. That is the government's choice.

Labor went to the election with a large commitment on infrastructure—fair enough—and we did too, but our commitment was not as big. Labor was going to redirect the money for the Perth Freight Link. That was Labor's commitment—fair enough. However, the government has to realise that if it takes \$1.2 billion from the commonwealth for the Perth Freight Link and invests it into Metronet, jobs will not be created; there will not be any. The dollar cannot be spent twice. Some people try to do that but it does not work very often. The other week Labor, upon being elected, went to the commonwealth, as it promised to do, and said, "Listen, mate, we're going to pull the \$1.2 billion that you allocated to the Perth Freight Link and reinvest it." Initially, the commonwealth said quite clearly that it would not give the government the money if it did that. It said that if the government ripped up the contract, it would not give it the money. In the end, the government said that it would go ahead anyway. It held the commonwealth, the state and the jobs to ransom. The government said that if the commonwealth did not give it the money, it would not do the work and would destroy the jobs, and tough luck. The federal Minister for Finance, Hon Mathias Cormann, and others could not accept that; they gave in. They agreed to give the money to the state to be redirected, and it shared some programs. One of the assets was Roe 8, stage 1. The government also agreed to do a patch-up job on High Street-Carrington Street—I am not sure exactly what it is. About \$100 million in costs was also incurred in ripping up the contract, but that is not my main point. My point is that the budget also did something that is a real challenge for this government. If this government makes jobs its number one priority, the commonwealth said that it can have the \$1.2 billion, the money from the redirection of GST and the overruns, and it can also have an additional \$1.2 billion to build the Perth Freight Link—it can have it all. If this government really wanted to create jobs, it would take the \$1.2 billion.

Mr W.R. Marmion: A new stadium.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: As my colleague said, that is a new stadium, and it is ready to go. This government could create the jobs today. In fact, it could stop destroying the jobs today. This is a significant broken promise, but this government will have to break promises over the next four years on almost a weekly basis, so get used to it. The first point is that the Perth Freight Link debacle, in the sense of Labor's position on it, is a policy formed on the basis of a masquerade of falsehoods. For instance, the biggest claim is that it is a road to nowhere. If that is the case, members for Jandakot and Fremantle, you are from nowhere, because the road goes from Jandakot to Fremantle. It connects Kwinana Freeway to Stirling Highway, so Fremantle is nowhere. The second point is the argument that the inner harbour is almost full. That is ridiculous and members opposite, in particular the member for Bicton, will see the number of trucks tearing through her new electorate growing at a rate of four or five per cent

Mrs Jessica Stojkovski; Mr David Michael; Dr Mike Nahan; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr Peter Katsambanis; Mr Terry Redman; Mr Tony Krsticevic

a year. Leach Highway will soon be defined as O'Malley's alley. It is, again, a facade. My point is that the government has a choice: does it want to create jobs or to cater to Greens preferences? It is the government's choice. I know what it has done, and it abrogates one of its key performance indicators—to create jobs. It has a mandate to create jobs. It has chosen to destroy jobs, not create them.

I will address the commission of inquiry. It is fully legitimate for a new government to come in and look for an independent inquiry into the books—fully legitimate. In fact, it has almost become standard policy. New governments do it to give them a fresh look and to make sure there are no wobblers and to ensure they understand the full implications. They use it as an example to get new views that might be different from Treasury—I am not criticising Treasury, but government needs different perspectives—and also to come up with some suggestion for reform. It is a useful policy and is very good. But to do that the inquiry has to be comprehensive. It has to look at revenue, recurrent expenditure and capital—all of it. The government cannot prescribe or restrict its duration, or limit it to certain projects, such as just capital projects. It cannot look at it just on accountability or transparency. The people doing the job must be given full range. I have no doubt that John Langoulant is a suitable person to undertake that job. He is a former Under Treasurer and a person with whom I have worked many times. I have the greatest respect for him. It was a good appointment. The trouble is that the inquiry falls very short of that objective. The government had a chance and it blew it. Instead of going out and giving the inquiry free range, it restricted it to a very narrow set of issues. It did not allow the inquiry to look at revenue issues. I am not saying taxes, but the inquiry should look at and understand all sorts of issues of revenue. The government excluded that.

The government excluded most of the recurrent expenditure. Western Australia's budget, capital and recurrent, in an average year is about \$35 billion, of which nearly \$30 billion is recurrent. The government excluded most of that and much of the capital program—not the aggregate program and all the forward estimates, but most of the major capital programs are excluded from consideration. I do not know why the government would do that. However, it can lead to only one conclusion. I guess the government will say that the major objective is to look at poor behaviour, lack of transparency, secrecy and whatnot. Some of the terms of reference are puzzling. For instance, the inquiry will include St John of God Midland Public Hospital. The thing that gives it away is that the full title of the inquiry is the "Commission of Inquiry to investigate financial mismanagement". It is pejorative. The government is saying that it is going to look at only mismanagement. The trouble is that if it really wanted to look, it would look more thoroughly. Most of these things are basically projects that the government and the union identified over the last four or five years as something secret and wrong. Let me tell members what the St John of God Midland Public Hospital is. It is a beautiful hospital, built on budget and on time. It saves the state huge amounts of money. By lowering the cost, it gets less payment from the state than would the public hospital and it services a much-needed area.

Ms A. Sanderson: There is no family planning.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: It will look at the whole hospital. Vasectomies and family planning are actually serviced in an adjacent facility. It will look at the whole hospital. It is pejorative—a negative on the whole hospital.

Another point that was raised in question time the other day is that all governments inherit projects from their predecessors. Three of them, like the Synergy billing system and Project Vista, were started, approved and given the tick off by a previous Labor government, when the member for Cockburn was the Minister for Energy. Those projects are included, but do members opposite know what? The Labor government restricted —

Mr F.M. Logan: I shut the thing down and put it up for sale. You are the one that opened it.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: The member for Cockburn's interjection shows how great an energy minister he was! Project Vista was the building. It was Synergy's building.

Mr W.J. Johnston: No, it wasn't.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Yes, it is. It was for the refurbishing of the building, but the building is still there. Do members know what? Synergy is in it. It has not been shut down. The billing system is still there and operating. I receive bills from it.

The government defined the projects narrowly to save it from scrutiny. I will not go on at length about this because we will talk about it later but two of the largest projects in terms of capital spend, which government members spoke of disparagingly for years when in opposition, are the Forrestfield–Airport Link and the Perth Freight Link. Why would the government leave out those? I remember when we proposed the Forrestfield–Airport Link that the former opposition disapproved of the route and it disapproved of it going underground. I remember all those campaigns, with then opposition members saying that going underground would be a disaster. Why would they say that? I do not know how many debates we had in this house about the Perth Freight Link. Obviously during the election campaign, the former opposition wanted to shut it down.

Mrs Jessica Stojkovski; Mr David Michael; Dr Mike Nahan; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr Peter Katsambanis; Mr Terry Redman; Mr Tony Krsticevic

Mr W.J. Johnston: We don't have to investigate it because it's dead.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: It is not dead. That is the point. The government is redeploying people who worked on those projects. I suggest that the reason the government did not include those projects is that it is altering those contracts against tendering principles, without disclosure. It is altering them in a very major way that I trust and expect the Auditor General to have a good look at down the track.

As to the commission of inquiry, the government lost a major opportunity there.

Several members interjected.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Mr Acting Speaker, there is a debate going on between two people. I am trying to give a speech.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr S.J. Price): Members, even though it is not a rule, the convention is that these speeches are heard without interjection. I ask that you adhere to that convention please.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Instead of having a thorough-ranging inquiry, the government took the low political road and put on a witch-hunt. The government appointed a good man to head the commission of inquiry. I trust that, to the best of his abilities, he will overcome the restrictions that are placed on this task and produce a worthwhile report.

I turn to the reform of government services. The government has a mandate and it made it quite clear that it was going to reform the bureaucracy, if you wish—the administrative services and the overheads of government—in a range of areas. I support the government trying to do that. It is an ongoing task. I think it will encounter some challenges—in fact, I know that the Treasurer will—for the simple reason that before the election campaign, we were pushing. Members opposite did not denigrate this. They first started on Troy Buswell and followed up on me for three and a half years. We undertook the most comprehensive reform of the delivery of government services in this state's history. We pulled out \$24.5 billion of costs from the public service, mainly in backroom services and bureaucratic and administrative costs. I was pushing for more but Treasury told us that if we did anymore, we would start affecting frontline services. In fact, I was going to do more during the election period but Treasury was going to put a caveat on our government stating that if we did more—in fact, duplicate what the Labor Party said it would do but of course did not submit to Treasury, saving \$750 million—we would affect frontline services. We went through and reformed the public service. One of the shocks that the Treasurer would have had is that he inherited a set of reforms that he now has to deliver on. They are locked in the budget—\$5 billion worth of reforms. He is sweating over it. That was that release. Welcome to my world! Members opposite will find a very tight public service. We reduced the number of bureaucrats and administrators—I do not say that in a pejorative manner—by 5 000 over the last four years. The public service was capped in June 2012. Importantly, the number of teachers, police and child protection workers—the frontline services—increased significantly.

Mr W.J. Johnston: That is just not true.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: It did, without a doubt. The minister's problem is —

Mr W.J. Johnston interjected.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: I accept that the minister disagrees but—do you know what?—he is in government now and he will find it is the reality. Members opposite went out and made clear accusations to the public and to their political base—they got support on that basis—that we had slashed and undermined frontline services. It was not true. Now members opposite have to live with the consequences of that mirage. We will hold the government to account for it. If members opposite can go through the public sector and the bureaucracy and find additional services with different efficiencies, we will support them. However, my concern is, like the commission of inquiry, that members opposite have taken a political route. In fact, they are operating on the Brian Burke school of thought.

Several members interjected.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: It is true. This is what every Labor government has done since Brian Burke perfected it, including Geoff Gallop. The only difference with Geoff Gallop was he did a thorough review of the public service before he adjusted the number of departments and CEOs or directors general. He went through a well thought out process. I think that process was also run by John Langoulant. Members opposite have sent a couple of political commissars in there with no documentation and no principles. All we have are press releases as to the changes, with amalgamations of government departments. That is all members opposite did. That is what Brian Burke did too. We will watch and talk to people exiting the public service, and the exit of another senior public servant was announced today. The government has changed the number of departments, which is fair enough, but Gallop did this too. Did it lower costs? Did it improve efficiency? It absolutely did not.

Mr W.J. Johnston interjected.

Mrs Jessica Stojkovski; Mr David Michael; Dr Mike Nahan; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr Peter Katsambanis; Mr Terry Redman; Mr Tony Krsticevic

Dr M.D. NAHAN: I thought it was going to but then the reality did not meet the expectations. Members opposite set up a department—DOIR. I do not know what it stood for, but it did not do anything. It included regulations, administration, promotion of business and industrial relations. It was a mess!

Mr W.J. Johnston: It didn't have industrial relations.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Yes, it did. It was a mess. The mantra "Big is better" does not apply to bureaucracies. One of the strange changes that I cannot get my head around is the amalgamation of the Department of Parks and Wildlife, Kings Park Botanic Gardens and Parks Authority, Perth Zoo and Rottnest Island Authority. Is that supposed to drive efficiencies? The Zoo, Rottnest and Kings Park have authorities and legislation, and they are actually pretty well run and efficient. There are no efficiencies here whatsoever. All it means is that those authorities will no longer be able to report directly to the minister. They will have to report through some director general. In fact, the member for West Swan was asked on radio what the benefit of this amalgamation was and she said, "I just have to talk to fewer DGs." She might, but we would not want our ministers to say that. There are no efficiencies here. My concern is—this is what we will monitor—that this is another Labor Party exercise, which it has done repeatedly in government before, to rattle the cage of the senior executive by threatening to fire 20 per cent of them. Why? It is because there are large numbers of them. The government has threatened to fire everyone, freeze their salaries and adjust the departments without any query. My view is that this is nothing more than an exercise in rattling the cage of the public service so it does not give fearless advice; it will give the advice that its masters want it to. The government will weed out people who it thinks do not approve of the Labor Party and it will parachute its own people in there. It will threaten the public service and put the unions back in charge. That might be a paranoid perspective, but it is a perspective based on histories of Labor Parties, and we will be watching the government and holding it accountable for that. There is no documentation, and no known rationale for doing this, and it is being done by people who would not know how to administer anything. We will be watching it. I note that history states that Geoff Gallop did this. The bureaucracy grew under his watch; there was a 22 per cent increase in bureaucracy. It was inefficient, ineffective and, yes, a large number of people were lost, but do members know what? Some of the best people were lost—some of the best ones. The government is going to lose, and already has lost, people—with some of the best people already gone out of this bureaucracy. The government will suffer consequences, because it needs them. A service review to be headed by Mr Rennie from New Zealand was also commissioned. I support that and I wish the government well. I think it is a good idea. We can always look at these services better and I wish the government well on that.

I turn to privatisation. We had a very rigorous debate and the Labor Party won that debate. The Liberal Party's asset recycling program was clearly rejected by the public.

Mr W.J. Johnston: You didn't have an asset recycling program.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: We did.

Mr W.J. Johnston: You were going to pay off debt.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: It was a recycling program. We were going to pay off debt and we were going to recycle assets.

Mr W.J. Johnston interjected.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: That is a position. We lost the debate. As a party, we do not run away from those policies in opposition.

Mr W.J. Johnston: Yes, you do.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: No, we do not. The government does not have a mandate to privatise assets. I know, because I read in the paper the other day that the merchant banks are salivating, according to the article, expecting a massive land and asset sales program under the new government.

Mr W.J. Johnston: Land sales?

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Asset sales. The electricity distribution and transmission assets in the Pilbara were clearly identified.

Mr M. Hughes: Western Power?

Dr M.D. NAHAN: It is Horizon Power. How could the Labor Party sell that after the party and its unions ran a multibillion-dollar campaign against the sale of the transmission and distribution assets? Do members see? The Labor Party is also backing away from the sale of the TAB; that was in today's paper. There was also mention of the multi-user facility, the sale of which the Labor Party spoke long and hard against in this house and the upper house. The government does not have a mandate to sell these assets. If the government does, I fully expect it to do it. We will hold the government to account for that program. I fully expect the government to do it.

I turn to the GST. The reform of the GST is a Liberal Party invention and program. As I said earlier, it was the Liberal Party that took on the project of reform—us—first with the Abbott government and second with the

Mrs Jessica Stojkovski; Mr David Michael; Dr Mike Nahan; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr Peter Katsambanis; Mr Terry Redman; Mr Tony Krsticevic

Turnbull government. They were the first federal governments to admit that there was an issue. At the same time the Shorten opposition said that there was no issue and that there would be no reform—that is what his official policy was. He said there was no policy and there would be no reform. The reality of the GST is that there needs to be bipartisan support in Canberra, because the decisions on GST are made on a year-by-year basis. If one government changes something, the next government can take it away. There needs to be long-term bipartisan commitment on this. In opposition the Labor Party took the line that anything that was bad for the state's finances and bad for the then Liberal government was good for it. The Labor Party repeatedly—often, weekly—said that the GST was not an issue, the GST did not cause a revenue problem and that the GST was as predictable as the sun. The Labor Party said there was no decline in revenue from the GST—that there was no issue. The Labor Party said, “We have a revenue problem, not a GST problem.” It was said over and again by the shadow Treasurer, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, the Leader of the Opposition and all of the Labor opposition. Now, what has changed? Indeed, when I came up with a whole raft of potential changes, including some that the Premier is now espousing, such as capping the percentage of royalties that are distributed, the Labor Party ignored them. One time I made a serious error. We were trying to convince, I think, Joe Hockey to quarantine the moneys paid to us from the North West Shelf from the GST. That would have given us an additional \$800 million to \$1 billion a year. I mentioned it in this house and within 24 hours the Labor Parties in Victoria and New South Wales were speaking about it in their respective Parliaments. I did not tell them and I do not think they read the *Western Australian Hansard*.

Mr W.J. Johnston interjected.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: I do not think they do—someone squealed. The Labor Party took that line. I will commit to working with and supporting the McGowan government in the reform of the GST with one proviso: I expect the Premier to go to Shorten and get him onside. There will be bipartisan support here—I promise it. I am not going to sit here and whinge and whine, because I know it is an issue.

Mr F.M. Logan: Why, do you think he's going to win very soon?

Dr M.D. NAHAN: No. I suspect that the government is putting politics and the Labor Party above WA. I suspect that the state government is trying to get Turnbull —

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Excuse me, Leader of the Opposition, it is a good idea if you face the Chair for at least part of your presentation. It avoids the interjections and means that you are making contact with the person you are meant to be speaking through in the house. Labor members, you should understand that it is really not acceptable to scream across the chamber during an Address-in-Reply. Even though this member has been with us for a long time and knows how to conduct himself, I ask you to just keep your interjections down, please.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker.

Mr S.K. L'Estrange: She should have been the Speaker.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: I will not go there.

To reiterate on the GST: we will be on team WA if the Premier gets Shorten to be on team WA; I promise that. We will support the reforms. The state government will have to negotiate them, and we will assist on that. This is what WA expects and the government has to put WA above party allegiance; we will do that. If the reform is successful, the government will be the beneficiary; it will get the money and it will be in government for four years.

I turn to the issue of meth. It is a scourge. We have a serious problem and that has been known for a while.

Mrs L.M. Harvey: Usage rates are coming down.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Yes. We did a lot; it is on the record. We made record investments in rehabilitation beds, treatment services, enforcement, assistance with drug addiction, and a dedicated meth helpline and training for frontline services to deal with addicts. We did a lot. We focused the police on it; we focused mental health services on it. Meth is a major cause of mental health problems and, by the way, we set up a separate mental health department. We invested money in mental health worth the equivalent of a new stadium every year. That was a major focus of ours. One of WA's top cops, Commander Pryce Scanlan, this month said that there were promising signs that the state's level of meth use is beginning to fall. It is early days now. The government has a mandate to deal with the issue. It is one of the government's key performance indicators and we will hold it to account—not just the government's bureaucrats but the government itself. And, of course, in four years' time the government will be held accountable by the public. We are agents of the public and we will hold the government to account.

Another Labor election commitment was mandatory maximum penalties for drug suppliers. We said that that would not do anything, because there is probably no record of anybody getting over the current maximum penalty

Mrs Jessica Stojkovski; Mr David Michael; Dr Mike Nahan; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr Peter Katsambanis; Mr Terry Redman; Mr Tony Krsticevic

of 25 years—never getting that, let alone above it. So, we recommended that if the Labor Party was really fair dinkum about this, it would introduce minimum sentences. We know that the current Attorney General has spoken many times about this in this house. He is against mandatory minimum sentences on this issue and everything else. The truth is that during the election the Labor Party committed to minimum and maximum penalties for meth supplies—it did; it matched our commitments—but this week the Labor government walked away from that. If the government were serious about meth, it would do something about it. I ask the government to please rethink that. It is a scourge and we have to watch it.

Amendment to Motion

Dr M.D. NAHAN: I move —

That the following words be added to the motion —

but regrets to inform Her Excellency that the government is following in the footsteps of the former scandal-prone Burke and Gallop–Carpenter governments—namely, failing basic accountability and transparency, and embarking on a course of politicising the public service

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Scarborough.

MRS L.M. HARVEY (Scarborough — Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [11.10 am]: Thank you, Deputy Speaker.

Point of Order

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: I understand that the Leader of the Opposition intended to move an amendment, but I do not think he has actually done so.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Did you not just move that amendment then?

Dr M.D. NAHAN: I will read it again!

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is in debate now.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: But the member sat down and then you gave the call to the member for Scarborough and he had not provided any documentation. He cannot now, subsequent to his sitting down, move his amendment.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Members, please. Everybody relax. My advice is that the member has moved the motion for debate and I then said that the question was that the amendment be agreed to. The member for Scarborough got to her feet and I gave her the call because we are now in a debate on whether the amendment is to be agreed to. Are you saying that that ruling is incorrect, member?

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: It is for you to make a ruling. All I am drawing your attention to is that my understanding of the standing orders is that they require amendments to motions to be in writing. I understand that the Leader of the Opposition spoke about what he wanted to deliver, but did not provide to you a copy. The member for Scarborough then got the call, so I am not aware of the Leader of the Opposition's compliance.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Yes, got it, thank you. I think I understand. I think you will find that this is the amendment, so I think we are on track with the correct standing orders for this house. I draw your attention to the amendment, which we now have in writing, for your interest, and ask that the amendment be agreed to. Member for Scarborough.

Debate Resumed

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: It is my pleasure to rise and speak to this amendment. First of all, I congratulate you, Madam Deputy Speaker, on your appointment as Deputy Speaker. I think you will perform admirably in that role.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I would like also to congratulate the Premier, in his absence from the chamber, on his election to government, and all other members who have been elected as a result of the outcome of 11 March.

I would like to put on the record that in my eight years in this Parliament I have never seen an Address-in-Reply speech by a Leader of the Opposition being delivered to a vacant front bench. I think that is testament to the Premier's character. Yes, he has had a tremendous win; yes, he won in a landslide; but for the Premier to not even have the strength of character or the courtesy to come into this chamber and sit and listen to the Leader of the Opposition deliver his Address-in-Reply speech is incredibly poor form.

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Excuse me, member for Cockburn, I am on my feet. Member, I draw your attention to the amendment, which is what we are debating. I need to call a relevance issue on you.

Mr F.M. Logan interjected.

Mrs Jessica Stojkovski; Mr David Michael; Dr Mike Nahan; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr Peter Katsambanis; Mr Terry Redman; Mr Tony Krsticevic

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Cockburn!

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I would like to start with the opposition's recent frustration in trying to get a direct response from the Premier with regard to ministerial motor vehicle allowances and ministers' double dipping. I want to use this opportunity to outline what this issue is actually about, because it is difficult to articulate these things during question time. On 1 December 2016, the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal handed down a determination with regard to ministerial allowances.

Several members interjected.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I have 20 minutes. I am not interested in your interjections. I have 20 minutes, and I will use it to speak.

Mr M. McGowan: I was at Australia's Biggest Morning Tea for cancer sufferers, just so you know.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Premier, I do not hear that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition wishes to take your interjection. Thank you for sharing that, though.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Welcome back to the chamber.

Mr M. McGowan: I notice you weren't there.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I was here, supporting the Leader of the Opposition, Premier. Oh, there he goes, walking out, having a hissy fit.

With respect to ministers' double dipping on their motor vehicle allowance, I want to outline a time line. The SAT made a determination on 1 September last year on allowances for members of Parliament. That determination, which was publicised, was around travel allowances and motor vehicle allowances, and was to come into effect for all members from 12 March 2017—the date following the election on 11 March. On 23 December 2016 it was published in the *Government Gazette*. On 19 January 2017, an article by Gareth Parker appeared in *The West Australian* about the travel allowance entitlement as part of that determination and, indeed, the determination came into effect on 12 March. The Premier, in response to questions in the other place, said that he became aware of this issue as part of his incoming government briefings. He did nothing about this and was silent on the action he had taken until he was contacted by Joe Spagnolo of *The Sunday Times* for comment on an article that was going to be published on 14 May—several months later. On 12 May, when the Premier realised that he and his grubby, greedy ministers had been caught, he wrote to the SAT and said, "I think you need to reconsider this determination, because my ministers are receiving a car allowance worth \$25 000 a year and a fully taxpayer-funded motor vehicle from the government fleet, with a driver, and with all expenses covered, including fuel."

The Premier has failed to table in this place or the other place the names of the ministers who have received the allowance and the motor vehicle. He has refused to say which one of those ministers actually came to him when they got their first payslip. At the end of March, or whenever it was, they would have received a payslip. Which one of them looked at that and said, "Oh, hang on a minute—I'm getting a travel allowance here, but I have my chauffeur waiting out the front to take me to work." Which one of the ministers did that? We do not know, because the Premier refuses to answer. Instead, when the Premier got caught out, he blamed it on the SAT. He said, "Oh, that's the SAT's fault. The SAT made a mistake." Well, it probably did, but what did he do about it?

Ms M.M. Quirk interjected.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Member for Girrawheen, what did he do about it? He did nothing. If he had done something about it, he would have answered the question. Why does the member for Girrawheen not be quiet and let me speak.

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Girrawheen, I have let you yell for some time now. It is not appropriate to yell across the chamber while a member is on their feet. If they want to take the interjection, you ask them, and they may take the interjection. Also, Deputy Leader of the Opposition, I do not think it helps to engage with members on the other side when this behaviour starts.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: We do not know, because the Premier has refused to tell us, when he had those briefings from the Department of the Premier and Cabinet after coming into office as Premier, and learnt about the fact that ministers were receiving a travel allowance and a taxpayer-funded vehicle. He still has not said whether he directed his ministers to contact the Department of the Premier and Cabinet and say, "Stop that motor vehicle allowance, because I've got a fully taxpayer-funded car." We do not know if he did that, because he has not told us. We do not know if some of those ministers were using their own vehicles, or if they were double dipping —

Ms M.M. Quirk interjected.

Mrs Jessica Stojkovski; Mr David Michael; Dr Mike Nahan; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr Peter Katsambanis; Mr Terry Redman; Mr Tony Krsticevic

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

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: We do not know whether any of those ministers contacted the Department of the Premier and Cabinet to say, “Hey, I’m an ethical person. This doesn’t seem right. I shouldn’t get a motor vehicle allowance and a fully taxpayer-funded motor vehicle with a chauffeur and everything covered.” What we do not know is whether these ministers will pay back that allowance. If they are getting the motor vehicle and the motor vehicle allowance, will they pay it back? The Premier is refusing to answer these questions. We have given him two chances but he has refused to answer them. We do not know whether the Premier has directed these ministers to stop the entitlement or pay back the money. He is not applying his gold-plated transparency standards to his ministers. The first job he created as Premier was a job for a new minister—a cabinet secretary to be paid a ministerial salary and receive a motor vehicle allowance and a fully funded taxpayer-funded vehicle. It is important that this issue be defined. Yes, the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal has made a mistake; we all agree with that. But why on earth did the Premier wait to do anything about it from when those departmental briefings alerted him to the issue on 12 May when he was caught out by Joe Spagnolo? Why did he not direct the Department of the Premier and Cabinet to tell the SAT to sort out this problem? Meanwhile, the issue is unresolved and those ministers are pocketing nearly \$4 000 a month while a chauffeur goes to their door and takes them to work, fully funded by the taxpayer. It is appalling and the Premier needed to take action earlier.

Several members interjected.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Do the maths? It is \$25 000 a year. Divided by 12, it is about \$2 500 a month.

Mr D.A. Templeman: You just said \$4 000 a month. Do the maths!

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think Hansard is having a little bit of difficulty hearing over the multiple voices yelling across the chamber.

Ms M.M. Quirk interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Girrawheen, if you want to be called again, before we even get to question time, you are heading the right way. That is enough. I would like the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to regain her feet and continue this debate, please.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. I get over \$4 000 a month because ministers are getting a motor vehicle allowance and a vehicle. It is double dipping; it is double the value. That is the problem, member for Cannington. Are you getting the motor vehicle allowance and a fully funded taxpayer-funded car?

Mr W.J. Johnston: I have had no payment from the Department of the Premier and Cabinet. I do not get any payments from the Department of the Premier and Cabinet.

Mr D.C. Nalder: He’s being tricky.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Tricky and sneaky.

Let us get on to the proposed commission of inquiry. I have a lot of time for John Langoulant; I think he is a very good choice and has the right kind of brain. I worked with him very closely on TAFE reform, which was largely lampooned by members opposite. I will be interested to see whether they unwind those TAFE reform initiatives that John Langoulant recommended, but we will wait and see in that space. We on this side are really curious because when we look at all the projects and contracts that our Liberal–National government entered into it is glaringly obvious that two of the largest transport projects are missing from the Langoulant inquiry’s terms of reference. Why would that be, members? The Forrestfield–Airport Link will cost \$1.86 billion, but it is not part of the commission of inquiry. The Perth Freight Link project was costed at \$1.6 billion, but it is not part of the commission of inquiry. Why do members think that is? I have a bit of an idea. We know that when we put the Forrestfield–Airport Link project together, the tenders came in somewhat under what Main Roads WA and Treasury thought was accurate, so we built a contingency into the pricing of the Forrestfield–Airport Link. In addition to that, labour costs have come down and the boring costs came in somewhat cheaper than anticipated, so there could be as much as \$500 million sitting as a contingency fund in the Forrestfield–Airport Link project. It is interesting that the Premier does not want that revealed to the community. It is interesting that that project has been omitted from the commission of inquiry. What do members think will happen to that \$500 million? I believe that that money will be used to put in place other projects that are required to make the Ellenbrook railway line stack up and look better when the business case is put to Infrastructure Australia. For the Ellenbrook railway line to exist and to share the Midland line with the Forrestfield line as well as the existing railway service, Bayswater train station needs to be duplicated so that there is a separate platform for the Ellenbrook line to use, because Forrestfield, Midland and Ellenbrook cannot share the same platform. That is a significant cost that should be part of the Ellenbrook railway project. I have heard, however, that the Bayswater platform duplication is being sneakily

Mrs Jessica Stojkovski; Mr David Michael; Dr Mike Nahan; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr Peter Katsambanis; Mr Terry Redman; Mr Tony Krsticevic

included as part of the Forrestfield–Airport Link project, using the contingency fund that the Liberal government put in place in the event that the tender for the FAL was slightly undercooked.

A member interjected.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Bayswater station.

The second thing that needs to happen for the Ellenbrook railway line to stack up is a signalisation upgrade of the entire Midland line. Unless the signalisation project is complete, three railway lines using one track will create a significant safety issue. Millions of dollars' worth of investment are needed for the signalisation project, which should be included in the Ellenbrook railway line business case because it is not required for Forrestfield and Midland to share the line; it is only required if the Ellenbrook rail line goes onto that line. I put to members that that signalisation upgrade will be funded from the \$500 million worth of savings from the Forrestfield–Airport Link, which our government managed effectively as a project prior to 11 March. The third thing that needs to happen for the Ellenbrook railway line to work is an upgrade of Perth train station. The Perth central train station will not have enough capacity to take another railway service. Three significant projects are needed—duplication of Bayswater station, a synchronisation upgrade of the entire Midland line and an upgrade of Perth central train station. They should all form part of the Ellenbrook railway business case, but they will not, members, because if that happens, the Ellenbrook railway line will not be funded by Infrastructure Australia. When we put that entire project together, plus the 75 per cent or so subsidisation from the consolidated account for the running costs, the project does not stack up. That is why when we were in government we backed away from it. It does not make sense to undertake that project in the context of the upgrades required, which will cost around the \$500 million proposed saving from the Forrestfield–Airport Link. That is why the Premier does not want John Langouant to look at the \$1.86 billion Forrestfield–Airport Link with a benefit–cost ratio of 1.5. When he looks at that project, he will say, appropriately, that those three expensive projects should go into the Ellenbrook case.

The second project is the \$1.6 billion Perth Freight Link with a BCR of 2.8. Why is the tendering process that the previous government undertook for the Perth Freight Link not included? With all the rhetoric about the Perth Freight Link and which project was more expensive, where the government should have started and what was the better way to do it, why not kick that into the John Langouant commission of inquiry? There has been criticism of the way the project was tendered and where the previous government started it. Why not get John Langouant, with his fine brain, to look at that project and determine whether those processes were accurate? I will tell members why. In its act of planning vandalism, the current Labor government has cancelled that project at significant cost to Western Australians. The result of the Perth Freight Link not going ahead will be a cost due not only to the cancellation of the project, but also carbon emissions, transport inefficiency and congestion, as well as the road safety cost of every single person who dies on Leach Highway at the unsafe intersections. It is the cost of the Fremantle container port not being able to work to full capacity because the freight cannot get there. That is the cost of cancelling the Perth Freight Link and that is why the Premier and the Minister for Transport, who is not in the house either—that is right; she is away today and is paired—do not want that project examined by John Langouant. John Langouant will look at that project and say that some of that money has been diverted to other projects, but some of the projects that it has been diverted to are consistent in that they feed into the area that Roe 8 and the Perth Freight Link would have served. How on earth can the government use the Gateway WA project as a precedent for transferring an underspend from one project to another when it is taking the funding for the Perth Freight Link down Jandakot way and plugging it up in Wanneroo for an upgrade of Joondalup Drive and Flynn Drive? The Gateway project precedent was clear. Because of the fantastic management of the Gateway project by our government, we had a \$50 million underspend, and that \$50 million underspend went to the Berkshire Road project, which Main Roads had already done the work on. It said, “We have saved \$50 million. Berkshire Road feeds into the Gateway project. Let us do Berkshire Road with the underspend from the Gateway project.” It made sense because it is in the same network. Wanneroo Road, Joondalup Drive and Flynn Drive have nothing to do with the Perth Freight Link. It is nothing like a precedent.

The reason the Perth Freight Link is not part of the Langouant inquiry is that the economic vandalism of the cancellation of that project will be uncovered. What will be uncovered is the lack of transparency and the shoddy tender processes in moving the money from the Perth Freight Link project across to other projects that have not gone out to a competitive tender process. All those businesses that were on the Perth Freight Link project that wanted to bid for these other projects have been excluded. That is why the Premier does not want John Langouant to look at that project. Other businesses that did not get the Perth Freight Link work wanted the work on the other transport projects, but they cannot get it because this government has had to put those workers who lost their jobs into other placements, so the tendering processes were abandoned; they were jettisoned. We do not know whether we are getting value for money. We do not know whether those other projects have had a competitive tendering test of value for money for taxpayers because the Premier and the Minister for Transport are hiding it. They are

Mrs Jessica Stojkovski; Mr David Michael; Dr Mike Nahan; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr Peter Katsambanis; Mr Terry Redman; Mr Tony Krsticevic

hiding it from the Langouant commission of inquiry because they do not want the taxpayers to know what their ridiculous economic vandalism will cost them into the future.

That is what we have. Gold-plated transparency? I think not. We have a murky process and a Premier who hides and will not even say which one of his ministers is receiving a motor vehicle allowance and a taxpayer-funded car. He will not let two of the biggest transport projects be examined by the Langouant inquiry because he knows he will get caught working from the Brian Burke handbook as Brian Burke's apprentice. He is using what he did when he was Brian Burke's apprentice to shift these tendering processes around. Members of the opposition will keep the heat on this Premier. We will make sure that the Perth Freight Link and the Forrestfield–Airport Link project get the scrutiny they deserve.

MR D.C. NALDER (Bateman) [11.33 am]: I also would like to acknowledge the win of the Labor Party at the recent election and reinforce that it was certainly a humbling experience for those on this side. We acknowledge that we are now in opposition and that members opposite form the government in the fortieth Parliament of Western Australia. Our responsibility is to hold them to account. On that point, I would like to discuss and raise the platform on which this government has come to Parliament.

There have been many comments over the last 12 months about transparency, openness and accountability. We have also seen a government that claimed to understand the finances, would pay down debt like a mortgage, was committed to \$5 billion in election promises and promised no new taxes. This is about due process and ensuring that the government follows due process in carrying out its duties as the government of Western Australia. I stand here today in fear that we are starting to see cracks in the facade of the new government that strike at the heart of the integrity of this government, and I would like to raise a few points along those lines.

When we talk about a commission of inquiry, we know it needs to be broad ranging, it needs to be open, honest and transparent, and it needs to hold everyone in this Parliament to full account. We cannot have a commission of inquiry that looks only at parts and pieces of what has transpired in the past or what is likely to transpire in the future, because if we are going to explore what has occurred in the past, it is there to assist and guide the direction of future Parliaments of Western Australia.

I reinforce the comments made by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. The arguments that were put in this chamber about the Perth Freight Link project over the past two to three years have been excessive and I find it somewhat surprising that that has been left out of the commission of inquiry. I feel sad at the closure of that project, but acknowledge that the Labor Party has won and it said that it would close it down. The reason I feel sad is that I feel a lot of the community has been misled over the benefits of that project for Western Australia. I fear that, even environmentally, we will be worse off for that project not proceeding. Forty thousand tonnes of carbon emissions would have been saved a year. Conditions and limitations were put on the project by the Environmental Protection Authority. For the amount of bush that would have been removed, six times that amount of bush would have been preserved in a national park forever. I could go on forever about the freight link.

One of the things that really surprised me during the election—the Leader of the Opposition raised this—was that it was long said that this was a road to nowhere. I cannot believe that the member for Fremantle and other members would stand in this house and say that a freeway to Fremantle is a road to nowhere. As a Fremantle boy, I would have thought that establishing a freeway connection from Fremantle, which I consider to be the second most important city in this state, to universities, hospitals, other freeways, the airport and the foothills was an opportunity to establish Fremantle as a growing city centre for Western Australia.

On the commission of inquiry, I believe that the government is going down a slippery slope if it believes it can shift the funds from the Perth Freight Link to projects at the other end of the city and try to use Berkshire Road as a precedent for doing it without a tender process. We have seen the member for Cockburn threaten and bully contractors over complaining about the government reneging on a contract that existed. Now the government has turned around and offered alternative projects to that contractor. Industry is concerned that if it speaks up about the fairness of it, it will be left out of future projects in Western Australia. I think that is a disgrace. It strikes at the transparency, openness and accountability of the government. I reinforce that they were threatened, and it is visible.

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Excuse me, member for Cannington. Member for Carine, you have someone from your side on their feet trying to have a debate. There is no room for an exchange behind him, so please just keep it quiet.

Mr D.C. NALDER: I do not believe that the extension of the Gateway WA project to include the Berkshire Road intersection provides a precedent for the establishment of new contracts for projects that are some distance away from the Perth Freight Link without the due process of a tender situation that allows for all partners and ensures that Western Australia gets the best price for any given project. We are opening up a slippery slope if we do not follow those due processes.

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Thursday, 18 May 2017]

p272c-306a

Mrs Jessica Stojkovski; Mr David Michael; Dr Mike Nahan; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr Peter Katsambanis; Mr Terry Redman; Mr Tony Krsticevic

I would also like to reinforce what the Deputy Leader of the Opposition said when she referred to the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal ruling. The SAT ruling has created an anomaly in this situation; we would all acknowledge that. However, to be honest, I cannot see anywhere in the SAT ruling how this anomaly would have shown up. It is not until we see the process whereby additional payments were made to ministers—because that is what we have been advised has occurred—that we become aware of this situation. I assure members that as a backbencher I received a car allowance but the moment I became a minister, I took the pool-car option and the car allowance stopped. To learn that the car allowance continues to be paid while a member uses the pool car is not something we expect should occur. I find it interesting that the Premier should stand up and threaten to bring in legislation that will stop the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal giving pay rises to members of Parliament, yet he writes a letter to the SAT asking it to reconsider the situation whereby ministers are double dipping on a car allowance. Why is he not insisting on that? Is he going to insist that they pay back that money? These are things we have not heard from the Premier. I think that every member in this house would acknowledge that it is wrong to receive the car allowance and have access to the pool car. I do not believe it should be happening, and we have not seen the leadership from the Premier on this issue that we expected to see. I acknowledge that it is an anomaly, but it is not the anomaly of the SAT ruling that I am really concerned about. I am concerned about when the Premier found out about it, when he acted upon it and what he is going to do to ensure that that money is paid back. That is transparency, openness and accountability. That is what he has espoused for a long time in this house and what the former Labor opposition stood for, but we are starting to see gaps and cracks in the facade of the government. I fear that this is only the start and that we are seeing only the thin edge of the wedge.

At this point I would also like to talk about the new wave energy farm in Albany. I do not believe that we have had open and transparent responses to the questions put in this house. It was news to me that there are common-use agreements for people to establish power generation in WA. During the campaign we saw a commitment for a \$19.5 million wave farm in Albany. We saw the Carnegie Clean Energy ASX announcement welcoming the opportunity to deliver that wave farm in Albany. I have a couple of concerns about transparency, openness and accountability around Carnegie and the wave farm. I am led to understand that Hon Alannah MacTiernan was a former director of Energy Made Clean before it was purchased by Carnegie. I note that in the photo in Carnegie's ASX announcement Hon Alannah MacTiernan was named as an MLC when she was not even in Parliament at that point. I never heard the Labor Party mention at any time when it announced that Carnegie would be building a wave farm in Albany that Hon Alannah MacTiernan is a former director of that company. Again, I have some concerns around the transparency, openness and accountability that the Labor government espouses and holds itself to. That is why we will continue to push this government to ensure that it is consistent with what it proposes.

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Cannington, I call you for the first time. Please do not have interchange behind the speaker on his feet. Thank you.

Mr D.C. NALDER: I would like to also reinforce another point made by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition regarding the Forrestfield–Airport Link project. I, as the former transport minister, am intimately aware of the contracts and negotiations for that project. I can confirm that after the cost of the contract, contingencies and project management expenses, there is in excess of \$500 million sitting in the budget. I will not go into the details of the contract costs to the specific dollar here because I do not think it is appropriate, but I can tell members that the total cost is in the vicinity of \$1.35 billion, including contracts, project management costs and contingencies. There is currently a budget of \$1.86 billion and enough funds available, pretty much, to do the Cockburn–Thornlie line. The government has been quick to try to point out the gaps or issues in the financials, but it is not willing to point out the excess credit we left in the finances. We are seeing only one side of the ledger. There is a hollow log of over half a billion dollars sitting in the transport budget. My point is that in the approach of being open, honest and transparent, it is important that both sides of the ledger are specified. The government cannot claim the negatives of one and leave out the positives on the other side. That is what we are seeing here and that is what we are sharing with people. If the government wants to do this commission of inquiry, it should make sure that all these projects are put in and it is looked into fully because it will find that there was a raft of projects and initiatives undertaken by the former Liberal–National government that were delivered and managed exceptionally well. The Gateway WA project came in under budget and ahead of schedule. We have seen it over and over. In the last few days I have witnessed the Minister for Transport—and, in her absence, others—talk about how the government is now finally doing something for the northern suburbs when she is talking about only a couple of intersections. I think she fails to remember that the former Liberal–National government dualled Gnangara Road; commenced the \$1.1 billion NorthLink WA project, which is a freeway through to Ellenbrook; built the Malaga interchange, which was number five on the list of black spot intersections in Western Australia; dualled Reid Highway across Mitchell Freeway; and completed the extension of Mitchell Freeway through to Hester Avenue. They are just a few of the things that the former government completed, and that was just the roads.

The Labor government also states that the former Liberal–National government did not do anything about public transport. Transparency, openness and accountability are about being honest. It would be nice for the government to acknowledge that the former Liberal–National government spent \$470 million on expanding and renewing the bus fleet by 30 per cent. New members in this house who represent the eastern suburbs might like to remember that the former Labor government decided to transfer to gas-operated buses against the advice of the Public Transport Authority. When we changed to gas-operated buses, we found that they could not be used in the eastern suburbs because there was not enough pressure to refuel those buses out there; hence, the PTA was left with 25 to 30-year-old Renault buses operating in the eastern suburbs. As part of the upgrade, the former Liberal–National government went back to diesel-powered buses and upgraded the fleet so that people in the eastern suburbs could have new public transport buses to travel on. That was \$470 million. It cost \$250 million to increase the rail fleet by 30 per cent. A lot of these things seem to be forgotten because everyone is focused on a physical rail line going somewhere. But we built rail lines as well. The former government spent \$220 million on a new station and rail line through to Butler. It built the Aubin Grove station. It was fascinating to see the Labor Party claim that as its project. We saw that there was a lack of car parking at train stations. The former government ensured that trains would operate more efficiently and effectively, and it delivered over 5 000 car parking bays during its term of government. These are just some examples. We commenced the Forresterfield–Airport Link, a \$1.35 billion airport rail link to Forresterfield. Again, it would be fantastic if this government, in the name of transparency, openness and accountability, acknowledged both sides of the equation. If the government wants a commission of inquiry, it should take everything into account and put it all in there so we can have a good look at what went on and what is going on. However, the government needs to include what it is doing. If the government thinks it is going to shift \$1.2 billion to new projects without going through a tender process, the opposition will continue to push to see whether it is getting the right deal for Western Australia and it is in the best interests of Western Australia or whether these are shady deals that the government is undertaking. To go down a path of establishing contracts without due process is a slippery slope. Openness, accountability and transparency are about due process. We need to see due process on all contracts that will be undertaken for the best interests of Western Australia.

MR S.K. L'ESTRANGE (Churchlands) [11.51 am]: In question time I congratulated the Premier, the cabinet ministers opposite and the new members of this place. I rise today to speak on this amendment. I am, like many Western Australians, starting to get a little concerned about where the government is headed. The government has been in power for just over two months. We are now into what for many of us here will probably be a long four years. However, a lot can happen in four years. I remind members opposite that the average tenure for Labor Premiers over the last four or five Labor Premiers has been about three years. They have a career lifespan of about three years on average. It is worth remembering that because there are some very ambitious people on the government benches—very ambitious people. The member for Morley is a very ambitious woman who is backed by the powerful United Voice union. She has strong support in this place from United Voice members.

Just over a year ago, there was an attempted coup on the leader who is now the Premier. There was an attempted coup. Those fractured lines are starting to appear within the benches opposite. This was evidenced very much when the first cabinet list went out and we noticed that the hard-working member for Cannington, who is a strong advocate for energy, mines and petroleum, did not get those portfolios. He was left off the list of those portfolios. A week later—lo and behold—he got mines and petroleum back. How did that happen?

Mr W.J. Johnston: Because I'd achieved everything that was needed to be achieved.

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: There you go. The member certainly achieved what he needed to. The member for Cannington managed to convince his Premier in under a week that he had made a mistake—he lacked judgement and had made a mistake, so he brought the member back on to the mines portfolio. Clearly, not all is well in Camelot!

One of the things that the member for West Swan said the other day when interjecting on members on this side of the chamber was, “In opposition, do your own research.” I took that on board and wrote it down. It was a very good point. Labor spent eight and a half years in opposition so it got pretty good at research. Here is a bit of advice from the former government: the difference between opposition and government is that the opposition has to do its own research, but the government must be accountable to the people of Western Australia and to this place. It must be accountable to the Parliament of Western Australia because it is in this place that the people have bestowed their trust in their members of Parliament to hold the government to account. I remind the government of that.

In just over two months, the government has already reneged on election promises. It has embarked on a path that is not open and transparent, as we are starting to discover and that we have heard from other members already. It already shows signs of taking the electorate of Western Australia for granted. Two obvious early examples are new taxes and the \$11 billion Loan Bill. I will get to those in a minute.

Mrs Jessica Stojkovski; Mr David Michael; Dr Mike Nahan; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr Peter Katsambanis; Mr Terry Redman; Mr Tony Krsticevic

Some further early examples include less than satisfactory ministerial conduct, a wages policy backflip, the way the Perth Modern School community is being treated over the school's future and the scrapping of the first home owner \$5 000 boost. That is just to name a few.

Let us look at the leadership efforts on the economy since the Labor government took power. I alert members to some comments made by the Premier very early in the piece, in which he said that the government was taking on the worst set of finances since the Great Depression. He said —

In Opposition as we were until a couple weeks ago, you never quite understand the magnitude of what will confront you in government. Now that we're there, you see the full horror on display before you.

That talking down of the Western Australian economy, whacking consumer and investor confidence, and discouraging overseas and domestic investment is no way to lead a state. It is clearly an attempt to shape the thinking of the Western Australian electorate to soften them up for two big cons. The first is the government's approach to dealing with state debt. That is the first big con. I remind members that before the election there was an article on PerthNow titled "Ben Wyatt details Labor's plan to iron out WA debt if elected". The article reads —

Under pressure to explain how Labor—which opposes the sale of Western Power—intends clawing back the \$30billion debt, Treasury spokesman Ben Wyatt announced today that a Labor government would establish a new "debt reduction account".

Iron ore royalties would go into that account to pay debt, rather than into consolidated revenue.

Here is the real kicker —

But the account would sit bare until "WA's GST relativity returns to above 65c in the dollar and the iron ore price is more than \$85 a tonne".

Today the iron ore price is \$US62 a tonne and the GST is far from 65c in the dollar. That begs the question that it went to the election with no debt reduction strategy or plan.

Let us juxtapose that with the post-election situation. The Labor government, under the new Treasurer, Ben Wyatt, says that it needs \$11 billion to cover the deficit from the previous government. Where was the openness and transparency with the people in the electorates of Western Australia, other than to say that it was going to write it down, just like paying off a house mortgage, when all along Labor had nothing more than a plan to simply introduce a massive loan bill in the first two months of government and hoodwink the people into thinking that this was its way of managing the economy? Its intention was just to get more money in and it did not have any plan to pay down debt. That is the government's first big con.

The second big con was on taxes. I will read some comments made in an ABC news article titled "WA election: Labor pledges no new taxes". This is a quote from Premier Mark McGowan back in February 2017. It was not long ago; it was this year. He stated —

"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 West Australians. If we're elected, full stop," he said.

He repeated it twice. He does that a bit. He repeated it twice and it has been reported in the media. That is what he took to the election. What do we see on the front page of today's paper? The headline reads —

EXCLUSIVE \$270 PROPERTY LEVY

The article states —

"All options are being considered as part of the budget repair process," a spokesman for Treasurer Ben Wyatt said.

Does this government really think that the people of Western Australia are that stupid that it can say there will be no new taxes—full stop—and then within two months it is already looking to bring in new taxes? That is just one of the things that this government has done. Let us look at the other things that this government has done and consider what the Minister for Transport said in this place during question time. She talked about a value capture tax as a key part of her Metronet program. That is another tax. The notion that this government can con the people of Western Australia into thinking that it has a debt reduction strategy and that it will not increase taxes when it has no debt reduction strategy and is going to increase taxes is the first big step on this government's slippery slope back into opposition. The government should heed my warning because the people of Western Australia will be awake to what it is doing.

Other things are linked to this aspect of trust. In December 2016, the now Premier McGowan said that he would adopt a policy of inflation-only pay rises for the public sector. He basically agreed with the government of the day when he said that he would go to the election with inflation-only pay rises. Within two months of coming into

Mrs Jessica Stojkovski; Mr David Michael; Dr Mike Nahan; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr Peter Katsambanis; Mr Terry Redman; Mr Tony Krsticevic

power, he said that there will be a wages freeze for four years and that some public servants will get a flat \$1 000 a year regardless of the consumer price index. How can the people of Western Australia or the public sector find that trustworthy? How is that an aspect of trust? We know that clearly it is not. It is of concern to all of us because he also said that he is going to usurp the authority of an independent Salaries and Allowances Tribunal. He is basically saying that he is going to shelve an independent umpire and give power to the Parliament where he has the numbers to run his wages policy. That is remarkable. I know that members opposite would not be too keen on it because a number of unions are very concerned about this.

The Liberal government went to the election and just after Christmas we announced a \$5 000 boost to the first home owner grant. It was a much-needed boost to support businesses, particularly small businesses, in the housing construction sector. The opposition did not oppose it at the time.

Mrs L.M. Harvey interjected.

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: In fact, the member is right; the Housing Industry Association said that it supported it. Two months in and this government has cut it short by six months—scrapped it. How does the government think that makes the industry feel when it sees things like that going on? I can tell members that the industry is starting to scratch its head and think, “What have we done?” Those people who elected the new government are starting to think, “What have we done?” One of the benefits of having that \$5 000 boost was that it would create jobs in that sector. Scrapping that grant by six months means that 325 new first home buyers are no longer there, and that means that 1 000 new construction jobs have also been scrapped. The government has done that with that one decision. In the greater scheme of budget repair, this was something to promote economic growth. It really was quite mean and nasty to do that to the people of Western Australia when they are trying to have a go. This government should rethink what it has done in that space.

The new government needs to focus on promoting economic development, encouraging investment and supporting industries, in particular small business. It needs to build networks with key stakeholders that can support Western Australia, and it must work collaboratively with the commonwealth while advancing Western Australia's interests. In one of my shadow portfolios, no better example exists than in the government's approach to the defence industry in Western Australia. Although I congratulate Premier McGowan and the government on appointing a minister to this role, I caution against the approach being taken by the minister to date because there is some degree of concern in this area. The Minister for Defence Issues needs to understand that he is no longer in opposition. He is new to being a minister of the Crown—we will give him that—but as a minister of the Crown he is accountable to the people of Western Australia to work hard to promote the sector. He must also make sure that he supports local industries in that sector to bid for contracts. It is about shaping the conditions for success, not standing back and disengaging with key stakeholders and whingeing and whining about what Western Australia is or is not getting.

On this whole notion of accountability, I will bring to the attention of members a pretty unambiguous question that I asked in the chamber yesterday, which states —

Was the state Minister for Defence Issues or his office yesterday offered a briefing by the office of the commonwealth Minister for Defence Industry on the naval shipbuilding plan?

The minister's answer was —

I can say that I was not offered a briefing by the minister's office.

I am a bit concerned about that answer because I have come across an automatically generated reply from the minister's office that states —

This is an automatic message acknowledging that your correspondence —

This was correspondence from the commonwealth to the minister's office, inviting him to a briefing that the minister said he was never offered an invitation to —

Mr W.J. Johnston: What is the date and time?

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: The reply is dated 16 May 2017. It was yesterday morning before question time. It continues —

to the Hon Paul Papalia CSC MLA, Minister for Tourism; Racing and Gaming; Small Business; Defence Issues; Citizenship and Multicultural Interests, has been received.

Please be assured that your correspondence will be actioned as appropriate.

Thank you for taking the time to contact our office.

Mrs Jessica Stojkovski; Mr David Michael; Dr Mike Nahan; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr Peter Katsambanis; Mr Terry Redman; Mr Tony Krsticevic

Mr W.J. Johnston interjected.

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: Hang on a second, member. I have also been told that two phone calls were made to the office of the minister to try to confirm that he understood what was being offered. Can I also say that the email sent to the minister's office, which was time stamped 5.42 am Eastern Standard Time, also went to all the other state and territory ministers at the same time. It was not as though Western Australia was being put at the end of the queue. All the ministers got the same offer at the same time—out it went. The email sent from the Office of the Minister for Defence Industry is headed "Subject: Naval Shipbuilding Plan Briefing" and states —

Hello

Today the Turnbull Government will release its Naval Shipbuilding Plan.

Minister Pyne would like to offer your office an opportunity to be briefed by the Department of Defence about the plan.

The Minister's Office is co-ordinating briefings to be conducted over the phone today.

If you would like a briefing please contact ...

It goes on. The offer was made, so for a minister of the Crown to categorically say, after a huge spray of all sorts of information, that his office did not receive that offer is straight-out incorrect. I encourage the minister to make sure that he and his office focus a little more on accuracy in the future.

It is an opportune time to also highlight the fact that the naval shipbuilding and defence industry's sector is a huge sector in which there will be tens of billions of dollars of contracts. These are not grants; these are contracts for which companies can bid. Fundamentally, the opposition is getting wrapped up around the axles because it is so hell-bent on trying to achieve handouts from the commonwealth government to the Western Australian community that it is spending less time on understanding that what drives the economy is business and that state ministers need to engage with commonwealth ministers early on, not late in the piece. The member who has been appointed the Western Australian minister of the Crown for defence issues should not wait to get a phone call from a commonwealth minister. He should not just sit and wait to see what happens. What is going to happen? A month goes by and nothing has happened. Then two months go by. A minister should not wait for Parliament to finally sit and for the opposition to say, "Hey, how come you guys aren't engaging?" and then deny that he has been offered a briefing. That is not how government works. The minister should get on the phone. For goodness sake, when I was made the shadow Minister for Defence Issues, I got on the phone and spoke to the minister's office. I asked what was happening. I contacted Senator Linda Reynolds' office and said, "Hey, senator, can I have a briefing? Where are you at with this particular portfolio? I want to know what the opportunities are and what we need to do for Western Australia." That is what a minister should do. That is about being accountable to the people of Western Australia.

This government is on a slippery slope when it starts backflipping on election commitments and going against what it promised the electorate with taxes, so today's front page is of real concern for the people of Western Australia. The government needs to be open, accountable and honest. It needs to be fair to the people of Western Australia by understanding their needs; by making sure it understands the needs of business and that government is there to support, encourage and promote business in Western Australia. It is not something that sits on chairs and waits to see what will happen, and when it does not happen the way it wants it, complains that it is not happening the way it wants it because it has not done anything about it. I encourage the government to work more on promoting our state, attracting investment, growing business sectors and, most importantly, growing jobs—and I ask the government to be honest and accountable to the people of Western Australia.

MR P.A. KATSAMBANIS (Hillarys) [12.13 pm]: I point out clearly that I am speaking to the amendment to the Address-in-Reply, and to the amendment only, as I have spoken previously in the substantive debate. I am not pleased to be on my feet speaking to this amendment today. I would rather not speak to it at all. In fact, I would rather not have had the need to have seen this amendment brought to this house. I would have preferred to be saying, "Well done on a good job, government. You got elected to do the right thing by Western Australians and you are getting on with the task and you are doing it." Sadly, in just a few short months, that is not the case. Sadly, we do need to come into this house today and point out that this government is on the wrong track already. It is already failing basic tests of accountability and transparency. It has embarked on a course of politicising the public service and it is already on a path of breaking a whole series of election promises. As each day goes by, we tick off one more promise that is broken, and this morning we woke up to another one—a brand-new tax when two or three short months ago, government members, and today's Premier, were holding their hands on their hearts and saying that under them there would be no new taxes and there would be no new increases in taxes. Unfortunately the people of Western Australia have seen this movie too many times before. I was thinking of saying that it was a bit like *Back to the Future*, but it is not because at least that movie provided us with some entertainment and

Mrs Jessica Stojkovski; Mr David Michael; Dr Mike Nahan; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr Peter Katsambanis; Mr Terry Redman; Mr Tony Krsticevic

escapism. The movie that we are heading down the path of is a terrible, nasty horror movie that will create nightmares and problems for the people of Western Australia if this government does not get off the slippery slope that it is on. All we need to do is look at a key area of responsibility of a state government—namely, keeping our society safe. Community safety is keeping our streets, our suburbs and our homes safe from criminals.

Before the election, the Liberal–National government promised to get tough on those horrible, nasty purveyors of poison in our society—the drug dealers: the methamphetamine dealers and traffickers. We introduced a policy of minimum mandatory sentencing that would ensure that those people —

Mr P. Papalia: Did you win?

Mr P.A. KATSAMBANIS: We will get to that. The member for Warnbro should just listen occasionally. Rather than go off like he is prone to do, why does he not listen sometimes? The Liberal Party made the promise that if elected, we would introduce minimum mandatory sentences so that those people who were dealing in death, who were trafficking drugs in our society, would be locked away for a long time so they could not do what they are doing right now. The then Leader of the Opposition—today's Premier and the member for Rockingham—jumped up and said, "Us too! We'll do that, too. We think it's a good idea." The then government and opposition were bipartisan on that issue. Clearly the public understood that both parties were going to the election with the same commitment. The Labor Party came to government and brought a bill before the house, supposedly getting tough on meth dealers, but where are the mandatory minimum sentences? They are nowhere to be seen. A key part of accountability for any government is sticking to what it promises. Already in community safety, this government has promised and not delivered. This government has proven that it cannot be trusted to keep our community safe. Instead, it has come up with this idea that increasing the maximum that has never been delivered by a court in Western Australia to a higher maximum is somehow going to fix the problem. I asked the Premier yesterday to point me to the last time a meth dealer, meth trafficker—any drug trafficker; it did not have to be in meth—in this state received a maximum penalty of 25 years. We heard crickets. We heard nothing. We heard vitriolic personal attacks—I am a big boy and I am happy to cop them—but we heard no answer, because there is no answer.

Dr M.D. Nahan: Yes, there is—zero.

Mr P.A. KATSAMBANIS: Zero. There is no answer that the Premier would like to give. Increasing the zero implemented 25-year maximum to a maximum of life will end up in another zero—double zeros; donuts. That is another broken promise of this Premier and this government in its first 10 weeks in office. Already the broken promises are mounting up. It would be very simple for the government to say, "Yes, we will increase the maximum, but we will also bring in some mandatory minimum sentences." Why did it not do that? Only the government really knows that, but what we do know is that three months ago the Premier believed that mandatory minimum sentences were the way to go. What we also know —

Mr W.J. Johnston: You had eight years in government.

Mr P.A. KATSAMBANIS: If the member for Cannington wants to say something, he should stand up on his feet and talk.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members, please let the member for Hillarys keep going without interruptions from both sides.

Mr P.A. KATSAMBANIS: We know that three months ago, the Premier believed that mandatory minimum sentences were the way to go. We also know that over a long period of time—years; perhaps decades—the member for Butler, the Attorney General, has not believed in mandatory minimum sentences. We do not sit inside cabinet and we do not know what goes on in cabinet, but when we see the Premier three months ago believing in something and then coming in with a bill that does not do what he said he believed in, it leaves every sane person to speculate that perhaps the Attorney General has already started rolling the Premier. Do members know who suffers from that?

Mr S.K. L'Estrange: The people.

Mr P.A. KATSAMBANIS: That is correct, member for Churchlands—it is the people of Western Australia because we are left less safe, with drug dealers on our streets, peddling that horrible, nasty stuff, when there is a simple fix. There is a fix that the Premier said three months ago was the right fix, but he has already backflipped. If it is only the first three months of a four-year government, my goodness, we are going to get less safe and less safe as the months and years tick on, and that is not a good thing. That is why I said right at the outset that I would rather not be making this speech. I have to make it; I do not want to make it. There are other areas, too.

Point of Order

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: Madam Acting Speaker, I draw your attention to the words that are proposed in the amendment to the Address-in-Reply. There is nothing in the amendment regarding community safety or other matters. It states —

Mrs Jessica Stojkovski; Mr David Michael; Dr Mike Nahan; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr Peter Katsambanis; Mr Terry Redman; Mr Tony Krsticevic

... failing basic accountability and transparency and embarking on a course of politicising the public service.

Could the member be drawn back to the proposed amendment.

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: Further to that point of order, there are clearly the words “and” and “and” in that sentence. The member for Hillarys is talking about accountability and transparency. If he wishes to also include “and embarking on a course of politicising the public service”, he can do so. It is quite a varied debate here in and around the topic of accountability and in and around the topic of transparency.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms S.E. Winton): Thank you, members. There is not really a point of order. I will let the debate continue, thank you.

Debate Resumed

Mr P.A. KATSAMBANIS: Perhaps the member opposite, the member for Cannington, was too busy talking to be listening, but I pointed out earlier in my speech that one of the first tests of accountability in government is sticking to the promises that it has made—sticking to the commitments that it has made.

That is a good way for me to move on to an issue that is very important to not just the people of the Hillarys electorate, but also all the people of the northern suburbs, and that is the Mitchell Freeway. They will see how a lack of accountability has already been demonstrated by this government. Again, in the election campaign, the previous government, the Liberal Party, had indicated and set aside funds from other projects to add an extra lane to the Mitchell Freeway from Hodges Drive to Hepburn Avenue and then another extra lane from around Cedric Street down to Vincent Street. The Mitchell Freeway would have had a continuous three lanes from Hodges Drive to Reid Highway and a continuous four lanes from Reid Highway to Vincent Street. It was very simple and it is much needed. Turn on the radio any morning and the first thing on the traffic report is that the Mitchell Freeway is congested. They usually say it is congested from Hodges Drive to Whitfords Avenue, but anyone who drives along it would know it is actually from Hodges Drive to Hepburn Avenue; then it mysteriously opens up when the third lane comes into operation. We know that through the good work of the previous government the Mitchell Freeway is going to get even busier when in the next few months the extension to Hester Avenue opens. It is a much-needed extension, but it is going to add extra traffic. We need that third lane, and we need it now. The new government let that issue sail by; it watched it happen. The members who were campaigning—the current members for Joondalup, Kingsley, Burns Beach, Wanneroo and the like—all sat back and watched it happen, knowing that the money was in the budget. It was already allocated and all that had to be done was send the people out there to do the work. The lane is almost ready to go. It does not need much more than to put down some bitumen. We got to the election and the Labor Party had said nothing about reversing that project or taking it away; it had ridden on its coattails. Then, the other week, the Minister for Transport released a plan for road projects and funnily enough the extra lane from Cedric Street to Vincent Street, running through the electorates of the member for Balcatta and the member for Perth, is there. It is a needed lane, and I applaud the government for that—well done for doing that one. But mysteriously, in amongst all the other road projects, the extra lane from Hodges Drive in Joondalup down to Hepburn Avenue in Greenwood has absolutely disappeared. Again, the government is silent as to why or when it might be built. If this government wants to be open, transparent and accountable, it should answer that question: where has that gone? It has disappeared, and the members opposite whose electorates it impacts have to give their account to the people of their electorates. Why has that lane that was funded and included in the ongoing projects disappeared? This government lacks the accountability to deliver on something that it promised before the election.

Look at the impact of the freeze on public sector wages.

Mr W.J. Johnston: Senior wages.

Mr P.A. KATSAMBANIS: I will pick up on the member for Cannington's interjection. He said “senior wages”. That is how the Labor government spun it to the public, so the media articles and commentary were about a freeze on senior wages, but, at the bottom, the government slipped in a change to the state wages policy. It is a change to the state wages policy that the Labor Party committed to during the election campaign—the 1.5 per cent maximum pay increase. The government changed that to a maximum of \$1 000, which effectively means that every single public servant in this state who earns more than \$67 000—every full-time teacher, every full-time nurse, every full-time police officer—gets an effective pay cut. They do not get a 1.5 per cent increase at a time when inflation is running at around two per cent; they get a maximum amount.

Ms L.L. Baker: Whose fault is that?

Mr P.A. KATSAMBANIS: I will pick up the interjection from the member for Maylands if she wants. Whose fault is that? It is the fault of the people who promised it and did not deliver it. The Labor Party said three months ago that it was going to deliver an increase of 1.5 per cent—three months later that disappears. It is interesting that people on the government benches, even as late as yesterday, were coming to this place and kissing the ring of the

Mrs Jessica Stojkovski; Mr David Michael; Dr Mike Nahan; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr Peter Katsambanis; Mr Terry Redman; Mr Tony Krsticevic

union leaders who they are here to represent. They were praising the union movement. I thought one of the basic tenets of the union movement was a commitment to collective bargaining—a commitment to the ability of employers and employees to go to an independent umpire when they cannot reach a decision.

Mr W.J. Johnston: It still exists.

Mr P.A. KATSAMBANIS: The member for Cannington says it still exists. Will the Western Australian Industrial Relations Commission be able to adjudicate a case—a dispute—and provide pay rises of more than \$1 000 to all those police, nurses and teachers if they do not strike an agreement with the government to accept the maximum \$1 000? I note that government members have gone silent all of a sudden, because all of these issues show a complete and utter lack of accountability, a lack of transparency and, in this case, the sidelining of the umpire. If the Liberal government had done something like that, or even suggested that it might do something like that, the trade union movement would be marching up and down the streets. We would hardly be able to get into this place. We have seen that movie too. Do members know what? When trade union leaders sell out their workforce, the people they are supposedly representing, is it any wonder that every time the Australian Bureau of Statistics releases the figures for trade union membership in the workforce, we see reductions. We see that the private sector now is around nine per cent unionised—is it any wonder? The majority of that is the forced unionisation that we see in the retail sector. The government would know about that—the effective closed shop. Already, we see this government lacking in basic accountability and transparency; it is embarking on a movie that we have all seen before. It is not going to end well if the government continues in this way.

This amendment to the motion should be seen as an alarm bell for the people on the other side. It should be a clarion call that this government has not started off well. The public of Western Australia had, and still have, extremely high expectations from their government—not from the Labor government, not from the Liberal–National government, but from their government. Instead, they are getting a litany of broken promises, a series of half-truths and an attempt to politicise the public service by pushing out good people who will not kowtow to their new masters, but who have the best interests of the state at heart, not the best interests of the Labor Party. The government ought to actually stop, take a look, and perhaps try to put the ship back in the right direction. If it does that—as I have said before and I say again today—I will applaud the government, because that is what the public is expecting. The public expects good government; it is not expecting a train wreck. People are not expecting the horror movie that the government is starting to show them. They are expecting the government to stand up and make the right decisions for the people of Western Australia, and it is about time the government started doing that. If it does, we will say, “Good on you”, but if it does not, we will continue to hold it to account, no matter how much it tries to shout us down.

MR D.T. REDMAN (Warren–Blackwood) [12.20 pm]: This is my first time on my feet in the fortieth Parliament. I have my Address-in-Reply speech coming, so I will expand more broadly on a few comments then. I want to welcome everyone back, and to welcome new members in particular, to the fortieth Parliament. I certainly look forward to the next four years of exciting debate in this place. I particularly want to welcome new country members from regional Western Australia—notably, the member for Pilbara, who unfortunately is not in the house at the moment. He has some very, very big shoes to fill up there, and we will no doubt keep him under pressure on that. I also welcome the member for Bunbury, someone who has a lot of history with the development commissions, which will be a topic of some of my commentary today. I welcome him to this house. The member for Dawesville is also new to this place; the member for Murray–Wellington is unfortunately not in the chamber at the moment; and sitting behind me is the new member for Roe.

I think we have some five new regional Western Australian members of Parliament in this house who will bring a lot of good debate in support of those areas. I have a bit of advice for them, from my personal experience of when I first came into this place. It goes to the heart of what we are talking about today—transparency and accountability. One of the things that gave me a little scare was first reading *Hansard*. One gets up, makes a speech, then goes and reads it in *Hansard*. Someone is recording everything that one says, and everyone out there can go online and read what one has said. Everyone out there can see where one sat on a division for a particular decision in this place. I can say that it was much easier to read when I was sitting over here than it was when I was sitting over there as a minister in the last government! I guess the point I am making to all new members—particularly those from regional Western Australia who are in government—is that they have a challenge. The challenge is that, on my count, there are only six regional Western Australia Labor Party members in this chamber. That includes the member for Mandurah, which is probably stretching the definition a bit!

Several members interjected.

Mr D.T. REDMAN: I talked about the number of regional seats in the Labor Party. One of the things I said when I was minister that has come back to haunt me was when I sat over there, goading the then Leader of the Opposition

about how far he had to go to fill the seats, right around here, to get to the middle and jump to the other side; now I find myself sitting here, surrounded by them!

The heart of the point I am making is that for everything we say in here, and for everywhere we sit on every vote, we are accountable for the decisions we make. We are in the cheap seats across here, as Gareth Parker put it. The government is not in the cheap seats; it has to make decisions and has to respond appropriately and correctly, with all the accountability and transparency that we expect of governments in Western Australia.

Another point that I will come to very briefly today is that a lot of comments have been made, on various aspects of the decisions we have seen so far in government, about the expectations of regional Western Australia going into the election. I should have brought a copy with me, but I remember the media release of the Labor Party's 200 fresh ideas. We had to go to the fine print to see what they were, and right in the middle was, "We support royalties for regions". That was a fresh idea that the National Party brought to the 2008 election, but nevertheless, also a fresh idea for the Labor Party. It also read, "We support the regional development commissions".

The point I am making is that expectations were raised during the campaign for those living in regional Western Australia that, in essence, the integrity of the royalties for regions program would be maintained and rolled out. There have also been comments about support for the regional development commissions as the shopfront, if you like, for setting up the economic and social priorities in regional Western Australia to grow and develop those parts of the state, which contribute substantially to our economy. Those are the expectations that are there; we took questions on that. They said, "But the Labor Party says that it supports royalties for regions". Absolutely; it said so in the middle of the 200 fresh ideas. It is probably a little unfair for me to get my feet now, because the Minister for Regional Development is not in the other place yet, but we are seeing decisions starting to emerge that give us cause for concern about the accountability of this government to regional Western Australians.

I turn now to the development commissions. Although they may seem small in comparison with many of the other agencies—nine of them, from the Kimberley right down through the goldfields, Esperance and great southern—they are there on a statutory basis. They have been the guiding light for government investment in regional Western Australia. In recent times they have been the platform for about \$1 billion a year in extra resourcing to regional Western Australia, directed to actually make a difference. In terms of scale, they are small, but in terms of importance, they are critically important.

It surprises us, therefore, when we see a mix of views coming from the government about what is happening with the development commissions. First of all—I do not like to be picking on new members in this place too early—the member for Bunbury was called by the media to respond to commentary about crisis meetings on what is happening with the development commissions. He gave his assurance that there would not be any cuts and that no-one would be removing the chief executive officers from the development commissions. I quote from an article that appeared in the *Augusta–Margaret River Times* of Friday, 12 May —

The Labor MLA and former SWDC chief executive dismissed rumours the chief executive roles at all WA's regional development commissions would be axed from July 1 to reduce the number of departments, despite crisis meetings held last week with Regional Development Minister Alannah MacTiernan.

The member for Bunbury has put on the public record his support for the CEOs. A little while before that, all the CEOs got letters to say that their job would finish at the end of June. In many cases, they are contracted well beyond that time, so there seems to be a difference between the defensive commentary of the member for Bunbury and what is actually happening out there, with development commission CEOs being told, "Don't come back after June 30".

There has also been the decision by the government to roll development commission staff into the broader Department of Primary Industries and Regional Development. From a very quick read of the act, the position of director of the nine development commissions is defined. The act defines the roles of the commissions and boards quite comprehensively as supporting jobs, growth and economic activity in regional Western Australia. It also gives guidance to staff and support, yet a decision is being made here to take staff out of the development commissions and put them into the central office of the Department of Primary Industries and Regional Development. It appears that we may or may not have a CEO; we do not know that. It appears that we are definitely not going to have staff with any sort of responsibility to the board or to the CEOs of the development commissions. If it is to play out that the government is going to put someone in there with some sort of leadership role, the boss will not be there; the boss will come from some office in Perth. I can see that the level of advocacy for regional development in Western Australia through an organisation that has been a platform for determining government priorities on investment to make a difference will be hollowed right out. The member for Bunbury

Mrs Jessica Stojkovski; Mr David Michael; Dr Mike Nahan; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr Peter Katsambanis; Mr Terry Redman; Mr Tony Krsticevic

was a development commission CEO. Clearly, he took his decision to run for Parliament at the right time, because it seems that after 30 June his job will not be there.

The minister has the challenge of dealing with legislative roles that come under statutory responsibilities. These are statutory organisations. She would have gone to the first meeting and said, “We need to sort this out and get these guys under the big department up here so I can control them and, by the way, get rid of the CEOs”. They wrote a letter saying, “Get rid of the CEOs”, and someone said, “Oh, but minister, these are statutory positions; what do you want to do now?” Right now, someone is running around the Public Sector Commission trying to determine what the hell they are going to do with the decisions the minister has just made.

I fear for the level of accountability to regional Western Australia as, going into the election supporting a royalties for regions program and development commissions right in the middle of the 200 fresh ideas, the first decision the Minister for Regional Development made, even before she took her seat as a member of the Legislative Council, was to move the staff to a central office. It may not be a physical move; they may stay put. But it is not about the people on the ground, although I think that is important; it is about the advocacy of an organisation that has had a level of independent authority in being able to make a call for the region it represents. If that is centralised to the Department of Primary Industries and Regional Development, we will go back to the dark old days of before 2008 when the extent of decision-making was what we woke up and saw after budget day with an amount of \$20 million a year for four years—\$80 million for regional development in Western Australia. That is hardly an investment that supports the part of the state that drives our economy; in fact, supports the part of Western Australia that drives our national economy. Some of these signals are of significant concern to us. I do not think they augur well for the new decision-making processes of this government compared with what it articulated going into the election.

I will quote a bit more from the 12 May article in the *Augusta Margaret River Times* as follows —

Ms MacTiernan did not confirm if the chief executive roles would be cut, but said boards and leadership positions would be kept.

I highlight again that there is a gap between her not confirming whether they will remain or not. That is uncertain. The member for Bunbury seems to think they will remain, but the comment remains that the staff will be moved to the Department of Primary Industries and Regional Development.

The member for Bunbury commented also that the move would see “far less organisational competition”. I am assuming he was talking about the Duncan review.

Mr D.T. Punch interjected.

Mr D.T. REDMAN: As a member of Parliament sitting in regional Western Australia—I hope the regional members sitting in this chamber watching this play out over the next few months in particular will recognise that “far less organisational competition”—I see that as code for, “We will make the decisions from Perth that suits the broader state government.” As I said right from my very first point, six Labor members from regional Western Australia are sitting in this chamber. The rest of the Labor members are seated around the back of this side, so a lot of people are sitting around here who have an interest in where resources go in regional Western Australia. They are heavily loaded towards metropolitan Perth. The one area in which there is a level of independent advocacy for regional Western Australia, on the back of what has been the most substantial shift in resources in this state’s history supporting the part of the state that drives our national economy, is being gutted. We do not know whether the development commission chairs will remain, nor do we know whether the CEOs will remain. They have been told not to show up after 30 June. Apparently, that will be a little difficult, so it will be interesting to see how that plays out.

One more point I would like to bring up is, I guess, a broader point. The National Party and I am sure the Leader of the Nationals—I will bring it up in the Address-in-Reply debate—took a couple of key platforms to the election. One was a new revenue source and one supports the partial sale of Western Power, both positions I support. The Western Power debate was brought up quite a bit by new members in the Address-in-Reply debate. One of the strong points made during the campaign was that if Western Power is privatised, prices will go up. That scared people also in my patch and I had to respond to that. I had the advantage of being a state government minister at the time, when it was easier to run commentary about all the elements of a fairly complex position that was taken to the election. But Labor members did not say that if we do not sell Western Power, power prices will still go up. The challenge for the Treasurer is to find a strategy of getting new revenue sources for this state. An easy revenue source is mum and dad taxpayers who pay their power bill, rather than considering alternative options that the Liberal–National government took to the 2017 election.

Based on this couple of elements, the Nationals think regional Western Australians have been duded, given the commentary we heard before the election and the commentary we are hearing now. Labor Party members are not in the cheap seats any more—they have a bit of work to do.

Mrs Jessica Stojkovski; Mr David Michael; Dr Mike Nahan; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr Peter Katsambanis; Mr Terry Redman; Mr Tony Krsticevic

MR A. KRSTICEVIC (Carine) [12.44 pm]: I, too, would like to participate in this debate. I would like to congratulate the Labor Party on its victory at the state election and wish the Premier and his ministers all the best for the future.

I will say at the outset that I am very disappointed at the level of debate that is occurring within the first week of Parliament. As the Premier has stated on numerous occasions, he is seeking a gold-plated standard of accountability and transparency. Unfortunately, he forgot to mention in the fine print that it is coated with fool's gold. That is the disappointing part. He started out very quickly announcing a commission of inquiry into financial mismanagement. It is important to note the Premier's comments when he said —

WA taxpayers have a right to know where all the money went.

They need to know how WA has gone from having the best set of finances in the nation, to the worst.

The Treasurer also said the following —

Western Australians have a right to know how the state got into this situation because every citizen will, unfortunately, bear the consequences of the financial repair.

The government is talking about financial repair and how the state got into these circumstances, but it will look at only 26 projects. It will not look at how the state got into this financial situation. It has picked 26 projects as it has seen fit. As we have heard in the debate so far, it has left out a number of projects. If the government is really interested in why the state's finances got into the state they did, and it has nothing to hide, one assumes it will hold a wide-ranging inquiry into all projects. That does not seem to be the case because it is a very narrow inquiry seemingly supported by very broad statements by both the Premier and the Treasurer about what it is trying to achieve. That in itself is misleading the people of Western Australia about this inquiry. Given the Labor Party's emphatic victory, I would have expected it to raise the bar to a higher standard and to deliver a better result. In the first few days of Parliament, I hear the former opposition behaving the way it did but it is sitting on the government benches. Members opposite have not realised that they are in government now.

Mr W.J. Johnston interjected.

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: I hear the member for Cannington interjecting frequently saying "MAX, MAX", as he does. In reality, he is saying that we broke promises, so it is okay for his government to break them as well. He is admitting that upfront. Every time he does that, that is what he is saying. Let us be honest. We talk about broken promises and that is his response. How childish for a minister to respond like that in this Parliament. I am sure that given the member for Perth made a speech about members' behaviour and his hope for this Parliament, the member for Cannington is not setting a very good example for the member for Perth.

I will dwell very quickly on new members. We are all responsible for what happens in this Parliament. Just because you are members of the Labor Party elected to this Parliament, does not mean your ministers will include you. It does not mean ministers will make decisions to the benefit of each and every one of you and your electorates. It is up to each and every one of you to hold ministers to account. Do not be silent; do not believe everything you hear. You need to inquire, probe and understand. Members have heard what I said about the scope of the commission of inquiry and comments of the Premier and the Treasurer. It must be of concern to members opposite why the commission will not look at the whole picture. Why are we spending \$1.5 million and employing such a highly respected individual to look at something that is being politically driven as opposed to the rhetoric we have heard of what it is supposed to be about? I do not understand. Actually, I do understand, but I do not think it is appropriate. I do not think newly elected members really want to see this issue politicised without aiming for a benefit. There is no point in getting to the end of this and saying, "You made a mistake", "This happened" or "This wasn't done". The minor stuff will not solve the problems that we are facing. I think it is very disappointing that that is the way we have started and that we are swallowing this fool's gold.

Yesterday, during question time, a question was asked about the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal and the double dipping on the motor vehicle allowance. I remember distinctly hearing government members yelling out, "What about your ministers; were you getting it as well?" or comments to that effect. I do not want to mislead Parliament, but I am pretty sure I heard something to the effect of "Were you getting it as well?" We heard today obviously that that did not come into effect until 12 March, so no-one could have got it. Even though the question was asked in an open, honest and transparent way, rather than giving an open, honest and transparent answer, there was ducking and weaving and avoiding the question. What is the purpose of not being honest? What is the purpose of not being up-front? What is the government trying to hide? If there is nothing to hide, members should just say, "We haven't got it" or "We have got it and we're giving it back. We didn't know. There was a mistake." Whatever the right answer is, members need to be up-front with that sort of statement. It is not about us trying to attack them. It is not about us trying to do the wrong thing. We just want to know the answers on behalf of the people of Western Australia. I am sure that government backbenchers want to know whether ministers are getting double the allowance and extra money in that way, because obviously nobody would like to see that happen. I would like

Mrs Jessica Stojkovski; Mr David Michael; Dr Mike Nahan; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr Peter Katsambanis; Mr Terry Redman; Mr Tony Krsticevic

to see the terms of the commission of inquiry expanded to include the genuine purpose of what it is trying to achieve for accountability and transparency, rather than being political, because I have learnt in my time in Parliament that we do not get anywhere at the end of the day by being political. We might get some cheap shots, but we do not improve the quality of the outcomes of this Parliament, and I really think that needs to change.

Obviously, the Labor Party made other commitments during the election about there being no further taxes, but I am looking at the \$270 property levy that will supposedly be introduced. It will be on a property with a gross rental value of \$24 000 or more. I link it back to land tax. People with properties have been hit with land tax increases already and now the government is putting a property levy on top of them. One of the things that people said to me during the debate on land tax was that their premises were not rented or the rental value was too high. We are saying to people that someone might determine that the rental value of their property—we know the process that that goes through—is \$24 000, but they cannot get \$24 000 for it. A lot of times people would say to me, “I’ll give it to you for \$10 000 if the government wants to take it, and you can make the extra \$14 000 for yourself.” I hope we link it back to reality, because there are a lot of vacant rental properties out there. People are trying to rent them out, yet the government is going to charge them more money. They are struggling with mortgages and are just keeping their heads above water, and now the government is saying that it will take another \$270 from each and every one of them because they have rental properties and are supposedly rich and have lots of money. That is not correct and it is a really bad assumption to say that.

Obviously, we have already had the debate on the pay rise. Public servants were told during the election campaign that they would get a pay rise of 1.5 per cent and that the government would stick to the wages policy. Straightaway that is a broken promise, and it could not have happened any faster. It was interesting that the Premier talked about taking away the powers of the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal and the Western Australian Industrial Relations Commission. I do not know whether the Premier is aware of this, but on 12 April 2016 the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal came out with a ruling for chief executive officers and elected officers of councils. He did not mention in his press release in May that the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal had made a determination in which it quite distinctly said that because of the financial circumstances, chief executive officers and elected officers of councils would not get a pay rise. The Salaries and Allowances Tribunal made a decision a month before the Premier made that statement. It worked that out for itself. It did not need the Premier to say, “Guess what? Things are tough. We might need to tighten up things.” The Salaries and Allowances Tribunal worked it out, but now the Premier is saying, “You guys aren’t smart enough to work this out. I’m going to take this away from you and I’m going to manage it.” But, wait a second; the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal also has not given pay rises to members of Parliament on many occasions because of economic circumstances, even when the public sector was getting pay rises. The Salaries and Allowances Tribunal looks at the real world and balances things out. For some reason, the new Labor government has a problem with accountability and transparency for other people who are sanctioned to make these decisions and have made good decisions in the past and will continue to do so. I do not understand the rationale for that. I feel sorry for everyone in Western Australia when these powers are being taken away from independent bodies and centralised within government. I think that is very sad. I support the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal decision of 12 April. I think it is doing a good job and, with guidance from Parliament and the people of Western Australia, it will continue to make good decisions. It was of note in that ruling that it referred to bands. Nothing stops councils from increasing the pay of their CEOs of elected officers if they are not at the highest level of that band; they can still give those officers a pay rise if they are not at the top of the band. I am not sure that all of them are, so there is a loophole for them to get through that.

It was also interesting to note during the election that the Premier mentioned his pledge to bring the budget back to surplus in his first term and to clean up the debt and deficit mess. I look forward to that, and I think the people of Western Australia also look forward to that. Introducing a Loan Bill seeking \$11 billion does not necessarily send the message to the people of Western Australia that there will be a surplus within this term of government. Again, I would like to see how the Premier will achieve that with his gold-plated transparency of fool’s gold. Obviously, I will be very supportive of anything he does in that particular space. We know that he made some \$5 billion of additional promises during the election campaign. Some of those were probably not the best decisions financially, and I am sure that, as he continues to break promises, some of those will be broken along the way. I promise that we will not make MAX noises when he breaks those promises. We on this side of the house will have a higher level of decorum than some ministers have.

Several members interjected.

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: I did not say that we would have a higher level of decorum than members opposite had when they were in opposition, but it will definitely be better than the way they behave as ministers. I really want to see the government step up. I want to see it do a good job and I genuinely want to see it succeed. At the end of the day, this is about the lives of each and every one of us and the lives of the people of Western Australia. As

Mrs Jessica Stojkovski; Mr David Michael; Dr Mike Nahan; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Dean Nalder; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr Peter Katsambanis; Mr Terry Redman; Mr Tony Krsticevic

much as we can argue in this place, our job is to help the government do a better job. That is our job—to help the government do a better job when it forgets what it has done along the way.

Mr D.A. Templeman: I have always liked you. Don't stop.

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: I hope I can work with the Minister for Local Government to do a better job in that sector. Speaking of the Minister for Local Government, I am disappointed.

Ms L.L. Baker: We are too!

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: Should we have a vote? I am disappointed. It comes back to honesty and accountability. We had a big discussion when former local government ministers were dealing with the City of Perth and the current minister said, "Sack her. Sack the council. Do the things that need to be done."

Mr D.A. Templeman: I said that she should stand down.

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: That was later on. The current minister said that the then minister should be doing things. He has been in government and he has also done very little.

Mr D.A. Templeman: Are you going to support the auditing bill?

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: It is our bill; of course I have to support it! It is our bill; why would I not support the Local Government Amendment (Auditing) Bill? It is disappointing that he expected things of our ministers that he should have known were not possible under the Local Government Act.

Mr J.N. Carey: The former minister did want to do more, but he was prevented by Colin Barnett.

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: No; the act needed to be changed. Why is the minister not doing anything?

Several members interjected.

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: Why is the minister not doing anything?

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms S.E. Winton): Members! Can we please let the member for Carine continue for a few more seconds.

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: All I am talking about is honesty and openness and working together.

Mr D.A. Templeman interjected.

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: I will not ask the Minister for Local Government to do anything that the Local Government Act does not allow him to do. I will not make up things. I will not make up stories. I will not pretend that he can do something when he cannot.

Debate interrupted, pursuant to standing orders.

[Continued on page 316.]

Sitting suspended from 1.00 to 2.00 pm