

Speaker; Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Bill Marmion; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr John Carey; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Mark McGowan

---

**EDUCATION CENTRAL POLICY — PERTH MODERN SCHOOL**

*Matter of Public Interest*

**THE SPEAKER (Mr P.B. Watson)** informed the Assembly that he was in receipt within the prescribed time of a letter from the Leader of the Opposition seeking to debate a matter of public interest.

[In compliance with standing orders, at least five members rose in their places.]

Several members interjected.

**The SPEAKER:** Is everyone finished on the government side? I am having a bad enough day as it is without you rabbling on.

**DR M.D. NAHAN (Riverton — Leader of the Opposition)** [3.13 pm]: It is a pleasure to speak on this motion. Perth Modern School is probably one of our oldest schools.

*Point of Order*

**Mr W.J. JOHNSTON:** The Leader of the Opposition has to propose the motion, otherwise we are not able to debate it.

*Debate Resumed*

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** In accordance with the standing orders, I seek to propose a matter of public interest. I move the motion —

That this house notes the McGowan government's backflip on Perth Modern School, but condemns the Premier for his arrogance for not consulting with parents and stakeholders before announcing their Education Central policy, and further condemns the McGowan government for its lack of consultation before announcing Kitchener Park as the location for a possible new high school.

**The SPEAKER:** Thank you, Leader of the Opposition.

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** Perth Modern School is one of our oldest and most important schools. It has a long history. It has a very vibrant sense of community, with the old Modernians, the parents and citizens association, the school board, and students and parents. They are passionate about the school—quite understandably. I speak not only as the Leader of the Opposition but also the local member for Riverton, which has over 300 parents with kids attending Perth Modern. It is very important to my electorate. Perth Modern has a great reputation. Since it was made an academically selective school over 10 years ago, it has gone from strength to strength.

**Ms S.E. Winton:** By the Labor government!

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** Yes, and if the Labor government made it an academically selective school, why has it done what it has done? Perth Modern School has been one of the pillars in the growth of the public school system over the last five or six years, with the public school system increasing its market share, if you wish, of secondary students—that is, people coming from the private system to the public system. There are many reasons for that: the increased support for and reforms that the previous government made to the educational system; the investment in new capital; and, of course, its teachers and curriculum. That has, importantly, provided for the growth of very strong secondary schools in Riverton and Willetton but also, importantly, Perth Mod. If Perth Mod has been a major instrument in improving community support for our public system, why would the government not treat it carefully? If the government really supported public education in this state, it would treat Perth Modern School carefully and what it would do, if there were some changes to be made to that school, as it would do for any public school and as any member on either side would do when we know that the glue, the essence of our communities, are often public primary and high schools, is to treat them carefully. Members meet the principals, teachers and the P&C to understand their issues. We do this almost as part of our DNA. Perth Mod is special because it does not —

**Mr J.R. Quigley:** In Scarborough you just demolished it!

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** No, Labor did! Labor demolished it. Was not the member for Butler the local member when Scarborough Senior High School was shut down?

Several members interjected.

**The SPEAKER:** Members! Members!

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** Perth Modern School has the state as its catchment. Its catchment is dispersed over this large state and therefore it does not have a single member representing it, looking after it and interacting with it, it has

Speaker; Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Bill Marmion; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr John Carey; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Mark McGowan

---

many members—all of us—doing that. We have to treat Perth Modern School as special. It has to be treated specially because of its nature.

The Labor Party went into the last election and announced, in the depth of the campaign, without any consultation with the various communities that associate with Perth Mod—whether it was the P&C, the student council, the board, the parents, the students or the local members with constituents who are students going to that school—that it would move the school holus-bolus to the city. I can tell this house that members opposite would not dream of doing that to schools in their own electorates. They would go out and talk with their constituents at length. There has been a long discussion in Perth and in and around the country about inner-city high-rise schools. I understand that was discussed a number of years ago in the Department of Education in Western Australia. In fact, New South Wales is in the process of building inner-city high-rise schools, but New South Wales implemented this as part of a five-year process. The New South Wales government is saying that it has to build high-rise schools because of the growth of inner-city high-rise dwellings, particularly with younger kids in those apartments. It has identified a number of sites and put that out for discussion. It asked a number of architects to come up with some ideas about designs and processes and how to do it, and, for instance, how to meet students' sporting, educational and transport needs—all that sort of stuff. It has identified a number of sites and put information out for discussion but it has not committed to building a single school. I think one is being built, but, otherwise, that is how you go about it. What did the government do? During the midst of an election campaign the Labor Party announced it was going to move the school without any consultation. On the radio today I heard Hon Sue Ellery, Minister for Education and Training, say that it was in the midst of an election campaign and they could not talk to the constituents.

**Ms R. Saffioti:** No, she didn't say that!

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** Yes, she did—it was very hard during an election campaign to talk to constituents and to the community associated with the school because they had no access to the school. First of all, that implies that they did not think about it before the election started. Actually, I think they did, but she said they did not think about it until the election campaign was going full bore. Sue Ellery is the local member of the Legislative Council, and I can tell members one thing about Hon Sue Ellery: she is very active in and committed to schools. Her office is in Southlands and she goes to the schools in my electorate. She knows them all and she goes there all the time. She knows their issues and she is intimately in touch with the schools in her electorate, about what they need and know, and she expresses it to whomever, including myself. She could have interacted with the Perth Modern School community if she wished, but she did not; she chose not to.

More importantly with Perth Mod, it was, if you wish, roadkill. It was totally unnecessary. The issue was: how to develop additional capacity in the western suburbs. Perth Mod was running and operating well, and very popular. It was functioning well and did not need too much more investment, so why did they need to touch it at all? They did not need to. They touched Perth Modern School because they wanted to have an inner-city school, but they did not want it to be a catchment school because the people living in that catchment in the city, particularly the people of Vincent and Perth, would revolt; they would not want an inner-city school for their children. What did the government do? It proposed moving the catchment school to the Perth Mod site—that is okay; it is adjacent to the city—to use Perth Mod as a guinea pig, and they talked to no-one about it. That is the McGowan government.

I listened to the member for Swan Hills' inaugural speech in which she went on and on—I know she means this sincerely—about how government links with the community, how government discusses issues with and represents the community.

**The SPEAKER:** Leader of the Opposition, can you talk through the Chair, please.

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** On the issue of Perth Mod and the western suburbs, the government ignored the community. When we asked the government legitimate questions, because members on this side of the chamber represent those communities, the Premier flippantly said that the issues were raised in the election campaign, but, they won so tough luck. That is not good enough. That is not even close to good enough. Rightly, correctly, the government has done a backflip and it is leaving Perth Mod alone—keeping its hands off Perth Mod—which is good, and we support that. The government should never have had its hands on Perth Mod and manipulated it in the first place; it now has a black eye. By the way members, the government will do this again. This is the government's methodology.

The real issue that remains is how to be meet demand for 4 000 additional desks, if you wish, in the western suburbs. The previous government went through three years of consultation with the Department of Education. We did it right; we talked to people before we did anything. We talked to parents, but not just in Leederville, Mt Lawley and Subiaco. We put together in the budget, in the forward estimates, a plan to invest \$39 million in

Speaker; Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Bill Marmion; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr John Carey; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Mark McGowan

---

Mount Lawley Senior High School, to invest substantial money in Carine and Churchlands Senior High Schools and in Shenton College. Of course, we also negotiated for the International School of Western Australia, the Japanese School and the Hyogo Prefecture Government Cultural Centre to move, so we could get access to the City Beach site, and we proposed in two stages to completely rebuild that facility. That is what a government does to adjust to changes in patterns of demand in our high school system. A government thinks about it and gets the Department of Education to monitor it. It is not one catchment; it is worked and the government invests. Something like \$250 million-plus is in the budget for this. It had nothing to do with Perth Mod.

Two weeks ago it had to be Northbridge; now it has to be Kitchener Park. My colleagues will talk about Kitchener Park, but, to me, it sounds like another thought bubble, in the sense that Kitchener Park has a couple of issues. I understand that the West Australian Football Commission has rights over it for parking for 70 years. It is adjacent to Domain Stadium, and its future is uncertain. I guess its use as a major stadium is certain, but its longer-term future is somewhat uncertain. Of course, we have the Princess Margaret Hospital for Children site, which, hopefully, one day will be torn down and used for other purposes. Then we have the City of Subiaco. The mayor did say that she welcomes a new high school in Subiaco, but she said that was as long as Kitchener Park remains green. I heard the minister—I might have heard this wrong—say that she is going to get the new high school up and ready by 2020. She must be dreaming. Overcoming all those hurdles with the West Australian Football Commission, the City of Subiaco and the Princess Margaret Hospital for Children site is not going to be done by 2020. Do members know what is going to happen? City Beach high school will not go ahead under this government and the existing schools—Mount Lawley and Churchlands Senior High Schools, and Shenton College—will be grossly overcrowded. You know what? They do not care.

**MR S.K. L'ESTRANGE (Churchlands)** [3.26 pm]: I speak to this motion because it is an example of how a new government has failed to consult with the people of Western Australia, and, most importantly, it has failed to consult with the community most affected by its decision to originally go ahead with this Education Central project. We know the Premier confirmed to this house that he did not need to consult with the Perth Modern School community or even the western suburbs communities most affected by population pressures today, because, as he said in this place, he took it to an election as a policy and got elected; therefore, that policy is all the consultation that they needed to do. We know that that is how the Premier feels about this issue; he spoke very strongly about all the educational advantages that this Education Central project would have in a high-rise building in the city. The Perth Modern School community and this side of politics strongly opposed that. We know that that was the situation.

We also heard the member for Warnbro say in answer to our amendment in the Address-in-Reply debate last time we were in this place that it was about a class war. We strongly disagree with that. We believe that the Perth Modern School community offers opportunities for people throughout Western Australia regardless of where they live or the household they were brought up in. If they are bright enough, they can attend that school, and they should attend that school on the site that it is on today. We have also heard the member for West Swan on occasion interject in this debate to make the point that Perth Modern School is elitist. This notion of class war and elitism that we hear from members on the other side of the chamber cuts to the core of what I think their whole rationale for closing down Perth Modern School's selective status was all about; it was about equalising education across metropolitan Perth.

Several members interjected.

**The SPEAKER:** Members, let the member have his say, please. You have an opportunity to stand up yourselves.

**Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE:** We know members opposite were opposed to Perth Modern School in its current construct and they set about to change it to suit their own feelings about that particular school. Today, the Premier and the government have done a backflip. It listened to our argument and our debate and it listened to the people of the Perth Modern School community. Once this house sat, the government was forced to listen because members on this side of the chamber made sure that the people who had not been consulted prior to the election when the government's policy was announced were heard in this place. We gave them a voice. We gave them a voice on the steps of Parliament House, in the Legislative Council and in here. As a result of their voice being heard, we have seen the monumental backflip of the Premier and the government today. It is the government's first big backflip after being elected to office less than three months ago.

Now that there has been that big backflip, we have heard the new backflip thought bubble. That is what we have had. They had a thought bubble going into the election around Education Central. Nobody knew what it was about. There was no business case and the community was shown nothing. However, today, we have had the backflip thought bubble from the "mid-strength" Premier who wants to create something new under his own banner. He has decided that he can progress this thought bubble to Kitchener Park. But what is lacking?

**Mr W.R. Marmion:** A business case.

Speaker; Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Bill Marmion; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr John Carey; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Mark McGowan

---

**Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE:** The member for Nedlands is quite right. There is no business case. We have seen no cost-benefit analysis for that proposal when comparing the proposal presented by the former government, which included a number of measures including building City Beach high school on a site owned by the government that was shovel-ready to go. That has been ignored. The government is ignoring what we said we were going to do to support Mount Lawley Senior High School. It is ignoring what we said we would do for Carine Senior High School and Balcatta Senior High School. Instead it has had a backflip thought bubble and has decided to ignore all the Department of Education's analysis of what would be needed—that is, what it advised the former government to progress—and decided, with a new thought bubble, to use Kitchener Park. Today the government has said that its consultation has been from reading a newspaper. The Premier said that he had consulted by reading a newspaper! The mayor of the City of Subiaco has said that the City of Subiaco would support something happening in Subiaco. I would be surprised if a mayor of a city would not want something done in their city! Of course they would want development in their city if it is going to support the city. What the Premier failed to say was that he has not consulted anyone about where this new school would go. He has not explained how the open green space will be utilised. He has not explained how he will get the approvals process through this place. Most importantly, the Premier and the government have not explained how long it will take. That is the key aspect of this thought bubble. We do not know how long it will take. The government is saying Kitchener Park will work, but it has no business case. We are saying that we have a plan ready to go that can immediately alleviate the problem that confronts Churchlands Senior High School, which currently, in 2017, has 2 581 students and which will have 3 251 students by 2020, and Shenton College, which now has 1 970 students and which will have 2 271 students in 2020.

The 10-hectare City Beach high school site is ready to go. Building could commence on that site so that refurbishment could occur and it would be ready for its first intake by 2020, in three years' time. We could have that ready now. If the government is hell-bent on thought bubbles, it could build a business case for an alternative school on the railway line somewhere near the city, but it will not go down that track. There is no doubt that the population in those areas will continue to increase and in time there will be a need for another high school to service the inner city and possibly aspects of the western suburbs. However, right now we have a shovel-ready, 10-hectare site at City Beach high school. It is a school owned by government and is ready to go. The government could hit the go button on that and then start planning its thought bubble in a bit more detail. The people of Western Australia deserve some detail. The government could do a cost-benefit analysis of its proposal. The people of Subiaco, the western suburbs and inner-city suburbs could be engaged and down the track, it could look at that project. However, right now, the government is continuing to show us how it simply does not listen, and it will be its arrogance and inability to consult the people of Western Australia that will be its undoing.

**MRS L.M. HARVEY (Scarborough — Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** [3.35 pm]: I rise to add to the points articulated by the member for Churchlands and the Leader of the Opposition on this motion. I also want to take issue with some of the commentary when the Premier was answering questions on this very important issue in question time. The constituents of my area are very concerned about this matter. They do not want to be travelling to Subiaco to go to school. In responding to questions today the Premier chose to ignore that the opposition does not dispute the growth of the population throughout Leederville and other areas in the member for Perth's electorate. However, there is a big redevelopment project in Scarborough. Not only is Scarborough one of the highest growth population areas in the City of Stirling but also a targeted infill agenda is being executed by the City of Stirling through the suburbs of Innaloo, Doubleview and certain parts of Wembley Downs, in which we have seen growth through the Perry Lakes development around the Floreat and City Beach precinct. Families are moving into Scarborough, Doubleview and Innaloo and they need a school.

The member for Butler made an accusation that needs to be corrected. He said that it was the former Premier, Colin Barnett, who disposed of the Scarborough high school site.

**Mr J.R. Quigley:** That is true.

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** No. The Attorney General was the local member at that time, and I was living in the area. He was busy in Butler and Clarkson and he does not know what happened.

**The SPEAKER:** Members?

Several members interjected.

**The SPEAKER:** I call the Attorney General and the Minister for Police to order. When I am on my feet, I want silence. Deputy Leader of the Opposition, if you are going to attack someone like that, expect that it will come back.

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** I will address my comments to you, Mr Speaker, because it is very important.

**Ms J.M. Freeman** interjected.

Speaker; Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Bill Marmion; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr John Carey; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Mark McGowan

---

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Mirrabooka, you are being called to order for the first time, too. So is everyone happy? Thank you.

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** It is very important that things are recorded correctly in this house. Scarborough high school was closed because it had 340 students. The Scarborough high school site would have been a perfect site for a western suburbs high school. It is right in the heart of a high-density development zone that is a priority for the state and the City of Stirling. It could have been used as a school site, but between 2002 and 2006 Hon Alannah MacTiernan, as the then minister, sold off the Scarborough high school site as 117 lots of land.

Several members interjected.

**The SPEAKER:** Members!

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** That is the question that those opposite do not want to answer. They are very sensitive about this matter because when they sold the Scarborough site, they shot themselves in the foot when it came to the future provision of education for the western suburbs. They sold it off to put some money in the bank. That is what they are planning for the City Beach high school site. They are looking at that site and thinking, "This is high-value land. We'll sell that off." Will that in any way go towards offsetting the cost of the Kitchener Park proposal? I doubt it. The constituents of my area of Scarborough, Doubleview, Innaloo and Wembley Downs know that their primary schools are absolutely full to the brim and they are really concerned that they will have to squeeze their children onto the Churchlands site or the Shenton College site when a perfect site is ready to go, with a school that can be up and running and ready to take students well before Churchlands reaches its projected growth of 3 250 students and Shenton College of 2 271 students.

I implore those opposite to not take the ridiculous political position that because it was a project proposed by a former government it was a bad project. It was a well thought out, well planned project. That plan is currently underway with the construction of the Doubleview Primary School and the International School of Western Australia is already lodging redevelopment plans. The City Beach high school site is ready to go. Do the sensible and cost-effective thing and utilise that site so that my constituents in Scarborough, Doubleview, Innaloo and Karrinyup can go to a school close to their homes and not in Subiaco.

Several members interjected.

**The SPEAKER:** Minister for Police, Attorney General, I call you to order for the second time. If you want to have a chat, go outside.

**MR W.R. MARMION (Nedlands)** [3.39 pm]: The proposal to move Perth Modern School to the central business district of Perth was flawed from the very start. Why was it flawed? It was flawed because there was no consultation. If consultation had been done at the beginning, the thought bubble by the Labor Party would have been put to bed straightaway. That is the nub of the issue. It was a bad proposal.

In my entire time as the member for Nedlands I have never ever dealt with an issue to which every single person I talked to was opposed. I walk throughout my community but I did not have to worry about doing that because people came from the member for Victoria Park's area, the member for Warnbro's area and the member for Swan Hills' area.

**Ms R. Saffioti** interjected.

**Mr W.R. MARMION:** The member for West Swan might laugh but people from her area signed my petition. Why did they do that? They did it because members opposite did not consult. A lesson for ministers opposite is that if they consult, they might make better decisions. A lot of things have been said by members opposite that are flawed.

The Premier—I will deviate to provide some facts—tries to divert the issue with some lateral thinking. He said in question time today that the population—I do not know whether it is true—of City Beach will go down by one per cent. Let us assume a high school is operating on the City Beach site, which is shovel ready—I will get to it in a minute—and 2 000 students are at the City Beach site, and the population goes down one per cent. How much is one per cent of 2 000? Can members opposite quickly calculate it in their head? It is 20. That is a lot of people! In a high school of 2 000 students, the population will go down by 20 students. Big deal! Members opposite should be working out where in the western suburbs is the best place to locate a high school. The catchment area is from way down in Mosman Park, in the member for Cottesloe's area, right up to the member for Scarborough's area and the only high schools are Churchlands Senior High School and Shenton College. Kitchener Park might be a good location one day provided it meets all the approvals and a business case is prepared. However, at this time, a school site is well located at City Beach, shovel ready. I know the government will not run with the City Beach site. Why is that? It will not do that because it is badged "Liberal". That is the nub of the situation. The government cannot backflip on the decision to relocate Perth Modern School to the CBD and admit that we were right after listening to the Department of Education, which came up with this idea

Speaker; Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Bill Marmion; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr John Carey; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Mark McGowan

---

after two or three years. The City Beach site is ready to go. If members opposite did not worry about their ego and admitted that the Liberal–National government's City Beach proposal was right, a school would be built within two years. What would that mean? It would alleviate a massive amount of uncertainty for the people in the area about where their kids will go. When I doorknock in the Wembley Downs area —

**Mr B.S. Wyatt:** Come on!

**Mr W.R. MARMION:** I did not see the member for Victoria Park doorknocking. When I was doorknocking, one of the major concerns of people in Cambridge Street mainly, close to the member for Churchlands' area, was planning where their child currently in primary school would go. They probably attend Jolimont Primary School at the moment. They have a choice of going to Churchlands, which looks like a refugee camp at the moment, or Shenton College.

**Ms M.M. Quirk:** Excuse me!

**Mr W.R. MARMION:** The classes are dongas.

Parents in that area want some certainty—within two years, not four years. If the government gets rid of the City Beach site, there will be two years of planning to build a new school and two years of construction. The government is saying to the people in the western suburbs, in which there are already two crowded schools, that their next school will be built in about four years. The opposition has suggested it can build a school next to Subiaco Oval by 2020. However, that will be a massive challenge because I can see from the plan that it will be funded through development along the railway line, which is value capture. We will need to see the business case and I think the government will find that the business case will probably take 12 months to put together. Due to some of the issues the government will face, it will probably be two years before a plan is developed and it will take two years to build. Therefore the people in the western suburbs will have no certainty about which school their children will attend. As a result, we can say that Shenton College and Churchlands Senior High School will remain overcrowded for another four years.

**MS R. SAFFIOTI (West Swan — Minister for Transport)** [3.45 pm]: Dear oh dear, this is the first matter of public interest we have debated and it is the most lacklustre performance I have ever seen. I am still trying to go through the member for Nedlands' analysis about the City Beach population growth and the student numbers. Did anyone understand what the member for Nedlands just tried to describe? The member for Nedlands said that the Liberal Party left Churchlands Senior High School looking like a refugee camp. He said that the Liberal Party left their own high school like a refugee camp.

**Mr W.R. Marmion** interjected.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** That is what he said. It is complete hypocrisy. The Liberal–National government had eight and a half years and in the last six months before the election it scabbled together the City Beach plan. For eight and a half years, it knew what was going on. It knew the primary schools in the key catchments were being filled and it did nothing. The member for Nedlands' analysis has completely thrown us all. I will read *Hansard* and try to understand what he said about the population growth. For eight and a half years members opposite did nothing. Why did the Liberal Party lose the seats of the former members for Perth and Mount Lawley? They lost those seats because the former government did nothing. For eight and a half years the Liberal–National government did not listen to people. Primary school populations are bursting and it did not plan for the future.

I heard the member for Scarborough speak realising only now that there is some development in her area. Does she not think that in eight and a half years she could have prepared for anything? I have a press release of 1998 from the then Minister for Education, which states in part —

Mr Barnett said the Scarborough Senior High School would close.

He made the decision. The member for Scarborough said that did not occur, but it did occur; it was the then Liberal Party's decision. Stand up and make a proper contribution to the debate.

**Mrs L.M. Harvey** interjected.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** We did not interject on members opposite, and I do not expect interjections.

I will go through the issue thoroughly. For eight and a half years the member for Scarborough did nothing. She is a member who failed to represent her constituency. The Liberal Party lost the seats of the members for Perth and Mount Lawley because it did nothing.

“Consultation” is the opposition's new buzzword. In eight and a half years the former government did nothing. We know that it looked at the Kitchener Park site, but do members know what? It could not figure out the planning issues because it was proposing to build a new stadium without sorting out what to do with Subiaco Oval. That is exactly what it did. As for a business case, the opposition chose a site for a new stadium because the then Premier looked out the window at a bit of land and said, “I think we should stick a \$1.7 billion stadium there”. That is how the former government did business cases. It had absolutely no plan for the

Speaker; Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Bill Marmion; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr John Carey; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Mark McGowan

---

Subiaco site. Consultation is the new buzzword. Remember that the then government scabbled together the City Beach plan in the hope that it could save the seats of the former members for Perth and Mount Lawley. In eight years the former government did nothing and then went scratching around to get this project. It included developments at Doubleview. Remember, this is an opposition that believes consultation is everything. When the former government committed to the Doubleview development an article in the paper read —

“This whole issue hasn’t been handled well, with little consultation with residents and parents in Doubleview,” she said.

“The general feeling is that they aren’t listening to us and this hasn’t been thought through properly.

So, in 2016 when the former government made that decision, it did not consult.

I quote from another article —

During a City of Stirling council meeting ... several residents voiced their anger over being blind-sided by the school reshuffle—claiming it contradicted the council’s own street and reserve trees policy.

One resident —

I will not say her name —

... asked during question time why the proposed changes to the school grounds had been handled “in such a cloak and dagger manner” by the local and state government bodies.

“I’m here about the Doubleview Primary School issue which doesn’t seem to be on the agenda,” ...

“There are things that are coming out of the woodwork that us as ratepayers are seeing and it’s all done behind closed doors and we have not had any say in it.”

That is what the former government did when it —

**Mr J.R. Quigley:** The member for Scarborough did that.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** I understand that the member for Scarborough was the member.

In the last six months, the former government scrambled around for policy because it could not figure out that primary schools like North Perth, Mount Lawley and Highgate were bursting and needed a high school. The former government could not figure that out.

The member for Nedlands went doorknocking and he brought a petition to this place that I am still flummoxed by. He went doorknocking and brought in a petition, because he actually met a constituent for the first time! They had never seen this person before, so they went up to him and asked, “Who are you?” He said he was a member of Parliament and he had a petition; that is how he collected the signatures. He did nothing. I know people who saw him act as a minister and who cannot believe how he never moved anything forward. The member for Nedlands said he went doorknocking on Cambridge Street. This school will be in very close proximity to Cambridge Street. Just across the road from the people he was doorknocking will be a new high school. The member for Nedlands can go back. I will grab that petition and we will write to all those people.

**Mr W.R. Marmion** interjected.

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Nedlands!

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** We will write to all those people on Cambridge Street—the ones who the member doorknocked saying, “Hi, I’m a member of Parliament. You may never have seen me before in your life. Here’s a petition. That sounds good.” I will get the details of those people and ring them and tell them that we are delivering them a school across the road. That is what we are doing. The member for Nedlands said that he supported a school with an AFL-sized oval. What better AFL-sized oval is there in WA than Subiaco Oval? It has a unique shape; I have always worried that the new stadium will not replicate the exact dimensions. It is a unique oval and I think that families and teenagers out there cannot wait to play on Subiaco Oval at lunchtime! Do members not reckon? They can relive the moment that Modra picked up the ball. They can relive those classic derby moments of years gone past—those missed opportunities for the Dockers. There have been a few, but I will not relive them all. Those people will be reliving them; I can see it now. I wish I could go back and at lunchtime and pretend that I am an AFL player, too, because it will be an excellent opportunity. We have gone through the interesting analysis of population growth by the member for Nedlands, and, as I said, I will dissect it tonight and see whether I can come back tomorrow having made sense of taking 10 per cent of 2 000, which is more than a one per cent reduction; I am still trying to work that out. The member went doorknocking on Cambridge Street, and people in that area will now get a new school, so they are pretty happy. The member said that Churchlands Senior High School was left like a refugee camp, which is something the opposition should be embarrassed about. The former government had eight and a half years and it did nothing.

Speaker; Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Bill Marmion; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr John Carey; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Mark McGowan

---

The member for Scarborough has now noticed that there is development in the area, but believed it was not the member for Cottesloe who committed to closing the school; in fact, it was.

**Mrs L.M. Harvey** interjected.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** It was.

Things happened again and again. The member for Churchlands said that the Labor Party had walked away from the academic selection model.

**Mr W.J. Johnston:** The one that we created.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** That was the one that we created in 2007. That is again another falsehood. We were never walking away from the academic selection model. Again, the opposition stood up and gave the most lacklustre performance I have ever seen on a matter of public interest. This is a new opposition, and that was its first MPI—30 minutes of nothingness. It was just embarrassment. The former government had no plan.

**Mr S.K. L'Estrange:** We'll take the win. The public know you lost—the backflip.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** The member for Churchlands should look around; I think he has to realise that the Liberal Party lost in the biggest defeat in its history. He should look around and realise that the Liberal Party has lost, because its attitude has not changed. What is the number one term used to describe the former government?

**Mr J.R. Quigley:** Arrogant.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** Arrogant—and today the Liberal Party displayed that arrogance again. It was absolutely 100 per cent arrogance. We have a better model, because do members know what?

**Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup:** Inspired.

**Mr S.K. L'Estrange:** Inspired by our opposition to your lot.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** What?

We have a better model because the population growth is near where the new school is going to be built.

**Mr J.N. Carey:** Inner city.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** It is inner-city.

**Mr S.K. L'Estrange:** What's happening in Northbridge?

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** The member did not talk about that, did he? I did not hear him talk about it. He went on some insane, crazy sort of thought-bubble speech claiming falsehoods.

I met the mayor and CEO of the City of Subiaco and we had a discussion about these things—as you do. I think that the City of Subiaco sees the benefit that our project will bring. That is the opportunity. The offer is on the table, and I bet that when they think about what we are bringing to the table, they will see that we will retain the playing surface, which is something the current opposition never committed to when in government. The former government had no plan. The former government never committed to retaining the Subiaco Oval surface; it never did. We have made that commitment. We are keeping the playing surface. We are looking at redevelopment of some of the —

**Mr C.J. Barnett:** Will you keep the grandstands, too? Who's going to use it? Who's going to use that stadium?

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** What was your plan?

Several members interjected.

**The SPEAKER:** Members!

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** No, the interjection was taken —

Several members interjected.

**The SPEAKER:** Members!

**Mr C.J. Barnett:** What are you going to do with an old worn-out stadium?

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Cottesloe!

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** I do not know; the member for Cottesloe seems to be—I was going somewhere!

As I said, we have a plan for Subiaco with huge benefits—that is, the retention of the playing surface for a shared facility. Members representing new, growing electorates know that shared facilities are common with new schools. There are shared playing ovals. There are possibilities to share other facilities, in particular other indoor sports complexes. There will be what is needed, such as basketball courts and all those facilities that I think people in Subiaco would welcome. We are going to bring people back to Subiaco. The member for

Speaker; Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Bill Marmion; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr John Carey; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Mark McGowan

---

Nedlands has disappeared; he has gone to find some more constituents! He had not seen any for eight and half years and he was so enthralled by meeting a few that he has gone out find a few more.

There is the ability to encourage business. What was the former government's plan for Subiaco Oval after the AFL left? It had no plan. It had no plan to support local business. There are other benefits. As I said, the Department of Housing site could potentially be redeveloped. There is enormous opportunity. I encourage the City of Subiaco to work with us, because we want to deliver a great outcome. We are serious about delivering a great outcome for the community. We have a process to undertake, and I am confident that we can deliver significant benefit. I am proud that we consulted before the election. I know that the member for Perth actually doorknocks, and he doorknocks a lot of houses. The member for Mount Lawley also doorknocks. It is because they doorknock that they are on this side of the chamber. Those members helped us form government because they doorknocked. I am confident that their constituents will see a brand-new school with design excellence serving them.

**Mr S.K. L'Estrange:** When will they see this design?

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** Sorry? Is this from an opposition that did nothing for eight and a half years? Is that it? The current opposition did nothing for eight and a half years. For eight and half years it allowed schools to be crowded. It allowed the primary schools to be crowded, with nowhere to go. That is what it did. For eight and a half years there was no plan, and then it cobbled together a plan that it did not consult the community on.

I am pleased and proud that we have formulated a plan in three months. Do you know what? It will deliver an excellent outcome for the community and the state. For those footy tragics like me, the Subiaco Oval playing surface will be retained. It is an excellent outcome. I urge everyone in this house to support it because we are doing something that the former government could not. Kitchener Park was on the table but because the former government did not have the ability to sort out football, it did not do it.

**Mr J.E. McGrath:** You haven't sorted them out yet.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** The former government committed to the stadium, when? In 2011? It committed to it then and left in 2017 without sorting it out. We are serious about job creation in this state and solving real problems, and we are working hard to do it.

Government members: Hear, Hear!

**MR J.N. CAREY (Perth — Parliamentary Secretary)** [4.01 pm]: The critical issue for this debate is: where do we locate a high school? We have heard from the Leader of the Opposition, but I do not think he actually mentioned the words "inner city". I counted; he said "western suburbs" at least three or four times.

**Mr S.K. L'Estrange:** That's where the problem is.

**Mr J.N. CAREY:** The problem, the issue and the facts show that the population growth is in the inner city. It is undeniable. It is projected that there will be 50 per cent growth in the city itself over the next 10 years. In North Perth there will be 16 per cent growth, and in Mt Hawthorn there will be 14 per cent growth. What is City Beach's projected growth? It is negative one per cent growth, yet the Liberals have proposed that we build our next high school in the western suburbs. It does not make sense. The communities of the inner city fully understand this because there are two clear options, and one is a second-rate option.

I would like to confirm for the Minister for Planning that I spoke to the chair of the Mount Hawthorn Primary School board, who confirmed that this was a great solution for dealing with overcrowding. I also spoke to the president of the Mount Hawthorn Primary School parents and citizens association, who said publicly last year that he was a lifetime Liberal supporter who for the first time voted Labor in the seat of Perth. He said that he is excited about this new school and the access to Subi Oval and that of all the solutions put forward, this is the best possible outcome.

Our own inner-city communities are telling me that this is the best option, because the alternative option, City Beach, is absolutely second rate. It is not as close to the inner city—that is pretty obvious—but it is also the numbers of students it will cater for. The new school at Kitchener Park will have 2 000 students; the City Beach option would have had 1 600 students. When we look at what the actual developments will mean into the future, we see that Kitchener Park is the stand-out. It will be a state-of-the-art designed school, versus what Mt Hawthorn and North Perth parents are being offered, which is partially refurbished buildings. This is why local inner cities —

Several members interjected.

**Mr J.N. CAREY:** Yes, it is! It is partially refurbished buildings.

Several members interjected.

Speaker; Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Bill Marmion; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr John Carey; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Mark McGowan

---

**Mr J.N. CAREY:** We offer them a completely new state-of-the-art facility. That is the truth.

**Mr S.K. L'Estrange:** It's not.

**Mr J.N. CAREY:** We are in this mess because of poor planning by the previous government. It had warnings. It was classic. My communities and P&C associations would tell me that Hon Peter Collier would glide in like he was on a catwalk, walk into the school and wave his hand. I actually felt sorry for the then member for Perth; I did! It was very clear to her and her electorate and her minister was western suburbs focused. I could see the embarrassment when the only option she could offer the inner city, as though it was a dirty term to the Liberals, was the western suburbs option. That warning was also given in a parliamentary committee. I will read from an ABC online news article headed "New inner-city schools needed for Perth, WA Education Department says". The article reads —

**Inner-city population growth could force WA's Education Department to establish two new schools in central Perth and another two in nearby suburbs.**

... made the comments in a parliamentary committee hearing today, ...

This article is dated 8 December 2015. What was the minister's response at the time? Like his usual fashion cavalier approach, it was, "Oh, we're fine for the next five to 10 years! We're fine! Don't worry about it!" What is really funny is that no-one in the inner-city communities took any assurance from this.

Here is my challenge to the Liberal Party: please come out campaigning with me in the inner city. Please, push your option of a non-inner-city high school. Explain to them, based on the population growth, its location, its access to public transport, and why the City Beach option is better. It is not. If we are to be a true global city, we must understand that we must start building our education facilities close to where people live—that is, the inner city. It is not a dirty term. The people and communities of Mt Hawthorn, Highgate and North Perth are very clear that the Liberals present a second-rate option and that Labor's plan for an inner-city school is best.

**MR P. PAPALIA (Warnbro — Minister for Tourism)** [4.06 pm]: I thank the member for Perth for his interest and congratulate him on an excellent first contribution as a speaker on a matter of public interest. It is good that he is interested because this is a matter of public interest, but, sadly, we do not have much interest from the opposition. About 60 per cent of its members have managed to stay in the chamber, not including, unfortunately, the Leader of the Opposition. If this was such an important issue, the opposition might have considered getting members to be here to listen or contribute to the debate.

I have found the Liberal Party of Western Australia's new-found interest in the concept of consultation interesting and enthralling. It is almost as though the moment it changed sides of the chamber it discovered this new idea. Firstly, the member for Nedlands has discovered the public. He found a constituent; that was a good thing. He has managed to find at least one constituent that we are aware of, but the rest of the opposition has just discovered the word "consultation". It is now demanding consultation by the government. We have just spent three months listening and have now changed our position based on the opinion of the people that the opposition is supposedly representing. That is a good thing. It is sad to watch the opposition almost grieving that the government has responded to people's request for a change. We know why—because it is desperate to cling to any opportunity it has to not talk about its previous performance in government. Unfortunately, this subject is all about its previous performance.

Let us talk about consultation. What consultation was undertaken by the Court government when it shut all the high schools in the western suburbs, creating the problem we now have to deal with? What consultation was taken by the previous Liberal government, with the now Leader of the Opposition a key player, when in 2011 it chose to announce without any analysis at all that it would shift a new football stadium to Burswood? What consultation was done with the then, I think, around 700 small businesses in Subiaco that were about to have their livelihoods massively impacted by the Liberal Party's unilateral decision? What consultation was done? How many times did the former Minister for Small Business meet with small businesses in Subiaco and what was his plan for those small businesses that would no longer have a football game every fortnight or so throughout the year? Tens of thousands of patrons would leave the football ground and provide an opportunity for revenue generation for hundreds of small businesses in the suburb of Subiaco. What consultation was there? What was the plan? The minister had no plan. The Liberal Party made the announcement in December 2011, after the Premier was driving along and looked out the window to one side of the car and saw that there might be an opportunity to build a stadium there. He was told that he could not do it on that side so he decided to do it on the other side.

That was the extent of the plan and that was the extent of the consultation. Hundreds of businesses were impacted but there was no plan in eight and a half years. In the six years since that decision was made, the former government did nothing. It did nothing to create a business case. That is another thing the opposition has

Speaker; Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Bill Marmion; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr John Carey; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Mark McGowan

---

just discovered—the need for business cases, and their benefits. What business case was undertaken before committing \$520 million of federal and state taxpayers' money to Ord stage 2? We got a road and a drain. The former government did not even have a baseline crop to support \$520 million—\$320 million of taxpayers' money. What business case was prepared before that decision was made? We know what the answer is.

*Point of Order*

**Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE:** This has nothing to do with the matter of public interest. He is talking about the Ord River scheme.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr I.C. Blayney):** Thank you. Minister.

*Debate Resumed*

**Mr P. PAPALIA:** What a ridiculous critique to make of this government: to demand a business case, to demand consultation and to demand a cost–benefit analysis. What cost–benefit analysis was made before the former government spent taxpayers' money underwriting a luxury apartment development in Karratha? Those apartments were only rented by the government. What business case, what analysis and what consultation was done? It is a joke.

**MR M. MCGOWAN (Rockingham — Premier) [4.11 pm]:** I confirm to the house that the government will not be supporting this motion moved by the opposition. It is true that the government has changed its position about the inner-city school. I think we have come up with a very good option. I want to indicate to the house and to the people of Western Australia that I accept that governments need to listen. I am not so arrogant as to assume that we get everything right. We have decided to change our position and we have come up with a very good option for the people of the inner city, including students. This school will cater for 2 000 students. It will meet the long-term needs of the inner city and it will meet the needs of the growing population of the inner city. Historically, some very bad decisions were made to close high schools in the western suburbs. This is rectification for the bad decisions that were made in the 1990s. It is in the right location. It provides for a broader redevelopment option around Subiaco Oval with the anchor of a new state-of-the-art high school that will support a growing population in that area and also in the inner city. It will also provide the opportunity for people to use and access the businesses of the inner city and Subiaco. From my point of view it is the right decision for the inner city, Perth, Mt Lawley, Nedlands and Subiaco. We have listened to the community.

When I look at the Liberals in opposition—I do not think anyone from the Nationals has spoken—all I see is sour grapes and unhappiness. They scream at us one day to change the position. We change the position and they scream at us for changing the position! It is classic early-term opposition that has not learnt. We have listened to the community. We are not so arrogant; we have changed our position. I note that on 25 May the member for Hillarys said that if we changed our plan on Perth Modern School —

I for one would applaud the government for it.

I have not seen him applauding today. The member for Scarborough implored us to change our position. The member for Nedlands asked us for “green space and an AFL-sized oval”. We will provide that. Under this plan, we provide Subiaco Oval.

Several members interjected.

**Mr M. MCGOWAN:** Listen! I did not interject on members opposite.

Several members interjected.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Members!

**Mr M. MCGOWAN:** We provide the member for Nedlands' electorate with Subiaco Oval no less, for his constituents to kick a footy around, to play with their children and for his constituents' children to use, and he complains!

Hon Donna Faragher indicated repeatedly that she would support us wholeheartedly if we changed our position. Today we changed our position and the Leader of the Opposition moved a motion in this house to condemn us. This is a classic case of “we cannot win”. What can we do to win with members opposite? Why can they not accept that we did what is in the public interest? We changed our position, as they were screaming at us to do, and now they are screaming at us again. Do members opposite not think the people of Western Australia will see through that? Do they not think Western Australians will see them as whingers and whiners; as people who say one thing one day and another thing the next? That is what they will see them as. A bit of free advice to members opposite: sometimes you need to be constructive!

**Extract from *Hansard***  
[ASSEMBLY — Tuesday, 13 June 2017]  
p761b-771a

Speaker; Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Bill Marmion; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr John Carey; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Mark McGowan

---

*Division*

Question put and a division taken, the Acting Speaker (Mr I.C. Blayney) casting his vote with the ayes, with the following result —

Ayes (18)

Mr C.J. Barnett	Mr P. Katsambanis	Mr W.R. Marmion	Mr D.T. Redman
Mr I.C. Blayney	Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup	Mr J.E. McGrath	Mr P.J. Rundle
Mr V.A. Catania	Mr A. Krsticevic	Dr M.D. Nahan	Ms L. Mettam ( <i>Teller</i> )
Ms M.J. Davies	Mr S.K. L'Estrange	Mr D.C. Nalder	
Mrs L.M. Harvey	Mr R.S. Love	Mr K. O'Donnell	

Noes (38)

Ms L.L. Baker	Mr M. Hughes	Mr S.J. Price	Mr C.J. Tallentire
Dr A.D. Buti	Mr W.J. Johnston	Mr D.T. Punch	Mr D.A. Templeman
Mr J.N. Carey	Mr F.M. Logan	Mr J.R. Quigley	Mr P.C. Tinley
Mrs R.M.J. Clarke	Mr M. McGowan	Ms M.M. Quirk	Mr B. Urban
Mr R.H. Cook	Ms S.F. McGurk	Mrs M.H. Roberts	Mr R.R. Whitby
Ms J. Farrer	Mr K.J.J. Michel	Ms C.M. Rowe	Ms S.E. Winton
Mr M.J. Folkard	Mr S.A. Millman	Ms R. Saffioti	Mr B.S. Wyatt
Ms J.M. Freeman	Mr M.P. Murray	Ms A. Sanderson	Mr D.R. Michael ( <i>Teller</i> )
Ms E. Hamilton	Mrs L.M. O'Malley	Ms J.J. Shaw	
Mr T.J. Healy	Mr P. Papalia	Mrs J.M.C. Stojkovski	

Question thus negatived.