

*Standing Committee on Legislation — Fourteenth Report —
“Inquiry into the Jurisdiction and Operation of the State Administrative Tribunal”*

Resumed from 20 May 2009.

Motion

Hon KEN BASTON: I move —

That the report be noted.

This was an interesting inquiry into the State Administrative Tribunal that was referred to the committee on 7 June 2007. Two years after the SAT legislation commenced, it was to be reviewed to see how the tribunal was operating. The legislation was referred by the Legislative Council, as I said, on 7 June 2007 to the Standing Committee on Legislation. On 7 August 2008 the committee was in the process of gathering further information and drafting the report when the 2008 state election was called and, of course, Parliament was prorogued. However, the inquiry was referred again to the committee on 11 November 2008 and we eventually finished this report in May 2009. It was therefore a fairly long drawn-out process. The members of that committee altered from time to time, particularly with the change of government. The committee inquiry opened with Hon Graham Giffard in the chair. Hon Giz Watson, Hon Matt Benson-Lidholm, Hon Sally Talbot and I were on the committee, and of course Hon George Cash was the substitute member for Hon Peter Collier from 7 August 2008, and then Hon Helen Morton. There were, therefore, various members.

The report made 60 recommendations and 25 findings, and raised many issues to which the government has responded. It supported 36 recommendations and all the present findings. Two of the recommendations are now no longer relevant due to legislative amendments, and the remaining recommendations are subject to review or further consideration.

One of the issues that came out of the report was that the State Administrative Tribunal had been established virtually as a low-cost way of negotiating outcomes. However, some problems arose in planning when people used the State Administrative Tribunal to bypass decisions made by local government. Many applications made to local government that were not fully filled out were, of course, refused by local government and were then referred to the State Administrative Tribunal, which seemed to create positive results for people to achieve their building planning approvals.

Another interesting aspect of the State Administrative Tribunal was that the Honourable Mr Justice Michael Barker served as the inaugural President and it was—dare I say it—his baby. He set up SAT and followed it through from 24 November 2004 to 6 February 2009. I congratulate him for the work he put into SAT and the time he gave the committee as a witness to this inquiry. In visiting the State Administrative Tribunal it was quite obvious that the facilities, although adequate now will, with the workload coming through, need to be increased and that will obviously require extra funding. Also, for the State Administrative Tribunal to work in regional areas it needs court facilities with videoconferencing. It certainly came to my attention and the attention of the committee that any new court building being constructed in regional areas will definitely need videoconferencing capabilities in place.

I think I have covered the misuse of SAT. I think the pressure on the State Administrative Tribunal is one of those last resorts or cheap resorts to turn to in order to achieve an outcome. For that reason all other disputes, without going through all the other disputes mechanisms, have been referred to SAT. Over time I think we need to be careful how we fund and manage that. It could grow into a monster by being used prior to the courts. I think more and more people will use the jurisdiction of SAT.

I believe the recommendations the committee came through with are very pertinent. I look forward to the use of the State Administrative Tribunal for many years to come. I hope that it does not lose the purpose for which it was designed and set up; that is, as a mediator and not just a court.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (Hon Max Trenorden): Before I give another member the call, I want to remind members that when seeking the attention of the Chair, members have to ask for the call and address the Chair—either the President when he is here, or a Deputy President or Chairman when he is not. At times it is difficult. I did not see Hon Ken Baston indicate he wanted the call. I ask members to address the Chair. We have a new member seeking to do that right now; that is, Hon Linda Savage.

HON LINDA SAVAGE: I would like to take the opportunity to speak about the fourteenth report of the Standing Committee on Legislation titled “Inquiry into the Jurisdiction and Operation of the State Administrative Tribunal”. I should say at the outset that I have a very particular interest in the State Administrative Tribunal for two reasons. The first reason is that I spent many years working in the area of

administrative law in commonwealth tribunals both at the Social Security Appeals Tribunal, firstly as a member and then as its director, and then I was appointed to the Administrative Appeals Tribunal. The second reason I have an interest is that I, along with Michael Barker and Peter Johnson, was part of a task force that was set up on behalf of the former Attorney General, Jim McGinty, with the assistance of a number of other members. The report of the task force was handed down in 2002. In that report we recommended the establishment of a State Administrative Tribunal. I will not go into the many reasons that we did that now, but one of the reasons, certainly coming from my background in administrative law, was that it enabled people who would otherwise not be able, because of the cost of getting legal representation or the complexity of going into the court system, to exercise their right to appeal against decisions or have disputes heard.

I think it is fair to say that Australia has led the world in the establishment of tribunals. If we look at the history of tribunals in Australia, at its core is the desire to enable people to go into a setting which is non-adversarial—that is, inquisitorial—that is low cost or no cost, and which enables persons to exercise rights that they would otherwise be unable to. One of the most important reasons to have tribunals was to enable people to respond to administrative decisions in particular—that is, decisions made by government departments. As members will be aware, the State Administrative Tribunal also deals with a number of other disputes. People who are familiar with SAT and its work will know that on some occasions unrepresented parties are involved in matters with represented parties. That means that the processes of SAT, along the lines of other tribunals within Australia, have to be particularly developed to enable unrepresented parties to be able to lodge an application and proceed to the appeal stage and have the matter heard.

To start with, I must say that I am very pleased to see that the committee's general conclusion states —

The Committee found the SAT to be operating efficiently and effectively and was of the view that this positive result has been due to the considerable efforts and dedication of the members and staff of the SAT. In particular, the Committee acknowledged the initiatives, work and leadership of the Honourable Justice Michael Barker, who served as the inaugural President of the SAT from 24 November 2004 to 6 February 2009.

In the short time I have left to speak, I will make some comments about mediation, about which the committee made some recommendations. Some members know that once applications have been lodged with the State Administrative Tribunal, a directions hearing is held. At a directions hearing it is not uncommon for the parties either to be compulsorily directed towards mediation or a suggestion is made that the parties go to mediation. That is a suggestion that is often taken up by the parties. The parties go into the mediation process. Mediation, if it is conducted skilfully, can to an extent, and sometimes largely, deal with the inequalities between parties. It is very important that we appreciate that the mediation process is a well-developed process. If members do not mind, I will quote from the committee's report. Ms Margaret Halsmith, who is the chair of LEADR—which is the national body for accredited mediators, of which I am one—informed the committee —

Mediation is the structured problem-solving process. It is an opportunity for parties with the assistance of an impartial facilitator to do four things; that is, to identify the disputed issues, to develop options, to consider alternatives and to endeavour to reach agreement.

As I said, in the mediation process, as in the actual hearing at the State Administrative Tribunal, it may be that there is a represented party—that is, a party represented by a lawyer—and an unrepresented party.

I will refer again to the report and some of the evidence before the committee. The committee heard evidence that the State Administrative Tribunal should prepare and distribute to parties prior to mediation a more detailed document that more fully explains the mediation process than the one that is already available. The committee recommended that the State Administrative Tribunal consider utilising what it described as an “intake specialist” to prepare parties for mediations, as well as compulsory conferences. I might read into *Hansard* what is meant by the “intake” process. That process involves officers of SAT being responsible for the intake process and who would be available, prior to the process commencing, to inform the parties of how the process will be conducted. In addition, intake specialists would be able to gather basic information from the parties that would be helpful in the mediation process. I think that is a very important recommendation. It is one that I look forward to, and hope that the State Administrative Tribunal takes up. Another important recommendation was that the State Administrative Tribunal ensures that all its mediators are nationally accredited and that SAT also considers becoming a recognised national accreditation body.

I certainly support these recommendations in the interests of improving the good work already done by the State Administrative Tribunal, particularly given that many of the parties are unrepresented and are coming into an environment which may feel quite familiar to people who have been in a court or tribunal before, or who work in one, but which is a very foreign environment for the vast majority of people. I commend the recommendations

made in the committee's report that the processes continue to be developed to ensure that the general public can better access the State Administrative Tribunal.

Hon KATE DOUST: I do not have anything of great value to add to the debate on this report, but I have been asked to see whether we can perhaps adjourn the debate on this report as there are other members who would like to speak on it but who are not able to be here this afternoon. Therefore, I will move that the debate be adjourned until the next sitting of the house.

Consideration of report adjourned, on motion by Hon Kate Doust.

Metropolitan Region Scheme Amendments — Baldivis Urban Area — Statement by Leader of the House

Resumed from 9 December 2008.

Consideration of statement lapsed.

*Joint Standing Committee on Delegated Legislation — Thirty-third report —
“State Administrative Tribunal Rules Amendment (No. 2) 2008”*

Resumed from 21 May 2009.

Motion

Hon ROBIN CHAPPLE: I move —

That the report be noted.

First of all, I need to identify that although representing the standing committee, I was not on the committee at the time this report was drafted. However, being a member of that committee, I have perused report 33. Indeed, it touched to a degree on the last matters that were spoken about in the previous discussion, and that related to the Standing Committee on Legislation inquiry into the jurisdiction and operation of the State Administrative Tribunal. The matter before the Joint Standing Committee on Delegated Legislation was indeed the State Administrative Tribunal Amendment Rules (No. 2) 2008. These were gazetted on 29 August 2008 and are contained in an appendix attached to report 33.

The joint standing committee of the day raised with the State Administrative Tribunal various concerns about the amendment rules, the majority of which were resolved through correspondence. As members know, the committee endeavours to resolve all matters wherever possible, and through negotiation we usually get that resolution. However, amendment rule 5 remained contentious, with the State Administrative Tribunal refusing to provide an undertaking to repeal the offending provision, and it did not rely on it in the interim. The committee was of the view that amendment rule 5 was not contemplated by the State Administrative Tribunal Act 2004 and offended the committee's term of reference 3.6(b), which states, according to the report —

In its consideration of an instrument, the Committee is to inquire whether the instrument - “...has an adverse effect on existing rights, interests, or legitimate expectations beyond giving effect to a purpose authorized or contemplated by the empowering enactment”.

The committee first looked at this rule on 9 March 2009, and on 2 April 2009 the committee resolved to move a notice of motion of disallowance of the amendment rules for the purpose of preserving its position while giving the amendment rules further consideration. The State Administrative Tribunal was advised of that resolution by a letter dated 25 March 2009. Again, the correspondence associated with that letter is contained in appendix 2 of the report. Although the committee gave notice of a motion for disallowance of the whole of the amendment rules, it now recommends disallowance of just amendment rule 5. Amendment rule 5 states, according to the report —

Rule 61(1) is amended by deleting “This rule applies to -“ and inserting instead - “Subrules (2), (3) and (4) apply to -.”

I will not read the whole section into the record, but the committee was of the view that the removal of the requirement for personal service in respect of the application may result in a licensee not receiving notice of an application threatening his or her livelihood—for example, if the licensee is absent from his or her address for a temporary period, such as a holiday or a stay in hospital, neither of which requires notification of change of address. Therefore, the committee went through a fairly lengthy process and produced report 33, which was signed off by Mr Joe Francis, MLA, the chairman, on 21 May 2009. The committee recommended at that time that amendment rule 5 of the State Administrative Tribunal Rules Amendment (No. 2) 2008 be disallowed.

The committee acknowledged in many ways the practical difficulties that the commercial agents unit of the Western Australia Police experience in serving applications made pursuant to section 67 of the Security and Related Activities (Control) Act 1996. However, the committee noted that in the event that service is proving to

be difficult, it is possible in an appropriate case for the Western Australia Police to apply to the State Administrative Tribunal for an order for postal service. Therefore, the committee found itself at significant odds with the direction taken by amendment rule 5. That most probably encapsulates for the house the salient points of report 33.

Question put and passed.

*Department for Planning and Infrastructure — Vehicle Licensing Information —
Statement by Minister for Transport*

Resumed from 9 December 2008.

Consideration of statement lapsed.

*Joint Standing Committee on the Corruption and Crime Commission — Fourth Report — “Corruption and
Crime Commission’s Response to the Select Committee into the Police Raid on The Sunday Times Report No 1”*

Resumed from 23 June 2009.

Motion

Hon NICK GOIRAN: I move —

That the report be noted.

In moving that motion, I will make a few comments. First of all, as will be abundantly clear to the members of this place, it has been some time since this report was put before the house. In fact, it was tabled on 23 June 2009, so it is approaching some nine or 10 months since it was put before the house. Nonetheless, it is pleasing to see the progress that we are making today, and I have to say that I was not necessarily sure that we would get to this matter today. However, we have reached it.

This is a very brief report that I draw to members’ attention.

Certainly in relation to reports that come before the house, this is a particularly concise one. That is because it relates to the more substantive report produced by the Select Committee into the Police Raid on *The Sunday Times*. That report was tabled in April 2009, and it is certainly quite a comprehensive report in and of itself. That report contained 11 findings and six recommendations.

The report before us now is simply the Corruption and Crime Commission’s response to that select committee report, because the CCC thought it appropriate to respond. I draw members’ attention to the concise executive summary by the then chairman of the committee, the member for Perth, Mr John Hyde, MLA, who indicated that once the select committee’s report had been brought to the Parliament it was considered appropriate for the CCC to comment on that because there were a number of findings and recommendations that related directly to the involvement, or lack thereof, of the CCC in the investigations following the police raid on *The Sunday Times*.

The response of the Joint Standing Committee on the Corruption and Crime Commission, which I now chair, was to simply annex, in its entirety, the response from the CCC, so that members of this place would have the benefit of understanding the response. Having perused the report and having been a member of the committee for a very short time before this was laid before the house, I would encourage members to be across it because, if nothing else, this report clarifies some perceptions and misconceptions about the role of the CCC when a matter is being investigated by the police. There seemed to be some suggestion at the time that the CCC should have been more involved in the investigation, but members can see that the commission has provided a response as to the circumstances into which that might take place, and why, in this particular instance, it was not necessary, particularly as a police investigation was already underway. It is worth noting that that is often the case, and I will quote from paragraph 13 of the commission’s response, which states —

It should be noted that the Commission consistently assesses well over 2,000 allegations per year and that the vast majority of these are referred to independent agencies or appropriate authorities for investigation, that is, they are not investigated by the Commission itself. In these cases, the Commission reviews the investigations once they are completed by those agencies and authorities.

In other words, the CCC often receives notifications or complaints that it refers back to the originating agency for its own internal process to be undertaken. The CCC then monitors, or supervises, that process. That is probably not well known or well understood by the public, but it probably is at the heart of this response to the select committee’s report by the CCC. I move that the report be noted.

Question put and passed.

Vocational Education and Training — Statement by Minister for Training

Resumed from 12 March 2009.

Motion

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: I move —

That the statement be noted.

I welcome the opportunity to make some comments about this ministerial statement.

On Thursday, 12 March 2009 the minister came into this place and made a ministerial statement that outlined some of the positive initiatives that were being undertaken in the training area. He firstly listed the Training Legislation Amendment and Repeal Bill 2008. This was reform legislation that was worked on and developed and in a format ready to be delivered to the Parliament before the Labor Party lost the election in September 2008, but this minister chose to include it as part of his achievements in the vocational education and training sector.

Hon Peter Collier: I certainly did!

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Sorry?

Hon Peter Collier: I certainly did!

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: The minister certainly did. This is a minister who is known to grab that which belongs to others and claim it as his own—no doubt about it! He did not even mention in the ministerial statement that that was what he was doing.

Hon Ken Travers: Sometimes he makes it up for other people as well!

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: That was the first initiative he laid claim to.

Hon Peter Collier: No, it is not! You had two years to put it through the Parliament; we refined it and put it through.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: The second initiative he laid claim to —

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (Hon Max Trenorden): Order! If Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich could just stop for a moment: I was chastised yesterday by members from both sides for not being strong enough, so I intend to be a little tighter on order. Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich has the call.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: The second initiative that he claimed credit for was a new State Training Board. The State Training Board has been around for many, many years. In fact, the minister was not right when he said that I had laid claim to establishing the State Training Board; I did not.

Hon Peter Collier: That's right.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: I want to correct that on the house's records: I lay claim to the Skills Formation Taskforce and its network of participating bodies, certainly not the State Training Board.

The State Training Board has been around for a long time and does some outstanding work. The State Training Board has put an enormous amount of energy and effort into formulating the state skills profile for 2009 to 2011. The State Training Board is headed up by a very capable gentleman by the name of Keith Spence. Keith Spence and his board members have produced a report of 250-odd pages that virtually details every piece of information that people could possibly want to have at their fingertips to be able to make decisions about the future direction of vocational education and training in this state. Once again, this minister has taken something that was already there, tried to repackage it, and now lays claim to a new State Training Board—there is no such thing as a new State Training Board!

Hon Peter Collier: We changed the membership!

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: He changed the membership! Do members know how hard it is to change the membership? Let us see how hard it is to change the membership.

Hon Peter Collier: Read the ministerial statement! Read it!

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: The minister must work out who he might want to put on there, and then he signs off to say, "We're going to get rid of Tom Bloggs and Rod Jones", and anybody else on the board that he does not want, and he puts his own people in there—it is a great achievement! That is hardly any great achievement; that is a simple, normal function of what ministers do.

Hon Peter Collier: You got the sack, didn't you?

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: The next matter was that of the industry training advisory arrangements. One thing this minister seems to be very, very good at is repackaging stuff that is already there. He repackages information—just about anything he can think of, he has repackaged, rebadged, gone out there, sold it as his own, and it is a real, real shame that he continues to do that.

I make these points because this issue is really interesting to me. I actually did a lot of research in the area of vocational education and training because I think it is absolutely critical to get the training agenda right. If the training agenda is right, it means that the level of skills development will be right, which means that the labour market issues that may present as a challenge can be addressed. We are moving into a boom period that people say is on our doorstep—certainly it is humming along above the twenty-sixth parallel—and it has already reached those regional mining areas. We hear of horror cases in the north west where people are paying rent of \$2 500 a week. I am told that it is like that in Port Hedland. That would indicate that there is already pressure in that area.

It is really imperative that we get the labour market components right to address the boom. This minister has failed to do anything really substantial in this area.

Hon Peter Collier: Didn't you get the sack?

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: This is the sort of interruption that one might expect from this minister because he cannot take criticism. He has clearly let the sector down. He has already said on the public record that at the end of June 2008, 2 500 apprenticeships were cancelled. He said that by June 2009 an additional 2 500 apprenticeships were cancelled. That is 5 000 in total.

Hon Peter Collier: Rubbish!

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: I will prove that during members' statements. It is not a problem. As I said, 5 000 apprenticeships were cancelled. When I was asking about these cancellations, the minister was less than forthright in the detail. We have seen 5 000 apprenticeships cancelled. Some of them may have re-entered the training market. We know for sure that there are some 3 297 fewer apprentices in training now than there were in September 2008 when Hon Peter Collier became the Minister for Training, and subsequently workforce development was added to that portfolio. That is very concerning. In Western Australia youth unemployment is 18.9 per cent. In addition, we have an underutilisation rate of some 11.9 per cent. That consists of an unemployment rate of five per cent plus an underemployment component of 6.9 per cent, making up the 11.9 per cent. The underemployment rate covers those people who perhaps work part time, who have piecemeal work and who are technically considered to be within the labour market but who want an increase in the number of hours they work, perhaps even full-time employment. We have not seen what this minister will do to address this 18.9 per cent youth unemployment. We have not seen anything in the planning from this minister of what he is going to do to address the issue of 11.9 per cent underemployment. We should keep in mind that the national underemployment average is 13 per cent. Given that we are a booming state in comparison with other states and territories in the nation, we are not really doing all that well in real terms.

This minister has been very, very good at glossing over the detail. He has not been upfront in providing detail to this place. In other words, he has been very tricky about what he is doing. He is presenting a picture showing that everything is going really well in training whereas we know that things are not going very well because we are speaking to people on the ground.

Hon Peter Collier: Who are you speaking to?

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Who I speak to is my business. Who the minister speaks to is his business. He does not have to work himself up. He is only working himself up because he knows there is a problem. He knows that the position is not sustainable.

On page 5 of this ministerial statement the minister made some comment about the government having signed up to the commonwealth government's national partnership agreement on the Productivity Places Program. We heard in this house only last week that the minister has transferred some of the funding for the PPP that should have been spent in this financial year to the next financial year. Some people will be missing out on training.

Hon Peter Collier: You have no idea.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: The minister would like me to have no idea. I want to take this opportunity to give a bit of a critique about the training agenda. We should keep in mind that this minister had no policy when he took over this portfolio. One might have expected that once he got this portfolio, he might have created a policy. He could have added it to this ministerial statement but he did not. He had no policy so he copied Labor's training plan, Training WA: Planning for the Future 2009–18. It was word for word.

Hon Peter Collier interjected.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (Hon Max Trenorden): Members, we have only a few minutes left before the suspension of the sitting for dinner, so if we can have a bit of silence for four minutes, I would appreciate it.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: We also heard from the minister in this chamber that he anticipated that there would not be much demand for increased skills as a result of the global financial crisis. There is no doubt that during 2008–09 there was a significant reduction, particularly in apprenticeship and traineeship training. The government, in its wisdom, has made training harder and less affordable for many young people. One of the first things it did was cut the It Pays to Learn allowance in the budget. It netted the government some \$58.3 million. In other words, \$58 million was taken out of the pockets of parents and apprentices and basically put back into the Treasury. Labor made the policy decision to introduce the It Pays to Learn allowance. We did that for a very specific reason. We recognised that if somebody does take an apprenticeship, there are costs associated with undertaking training. The first thing that the minister did was ensure that he took that money away from apprentices and basically put it into his own pocket to be redistributed in other ways.

This minister, in the creation of the new department and then in the spending of very limited training funds that were made available to him, chose to spend much of the money on an advertising campaign. I would have thought that if 2 500 apprentices had their apprenticeships cancelled in 2008 and then another 2 500 again in 2009, that money could have gone into the funding of apprenticeship places. But no, this minister took it upon himself to use the money to promote his department and, in doing so, promote himself. This minister has got his priorities wrong. This minister is about gloss. This minister is failing the training system.

Hon Peter Collier interjected.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Members, we have only a short time left.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: It is also very concerning that I cannot for the life of me understand why this minister —

Hon Peter Collier: Why you got the sack? It was because you were incompetent!

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: The minister always resorts to nasty —

Hon Peter Collier: You're incompetent.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: If I am incompetent, the minister should just sit back because it will not matter what I say.

Sitting suspended from 6.00 to 7.30 pm

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (Hon Helen Morton): Members, we are currently dealing with the vocational education and training ministerial statement and Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich is speaking. I just indicate that there are six minutes left on this particular session.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Thank you, Madam Chair. I had actually packed away all my information, but anyway it does not really matter. I think that I have covered in most part the points I wanted to make. I have some concerns about the future of training in Western Australia. I am particularly concerned with the issue of making sure that we have sufficient workers to meet the demands of the resources sector. I am not so sure that the strategies that have been put into place by this minister will deliver that workforce. I have already alluded to the 18.9 per cent youth unemployment rate as at February 2010. Clearly the priorities should be about getting these young people into training, and then from training into employment to make sure that they are work ready. In fact there is a bit of a debate going on at the moment, given the comment of Mr Abbott in the media in relation to the prospect of perhaps having the dole cut and forcing young people to move into the mining sector. I would like to make some points in relation to that. The mining sector has some high occupational health and safety requirements. Like most industry sectors, the mining sector does not take untrained personnel on board; but it does want a job-ready labour supply. That means that as a priority those unemployed people should be trained so that they are job ready and can take up the opportunities that present themselves in the mining sector, or indeed in any other sector where there is a skills shortage. There is no doubt that there will be some flowthrough for existing workers and certain industry types. I refer, for example, to the hospitality industry, from which many people are already noted to be leaving to look for opportunities in the resources sector. In doing that, they will create vacancies in the hospitality sector which, of course, will need to be backfilled over time. It is therefore very important that the minister get this right, in terms of the statement he made way back then. I had hoped that by this time we would see a very clear strategic direction. We have not seen that today.

It is very concerning that there is so very much effort going into looking for and moving towards skilled migration, which I believe may well be detrimental to Western Australian jobs for Western Australian workers. I hold the firm view that we need to look after Western Australians. We need to prepare Western Australians for the opportunities that lie ahead. Our priority should be to make sure that we pick up in particular those young

people who are unemployed, of whom there are many, and also those people who are under-employed, also of whom there are many, and that we give them the appropriate training to prepare them for the opportunities that lie ahead. I believe that jobs should be given to those people as the first priority.

Question put and passed.

Progress reported and leave granted to sit again, pursuant to temporary orders.