

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

Amendment to Motion

Resumed from an earlier stage of the sitting.

MR J.M. FRANCIS (Jandakot — Minister for Corrective Services) [2.47 pm]: Before question time I was referring to my comments that the member for Warnbro took some offence to, which were that some people are not necessarily in the right job, and I referred to an email, one of a number of phone calls and emails that went into my electorate office from prison officers. People who work in the system are saying, “You know what, you’re on the money. Perhaps we can review the selection criteria and the training program.”

Mr P. Papalia: How many emails did you get like that?

Mr J.M. FRANCIS: I will not yell over the top of the member for Warnbro. The people who contacted me said perhaps we could review the selection criteria and the training program curriculum for young prison officers. I was making the *Top Gun* comparison. In the movie *Top Gun* the aim of the fighter pilots is to be the best of the best, so they can end up as instructors of other fighter pilots. Perhaps there is now an argument that we need to be a bit more selective in getting the right people to be instructors at the academy for prison officers, so that when new prison officers join the system they are taught and mentored by what I would call the best of the best. I had this conversation with the people at the Prison Officers’ Union and they agree with me. They think there is merit in reviewing the selection criteria and the training program for prison officers. When I refer to prison officers I always make the point that it is a very tough job to be a prison officer. They need a certain cut of the jib, they need a certain thickness of skin, they need a certain toughness about them to deal with essentially very dangerous people. It is a difficult job and we have to respect that. We have to respect what prison officers do and we have to acknowledge that they have a very challenging job. But just like someone needs a certain thickness of skin to be a prison officer, just like someone needs a certain thickness of skin to be in the Navy or to be in the Army, or that it takes a certain type of character to be a bus driver or a train driver or a pilot, a person needs a certain type of character to be a paramedic who turns up at the scene, or to be a journalist, whatever —

Mr J.E. McGrath interjected.

Mr J.M. FRANCIS: Member for South Perth, a person needs a certain type of character to be a politician! Can members imagine what would happen if a member stood in this place and said, “Stop Parliament. I’m so stressed; I can’t handle what members of the Labor Party are saying to me!” We would be yelling at the member to resign. If the member for Warnbro was so offended by that comment, perhaps he is in the wrong job. There is nothing wrong with acknowledging that sometimes across all of government some people might be in the wrong job. They may not be cut out to do the particular job they are doing.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

Mr P. Papalia: You’re getting upset because we criticised you for that.

Mr J.M. FRANCIS: You are the one who took offence at my remarks!

Mr P. Papalia: I didn’t.

Mr J.M. FRANCIS: What is so wrong with saying, “Perhaps —

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr P. Abetz): Members! The member for Jandakot is on his feet. Please give him respect by remaining silent so that he can be heard.

Mr J.M. FRANCIS: I do not know what is so wrong with saying that perhaps some people in society across a range of jobs are not cut out for the job they are doing. When we look at the raw statistics such as —

Mr P. Papalia: You did it in the context.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Warnbro!

Mr J.M. FRANCIS: Ease to five, midships—just cool down!

We have to look at some of the statistics that ring alarm bells to me, as were reported in *The West*. When such a large number of youth custodial officers are on workers’ compensation leave and almost 50 per cent of the causes are stress related, if that does not ring alarm bells to the member for Warnbro, he is obviously not looking at it objectively. The number of workers’ compensation leave claims related to stress among adult custodial

Mr Joe Francis; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr John Quigley; Mr Murray Cowper; Mr Tony Krsticevic

prison officers, which is somewhere between 30 and 40 per cent, compared with the general government sector, if we look at the Auditor General's report today, which shows them at somewhere around 10 per cent, clearly —

Mr P. Papalia: That's their work environment.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Warnbro!

Mr J.M. FRANCIS: Member for Warnbro, I am happy to have this conversation. When the member left office in 2008—I have only just done indicative figures on this—there were about 2.8 prison officers for every prisoner. There is now about three. We have increased the ratio of prison officers to prisoners to higher than it was when the member left government in 2008, so I cannot accept that point of view. If the member for Warnbro is going to say that we have failed to provide enough prison officers, we are doing a lot better at it than his government did. We have increased the ratio. In the first four years of this government we recruited more than 670 net new prison officers. I accept that the prison muster has gone up. It took the Labor government eight years to get the same ratio.

Mr P. Papalia: How many did you say?

Mr J.M. FRANCIS: About 670 net.

Compared with the growth in prisoner numbers over eight years during the previous Labor government, which was roughly about the same, we increased the number of people working as prison officers dramatically. I accept that the prison muster has increased. Over the past two years the prison muster has grown just slower than the population rate, which says to me that tough penalties actually work.

Mr P. Papalia interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Warnbro!

Mr J.M. FRANCIS: It is an incentive for people to not commit crimes.

Mr P. Papalia: By how many has it grown in the past two years?

Mr J.M. FRANCIS: I cannot tell the member off the top of my head. I will get that information if he wants to know. We have to look at the fact that a huge percentage of youth custodial officers and prison officers are on workers' compensation leave due to workplace stress. Perhaps some of them are in the wrong job. I do not think there is anything wrong with saying that. We can say that about anyone in any occupation. I suspect that some politicians are in the wrong job, who perhaps cannot handle the stress of the job.

Mr P. Papalia: If they were in the job for 10 years before you shut Rangeview, is it their fault or yours? It's entirely yours.

Mr J.M. FRANCIS: Government is about adapting and overcoming. Sometimes we just have to change with the times. No-one is ever in the same job doing the same thing for such a long time. Sure, moving from Rangeview to Banksia Hill would have presented some challenges for some people. But that does not explain all the numbers I have just given the member.

I would say, member for Warnbro, when we look at the high rates of stress leave in this particular sector of government, I stand by the remark that perhaps just some of them—I say "perhaps"—are in the wrong job, and there is nothing wrong with saying that. People can move on and do other things with their life. Everyone in this place has a different story to tell. Members have found that some of their previous jobs were stressful while others were not. If I stood up and said, "Premier, I can't handle the stress", the opposition would be yelling at me to resign. They would say, "You're in the wrong job, minister. If you can't handle the interjections from the member for Albany, you're in the wrong job. If you can't handle the interjections from the Leader of the Opposition and you're too stressed, you're in the wrong job."

Several members interjected.

Mr J.M. FRANCIS: Bring it on! The opposition does not bother me. What I am saying—keep interjecting—is that perhaps some people in all jobs across all society might be in the wrong job if they cannot handle it.

MR F.M. LOGAN (Cockburn) [2.55 pm]: I rise to speak to the Address-in-Reply and respond to the Minister for Corrective Services' statements. Let us get to the facts of the corrective services portfolio and the situation we face today. The number of prisoners has gone up from under 3 500 to more than 5 000 over the four and a half years of this Liberal-National government. The Liberal-National government said it would deal with the expansion of prison numbers by building more prison units and providing more prison beds. The government has allocated \$670 million to the construction program to deal with that expansion. As a result of that expansion program there are six new units, two of which are occupied by children, one of which is still not open and three existing units have been closed, supposedly for maintenance. That gives the government a net gain of under 10 extra beds for \$670 million. The construction of the Eastern Goldfields Regional Prison has been put off until

Mr Joe Francis; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr John Quigley; Mr Murray Cowper; Mr Tony Krsticevic

2014 before it even commences, and I doubt it will even start then. I believe the Eastern Goldfields Regional Prison will be deferred yet again. We have seen the privatisation of Rangeview Remand Centre, in contradiction to a cast-iron commitment a previous Liberal government gave to local residents that it would never become a prison. The privatisation of that facility being run as a private prison by Serco has led to overcrowding in the Banksia Hill Detention Centre and ultimately to the riot that occurred at the Banksia Hill juvenile correctional facility. From the time children were transferred from Rangeview Remand Centre to Banksia Hill, we saw the level of violence and animosity between the children in the facility and between the children and the guards grow and we also saw an increased number of incidents. In June or July last year a deputation of nearly 100 correctional services workers came to the front of Parliament House and laid out the problems of violence in the Banksia Hill juvenile facility to the then correctional services minister. One of the staff members showed the then minister the injuries that he had just received from one of the inmates.

Mr D.T. Redman interjected.

Mr F.M. LOGAN: As the minister just said, they were looking for leadership, and they got none. They warned the correctional services minister last year of the likelihood that a riot would take place, and it happened.

The summary of what has happened in correctional services over the past four and a half years is that there have been four ministers, a riot, children locked up in an adult prison and overcrowding. It is no wonder that the minister has staff on sick leave or on workers' compensation. It is not because they are bludging but because they have been injured and taken to hospital. That is why they are receiving workers' compensation. The minister has staff at the prisons doing overtime because of the shortage of prison officer numbers. They are not roting the system, as the minister said was the case. If the minister thinks their skin is not thick enough, he should go and do the job for a week. He should go to Casuarina Prison and mix with the type down there! See if you can do that job yourself, big mouth! See how tough you are! See how thick your skin is! The minister should not stand in here criticising the work of prison officers who every day do a job that nobody else in the community would do because it is so dangerous. Every day when they go to work, they are possibly or likely to be injured, but the minister says, "If they don't like it, well, they're in the wrong job; their skin is not thick enough." This minister is the man who came into this chamber and whinged about United Voice driving a trailer past his house and he felt threatened: "I feel threatened because a trailer is coming past my house!" This is the guy who is talking about prison officers being thin skinned, but he was concerned that a union that drove a trailer with a sign past his house was a threat to him and his family. What a joke!

Mr J.M. Francis: Do you condone that action? Is that an acceptable standard for you, member for Cockburn?

Mr F.M. LOGAN: If I were to compare what happened to my family, in my role as an MP, with the minister's experience, we would be here all afternoon. I could introduce the minister to my wife and she would tell him what it is like to be really threatened. When your children have to climb over the back fence to go to school, the minister will know what being threatened is like!

Let us get down to answers we have heard in this house so far from the Minister for Corrective Services, because this is serious and they will require further examination. The minister has told this house over and over again that, first, he never met Mr Ian Johnson, the then Commissioner of Corrective Services; second, the minister was away for four weeks —

Mr J.M. Francis: No, I was here.

Mr F.M. LOGAN: The minister told the house on numerous occasions that he was on holiday for four weeks —

Mr M. McGowan: The commissioner.

Mr F.M. LOGAN: I said that—the commissioner, Ian Johnson. The minister said that he had no opportunity to meet Mr Johnson because he was on holiday for four weeks. That is what the minister told this house over and over again. The minister also said, "I know he did come back for a week, but I will check my diary and see why I was not available and he was not available". The minister told this house over and over again that he had no opportunity to meet with Mr Johnson because he was on holiday for four weeks and after that he was terminated by the Public Sector Commissioner. When the member for Warnbro pointed out to the minister that Mr Johnson was available to meet with the minister for one week, the minister changed his story and said, "He was on holiday for three or four weeks. I don't know. I'll check my diary and see why I wasn't available." Why would the minister not be available? Corrective services is his key portfolio. Mr Johnson was the head of that department. It was the minister's opportunity to meet with him. The minister would have been available. He needs to front up and tell this house exactly what went on, because so far he has told this house three different versions of the one story. First of all, he did not have an opportunity to meet with him; then he was away for four weeks; then it was three or four weeks. Now he says he is going to have a look at his diary to see why he did not have an opportunity to meet with him. The minister needs to tell this house the truth. He also needs to tell the truth about why Mr Johnson was terminated. The minister has said to the house that, over the four-week period

Mr Joe Francis; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr John Quigley; Mr Murray Cowper; Mr Tony Krsticevic

that Mr Johnson was away—this is one of the stories that the minister has told the house—he, the minister, had undertaken a thorough review of the portfolio; the cold-eyed review that the minister claims took place. As a result of that, the minister formed the view that the department needed to change tack. He then said to the house, “I had some issues, and I raised them with the Premier”. The question that has been put to the minister in this house on two occasions, by the members for Rockingham and Warnbro, is: what were those issues? Minister, would you like to tell us?

Mr J.M. Francis: I’m not going to respond by way of interjection. I’m not going to interject on you. It’s not my style.

Mr F.M. LOGAN: What were the issues? The minister wants my argument? It is right here: what were the issues?

Mr P. Papalia: What a weak person!

Mr J.M. Francis: And that’s exactly the reason why I won’t respond to your interjections.

Mr F.M. LOGAN: What were the issues?

Mr J.M. Francis: If you’re going to resort to personal abuse, tough luck.

Mr F.M. LOGAN: This is the minister who suggested that some prison officers should change jobs because of their thin skin, yet he will not front the media and explain why the head of his department was sacked. This is the tough minister telling prison officers they should go and get another job! He will not front the media to explain why he terminated a highly respected, highly regarded long-term public servant from his job. The minister told the house that he had nothing to do with the termination of Commissioner Johnson and that it was all the work of the Public Sector Commissioner; that was one of his stories, but today he has admitted that he had carried out a review of his portfolio, that it was a cold-eyed review, that the department needed a change and that he had some issues with Commissioner Johnson, which he raised with the Premier, but he will not tell the house what they were. He has contradicted what he has already told the house, but when he is given an opportunity to say what the issues were, he says, “I’m not going to answer your questions; why should I?” We will find an opportunity in which the minister will answer the questions; we will find an opportunity where the minister will be required to answer the questions.

It does not become any minister—never mind one that has been in the job for only five weeks—to behave in this way. It is disgraceful behaviour for a new minister to have the temerity to say to the Legislative Assembly that he will not answer questions about the termination of a senior public servant in Western Australia. That is a disgraceful situation, made even more disgraceful because the minister will not go out and front the media and tell the general public of Western Australia what the issues were. That is the record of this minister, five weeks into the job. He tries to cover up this absolutely disgraceful behaviour by saying, “I’m going to take a new approach. I’m going to look at justice reinvestment.” His government has had four and a half years to look at justice reinvestment and did everything it possibly could to trash the whole notion. When the former member for Bateman was taking the mickey out of justice reinvestment, guess who was nodding his head, like the poodle he is? The member for Jandakot—the minister. He was nodding his head, indicating that, yes, justice reinvestment was a load of rubbish because his mate the then member for Bateman, Attorney General and Minister for Corrective Services, was dissing the justice reinvestment policy. Now he comes into the chamber and says he has completely changed his mind and that justice reinvestment is great. The member for Bateman has gone, the minister is his own man and suddenly, on the road to Damascus, he has had this complete change of heart and justice reinvestment is now good.

Dr A.D. Buti: Member, he won’t acknowledge who’s the author of it—our side, the member for Warnbro.

Mr F.M. LOGAN: I know. The only reason this minister has had a change of heart on justice reinvestment is, as the member for Warnbro just said, by necessity. There are 5 000 prisoners, and that number is growing. As a result of implementing the election commitments that were given just recently about locking up more people, that number of prisoners will grow substantially. One way of trying to reduce the prison numbers is to take the path that the Minister for Corrective Services has highlighted, which is justice reinvestment. That does two things. First, it reduces the intake of prisoners. Second, it keeps the costs down as a result of keeping people out of jail. The only reason this minister is looking at justice reinvestment is not because he really believes in it, because he does not believe in it. He likes to portray himself as this hardline, right-wing, free marketeer gunslinger. Does he really believe in justice reinvestment? Of course he does not. He would not have a bar of it if it did not benefit his government in helping to keep prisoner numbers down and thereby keep the cost of running prisons in Western Australia down. The only reason the minister is looking at justice reinvestment is because his department has a major economic problem.

Mr Joe Francis; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr John Quigley; Mr Murray Cowper; Mr Tony Krsticevic

Division

Amendment put and a division taken, the Acting Speaker (Mr P. Abetz) casting his vote with the noes, with the following result —

Ayes (21)

Ms L.L. Baker	Mr D.J. Kelly	Mr J.R. Quigley	Mr P.B. Watson
Dr A.D. Buti	Mr F.M. Logan	Ms M.M. Quirk	Mr B.S. Wyatt
Mr R.H. Cook	Mr M. McGowan	Mrs M.H. Roberts	Mr D.A. Templeman (<i>Teller</i>)
Ms J. Farrer	Ms S.F. McGurk	Ms R. Saffioti	
Ms J.M. Freeman	Mr M.P. Murray	Mr C.J. Tallentire	
Mr W.J. Johnston	Mr P. Papalia	Mr P.C. Tinley	

Noes (36)

Mr P. Abetz	Ms M.J. Davies	Mr A.P. Jacob	Mr N.W. Morton
Mr F.A. Alban	Mr J.H.D. Day	Dr G.G. Jacobs	Dr M.D. Nahan
Mr C.J. Barnett	Ms W.M. Duncan	Mr R.F. Johnson	Mr D.C. Nalder
Mr I.C. Blayney	Mr J.M. Francis	Mr S.K. L'Estrange	Mr J. Norberger
Mr I.M. Britza	Mrs G.J. Godfrey	Mr R.S. Love	Mr D.T. Redman
Mr T.R. Buswell	Mr B.J. Grylls	Mr W.R. Marmion	Mr A.J. Simpson
Mr G.M. Castrilli	Dr K.D. Hames	Mr J.E. McGrath	Mr M.H. Taylor
Mr V.A. Catania	Mrs L.M. Harvey	Mr P.T. Miles	Mr T.K. Waldron
Mr M.J. Cowper	Mr C.D. Hatton	Ms A.R. Mitchell	Mr A. Krsticevic (<i>Teller</i>)

Amendment thus negatived.

Motion Resumed

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr P. Abetz): Before I gave the call to the member for Cannington, would members please take their conversations outside the chamber and give the member the opportunity to speak in silence.

MR W.J. JOHNSTON (Cannington) [3.20 pm]: Thank you very much, Mr Acting Speaker.

I want to start by noting that we meet on the traditional lands of the Noongar people, and by paying my respects to their elders past and present. I make the point that this is the first time that I have used that introduction in the chamber. I think that it is worth members thinking about this. Four years ago when I gave my inaugural speech, I did not give an acknowledgement of country and I now regret not having done so, because I think it is worthwhile. This is something that I have come to terms with over the past four years as a member of Parliament. I think it is time that Australia moved on with Indigenous issues.

I note that the member for Kimberley gave a thoroughly excellent inaugural speech. We all get applause at the end of our inaugural speech. But I think that every member of this chamber, no matter on which side they sit, gave genuinely warm applause to the member for Kimberley for her contribution. I think that her inaugural speech will be looked at by people in the future as an important occasion for the Parliament of Western Australia and the development of democracy in Western Australia. The reason that was such an important occasion is that the member for Kimberley used her Indigenous language in her speech. I note that the standing orders do not actually allow us to use a language other than English. I used Indonesian once. That was because I was referring to a formal name, and it was easier to use Indonesian to describe something about Indonesia than it was to use English. But I immediately provided a translation of the words. It is odd that our standing orders do not allow traditional languages of Australia to be used in the chamber. I understand the reason for that and it is that we need to ensure that the words that are being said are parliamentary. But I think it is time for the Parliament to consider how we deal with people who have as their native tongue an Australian language that is not English. I think it is time for our standing orders to be looked at in that regard. I do think that the member for Kimberley's powerful and moving inaugural speech will be looked at by future scholars of the development of our democracy. Yesterday, many members reflected very well on the late Ernie Bridge and the great achievements that he made for our Western Australian democracy. I do not want to undermine the value of other Indigenous Australians who have served in this Parliament, such as Carol Martin and the member for Victoria Park, but I think that the member for Kimberley's inaugural speech will be seen as being very special.

I want to make another point about the standing orders. There are some people who think that it is controversial that the Parliament starts each day with a prayer. I make this point not just because I am a Christian. I believe it is important that we reflect that prayer. I make the small comment also that in the past four and a half years, the Catholic version of the Lord's Prayer has been used, and now we have returned to using the Anglican version of the Lord's Prayer.

Dr A.D. Buti: Shame!

Mr Joe Francis; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr John Quigley; Mr Murray Cowper; Mr Tony Krsticevic

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: No, no! That is fine by me. I just want to make that point, because I think it is important to recognise the difference. I do not have any problem with that. I think it is good. I think it is worthwhile. We should continue to start each day with a prayer. But I also think that we should look at what they do in the Australian Capital Territory. The ACT Legislative Assembly starts each day with an acknowledgement of country. As I have said, I believe very strongly that it is important to start each day with a prayer. But it is probably now time for us to look at also providing some acknowledgement of country each day when we start our work. After the 2008 election I went on a holiday with my family—just the usual sort of thing post-election—to New Zealand, and I visited the Museum of New Zealand Te Papa in Wellington. The integration of the Maori culture in the story of New Zealand is extraordinary. The New Zealanders have done a brilliant job of ensuring that their Indigenous culture is not only acknowledged but also part of their continuing culture.

The next step for Australia is how to move on from the acknowledgement of an Indigenous history. The member for Kwinana made the worthwhile point that Australia has had a violent history. As an Irish Australian, I acknowledge the Hunters Hill uprising, the Eureka Stockade and the story of Ned Kelly. Every morning when I look across the chamber I often think about Ned Kelly and that fabulous beard, which is now seen on players on the Australian Football League field and even an attendant in this chamber. It should not be forgotten that Australia does have blood in its history. Although I am not Indigenous, I believe that Indigenous Australians should feel offended that the blood that was spilled by Indigenous Australians is not acknowledged.

Although I do not remember the title, I refer once again to the book written by Stan Grant, in which he detailed the resistance to settlement by Indigenous people in New South Wales. I am not familiar with all the stories of Indigenous resistance, but I am familiar with the story in that book and we should begin to think about how to acknowledge and include Indigenous culture in our story. I believe it would be appropriate for the house to acknowledge our Indigenous heritage by integrating it into the prayer at the beginning of the day. As a Christian, I believe it is good that we pray at the beginning of each day, and I wanted to raise that matter because it is part of my journey in understanding Indigenous Australians. I also hope that other members will think about and discuss that possibility, because I am not right on every idea.

I now thank the people of the Cannington electorate for endorsing me again for this important job. The electorate of Cannington is, like every other electorate, special and unique. In Cannington many young people are starting out in their lives. There is an overrepresentation of not only young people but also old people in the electorate, people who have made a great contribution to the state, the city and their community. Many of those older people work as volunteers, and many of the vibrant community groups in Cannington survive only because of the work done by those older Australians. That is not to say that young people do not make a contribution, because they are also active in the community.

Another important characteristic of the electorate of Cannington is its large number of migrants. According to the Australian Bureau of Statistics, about 45 per cent of the people living in Cannington were born overseas, with 25 per cent having been born in Asia. There is also a large Indigenous population in the electorate. I believe that when one looks at Cannington one is looking at the future of Australia. It is a community with a large percentage of older Australians, a large percentage of migrants and a large number of young people. It is a great honour to be endorsed by the people of Cannington to serve again in the Parliament of Western Australia.

I thank all the volunteers who worked on my campaign. I have a list, but I will not mention every single name. I would like to thank every one of the more than 85 people who were involved in my campaign, including all those people who helped with the letterboxing, the election day work, the enveloping and the different campaign tasks that members would be familiar with. I thank my electorate staff for the hard work they do in dealing with all the problems and issues that arise in the electorate.

I also want to acknowledge my kids. We acknowledge them in our inaugural speech, and then sometimes we probably do not think to acknowledge the work they do and the separation we have from them. So, I want to thank Rebekah, Zoe and Liam. They put up with a lot, as I am sure do the children of other members of the Assembly, and we should not forget them. I was talking to the member for Bunbury yesterday, who made the point that when you get to the end of your life, nobody says, “I wish I had spent more time at work.” But we do spend a lot of time at work, and that is what the member for Bunbury and I were talking about yesterday. Our families do suffer, and I want to acknowledge them. Of course, I want to thank my wife, Hon Kate Doust, a member for the South Metropolitan Region, and the support that she continues to give me.

I want to congratulate the newly elected members of the Assembly and those members who were re-elected. In particular, of course, I want to congratulate the people on my side of the chamber, as members would expect. I acknowledge all the new Liberal members, and I note the comments of the member for Mandurah. It will be interesting to see how that goes. I look forward to working with the new member for Alfred Cove, the new member for Bateman and the new member for Belmont on the Public Accounts Committee. That will be interesting. It will be a new job for me, and it will be interesting to see how that all works.

Mr Joe Francis; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr John Quigley; Mr Murray Cowper; Mr Tony Krsticevic

I would also like to congratulate the Liberal Party on its clear and decisive election victory. The Premier might be sitting in his office choking right now! But I also acknowledge that the Premier had a ringing endorsement in this election. As a Labor member, I cannot say anything else. After the 2008 election, the Premier used to get cranky with me because I would never acknowledge that he won the election, because what he did, in fact, was win the negotiations with the National Party to form a government. The National Party might have made a different decision, and then there would have been a different Premier. But this time we have to acknowledge the result, and that means that the Labor Party acknowledges that we were defeated.

I will just make the point that the people of Western Australia never get an election result wrong. That is the purpose of democracy—to let the people make a decision, and they made a decision. But that is not to say that WA Labor does not have a role here in the Parliament. We have a solemn duty too. Our solemn duty is to hold the government to account, and we will do that. We will do that in a robust and energetic fashion, because that is what we are expected to do. When the Premier flaps his arms and folds them and says, “Don’t you get it? You lost”, yes, of course we understand that, but that just means that we have a different job from that of the Premier. The Premier has to run the state, and we have to make sure that he does it properly and we will continue to do that.

I want to go on and talk about some issues in my electorate, because, as all those who have been here for a while know, we do not get a lot of chances to talk about the issues directly related to our community, and this is one of those occasions. I was pleased yesterday to catch up with my good friend the Minister for Housing to talk about some issues in my electorate, so I want to get them on the record here as well. The first one is the proposed development at the former Ferndale school site. I want to make the point that I am not opposed to urban infill—it plays a sensible role in the development of Perth—but that does not mean that every proposal for infill development is sensible. The Karri Way site is over five kilometres from a train station, so we can hardly say that that makes it a transport-oriented development. When the government decided—I support the government’s decision, even though I did not know about it in advance—to sell the school buildings to Damla College, I thought that was a great decision. That means that the bushland will be saved, which everybody has in writing from the former Minister for Education, Hon Dr Liz Constable, and that is good. But once we save the bushland and save the school buildings, there really is not enough space there to build houses and we will end up with no open space. That is an important piece of open space for the southern end of Ferndale. I do not think that the development the Department of Housing intends to build can be built on that site. There is another site it wants to build on, which is the former Kinlock primary school site. I have a different view: I think the Department of Housing and the state government can build an effective development on this site but it needs to think about how much open space is retained. There has to be enough open space to kick a football. That is the way I put it. It is not just to have a couple of trees. Of course saving trees is important, but we need a bit more. We need somewhere for kids to go with their father or mother to kick a football. I am happy for the development to go ahead subject to ensuring the roads do not point right at somebody’s bedroom and those sorts of technical issues that I am sure can be accommodated by the planners. There needs to be sufficient open space for people to still kick a football around.

The Department of Housing is also involved in the Quattro development. There is a series of multi-unit blocks at the end of the development. The Quattro residents originally thought 36 units would be built on those blocks. They now find that 97 units are to be developed. This is 1.5 kilometres from Queens Park train station, on a narrow suburban street. The government has already worked out that a bin truck and a bus will not fit down the road when there are cars parked on the street, and cars will be parked on the street. There needs to be a proper assessment of how that is done. I do not think the current proposal will work. The most important thing for local residents is they did not know that development would happen when they bought their blocks. It is a bit rich for the Department of Housing to wait until the last block was sold to the new residents in Quattro before it announced there would be 90-odd units on the site. If the department had been more honest, it would probably be less of an issue. The department needs to think about that.

[Member’s time extended.]

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: I now raise the issue of the block at the corner of Cecil Avenue and Sevenoaks Street. It is literally across the road; hardly further than from me to you, Mr Acting Speaker (Mr P. Abetz), from the train station at Cannington. It is a perfect location for a TOD—a transit-oriented development. There is a block next door owned by the Department of Health. There is some council-owned land across the road—go for it. If the government wants to build up to 150 units on that site, a couple of floors, shops and offices—go for it. It would be a fabulous site. There will be traffic issues. It will have to be properly planned, but that is an ideal site for fairly priced housing. There could be some units for older people. It could be a great opportunity to provide the spark that is needed for the Cannington town centre to get going. The council has had plans for a long time to get the CBD, as they describe the Cannington town centre, going. It has not happened. The council has employed a very experienced planner in Mike Mouritz. It is a great opportunity, and the Department of Housing could help

Mr Joe Francis; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr John Quigley; Mr Murray Cowper; Mr Tony Krsticevic

by working out what it wants to do on that site and do it. Some affordable housing would be great; a bit of social housing would be okay; some aged accommodation would be great. It would be a great development.

I want to go on to note that since Parliament met last year the City of Canning has been suspended. It will be interesting to see what results from an inquiry. I look forward to seeing that in March of next year, which I think is the month the report is to be completed by. It means that the ratepayers of the City of Canning do not have any elected representatives. I keep in touch with the commissioner on a regular basis, but I caution a couple of things: the first is that I hope this is not used as an opportunity to bring out the garbage in terms of planning—the sorts of controversial planning issues that might be around that could not get through an elected council. I do not expect that that would be done during this period. I certainly hope it is not.

The next thing is that there is going to be pressure on rates, and we do not want to have rates increase unnecessarily. That goes to the question of boundaries; we do not want to have the council chopped up while there are no elected representatives, with the potential for rates to go up significantly. I know there is a proposal around from some people to cut the City of Canning into pieces, give part to the City of Gosnells, part to the City of Melville, and amalgamate another part with the Town of Victoria Park and give that whole bit to the City of South Perth. That, potentially, would increase the rates for people in my electorate quite significantly, and I would not support that.

I just want to go on to some local issues I think are important, and I want to get on the record my desire to have these things dealt with. The first of those is Hester Park in Langford, which has been neglected for too long. I worked on the City of Gosnells for the last four years to get it to create a master plan, and last year it finally decided that it would allocate resources to creating a master plan for Hester Park, which I would welcome. Unfortunately, when it went to the Department of Planning to get sign-off on the work it was going to do, the Department of Planning told it not to do any more work because the Department of Housing had raised with the Department of Planning that it saw Hester Park as an opportunity to subdivide the land and put more houses in. It has been pointed out to me by local residents and activists that when the so-called Ruby Gardens development was done on the corner of Nicholson Road and Spencer Road, it was actually carved out of the pre-existing Hester Park, and the local community accepted Ruby Gardens on the basis that that would then protect the remainder of Hester Park. So it was sort of salami tactics, and they are now coming back and saying hang on. I am very concerned about that and local residents are concerned about that. There might be some opportunity to come up with a good plan, but I think the Department of Planning needs to get out of the way and let the council finally get on and do something at Hester Park because it is just not something we can be proud of. When I look over the bridge to Canning River Regional Park in the City of Canning and the high-quality nature of that park, I can see what Hester Park could look like if we could get a master plan and some investment. Let us get Planning out of the way so that we can get on with it.

The next issue I raise is Langford shops, which are a disaster with hardly any tenancies occupied. It is a place that encourages criminal behaviour because it is not open to the street, and all the shops have shutters on them at night-time. One of the restaurants at the Langford shops even locks its doors at night, so if people want to go and have dinner there, they have to knock on the door to be let in. It is ridiculous. As I understand it, the problem is that, from memory, there are 23 separate tenancies with 18 separate owners. It is not going to go anywhere without some leadership from government and from the council. I know the council would basically give any zoning approval to the owners of the shops, but it probably does need a bit of effort from the government as well because otherwise all the interests will not be able to be aligned. In saying that, I of course point out that it is a long way—five or six kilometres—from a train station, so it is not really going to be a transit-oriented development. But the shops cannot be allowed to go on as they are because it is just a magnet for crime.

Moving on to Beckenham, I encourage the government to put some money in for the council's Mills Park redevelopment plans; they are worthwhile and they just need a bit of help. They need help from the federal government as well, but if the state government can help, that would be great. In talking about Beckenham I have to raise aircraft noise. I am interested that the Minister for Transport is still leaning on the airport to build the third runway. I make the point that his arguments are quite spurious, and it would cost \$600 million to build the third runway. It is not clear that it is needed. There are 21 million passengers a year through Brisbane Airport and there are 12 million passengers a year through Perth Airport. Therefore, it is not the airport configuration that is causing the problems because, clearly, Brisbane is only just now investing in a third runway. Clearly, the current airport configuration can take many more planes. The other thing I point out is that if a third runway is built, it still does not solve the problems of the fly in, fly out workers who have their terminals on the northern part of the airport, because those planes will still have to cross the principal runway to get to either the existing east-west runway or the proposed runway. The proposed runway will be a full-length runway anyway. That will deliver unfair load noise on to the people of Beckenham and I am opposed to it and I will continue to be opposed to it.

Mr Joe Francis; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr John Quigley; Mr Murray Cowper; Mr Tony Krsticevic

The Canning Agricultural, Horticultural and Recreational Society at the showgrounds is a great organisation, but we still need—the Minister for Racing and Gaming is not here—a commitment that the dogs will stay at Cannington. We do not want them moving into the city. One way or another, the showgrounds are an important opportunity for investment in the local area. Again, it helps the City of Canning with its Canning town centre.

Kent Street Weir is not only an important part of Canning River Regional Park, but also an important environmental management tool. It needs some work. It needs renewal. It needs a fish ladder. It needs all the different bits and pieces that will keep it effective in preventing salt inflow into the Canning River. A bit of money needs to be spent there.

The Gerard Street bridge needs to be landscaped on the East Cannington side. It is ridiculous that it is landscaped on the Canning city town side where nobody lives, but it is not landscaped on the side where the houses are so every summer the wind just blows all the sand over everybody's backyards, so that needs to be worked on.

The bike path that the City of Canning has built along Railway Parade is fabulous, but it is ridiculous that it ends with a sign that states "no road". It is ridiculous. We can see a photo of it in which there is just the bike path and when we get to the City of Gosnells, there is literally a line on the ground where the city's boundary is and a sign saying that the path has ended. The City of Gosnells needs to continue that path through to Kenwick. During the election campaign I was handing out stuff at Beckenham train station and saw a number of pushbike riders coming out of Beckenham and further east winding their way through the traffic to get down the road to the bike path.

Local residents complain about four-wheel drives using Maniana Park. On Monday night I met with the Maniana soccer club, which has to jury-rig lighting at night. Clearly, we need more work at Maniana Park. Likewise, Queens Park bushland right next to Maniana Park needs a bit of work.

A very important issue in the local community is Bentley Hospital. The government's desperation at the 2008 election over Royal Perth Hospital has directly led to the cut in services at Bentley Hospital. We need to retain the services at Bentley Hospital, including the maternity services. The minister said he might give it a lick of paint, but the local community deserves better. It is an important local facility and the idea of not having a local health facility is not acceptable to the local community. Likewise, I have raised before, and I will keep raising, the question of the Wharf Street, Hamilton Street and William Street railway crossings. With the increasing volume of train traffic, those three crossings are now not functional in the morning. Between 8.00 am and 9.00 am there is half an hour with the boom gate down. It does not work. It needs to be addressed. Albany Highway past Westfield Carousel Shopping Centre does not function. The Acting Speaker's (Mr P. Abetz) residents probably suffer in the same way. The corner of Nicholson Road and Metcalfe Road is also a problem. As a result of increasing volumes on Nicholson Road, people cannot get out of Metcalfe Road and traffic is going into the other parts of the suburb of Lynwood. That is not good enough. We need a solution. I have some ideas for the Minister for Transport, if he talks to me, about how we can deal with Nicholson Road to try to break up the traffic flows around there and provide some crossing for schoolkids going from Langford to Bannister Creek Primary School and from Lynwood to the Catholic school in Langford.

MR J.R. QUIGLEY (Butler) [3.49 pm]: I want to speak about infrastructure in the electorate of Butler. I have spoken before in this chamber about the exploding population in my electorate. Two years ago at the redistribution the population was levelled off at between 23 500 and 24 000 electors, but by election date the number of electors in my electoral district of Butler had risen to just under 29 000. It is the largest number of people in any metropolitan electorate and geographically the largest electorate in the metropolitan region. The growth along Marmion Avenue north from Butler through to Yanchep and then to Two Rocks after that is just phenomenal and has to be seen to be believed. The provision of infrastructure in the area, however, is abysmal. The growth has far outstripped the local government's ability to provide infrastructure. Thousands of families are moving into this area. The Premier has spoken before about the number of people arriving in Western Australia on a weekly basis. A very large number of them are moving into Jindalee, Alkimos and Jindowie. Members may have seen some of these names advertised in the large advertisements in the real estate sections of newspapers, but no community infrastructure is being provided. This has led to a crisis in my electorate. There is one playing oval in the district of Yanchep, being Oldham Reserve. It was there as a small oval when Yanchep was a village, which is now completely swamped by the number of people trying to use it. On any one weeknight about eight football teams try to train there; little athletics teams cannot use the oval, as there are just too many people; the cricket club cannot use the oval, as it is over-run; and the surface is ripped to shreds by the number of people using it. This has had the effect of people dropping out of sport because they have to travel kilometres—right down to Butler some 14 kilometres away—to access playing grounds. Youth are dropping out of sports and teams are falling over because of inadequate facilities.

It was therefore in these circumstances that the former Mayor of the City of Wanneroo Jon Kelly sat down to try to figure out an answer. He came up with a solution to propose to the major landowner in the area, Yanchep

Mr Joe Francis; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr John Quigley; Mr Murray Cowper; Mr Tony Krsticevic

Beach Joint Venture, because the City of Wanneroo did not have the funds to build any playing fields out there. It could not keep up with the development, as it has to service Banksia Grove, Carramar and everywhere over the City of Wanneroo. The proposal to this landowner, which owns most of the land between Yanchep and Two Rocks—a huge area of land—was for the company to pre-fund the provision of community facilities. By the way, it was initially for one football oval; then two football ovals and passive recreation space; and by the time the requests were finished, the city was seeking an area of 17.6 hectares in total, of which 12.8 hectares would be for active playing fields and four-odd hectares for passive recreation. Yanchep Beach Joint Venture, through its chief executive officer, Mr Gin Wah Ang, who is very community-minded, agreed to the city's request to pre-fund all these works. The city said it would build an access road into the proposed grounds, but when the time came and it was getting closer to doing all this, the city worked out that it could not build the access road where it intended because there was a four-metre height differentiation. The city therefore said that it would have to build a new access road by extending Marmion Avenue to what would become little Marmion Avenue and said, "And that would cost \$1.8 million, Mr Developer; can you pay 50 per cent of that as well?" So the developer met and said it would pay for 50 per cent of the access road as well. To cut a long story short, the council, over several meetings, kept on resolving to proceed with this plan. This area of land exceeded the 10 per cent of public open space that the developer in the full course of time would have to cede free of cost to the public—we all know that scheme; as land is developed, 10 per cent of the land has to be ceded until a maximum is reached. Because this would exceed that 10 per cent, taking the figure to 13.8 per cent of the total development, the city said it would buy the land from the developer in the same way as was done by the City of Gosnells with the Passmore Street playing fields. The city would fund the purchase of this from the district development fund. All the other landowners in the area developing their lots would be required to contribute money, as is normal, to a district development fund and in the fullness of time some credits would come back to the developer who was pre-funding all of this. This was all proposed in "District Planning Scheme No. 2 — Amendment No. 122" for the Yanchep–Two Rocks development contribution plan.

As recently as October 2012, it was full steam ahead. The council unanimously resolved to proceed in this way to expedite the delivery of some playing fields so that something could be done to provide facilities for young people and families in this area. Just think how far away Yanchep is. They desperately need these playing fields up there, because if we do not engage the youth with sport and good activity, we know what happens and we know the social problems that will evolve in the course of time. That is the reason the Yanchep Beach Joint Venture, through Mr Gin Wah Ang, agreed to pre-fund all this. It was pre-funding approximately \$3.8 million worth of works; that is a lot of money for a developer to pre-fund as a community contribution, knowing that it would be 10 years before a lot of this money was recouped. Even the planning for this has involved expenditure by Yanchep Beach Joint Venture of some \$400 000. A deed was to be entered into between the city and Yanchep Beach Joint Venture to facilitate all this going ahead, and it was resolved as recently as October 2012 that the city would enter into and complete this deed. But then the city officers extended the period for comment on proposed amendment 122 to give associated landowners as far south as Alkimos, because they would all be contributing to the district fund, a chance to comment. Not much of an explanation was given to developers as far south as Alkimos about why the district development fund, the community facilities plan, would be pre-funding the purchase of this land—that is, to accelerate delivery of these facilities about 10 years ahead of time—so they put an objection in that was received after the time for objections had lapsed. We do not take issue with that. That was dated 22 November 2012. A further meeting was held between the other landowners; that is—I will name them here—the Capricorn Village Joint Venture, the Peet Yanchep Land Syndicate, the Fini Group, the Australand Property Group, the Police and Nurses Landreach Pty Ltd, The Reef and Peat Yanchep Pty Ltd. They all had a meeting to discuss this and resolved to change their stance somewhat from their initial objection once the whole scheme had been explained to them, so that on 4 December 2012 they wrote to the city a letter, which reads —

In relation to this, we first want to clarify for the record that we are in no way critical of the Yanchep Beach Joint Venture ... or their involvement in the early delivery of this open space. Secondly all of the landowners are fully supportive of the Yanchep District Open Space proceeding next year, —

That is, 2013 —

ahead of when it would normally be provided.

They then go on to say that they seek some justification from the city for why the land is being purchased and not ceded free of cost in due course. I have already covered that because the land involved exceeds the 10 per cent that was required under the legislation to be ceded free of charge and it was being delivered 10 to 15 years in advance of what would be required under the legislation. This was being done to provide facilities for the thousands of families being moved into the area by the six developers I have named here in Parliament today. As I said, that letter was dated 4 December 2012.

Mr Joe Francis; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr John Quigley; Mr Murray Cowper; Mr Tony Krsticevic

A report was prepared for the Wanneroo City Council on 11 December by the city officers; that is, a week after the developers wrote supporting the proposal, but just seeking some clarification, and no mention was made of the developers' change of position. The report by the city officer reads in part —

Critically, Council should note that during recent advertising of proposed Amendment No. 122 ... the City received submissions from developers ... objecting to the proposed inclusion ...

No mention is made of this letter of 4 December. I do not want to name this officer now; I will name him later. It does not surprise me; it is the same officer who was involved in the Yanchep sky bridge fiasco, which caused the Liberal Minister for Planning to be so critical of the processes of the City of Wanneroo and write a letter to the city telling it to dismantle or radically alter the sky bridge it built six metres high in front of people's homes. It is the same officer. Anyway, I will leave his name for another day. No mention is made of this letter of 4 December.

The community is told that it will all go ahead, but suddenly in February 2013, an announcement is made by the City of Wanneroo that it is completely abandoning this project in its entirety and, as an alternative, is going to Two Rocks, 14 kilometres to the north, and tearing up the public open space, the passive area up there known as Charnwood Reserve, which is very much valued by the local Two Rocks community, and trying to build on that reserve among people's houses one football oval with floodlights without any consultation at all. That set the Two Rocks community on fire. The member for Wanneroo is smiling because he lives not far from this area and he knows what happened and how upset those people are. He is nodding assent because he knows the truth of what I am saying; that is, this community was aghast at what the City of Wanneroo did.

I then issued a freedom of information application on the City of Wanneroo to get to the bottom of why for two years it had been promising the community early delivery of these ovals. When I sent my freedom of information request through, I was contacted by the information officer. He said to me, "John, there's a bit of a problem here." When I asked why, he said, "I'm told you can see some documents, but there are documents you will never be allowed to see." I got off the phone from him and wrote straight to the Information Commissioner to report this event. He then rang me back in distress saying, "Don't make me the scapegoat. I told you that in confidence." This city is trying to act in secret. I kept on digging, which is how I got to this secret report in which the city was seeking to blame the six adjoining land developers for their decision to cancel this project. I will repeat the landowners' names—Capricorn Village Joint Venture, Peet Yanchep Land Syndicate, the Fini Group, Australand Property Group, Police and Nurses Landreach Pty Ltd and Peet Yanchep Pty Ltd. They were not aware that they were being used as the excuse for denying all the families that they were bringing into the area the use of the recreational facilities. They had written off this letter of 4 December thinking it would be taken on board.

After I was denied access to the documents by the City of Wanneroo, I made some further investigations and was able to independently source the letter of 4 December that the landowners wrote. I forwarded this letter to the new mayor. When I say new, she is not that new; she has been around for 18 months, but she took over from Mayor Kelly and voted on this report and followed the officers' recommendation and cancelled the reserves. I said to her, "Mayor Tracey Roberts, were you aware of this letter?" I faxed it to her at six o'clock one Wednesday night.

Mr P.T. Miles: At 10.00 at night.

Mr J.R. QUIGLEY: No, I sent it through to her at six o'clock. She went to one of her colleagues who lives close by—a very decent man who is soon to be the Liberal member for Moore, Mr Ian Goodenough—and they had a confab. They were both aghast that they had not seen this letter and that it had not been drawn to their attention.

[Member's time extended.]

Mr J.R. QUIGLEY: At 10 minutes to 10.00 pm, the mayor rang me and asked me if I was up because she was going to send me an email. I said I sure was because my blood was boiling. At 10 minutes to 10.00 pm on a Wednesday night, she received an email from the chief executive officer of the City of Wanneroo saying, "Attached is the letter of 4 December. We have just found it." At 10 minutes to 10 at night! "This must be the letter that Quigley's referring to." The mayor of the City of Wanneroo then convened a special supplementary council meeting for 10 April 2013 at which by an absolute majority the council revoked the decisions of February when the sporting ovals were cancelled and directed the city officers to re-enter into negotiations. On 4 April, about four working days before that meeting was convened on 10 April because of the intervening weekend, a city officer—not the one who is responsible for this fiasco—got one of his subordinates to write to the six landowners in response to their letter of 4 December. The city officer's letter states, "You wanted the justification of why we're trying to provide these sporting ovals in advance and fund them out of the district contribution fund." The council's letter refers to the landowners' requests for justification and tells them to go

Mr Joe Francis; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr John Quigley; Mr Murray Cowper; Mr Tony Krsticevic

and read the original documents. What a haughty and stupid letter they wrote! They were told to give a response within three days. These officers had taken four months to respond to the landowners' reasonable requests, and then they gave the landowners three days to reply, giving no justification or explanation whatsoever. Since then, when the council met on 10 April, it revoked the decision to cancel the development of the ovals and instructed the city officers to try to conclude the deal with Yanchep Beach Joint Venture. The board of this joint venture had scrapped this old plan because they had been told it was all off. They were also going to go and tear up the plans for the Charnwood Park redevelopment. However, in good faith, the joint venturers still received the mayor when she came to see them. The mayor took along a city officer, whom I will later name in this Parliament, who, I am told, stood stiff as an ironing board, drumming his fingers on the arm of a chair. The member for Wanneroo has heard this story as well. This officer was drumming his fingers on the arms of a chair; he did not want to be there or to act in good faith with this developer at all. The developer, Yanchep Beach Joint Venture, which was acting in good faith in the interests of all the residents who were coming into this area, sought independent advice—I know there are some people from local government in the chamber this afternoon—from Mr Guy Ferraro, a former executive director of the Department of Planning, and from Mr Mike Allen, who was also a senior director at the Department of Planning, to reassess this proposal. Under this proposal the land would be purchased out of the district development fund and delivered 15 years ahead of time to satisfy the current need. Under the normal course of events, as this report identifies, it will be something like 2026 before there are sporting grounds out there. We will have lost two generations of youth from sport. The children who should be using these ovals will be parents themselves by the time this comes about, because of these silly council officers! A report has been prepared, and here it is. I will seek your leave, Mr Speaker, to lay this on the table for the rest of the day for the information of members.

The SPEAKER: Leave is granted.

Mr J.R. QUIGLEY: I will lay it on the table at the end of my speech for members to read.

I understand this report has now been distributed to the six adjoining landowners who, as long ago as 4 December 2012, sought this information. It is provided here. In its conclusion, the independent report reads —

- The proposed District Open Space located near the Yanchep City Centre is intended to provide the district, sub-regional and regional community with active senior playing fields. In the short to medium term these facilities will serve a regional catchment from Two Rocks to Alkimos.

That is right outside the area funded by the Yanchep Beach Joint Venture. In other words, they would be pre-funding grounds that will be serving families that are not ever likely to be their customers; they are doing this in the community to be seen to be good developers and good community members. The second point reads —

- Being 17.6 ha in size, the facility will be significantly larger than what can and should be described as local/district public open space facility under the objectives of LN. —

That is, local neighbourhoods —

Providing such a large public open space contribution in one location would be contrary to the intent of established planning policies and will result in adverse residential amenity outcomes for future residential areas around the Yanchep city centre.

- The local/district and regional components of this facility should be separated to ensure the fair and equitable distribution of costs —

That is, fair and equitable distribution of costs amongst all the adjoining developers —

for the provision of these necessary facilities. Consistent with the requirements of Liveable Neighbourhoods, a maximum of 7ha of this open space should be included as part of the 10% local/district open space contribution. The balance should be acquired —

This is critical —

through the City of Wanneroo Developer Contribution Plan. The approved plan of subdivision for the open space has identified a lot of 12.8ha which is the land that should be acquired under the DCP.

I am laying this document on the table and I will send this speech and this report to these six developers, because the community wants to know whether these additional six developers, now that they know the truth and have the full information before them, will try to stand in the way. What is being said is that they are going to have to contribute anyway, over the years, but are they going to stand in the way of the district development fund being used for the acquisition of this land? In other words, are they going to continue to bring families into this area by selling it as an area for new young families, like Alkimos or Jindowie—these places that we see in the big

Mr Joe Francis; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr John Quigley; Mr Murray Cowper; Mr Tony Krsticevic

advertisements—but at the same time use their commercial might to try to influence the City of Wanneroo to deny families reasonable playing areas?

I will come back to this chamber—I know the Legislative Council meets on 20 May—and I shall report on the response of these six developers. I have heard, through word of mouth and hearsay, that one of them—a very large, publicly listed company—has said, “Now that we understand, we fully support the scheme.” I have spoken to the chief executive officer of another developer—who acts for a consortium and whose salary, I understand, is dependent upon certain key performance indicators and what profit is shown—who does not want this. When I explained to this particular gentleman that these families need it now, not in 2026, this chief executive officer—whom, I might add, lives down in the leafy western suburbs near Cottesloe, where there are ample facilities—said to me this: “I don’t care; let it happen in due course.” It reminded me of what Marie Antoinette is reported to have said after she inquired about why the peasants were rising. When she was told it was because there was not enough bread to eat, she said, “Let them eat cake.” That was the response of the chief executive officer. I do not want to name him here, because he is acting for a consortium. I cannot imagine, knowing the quality of the companies he represents, that that is the considered position of the board of each member company of the consortium; I cannot imagine that for a moment. I think—I hope—that that was just an off-the-cuff remark.

I can imagine that if any of these six developers wanted to put their foot down and stop this playing field and force the City of Wanneroo to then desecrate and rip up the Phil Renkin reserve in Two Rocks and destroy another community, there will be a lot of people between Alkimos and Two Rocks who would be upset with any developer who takes such a mean-spirited attitude. We know that the big developers involved in this, including Yanchep Beach Joint Venture through Mr Gin Wah Ang and another big developer that is a public company, have, through hearsay, already voiced their total support for it. We know that this is not a scheme dreamt up by Yanchep Beach Joint Venture to sell land into this scheme, because it was Yanchep Beach Joint Venture that was approached by the City of Wanneroo to come on board and pre-fund it all.

What more responsible developer could we have in a community? The community is desperately hoping that once the six developers that I named in Parliament this afternoon have read the independent report of Mr Guy Ferraro and Mr Mike Allen, who had assessed this, and realise that this scheme that was proposed by the City of Wanneroo exactly replicates the process by which the City of Gosnells worked to deliver the Passmore Street playing fields, they will say, “We want the families that we are bringing into the area to have proper recreational facilities.” I will lay these papers on the table.

[The paper was tabled for the information of members.]

MR M.J. COWPER (Murray–Wellington) [4.20 pm]: I would like to take this opportunity, Mr Speaker, to congratulate you on your ascension to the position of Speaker, and to all other members who have taken their seat in this chamber. Each of the 59 members who occupy this place have their own stories as to how they came to be here.

This is my opportunity to quickly touch on the progression that the electorate of Murray–Wellington took in recent months. First, I would like to acknowledge and thank a range of people who assisted leading up to the last election. It is very important that from time to time we go back to the people of our electorates and put forward our case for being re-elected to this esteemed place. The feedback and comments I got from the people who supported me and voted for me on the day was very warming. One young chap said, “Murray, I voted for you because you are honest.” That is probably one of the greatest compliments that anyone has ever paid me. With that, I acknowledge that I have a responsibility to the constituents of Murray–Wellington. During this four-year term, it is my intention to robustly put forward the various issues that are affecting the people in the Murray–Wellington electorate. As the previous speaker said, a number of issues impact on electorates, particularly those in peri-urban environments.

The Murray–Wellington electorate consists of the Murray, Waroona and Harvey shires. The Murray shire has seen growth of about six and a half per cent while the Harvey shire has experienced growth of about six per cent. They take in areas in the south, including Australind, Kingston, Treendale and Galway Green, which have aspirational families. We have seen a great commitment by this government to build facilities in these areas. We are spending a lot of money on recreation in particular. The recreational area around Leschenault is significant. New playing fields and pavilions have supplemented the existing facilities, including the recreation centre and the swimming pool. In recent times, new schools have been built to accommodate this very fast growing area. In fact, this year Australind Senior High School has in excess of 1 300 students. Given the growth in the area, it will get to around 1 600, which is remarkable, given that when I was the officer in charge of the Australind Police Station, it had about 1 300 students. After Eaton Community College was built, numbers were taken back down to manageable levels. We have seen continued growth. That is evidenced by the size of the primary schools that are feeders to the Australind Senior High School, including Parkfield Primary School, which has around 600 to 650 new students. Kingston Primary School is a new school that opened about two years ago. It

Mr Joe Francis; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr John Quigley; Mr Murray Cowper; Mr Tony Krsticevic

commenced with about 500-odd students and now has in excess of 750 students. Of course, we have seen great commitment in recent times to a new school at Treendale. People who travel through the south west along the Old Coast Road on the Australind bypass will see Treendale on the right-hand side, about 10 kilometres out from Bunbury before they get to the Collie River. We welcomed, in particular, the announcement by the government during the election of a bridge to connect the communities of Eaton and Australind, Eaton being in the member for Collie–Preston’s electorate, and the communities of Treendale and Australind on the north side of the Collie River. That bridge will create a great connectivity between the two groups. It will allow access for people to shop and obviously to travel to and from work, but, moreover, it will significantly improve the capacity of the State Emergency Service, the fire brigades, the Australind police and also St John Ambulance, which, with the exception of the fire station, are all located in Australind. The fire station is an ongoing problem. We need some commitment from the Minister for Emergency Services to the fire station. As members may well know, there was a problem when a developer went broke and the contract for the land that was set aside for the new fire station unfortunately fell through. The parcel of land on Paris Road in Australind is obviously still tied up with legal problems. The contract expired on 30 June last year. After discussions with the previous minister, we have a commitment to build a new fire station. The money that was allocated three years ago has since been reinvested in the Bunbury fire station. Given the growth of the population in that area, I look forward to seeing a commitment to a new Australind career firefighting station at that location.

As I mentioned, the Murray–Wellington electorate is not short of issues. It has an agricultural base and is arguably the premier food-producing area of Western Australia. It has a dairy industry and a beef industry. Vegetables such as potatoes, onions, carrots and the like are grown along the Myalup coast. Of course, it has the remnants of a timber industry in the forests, particularly around Dwellingup. It also has orchardists and the like. It is a very diverse electorate that has a number of varied issues.

One of the other points that wash across this whole area is that it is also a mining region. People may seem surprised that that is the case. In fact, the Peel region is the third-largest mining region in Western Australia. It has the Boddington goldmine, the alumina refineries at Wagerup and Pinjarra and also the bauxite deposits in the Darling Scarp. On top of that, there are also mineral sands and the like. In summing up all of that, the community contributes well above its weight to the state’s coffers. Members of the community see themselves as people who can do. In recent times, the community has been the beneficiary of some royalties for regions funding. I look forward in the next term of government to some of that sunshine coming further south to Peel and the south west. If we sit down and analyse where the money has been spent, we will see that a considerable amount of that money has been spent, quite rightly I believe, in the Pilbara with the Pilbara Cities program, the Ord River project and the like. Significant money has been spent in the midwest, the goldfields and the wheatbelt. I do not think anyone in this place would deny that, over many years of neglect, some of the facilities in the wheatbelt have been forgotten about. It is very pleasing to see that the people who live out that way who contribute to the wealth of this state are getting some of that sunshine. What I am signalling is that some very patient people down my neck of the woods are very keen to see some of the issues of concern addressed.

I wish to touch upon only a few of those significantly important issues, but that is not to say that it is an exhaustive list. Of particular interest to the people in the northern part of the electorate in the Peel region is the accessibility to industrial land. I am referring to the Nambeelup industrial estate. This is an area of land to the east of Kwinana Freeway, near Lakes Road, that has been identified in a number of planning schemes as a future industrial estate. This industrial estate has the capacity to produce 7 000 jobs for people who live in Mandurah and the Shire of Murray. In fact, it has been the number one priority for the City of Mandurah and the Shire of Murray, and also for the Peel Development Commission. The problem with this land is that it has been subject to inordinate delay in bringing forward what is urgently needed for this region. It would appear that a number of hurdles have been presented, one after another, to delay this project. I have a particular theory as to why that is the case. I will not discuss that in this forum. But I will say that I am at the end of my tether when it comes to my patience with the bureaucracy that is occurring in some government departments. When we consider the number of different reports and requirements of some of the government agencies that are dealing with this land, it is just crazy. The handing down of the report has already been delayed for two years. We will now have a further delay of six months. The reason given for that delay is very flimsy. At the moment, there is a traffic strategy that involves looking at the traffic movements around this proposed industrial estate up until 2031. However, someone has now decided that that strategy needs to be extended from 2031 to 2051. That has set back this project another six months. As I understand it, there is a bit of conjecture between various landowners and the proponents of this area, in particular LandCorp, which owns a considerable chunk of the land in this area, revolving around the width of an easement for a transit bus that is likely to adorn this area sometime in the next 30, 40 or 50 years. That would appear to me to be another example of the impediments that have been thrown up, I believe deliberately, almost in a scandalous manner, to delay this project.

Mr Joe Francis; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr John Quigley; Mr Murray Cowper; Mr Tony Krsticevic

Currently, a number of landowners are sitting on landholdings in this area, and it is costing them, by virtue of the money that they have tied up with banks, to the tune of about \$6 000 a day. In the past two years alone, the money that has been lost on this project is in the vicinity of \$8 million. That is money that will never be recouped and that will inevitably be passed onto the potential buyers in this estate. That will put some of the costs beyond the reach of people who may wish to set up shop in this neck of the woods. I believe that the reason this project is being delayed is that there is an attempt within government departments, particularly the Department of Planning, to pay a free kick to the Keralup proposal. Keralup is a portion of land in the north west corner of the Murray shire. There are significant environmental problems with that land. I believe that LandCorp and the Department of Housing, which are the proponents of the Keralup development, think of themselves as some sort of pseudo land developer. They might see themselves as potentially a Nigel Satterley or a Peet and Co. The only difference is that they are using taxpayers' money to do this. As a Liberal, I have a fundamental problem with that, because suitable land is already available in the district for this purpose. This land is already owned by large developers. I am not pushing the barrow of any particular developer. But I would say that if Keralup is to rise or fall, it should do so on a level playing field. It should rise and fall on a playing field that provides equal opportunities for all the proponents in the district. I am not asking for any special favours. But it would appear that someone is standing on the hose of the private land developers in order to get the Keralup project up and running.

I have already made comments in this place and outside this place about my belief as to what will eventuate at Keralup. I have concerns that it will turn into a ghetto; I have concerns that it is going to impact significantly on, and to the detriment of, the environment in that neck of the woods. When we look at the amount of land that is currently available in that district, we can see that the issue of having affordable housing can be satisfied by simply allowing free enterprise to go about its business. So, once again, I have called upon the Premier to intervene in this proposal, look at why it has been delayed, and get off the hose and allow them to get on with their business, because at this time the cost is spiralling for no other reason than that some bureaucrat sitting in a government department somewhere has to satisfy what I believe are other surreptitious reasons for the delay.

In the meantime, there are other significant issues around the place involving planning. As far as housing is concerned, a number of land developers have found that they have fallen foul of the existing planning procedures, such as the south metropolitan Peel regional 2031 spatial plan, which I have referred to, and also the greater Bunbury region scheme. Again, they put out, at great cost to the community, a consultation process under which people could make submissions on what should be done and where it should be done, in making urban deferred land available. When all the submissions were collated and put together, an indicative report was produced. When the final report was handed down, it appeared to be totally different from that which was discussed and circulated between all the proponents in those areas, or people who had an interest in those areas. That is an ongoing, very frustrating issue that I will be seeking some clarification of.

As I mentioned before, the areas around Australind are growing rapidly. Therefore, some assistance will be needed to get some of the land rezoned in order to make good land available for housing for aspirational Western Australians. Members also have to remember that the people who are moving into these areas do so for a number of reasons. One is that many of them are coming to the area from the north, from the east and from overseas.

[Member's time extended.]

Mr M.J. COWPER: They wish to take advantage of the lifestyle—one that is not reliant on having to jump onto a bus or a train to get themselves all the way into the city. In my neck of the woods, we have access to infrastructure. We have a freeway through the heart of the electorate; we have the main water source that supplies water to Perth running through the middle of the city; we have the powerlines that run from Muja power station to the city. Therefore, we already have in place significant infrastructure to deal with the potential growth in that area.

What concerns me is that the departments seem to be fairly willing to allow development on the northern side of Perth with free abandon. The problem with that, though, is that every time they tack another suburb onto the northern end of the Perth metropolitan area, it is up to the taxpayers to submit to money being spent on extending the railway line, the freeway, the power supply, the water supply, the sewerage and all the infrastructure that goes with that. All that stuff that I have said is already in place in our neck of the woods has to be added on. The cost of the extension of the railway line by five kilometres—I recall bringing that bill to this place—was \$240 million, and so it goes. When we look at the cost of that for the taxpayers and compare it with the cost of the land in my area, it would appear that there has been, if you like, some favouritism. That is another area that I wish to pursue during these four years.

In my last 12 minutes, another issue that I wish to speak on is an application by a very big corporate citizen in my electorate, Alcoa, which has been in the area for a number of years. In fact, it is celebrating its fiftieth year of operation in Western Australia, and it is about 41 years since the refinery opened in Pinjarra. It was established

Mr Joe Francis; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr John Quigley; Mr Murray Cowper; Mr Tony Krsticevic

at that time under a state agreement act, with the assistance of the then Premier, Sir Charles Court. It saw the construction of a purpose-built town in north Pinjarra, or Carcoola, which housed mostly British immigrants who had come to work at what is now the Pinjarra refinery. Up until now the refinery has obtained bauxite from the Darling Ranges. For every tonne of alumina extracted from bauxite, there is about three tonnes of residue. Residue is the waste product. It is currently being stored at a rate of about 10 million tonnes per annum. The “mountain” at the back of Pinjarra is growing at a rate of 10 million tonnes per annum. Over the next 30 years that will amount to around 300 million tonnes. It equates to about the same amount that is currently there. The residue contains sodium hydroxide, which is caustic. It is used in the process of extracting alumina. It remains evident in the materials. Alcoa has been looking at ways to deal with this waste material. There is a plant at Wagerup. I have been working with Alcoa to try to enable the material to be processed in a fashion where we can extract the caustic to use for building material. At one stage it was producing about 10 tonnes per day.

I believe Greenland Road, the new road that is part of the connection between the South Western and Forrest Highways, was made from the material that I am talking about. The sand was extracted, and the company was able to extract the caustic. It now has a use for the waste residue, which I think is commendable. Unfortunately we do not seem to be progressing much beyond it being used on a small scale, as was demonstrated. I will be very interested to observe how Alcoa deals with this waste residue issue. When residue is dumped in a big pile, it has to be kept wet. If it is not wet, people will be covered in dust. If it is not wet, there is potential for particles of caustic to fly in the wind and land within a certain radius of that plant, depending of course on how strong the winds are. Anyone who lives along the Darling Scarp would know that during summertime there is a very strong prevailing easterly wind.

There are two applications by Alcoa. One application is to the Murray shire for an amendment to town planning scheme 4. It is for an amendment to the 283 hectares that allows the land to be specified “special use” rather than “rural”. It will allow the Pinjarra refinery footprint to increase by around 600 acres. The idea is then to relocate some water treatment areas. The existing water treatment area will be converted to waste residue. It will increase the size and the footprint of the mountain that sits there.

Straight up, Alcoa is a very important part of the community in my electorate. It employs many, many people. Alcoa has been a very good contributor over many years to a number of community-based events and programs. It sponsors the local football league. It also contributed towards the local swimming pool. Over time the company has demonstrated it is a very important part of the community. Notwithstanding the fact that it has been there a long time, many residents distrust Alcoa, which may well be unfounded. It may well be an unfair criticism. The reality is that there is that perception to contend with. Given that this application to the Shire of Murray for an amendment to town planning scheme 4 also coincides with an amendment to the Peel region scheme, which, as I understand it, goes to the minister for determination, then if the minister sees fit to sign off on the Peel region scheme amendment, town planning scheme 4 will have to comply with the Peel region scheme. That being the case, there is very little value in the community informing the council of its concerns by way of submissions. Having said that, I put on record in this place that I have written to the Minister for Planning and the Premier of Western Australia, asking them to deal with this issue and to have regard to the community I represent. This is not a minor amendment; it is substantial. A minor amendment would be something like a new roadhouse out there on Forrest Highway, which hopefully we will see sometime in the near future. A minor amendment would be the reclaiming of some land on an intersection that, for one reason or another, was not required anymore, and therefore it would be able to be used in a manner that was in the best interests of the community. That is a minor amendment. The 283 hectares of waste residue that contains sodium hydroxide and other mildly radioactive material inherent in that type of material is not a minor amendment. We are about halfway through the life of this refinery and about halfway through the life of the extraction of minerals from Darling Scarp, and it will impact on not only this generation, but also those of the next 30 or 40 years. It is appropriate that a community consultation process be entered into, notwithstanding that Alcoa will protest that it has met all the various requirements. It needs to go back and better engage the community further in a more open and transparent manner.

By way of example, when the refinery opened in 1972 or whenever it was, 80 per cent of the workforce of the Pinjarra Alcoa refinery lived in Pinjarra; nowadays, I believe it is as low as 20 per cent. Nearly 60 per cent of the workforce no longer lives in the town; it has chosen to live elsewhere. From that, an inference can be drawn that there are people who choose not to live in the shadow of the great mountain that has built up over the past 40 years. It is appropriate that, before we go bringing the waste residue area closer by about half to the town, which will put it about a kilometre away from the back of the Pinjarra racetrack—those who are familiar with that area know that it would encroach—there is an opportunity for the community to discuss with Alcoa whether it could look at perhaps relocating its residue areas to the east, south or even the north. Certainly the concern is that it is progressing westwards towards the town, which is something that people who have been in contact with my office are not comfortable with.

Mr Joe Francis; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr John Quigley; Mr Murray Cowper; Mr Tony Krsticevic

Members may know that I brought a petition to this place yesterday, and I understand from my office that I will be bringing in the same petition with further petitioners when Parliament resumes next week. This is a major issue as far as the relationship between the town and a major employer, and the capacity for a decision-making process that involves the community. I think that is the key point. At no time have we said that Alcoa should shut down, at no time have we said that Alcoa has not been very good for the community—it certainly has—but in essence we are asking for there to be greater involvement with the people who, at the end of the day, will be most affected by this decision.

Alcoa's operations also extend down to Wagerup and, as members will be aware, people living in that area have had concerns for many years. Alcoa has largely demonstrated a good capacity to be able to deal with them, although not everyone has been satisfied. Under the supplementary property purchase program instituted by the previous government, Alcoa has purchased land that people have considered to be too close to the refinery. The people who felt affected or aggrieved by it have since relocated. I think that same sort of spirit should be demonstrated in this case. I look forward to working with the community, Alcoa, the minister and this Parliament to come up with a resolution for this issue because this is a matter that will impact on many people for many years to come.

In the last minute I thank my family for their support and my close friends who have got me back into this place. They put a lot of effort into where we want to go and put up with a whole lot that they probably should not have to. The same could probably be said for everyone in this place.

MR A. KRSTICEVIC (Carine) [4.51 pm]: I firstly congratulate you, Mr Speaker, on being elected as the Speaker of the house. I cannot think of a better man to do the job; you have my full support and obviously also did during the vote. I am happy to say that publicly. I also congratulate all the members who have been re-elected and elected to this house. It is good to see that there is still a vocal group that is keen to express its opinions, which is very, very important in this place. I also thank the parliamentary staff whom I have seen over the past five years do a fantastic job in supporting members in this place and throughout Parliament. As one of the class of 2008 I found that support to be invaluable and I know that the new members in the 2013 election will also find them to be very professional and helpful. Please utilise their services because they are very keen to help.

As we all know, one of the most important parts is our staff in our electorate offices. Without them and without the professional and hardworking dedication that they display every day we would not look half as good as we do in the community. I have some outstanding staff who deliver at an exceptionally high standard. They keep me on my toes and they always encourage me and support me in raising the bar. They are also very keen to challenge decisions and things happening at both government and community levels. It is important to understand that we need staff who will tell us what is happening on the ground and who will share not only their views but also the views they get from the electorate. If we disregard their advice, we are obviously on the back foot. I really encourage everyone to make sure they engage with their electorate staff.

In terms of the Carine campaign, I thank all the people who were involved in my committee and all the supporters, both Liberal Party and friends. Without all those people manning booths and doing all the other work that is important, we would not have been able to present the professional face that we did on election day. I had an abundance of people helping on election day. I was not knocking people back, but I was redirecting them to other electorates to assist. It is not all about me. For a long time, as the member for Carine I have realised that it is important to support all our colleagues, not only on the ground during election campaigns, but also in Parliament. It is important to share opportunities, experiences and advice. The Liberal Party and the branch members are the most important in this whole equation because their job is to do the preselections. If we are doing a great job, they will preselect us. Obviously, that needs to be ratified by the wider Liberal Party, but I am lucky enough that everyone within the branches and also within my electorate thought I was doing an outstanding job in the first four and a half years. Their support has been greatly appreciated and we can never value that support enough.

I just want to put on the record that I realise I am here in this place because of them. It has also been stated that as much as I might think I am a great bloke who does a wonderful job, at the end of the day people in the electorate vote for the party of choice, and in my electorate the party of choice is the Liberal Party. It always has been and always will be, subject to the fantastic work that the local member does, of course, which also contributes to that support. The next preselection is a long time away, so I do not need to spend too much time talking up the candidates; they all know exactly what I think of them anyway. I say to all the people who ran in those 59 seats that from our perspective we had the best group of candidates that we have ever had.

Mr W.J. Johnston: Certainly better than in 2008!

Mr Joe Francis; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr John Quigley; Mr Murray Cowper; Mr Tony Krsticevic

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: In 2008 we were obviously outstanding and we will come out of that a bit better. In saying that, of course, the 2008 crew were candidates again at this election and every single one of them came back and was re-elected. It is very unusual for every single person to be re-elected.

An opposition member interjected.

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: It may well be. It just goes to show the outstanding and wonderful benchmark set in 2008, which then obviously encouraged a whole new group of amazing candidates to put up their hand for the 2013 election to become part of this wonderful team that we have on this side.

The member for Mandurah identified that we have a great amount of talent on our side and he is already starting to single people out and talk them up. He has done that over the past four and a half years and most of the people he has pointed to are either ministers or parliamentary secretaries who have worked their way up somewhere through the Parliament. The member for Mandurah is therefore a great spotter of talent; he is a great talent scout. It would be great occasionally if he were able to identify some talent on the opposition side rather than always identify it on our side. That is just a bit of advice for him—that he might start looking that way as well and maybe some things will change there too.

As I said, all the candidates did a great job. I want to mention two particular candidates. The Liberal candidate for Midland, Daniel Parasiliti, lost by 24 votes. He did an outstanding job. He is an outstanding young man. I have met him on numerous occasions. I think Midland has missed out by not having him as its local member. He is full of energy. He is a very intelligent young man. He is well connected with the community and understands what needs to happen. He lives locally and he is just someone who really would have contributed in a great way.

Mrs M.H. Roberts: You don't even know where he lives. Where does he live?

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: The other person I want to also mention is the candidate for Collie–Preston, Jaimee Motion.

Mrs M.H. Roberts: You have just misled the Parliament. Are you aware of that?

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: I am sorry?

Mrs M.H. Roberts: You have misled the Parliament. He lives south of the river. He doesn't live in Midland.

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: I think he is shifting. Is he shifting? I am not sure, but he works locally anyway and has a physiotherapy business there. So I may be mistaken there.

Jaimee Motion also did a great job in Collie–Preston, losing by 56 votes. That was, again, an outstanding achievement. All the candidates across the board did a fantastic job and I really want to thank them for the great job they did.

Obviously we came to the last Parliament in 2008 and we won the last election. It would be honest to say that we were surprised by the result on that occasion. But when we came to this Parliament in 2008 there were 24 Liberals in this house, five Nationals, four Independents and 26 Labor —

Dr A.D. Buti: You didn't win the election. How can you say you won the election?

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: We formed government with the Liberals and the Nationals and the support of the Independents. That was obviously a decision that was well founded by the community, as we came back in 2008 as a minority government. When we look at the make-up of our government in 2008 with, as I said, four Independents, five Nationals and 24 Liberals and we look at the federal Labor Party, which is in a similar minority government position, we can see that the difference between those two governments is like chalk and cheese in terms of how well we have done as a government. When I talk to people out there in the streets, they talk about the wonderful, strong decisions that are made by the Premier and about the fact that he stands up for WA and gets things done; all those sorts of things that members of this house were complaining about were not issues that people were seeing in the community. That is an important thing to remember. Members on our side of the chamber would have got that message loud and clear, not just during the election but also over the past four and a half years in terms of how well we did during such trying times.

Dr A.D. Buti: Trying times? What trying times?

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms J.M. Freeman): Order! Let the member for Carine continue his speech, member for Armadale. He is not asking for interjections.

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: Thank you very much for your protection, Madam Acting Speaker. I was not seeking interjections. It would be nice to get some of these facts on the table without too many interruptions.

When I came into this Parliament and became a member of the Public Accounts Committee I was told that it was a great committee to be on. I was told I would learn a lot, it would ease me into the Parliament and build on my

Mr Joe Francis; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr John Quigley; Mr Murray Cowper; Mr Tony Krsticevic

skills. The member for Jandakot, Hon Joe Francis, who is now a minister, and I were the two Liberal Party members on the Public Accounts Committee. The committee also comprised the former member for Willagee, Hon Alan Carpenter, the then member for Balcatta and the member for Gosnells. I thought, “Wow! This looks like it will be a lot of fun.” It was also a lot of hard work. When the former member for Willagee left this Parliament he was replaced on the Public Accounts Committee by the member for West Swan. She had been a chief of staff for Premier Carpenter and had worked in Treasury for many years. Members can imagine what it was like. On that committee were former ministers, a former chief of staff and a former head of the Conservation Council, and the member for Jandakot and I walked into that committee fresh, without that kind of background and experience, and I thought, “This is going to be very interesting.” But I can say there were many challenging inquiries in those four and a half years and the committee was faced with many difficult situations, and I believe we on our side did an exceptional job.

Ms R. Saffioti: You did, member.

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: I thank the member for West Swan very much for that comment. It was a great learning experience even though it was an opposition-led committee. I learned a lot in those four and a half years, and opposition members knew what they were talking about, had something to contribute and were very capable, especially the then member for Balcatta and the former member for Willagee. I took the opportunity to learn from them and that four and a half years’ experience has made me a better member of Parliament. Although I am not on the Public Accounts Committee this time around, those four and a half years afforded me a fantastic opportunity.

Opposition-led committees were an interesting concept when they were first floated, and due to the make-up of the Parliament we did that the first time around, and I think they worked. The inquiries were vigorous and focused on particular political avenues, but at the end of the day the government scrubbed up well. Those inquiries showed that the government was doing things well but that there is always room for improvement and things could be done better. That will probably never change whichever party is in government, because of circumstances, processes, the bureaucracy and the need to work through things.

In 2008 the coalition won 10 seats from the opposition; in this last election the coalition won five seats. That is a fantastic result. As for the quality of members of Parliament, 13 new members came into this house in 2008 and there are eight new members this time around. There is 13 out of 24 and now there are another eight, so 22 out of 31 members are from 2008 and 2013. That shows a great level of rejuvenation, strength and growth for the party and the Liberal–National government will benefit enormously from these new members.

The 2013 election produced a 58 per cent two-party preferred result—an amazing result and the best since 1917. I am surprised it was so large. Given the feedback I received from the people I met in the street I expected the coalition to do well, and a small part of that could be due to discontent with the federal government, but I would like to think it was not a large part. The feedback I received was that the government was doing a great job and the Premier was doing fantastic work, and I was told to keep up the good work, keep making those decisions, keep delivering those projects and stop talking about things. That worked a treat.

In terms of my own electorate my primary vote was 45.1 per cent and the two party–preferred vote was 68.2 per cent, so there was a great 18 per cent increase. I think it is important to highlight these facts. On the Liberal side 20 seats now have a margin greater than 10 per cent as opposed to eight in 2008. The ALP has two seats with a margin greater than 10 per cent and the Nationals have two seats with a margin greater than 10 per cent, so I think we have had an outstanding result for all those members in all those seats. Some of those are marginal seats and the elected members have done a great job.

Ms M.M. Quirk: Tell us about your seat, member; I’d be interested to hear about your seat in Carine.

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: I will get to that; I have some points to cover there.

In terms of Canberra and its attack on federalism, in 1901 we became part of the Federation and back then the Federation was really about defence and immigration.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms J.M. Freeman): Members!

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: That was what it was about. It was also limited to the powers of section 51 of the Constitution. I think it is important that we take note of that and that we do not forget that federalism has its place, but we have to be careful about giving up too much power to Canberra, either through weak state governments, or through adverse High Court decisions, which have obviously eroded our powers. I also say that from that perspective uniform legislation is something we need to be wary of because that is just a way of Canberra grabbing more power, and eventually if we sign over too many powers, the balance will tip in the other

Mr Joe Francis; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr John Quigley; Mr Murray Cowper; Mr Tony Krsticevic

direction and I think that would be very, very detrimental to this state. Things like the mining tax have had an impact. The world is struggling and things have slowed down in the rest of the world, but we have to be careful not to slow things down in Western Australia and Australia. Things like the mining tax have been poorly crafted and push businesses away. At one stage the federal government wanted to take over the health system. That seems to have fizzled away very quickly. There's obviously the carbon tax, and there is the Gonski report, which the federal government is trying to use to take over education. The federal government wants the states to fund these things; it wants to throw a few dollars in itself, but it wants to try to take control and centralise these things. We need to keep supporting the Premier and ensure we stand up on all these attacks on our individual rights as a state. Do not forget that 10 per cent of the population has been producing 40 per cent of the wealth.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members!

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: As we know this state's population is growing by 1 000 people a week and it is putting pressure on all of our services, whether it is our roads —

Several members interjected.

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: I will have another 14 minutes left once I get an extension, so there is plenty of time to talk about my electorate, but there are some broader issues —

Several members interjected.

Mr P.T. Miles: Ask for an extension.

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: Can I have an extension please?

The ACTING SPEAKER: Extension granted.

[Member's time extended.]

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: Thank you very much, Madam Acting Speaker. I want to make sure I get some stuff in about my electorate as well of course. But it is okay, because at the end of the day it is not just about talking in this place, it is about action on the ground. I will talk a bit later about action on the ground. That obviously translates into votes at the ballot box as well, so I cannot complain about that.

We talked about state debt and like all of us out there, we know we need to borrow to build and we need to borrow to do things. We have to ask ourselves how much we are borrowing, what we are borrowing for and whether it is adding value to the community. I do not want to spend any more time on the federal government, but as we know, it was in the black to \$40 billion and now it is in the red with some \$262 billion of net debt. I am not sure too many people can physically grab on to many things and say that the \$300 billion turnaround has resulted in some assets, at least not here in WA. In terms of state debt, this 2012–13 capital works program is worth \$7 billion, but what are we spending this money on? We know there is a new \$1.2 billion children's hospital being built at QEII. We know there is \$610 million for the City Link project. We know there is \$440 million for the Elizabeth Quay development. We know there is \$428 million for the new museum and cultural centre. There is \$393 million for the Joondalup Health Campus. There is another \$117 million for the Albany Health Campus. There is \$2 billion for Fiona Stanley Hospital. There are the roads, the rail, the hospitals, the schools, the cultural centre; there are all sorts of things.

Several members interjected.

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: There is rail going up to Butler.

There are independent public schools, the Ord project and Pilbara Cities. The former member for Perth criticised a lot of these projects and did not support them, and he is not in this place any more. He is not in this place because he was not supporting the people of Perth and he was not supporting the projects that were being built in Perth. He was just criticising them all and wanting them all to be stopped, and I think that is reflected in the results of the election. I think a lot of good work is being done. It is not about how much we borrow; it is about how we invest our money. I think we have done a fantastic job from that perspective and we should continue down that path. A lot of these projects will build and redefine the city and create opportunities for the private sector to come on board and grow and build on that.

I will focus on a couple of very key points in my electorate. One of the first things I did when I was elected was to advocate for a new Lake Gwelup Primary School, and that was built, thank God. The original school was in very poor condition and was falling apart, but was in a growing area. Some great work has been done there. Prior to the election I was arguing very strongly for an upgrade of Reid Highway between Erindale Road and Marmion Avenue, and \$48 million has been allocated towards that project. That will make a huge difference to

Mr Joe Francis; Mr Fran Logan; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr John Quigley; Mr Murray Cowper; Mr Tony Krsticevic

not just the people of Carine but those in all the northern suburbs. It is fantastic to finally see these things happen.

On social issues, we have spoken about the Karrinyup Lakes Lifestyle Village, so everyone is familiar with it. New legislation has been passed to help people in retirement villages.

Ms M.M. Quirk: Half of it.

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: The main components are through and the rest will come through this term. The residents are very grateful. Their issues have been resolved and they are doing a great job rejuvenating that village and putting people's lives back on track.

Duncraig Senior High School, which is within the newly redistributed part of my electorate, has been allocated \$5 million for a new administration block. That school caters for gifted and talented students and is doing a fantastic job. I have started connecting with the new area of my electorate by visiting schools and going to P&C meetings and starting to become part of that community.

Being a member of Parliament is also obviously about the little things we do and about local issues, whether it is advocating on behalf of the community at local government level or at federal government level or even through the state bureaucracy. A lot of work has been done at that level from not just my office, I am sure, but all members' offices. The electorates of Hillarys and Scarborough are on either side of my electorate and my constituents use the facilities in both those electorates extensively. I think the \$30 million Scarborough redevelopment is a fantastic opportunity that will rejuvenate the area. I think this state has a very, very bright future. A lot is happening. A lot more private investment will come on board. Hopefully, in the next four years we will look at getting rid of red tape, reducing bureaucracy and making it easier for people in business to navigate through government departments, because I think that is very, very important. Some of those things have already happened, but there is a lot more work to do. I am very keen to support that and make sure those things are freed up. All the members on our side are actively pursuing ways to reduce various pieces of red tape and complexities to try to make life easier. I think that is very important because the private sector wants to be let loose so that they can create jobs and therefore add to the state's wealth. That is very important because it is not about government creating wealth but about government creating opportunities so that the private sector can jump on board and do what needs to be done.

Things are pretty good in my electorate, I have to admit. Some of the sporting facilities there have become rundown, but from working with the local council I know that the community facilities at Charles Riley Reserve and a range of other places are all being upgraded. They are well and truly overdue. It is important to make sure we are reinvesting into those areas. People talk about giving back and ask how they can give back. We give back by doing things at that community level. I think that is very important. In my electorate the government has supported core activities at the grassroots level so that people can participate in sport and community activities and really feel connected. I am very positive about the next four years; I am very positive about our legislative agenda; and I am very positive about the new ministers.

Several members interjected.

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: I think a lot of great opportunities will become available. It is important to give that support. I am sure that, as usual, the opposition will criticise all the good decisions, including the law and order decisions. It is their job to oppose everything.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members!

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms J.M. Freeman): Members, that is enough. You have had your fun. Let the member continue.

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: From my perspective, we have done a great job over the last four and a half years and no doubt we will continue to do that. As a member of this side of the house I will make sure that we support the community and business and fight for this state's rights. I will continue to do that with my colleagues.

Question put and passed; the Address-in-Reply thus adopted.