

Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Vincent Catania; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Peter Abetz; Dr Mike Nahan; Acting Speaker; Mr Eric Ripper; Mr Bill Marmion; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Mick Murray; Mr Joe Francis; Mr Peter Watson

ELECTION PROMISES — BARNETT GOVERNMENT

“Liberal Plan for the First 100 Days of Government” — Motion

MR M. McGOWAN (Rockingham) [4.10 pm]: I move —

That the house condemns the Barnett government for its failure to implement the election promises contained within its first 100 day plan document.

Members might have noted that the opposition’s theme today has been to take up the document entitled “Liberal Plan for the First 100 Days of Government” that was prepared and published by the then Barnett opposition, now Barnett government. The reason for the opposition’s action is that this is the second last day of the Parliament for this year. Therefore, this is the last opportunity for the opposition to deal with this issue in the Parliament.

The opposition is aware that this government is probably three-quarters of the way through its first 100 days in government. There are still a few days to go to reach that 100 days and the opposition is neither silly nor churlish enough not to understand that. However, we understand that it is impossible for many of the commitments contained within this document to be met. Government members, including the Premier, say that we are only 72 or 75 days through the first 100 days of the new government, but they need to understand that it is impossible for the commitments contained in that document to be met. No degree of obfuscation or number of excuses will see that fact denied.

The opposition has moved this motion to ensure that it is on the record that the new government will not meet the commitments it made to the people of Western Australia in the lead-up to the state election. The new government made a number of promises in the lead-up to the 6 September election and it published a number of policy documents that were summarised into one document, which was titled “Liberal Plan for the First 100 Days of Government”. It was released by the now Premier as a 100-day plan that meant that the new government would hit the ground running.

Western Australians would have thought the document was a pretty fair summary of what the new government would be about if it was elected. The opposition has concentrated on this document instead of the other commitments made by the new government, although it will get to those, because this document was released with great fanfare in the days leading up to the election and was regarded as a synopsis of what would happen in the first 100 days of the new government.

Whenever we have raised this document in this house the Premier has smiled and laughed, as though the document did not matter. He has smiled and laughed in question time and on other occasions when the issue of this document has been raised as though it is irrelevant. He is doing it again now. It goes to show that he regards these promises as non-core promises—things that do not count—contained in a throwaway document that was released by him in the days leading up to the election.

The Liberal Party’s promises that were made in the lead-up to the election were promises made by this Premier; they were not the promises of Paul Omodei, Matt Birney or the member for Vasse. The Premier has often said in this place that he is not bound by the promises made by others. However, I am referring to the promises that the Premier made and to his credibility being on the line. The Premier needs to advise the Parliament and the people of Western Australia why dozens of the Liberal Party’s commitments will not be implemented by the new government within the time frame he gave.

In a democratic system, the first 100 days of a new government are the most productive. It is said in the United States that the first 100 days a new president is in office are his most productive. That is the time that he has the mandate and authority to get things done before subsequent events overwhelm the new government.

The government is moving at a snail’s pace to implement the 45 promises in the document. The Leader of the Opposition and I estimate that a lot more than half the commitments will not be implemented.

Mr C.J. Barnett: Were you pleased with the announcement on Esperance today?

Mr M. McGOWAN: The Premier has forgotten what the standing orders state about a question of relevance. When he was manager of government business, he knew the standing orders, but he has forgotten them. The standing order on relevance states that members must deal with the subject that is before the Parliament. We are dealing with the Premier’s broken promises as they relate to the Liberal Party’s document. I look forward to the Premier answering the questions that have been raised. In doing so, he should not be rude, churlish and offensive as he was to the Leader of the Opposition in question time when he said that the new government’s first 100 days in office do not conclude until New Year’s Eve. It was unbecoming of a Premier to act in such a rude and offensive way in question time, particularly given that how he would lift the standard in the Parliament has

Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Vincent Catania; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Peter Abetz; Dr Mike Nahan; Acting Speaker; Mr Eric Ripper; Mr Bill Marmion; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Mick Murray; Mr Joe Francis; Mr Peter Watson

featured in editorials. He also alluded to the drinking habits of members of Parliament. We can all go down that road, but that is the road he went down in question time. In future he should demonstrate the standards he professes rather than acting in that manner.

The reason that it is impossible to implement these promises is evident. One promise is that six pieces of legislation will be passed within the first 100 days of the new government.

Mr C.J. Barnett: You would not pass the truth-in-sentencing legislation or the surrogacy legislation?

Mr M. McGOWAN: I am not referring to those pieces of legislation. We are supportive of both pieces of legislation. The surrogacy legislation was entirely the former government's legislation and the truth-in-sentencing legislation was, largely, the former government's legislation.

The Liberal document states that six pieces of legislation will be passed and issues that the Liberal Party campaigned on will be implemented, but the government will fail to do that because Parliament concludes for the year tomorrow. The Premier has talked about these issues in the 12 years I have been in this Parliament. However, he has not introduced the relevant legislation and that illustrates that he does not consider the promises he made to be of any significance or importance.

The document "Liberal Plan for the First 100 Days of Government" commences on a false premise. It states —

After eight years the Labor Government has blown the boom.

Labor has failed to deliver the benefits of the boom to the people of Western Australia — and too many families and small businesses are missing out.

That is a completely false premise. The previous government set in train the biggest and best capital works program in the history of Western Australia. We did that by maintaining a budget surplus that allowed us to meet the demands of a booming, growing state. It was the strongest capital works program per capita of any state in Australia, and better per capita than any state government in the history of Western Australia. At the same time, we provided more teachers, more nurses, more doctors and more teacher assistants, and maintained the lowest unemployment rate in the modern history of Western Australia. We ensured through our training systems that more people were trained and educated than ever before. We also provided five rounds of significant tax cuts to the people of Western Australia. That, in a nutshell, is what the previous Labor government did with the boom in Western Australia.

Mr C.J. Barnett: What about your tax increases?

Mr M. McGOWAN: I am glad the Premier asked that question. The previous Labor government maintained a budget surplus. We took the view that we had to maintain a budget surplus. As we know, when the Premier was last in government he ran five budget deficits. We took the view that responsible economic management meant that we had to maintain a budget surplus. There were some tax rises, but there were far more and far deeper tax cuts than there were tax rises during the Labor Party's eight years in office. We achieved this while maintaining a budget surplus. If the government wants to talk about the boom, one of the best indicators of good economic management is the maintenance of a budget surplus. Within the first 100 days of the new government, we have had indications from both the Premier and the Treasurer of a move towards a budget deficit. The government is already softening up the public for the fact that it will be spending more on the ordinary business of government than it will receive in receipts. That is not good economic management.

The Treasurer said yesterday that he thought it was okay for the government to borrow to pay the wages of state government staff, to borrow to pay for the stationery used by state government staff and to borrow to pay for the petrol used by the people who work for the state government. He said yesterday that that was okay, and today he was backed up by the Premier. If the government wants to talk about the boom, about success and about ensuring that we do not blow the boom, I ask: what is the new government doing? It is making sure that future generations of Western Australians will be burdened by its spending and its borrowing. The new government does not have a mandate to take the state into deficit; it has a mandate to carry out the promises contained within this document. I do not see any mention in the Liberal Party's 100-day plan document about taking the state into deficit, but maybe I have missed it. Maybe the Premier, as the author of five out of eight budget deficits last time he was in government, can show me which of these 45 dot points says that it is okay to take Western Australia's state government into deficit—that after eight budget surpluses under the previous Labor government it is now okay, during the first few days of the new government, to take the state into deficit. I did not see it; maybe I missed that particular dot point. Maybe it was Liquid Papered out!

The government talks about how the Labor Party blew the boom. We cut stamp duty for first home buyers. That was a huge initiative; it had never been done before. Stamp duty for first home buyers is virtually zero. We took the issue of housing affordability seriously, and we saw the way forward to ensuring that the benefits of the

Extract from *Hansard*

[ASSEMBLY - Wednesday, 3 December 2008]

p879b-897a

Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Vincent Catania; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Peter Abetz; Dr Mike Nahan; Acting Speaker; Mr Eric Ripper; Mr Bill Marmion; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Mick Murray; Mr Joe Francis; Mr Peter Watson

boom went to ordinary Western Australians. Under the Labor government, the release of land in Western Australia more than doubled, from 7 000 lots during the last year of the Court government to 17 000 lots. That was what we managed to do. We made housing affordability much better for first home buyers and brought home the benefits of the boom to ordinary Western Australians. We also put in place the shared equity scheme for low-income people so that they could afford their own homes. We put both those initiatives in place. What has become of the shared equity scheme? It has been completely gutted by the new Treasurer. The Premier is laughing again—laughing at the plight of first home buyers. Do members notice that? When the subject of housing affordability for first home buyers was raised with the Treasurer, he replied, “So what?”, as though it did not matter. I suppose it is okay if one lives in Shenton Park and the world is one’s oyster, but out in the suburbs that we represent, affordability of housing and the shared equity scheme are very significant issues.

We then found out today that another agency responsible for 3 600 loans for low-income Western Australians—Keystart—is not passing on interest rate cuts to ordinary Western Australians. The Treasurer said that one of the things the previous government should have done was ensure that interest rate cuts were passed on. However, when he is asked about his own agency, he replies that he will have to discuss the matter with the agency. It is apparently okay for all the other financial institutions to pass on interest rate cuts, but not the Treasurer’s own agency, Keystart. This is the man who said that housing affordability is the most important issue in Western Australia, yet his own agency is not passing on interest rate cuts.

I do not think that that is acceptable for ordinary Western Australians who have home loans through Keystart. I do not think that it is acceptable to those ordinary Western Australians who expect to access the shared equity scheme set up by the Labor government for the Treasurer to gut the scheme and say, “So what?” I do not think either of those things are acceptable, and I do not think it is acceptable for the government to undo all the good work of the former government that ensured that the state budget was in surplus, and say within 75 days of forming government that it is going to go into deficit. I do not think that any of those things is acceptable. Those opposite have gone from being deficit hawks to deficit doves, from housing affordability warriors to housing affordability weaklings and from capital works proponents to capital works underminers. That is what has happened in 75 days in office. In my view, and in the view of the opposition, that is completely unacceptable.

In its “Liberal Plan for the First 100 Days of Government”, the Liberal Party promised to introduce or pass six bills, but that has not happened. The Liberal Party made a commitment to increase the penalties for graffiti vandals but I have not seen any legislation on that. The Liberal Party did not say that it would introduce legislation to do that; it said it would increase the penalties. That legislation was supposed to have been passed in Parliament within the government’s first 100 days in office. The Liberal Party also promised to introduce mandatory sentences for thugs who assaulted police and public offices; increase penalties for hoons; toughen the cannabis laws and prostitution legislation; and pass legislation to deal with political lobbyists. All those promises were to be implemented within the first 100 days of forming government, yet none of those promises has come to fruition—not a single one. Okay, the government introduced the Royal Perth Hospital Protection Bill 2008. It is just three clauses! The Minister for Health must be so proud that he has introduced a one-page bill that consists of three clauses. That must have really taxed the minister! He should go on a holiday after that. It is about time he headed over to Thailand after all the work he has done on the three-clause bill for Royal Perth Hospital.

I will allow other members to have their say but the last matter I will refer to is the Liberal Party’s commitment to introduce new arrangements to give school principals the authority to run their schools without bureaucratic interference if the school community chooses. This idea has been around for a while, as members who are familiar with education are aware, and there are varying views on it. The then opposition not only put that commitment into its 45-dot point 100-day document, but also released it as a policy in the lead-up to the election. I note that the Minister for Education yesterday assured the house that that commitment would be kept. She has 25 more days to ensure that new arrangements are put in place to give school principals the authority to run their schools without bureaucratic interference if the school so chooses. The promise was made not only in the 100-day document, but also in *Hansard*. The minister said it in this house. I will be gobsmacked if that promise is kept. When the Premier gives a press conference on New Year’s Eve about the commitments the government has kept, I will bet that that is not one of them. I bet that the Minister for Education misled the house yesterday about that commitment because it is not possible to implement that commitment within 25 days, given all the issues involved with the running of schools. As former Ministers for Education and Training, the Premier and I know it. An incredible level of naivety and a lack of understanding about the running of the education system and schools was shown when that commitment was made, firstly, in the document and, secondly, when the minister repeated it in Parliament yesterday. The Premier will have to answer for that commitment. We will remind him on that day about the promise that was made not only in the 100-day document, but also in Parliament yesterday.

Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Vincent Catania; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Peter Abetz; Dr Mike Nahan; Acting Speaker; Mr Eric Ripper; Mr Bill Marmion; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Mick Murray; Mr Joe Francis; Mr Peter Watson

Dr K.D. Hames: Do you know what you're doing? You're making it easier for us because every time you stand up and whinge, it makes it easier for us to get through these things in 100 days that we want to get through. I appreciate your support.

Mr M. McGOWAN: That contribution was stunning! I can see why the minister needs a holiday after hearing that comment emerge from his lips. I would defy anyone to interpret that contribution. I can see why the minister must get on a plane to get away and clear his head. This is a serious motion. A number of Labor members will speak about the first 100-day plan of the new government. The Premier is again smirking, smiling and laughing about the new government's promises, as though they do not matter. I urge him to treat these issues with the seriousness that they deserve because they are serious issues and he must answer to this Parliament and to the people of Western Australia.

MR V. CATANIA (North West) [4.35 pm]: The government will have some trouble with the North West electorate.

Mr T.G. Stephens interjected.

Mr V. CATANIA: We got a swing towards us in the North West.

Mr T.G. Stephens: There's not a National member from the north west in the chamber.

Mr V. CATANIA: That is right; they are gone. The government will find it hard to deliver its promises and to compete with what the Labor Party delivered over the past eight years, especially in the north west. The "Liberal Plan for the First 100 Days of Government" is great, but many projects for the North West electorate have been put in the forward estimates and I am struggling to get answers from the government about what stage they are at. I have written to the relevant ministers and have placed questions on notice, which I am sure will be answered in due course. The one big project that the community in Carnarvon is concerned about, which unified the whole town, is the justice complex. The community fought hard for that complex. I conducted a survey that found 87 per cent of the community want the justice complex shifted from its current location. That would enable tourism to develop and allow Carnarvon to grow. That is the first piece of the jigsaw puzzle for Carnarvon to go forward. The former Labor government, of which I was a part, agreed to relocate the justice complex on the former Gascoyne Traders' site, which is about one kilometre out of town. That would have allowed the magnificent piece of real estate to be developed so that Carnarvon could reach its potential. The forward estimates under the previous government indicated that the new police and courthouse complex would have cost \$48 million. The complex would have created a new entry statement for the town. I have spoken to the Minister for Police and have revved him up to ensure that he —

Mr R.F. Johnson: Revved me up? Encouraging me, you mean.

Mr V. CATANIA: Very much so. I encouraged him to fulfil the commitment that we made and to provide the funding that we had provided for in the forward estimates. There is a question mark over that \$48 million. Carnarvon desperately needs a new power station because the aging power supply is causing problems for the horticultural industry and businesspeople in general. My office often experiences power failures. The power station is an important piece of infrastructure and the \$70 million provided for it in the forward estimates has vanished, and does not look like it will return. It is interesting that some of these types of projects are disappearing from the forward estimates.

Several members interjected.

Mr V. CATANIA: If members opposite want to talk about the 100-day plan, under the heading "Regional and Rural Western Australia", the Liberal Party committed to immediately reinstating the rural crime squad. I would like to know what stage that is at and whether it will be reinstated.

Mr R.F. Johnson: Has it been 100 days yet?

Mr V. CATANIA: No, but I look forward to seeing it because that is important to the pastoral industry.

Mr R.F. Johnson: Watch this space.

Mr V. CATANIA: It is good to see that it is on the government's radar. Many other projects in the North West are not on the government's radar. When the Treasurer was the Leader of the Opposition, he came to Carnarvon. He wanted to big-note himself and said that the Liberal Party would support and fund the upgrade of the memorial for HMAS *Sydney*. I have yet to hear a response about whether that is going to happen.

Mr R.F. Johnson: I am going to do my very best to look after you in your seat, my friend!

Mr V. CATANIA: I thank the minister. I look forward to that.

Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Vincent Catania; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Peter Abetz; Dr Mike Nahan; Acting Speaker; Mr Eric Ripper; Mr Bill Marmion; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Mick Murray; Mr Joe Francis; Mr Peter Watson

Another police station that the minister can help out with is Mt Magnet Police Station.

Mr R.F. Johnson: I am aware of that one!

Mr M. McGowan: He is going to fix it!

Mr V. CATANIA: I hope the minister is going to fix it. I have confidence in the minister to deliver such important pieces of infrastructure for the town. That police station will not affect just the town of Mt Magnet; it will also affect Cue and Meekatharra. That new police station, which we had planned at a cost of \$4.7 million, will ensure that we can attract and retain police officers—and are able to lock up criminals as well.

Mr R.F. Johnson: I cannot get it built in the next 25 days—I am really sorry—but I will look after you, I promise!

Mr V. CATANIA: I am happy to have it in 101 days. It is not a problem!

When it comes to promises, I must say that I really did not have that many promises from the then opposition. I really did not have that many from my opponents. It is not very clear at the moment what few promises the electorate of North West did get. The community in Exmouth is wondering whether a commitment was made for a \$5 million upgrade to the Exmouth school or for a \$26 million new primary school. We still have not worked that out. The Premier was in consultation with my opponents during an election campaign. Perhaps the Premier can let me know what the exact commitment was and where it is at.

Mr C.J. Barnett: You must be delighted about our decision to lift the ban on uranium mining, being such a supporter yourself of the industry!

Mr V. CATANIA: The Premier would know, if he reads *Hansard*, that when it comes to uranium mining, I believe we should have a real and informed debate.

Mr C.J. Barnett: You said more than that! You were right there with all the rednecks! Come on! Don't go wobbly at the knees now!

Mr V. CATANIA: I want to get back to the government's lack of commitments to the seat of North West. I will continue the theme of education. The government's 100-day plan, under "Education", states in part —

- Allocate initial additional funds needed to commence work on new schools and school infrastructure and facilities upgrades across the state.

Karratha Primary School was part of the \$102 million that we had planned to spend when we were in government to build a state-of-the-art education precinct. That is what the people of the Pilbara and Karratha deserve. However, the \$26 million school that we had planned for Karratha seems to have gone—vanished. That was in the forward estimates of our government. We are still waiting on an answer from the government on that school. I will mention one more promise, and I think that is it—the \$10 million that the former government had allocated for the upgrade of Nickol Bay Hospital. This issue was raised during the election campaign, because this is the biggest issue for Karratha residents. Despite royalties for regions, and despite the fact that Karratha is part of the region that produces a lot of the wealth of this state, Karratha does not have the state-of-the-art hospital that it deserves. The Premier came to Karratha and made a commitment that he would put \$10 million into the upgrade of that hospital. That is great. However, obviously a lot more needs to be done to bring that hospital up to scratch. For example, we need \$2 million to put a mammography unit into that hospital. Very important pieces of infrastructure are needed at that hospital. I look forward to the government fulfilling that commitment.

That was the extent of the commitments made in the seat of North West. However, when I add up what has been promised by this government, and what we had in our forward estimates, it comes to roughly \$150 million. That \$150 million has suddenly vanished from the seat of North West. I hope that the new government, in coalition with the National Party, does not re-badge that \$150 million into royalties for regions and start filtering that out to other projects that the government might see as a priority. That is my greatest concern. I have worked hard in the north west to get a feel for what the community wants, and I have managed to prioritise those pieces of infrastructure.

Mr C.J. Barnett: So in your area you will be supporting royalties for regions? We will be looking for your full public support.

Mr V. CATANIA: I will support royalties for regions only if the projects that we have commenced and that are in the forward estimates are not taken away, as appears to have happened. I do not want that \$150 million to be taken out of the seat of North West and re-badged for other projects that the government sees as a priority for that seat. My concern is that the government will not deliver on important pieces of infrastructure that the north west electorate needs and that it has prioritised, as I have, over many years. I am sceptical that the new

Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Vincent Catania; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Peter Abetz; Dr Mike Nahan; Acting Speaker; Mr Eric Ripper; Mr Bill Marmion; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Mick Murray; Mr Joe Francis; Mr Peter Watson

government will not achieve in its first 100 days what it has set out to achieve. I am very sceptical that the commitment to projects that are important to the residents of the north west will not be fulfilled but will be taken away and re-badged under royalties for regions and given as trinkets to show that the National Party is delivering in my electorate. I am sure that those projects that may be re-badged by taking away that \$150 million are needed in the community. I do not doubt that. As I have said, I support this motion.

Mr R.F. Johnson: You should have a lot of your answers, I would have thought, by tomorrow. I have signed off on a lot of questions from you in relation to some of the specific areas that you have mentioned today. I am going to do my best to look after you.

Mr C.J. Barnett: You couldn't do any more!

Mr R.F. Johnson: Yes; I couldn't do any more!

Mr V. CATANIA: The minister has just reminded me of another police station!

Mr R.F. Johnson: I thought you had missed one!

Mr V. CATANIA: I am referring to the police station closures that have taken place in regional Western Australia. One of those was Gascoyne Junction Police Station. Is Gascoyne Junction Police Station going to be reopened?

Mr R.F. Johnson: I would love to tell you the answer to that, but at the moment I am arranging meetings with the local shires, and with the police commissioner, because, of course, that is an operational issue.

Mr V. CATANIA: I am glad the minister has said it is an operational issue, because when he was in opposition he actually blamed us for that closure.

Mr R.F. Johnson: Do you want the answer? I'm having serious discussions with the police commissioner, and with the local shires, to see how we can address the need for police stations in regional and rural areas and provide a better police presence. That is all in hand. That was not part of the 100-day plan, of course, but I am going to look after you. I keep telling you that.

Mr V. CATANIA: I will have faith in the minister, and I will make sure that the residents of the north west hold the minister to account for that and that he does deliver important police stations that we desperately need in my electorate.

Mr R.F. Johnson: So I can count on you to do a really good write-up for your local paper, the *Countryman*, and dispel the comments that they have made about it!

Mr V. CATANIA: I will carry on. As I have said, I hope the new government will fulfil the commitments that we made, because they are important to my electorate. We have worked hard to make sure that we have a priority order for the north west. I hope that that \$150 million is not taken away from the north west electorate. Also, I hope that the three per cent efficiency cuts do not apply to front-line services in my electorate, and I am not talking just about the police. I hear whispers around the seat, particularly when it comes to fisheries. Fisheries are a very important part of my electorate, because it contains the World Heritage area of Shark Bay and the Ningaloo Reef. I have a grave concern that a cut may be on the way for front-line services that look after what I believe is one of the most important areas of World Heritage and reef systems. My concern is that those cuts will bite hard into those areas, where we should be increasing staffing levels to cater for the increase in tourism and the number of people who want to see our World Heritage areas and reefs. I have grave concerns that the 100-day plan, and the plan in general of the government, is to re-badge what the government thinks is a priority to assist in its own members' seats, and it will leave the north west bare, as it did when it was in government for eight years previously. I believe the former member for Ningaloo stood in this place and said that Labor delivered more in its first four years in government than the Court government delivered to the Gascoyne in eight years. He was one of the Liberal Party's members. It is interesting to go through *Hansard* —

Mr R.F. Johnson: I think you might be taking his comments out of context.

Mr V. CATANIA: I do not think so. I can also quote what he said about the Indigenous affairs minister at the same time, but I will wait; I will raise that at another time perhaps. In any event, I think what he said is along the same lines. It is interesting to go through *Hansard*—I encourage new members to go through *Hansard*—because one never knows what one will find. It is interesting to see. Anyway, I will give the minister the benefit of the doubt, and I am sure he will deliver on those very important items. I look forward to keeping watch.

MS L.L. BAKER (Maylands) [4.52 pm]: While we are obviously very positive and in a good mood, I should mention Maylands and some of the commitments that the government made in Maylands. Fortunately, that will not take terribly long, because there was only one direct commitment, and that was the one about public

Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Vincent Catania; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Peter Abetz; Dr Mike Nahan; Acting Speaker; Mr Eric Ripper; Mr Bill Marmion; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Mick Murray; Mr Joe Francis; Mr Peter Watson

transport and car parking bays. I suppose that it might be worthwhile to recheck the priorities for public transport in Maylands in the first place, because parking bays may have been the Liberal Party's election priority, but I think some other issues that are probably equally important need also to be looked at. There are issues with transport across the electorate, including getting into the railway station. There is also a great deal of concern about public transport and the rail network. I think the Australian Labor Party ordered some new carriages when it was in government. We want to make sure that they are delivered on time and used as soon as possible. I think they are due in March. We want to make sure that they turn up, so we will be counting on the government to deliver them. Maylands residents also place a great deal of emphasis on security on trains. Therefore, it is important for the residents in my electorate to see that the security system that the government has in place is effective. I think it could do with some bolstering. That was really the only direct promise.

I will deal with education. There are five schools in my electorate. John Forrest Senior High School is the only public senior high school in the electorate. Some commitments were made in the forward estimates, and I believe they are being carried forward, which is great. There was a commitment to repair the reception area in the administration block at John Forrest. However, there are four little primary schools in my electorate: Inglewood Primary School, Hillcrest Primary School, Bayswater Primary School and Embleton Primary School. They are not big schools; they are quite small. Their asks are pretty modest, but none of them was included in the announcements made by the Minister for Education last week. Therefore, it would be really helpful —

Mr M.W. Sutherland interjected.

Ms L.L. BAKER: I am talking about the election commitments that the Liberal Party made. If a child happens to go to Inglewood Primary School, that child is likely to have grazed knees, bruises and a few bangs and bumps, if not a broken limb. Anyone who has ever walked across the bitumen paving in the school playground will know that it is quite dangerous. The school has applied for some upgrades, repairs and maintenance to be carried out, and I hope that that will come through. Hillcrest Primary School has badly leaking roofs and toilets. This is not the kind of thing that parents would like their children to be putting up with on a daily basis. Therefore, I am keen to see the government meeting its promises on the upgrading and maintenance of schools.

Mr C.J. Barnett: You should invite the education minister to visit your schools.

Ms L.L. BAKER: Yes, I will, definitely. I have written to her, and I will continue to pursue this. Apart from upgrading toilets and the old, leaking, dilapidated buildings, it would be really good if some of the commitments that the Liberal Party made on the environment were carried out in the Maylands electorate. Of course, the Swan River runs straight through the electorate. A bit of investment is needed, particularly to help small and medium-sized businesses audit the work that they are doing to ensure that they are not polluting the river or polluting the groundwater in the area. The Swan Catchment Council is really concerned about this kind of thing. Therefore, it would be good to start looking at the river quality as part of the environment commitments. I would be really keen to see that happen. I have not heard anything from anyone about that yet.

I suppose the final issue that we in Maylands will be looking at to see how the government performed in its first 100 days is that of seniors and the commitments the government has made to alleviate some of the concerns that seniors in my electorate have.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mrs L.M. Harvey): Members on my right, I am finding it really difficult to hear the member for Maylands. Would members keep the noise down, please.

Ms L.L. BAKER: A lady who is a pensioner came to see me last week. She said that she had just had a rental increase from \$170 a week to \$300 a week. There is not much that we can do to help her at the moment because the housing is simply not available. I know that strategies to deal with that are being looked at. Added to that is the fact that free public transport will not be introduced until next year, I think, and that is not helping her deal with her increased cost of living. I believe that the concerns of seniors in my electorate are very important also.

Mr C.J. Barnett: When was Labor planning to bring that in?

Ms L.L. BAKER: The free travel for seniors?

Mr C.J. Barnett: Yes.

Ms L.L. BAKER: An immediate start-up was promised, as far as I remember. It was immediate, yes. I do not need to check; it was to be an immediate start-up. The government has a number of expectations —

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: I remind members that they are not permitted to interject from anywhere but their own seat.

Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Vincent Catania; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Peter Abetz; Dr Mike Nahan; Acting Speaker; Mr Eric Ripper; Mr Bill Marmion; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Mick Murray; Mr Joe Francis; Mr Peter Watson

Ms L.L. BAKER: I am having trouble getting back into my seat; I am sorry, Madam Acting Speaker.

Finally, I would like to emphasise that when the government raises expectations in a community, it needs to deliver on them. I will be looking very closely—I am sure that all the constituents in my electorate will be too—to see how the government goes over the next 28 days in delivering on these promises.

MR P. ABETZ (Southern River) [4.58 pm]: In terms of the delivery of the Liberal government, I draw the attention of the house to what has happened in the electorate of Southern River. Excelsior Primary School was built four years ago by the Labor government in a new, growing area. It was built without any guttering on the building. The result is that when the water runs down, all the schoolbags get wet, and the problem is —

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mrs L.M. Harvey): I am interested in listening to the member for Southern River, and I trust the rest of the house is too.

Mr P. ABETZ: Thank you, Madam Acting Speaker; I appreciate your interest in what I am saying. I hope it is also of interest to members on the other side of the house.

The issue was that, for four winters, the teachers of that school—there was no drainage for the stormwater to escape—had to take towels to school. When kids moved from one block of classrooms to another, they had to take off their shoes so that the teachers could help dry their feet before continuing teaching. That issue was brought to the Labor government’s attention over four years, and nothing was done. In the lead-up to the election the parents held a public meeting to which they invited me, as the Liberal candidate, and Paul Andrews, the then member for Southern River. After three winters of this, all he could come up with, on behalf of the Labor government, was an allocation of \$20 000, which would have paid for new gutters on perhaps one or two of the buildings. The design of the school was such that installing new guttering would be a major operation. Thankfully, in the election campaign, the now Barnett government promised funding to not only fix the problem but also integrate a drainage system and rain-water tanks to feed some of the water into the toilet flushing system. The good news is that, having waited for three years for something to happen under Labor, this work will now be completed over the coming summer holidays, so our people are very thankful that this government is delivering.

DR M.D. NAHAN (Riverton) [5.01 pm]: We have heard a lot from members opposite—“fiscal fiends” is what I think they have called themselves—about their surplus over the past two years of \$2 billion. We also heard a rather unique statement today that they were, I think, “housing affordable warriors”. I would like to discuss that further.

Mr M. McGowan: I was referring to your side, not you personally.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Good; I am a warrior.

Mr P.B. Watson interjected.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Does the member for Albany want me to start? That would be a nice thing to do. When members opposite first came into government in 2001, what was the situation in housing affordability? I will tell members: it was at a record high.

Ms R. Saffioti: It was a recession.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: That was when they were very low.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr V. Catania): Order!

Dr M.D. NAHAN: When the Labor Party lost government, what was housing affordability? It was at a record high. Members opposite destroyed housing affordability for hundreds of thousands of Western Australians. Hundreds of thousands of Western Australians lost the dream of home ownership.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Hundreds of thousands of people were destitute. Thousands of people are homeless.

Mr P.B. Watson: That’s a big call—hundreds of thousands.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Hundreds of thousands of people have lost home ownership because the government of members opposite priced them out of the market.

Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Vincent Catania; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Peter Abetz; Dr Mike Nahan; Acting Speaker; Mr Eric Ripper; Mr Bill Marmion; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Mick Murray; Mr Joe Francis; Mr Peter Watson

Mr M. McGowan: Do you understand what “destitute” means?

Several members interjected.

Mr M. McGowan: When you say “destitute”, do you know what it means?

Dr M.D. NAHAN: I know what it means.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! I am finding it very hard to hear what the member for Riverton has to say, and I am sure members want to hear what he says, so please, members, a bit of silence.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Thank you, Mr Acting Speaker. Home ownership has been very important to this state for some time, particularly to people who vote for members opposite. It is essential for people on modest incomes who have come to Western Australia, to live and raise a family, to own a home of their own. It has been a challenge in Western Australia to achieve this for a variety of reasons. The rate of growth of the economy has gone up and down, but successive governments over the generations have been able to see people achieve home ownership, until the last government. In nearly eight years, that government destroyed the dream of home ownership. This government must now deal with the ramifications of that.

The issues are not only about home ownership; they are also about how the Labor government achieved the budget surplus of \$2 billion. It created the mother of all housing bubbles. When that government took office in 2001, the economy was slow. That is why the budget was not in surplus.

Mr W.J. Johnston interjected.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: It was in recession. When members opposite won government in 2001, it was in recession.

Several members interjected.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Members opposite did nothing; the state came out of recession by itself.

Several members interjected.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Members opposite won the 2001 election because the economy was in recession.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order, members!

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Then what did they do? The Minister for Planning and Infrastructure at the time had a great plan! She did nothing. She sat on planning decisions for 18 months and consequently created a shortage of land supplies. When people told her about it, she claimed, “No shortage.”

Mr P.B. Watson: I have read this somewhere before.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Yes; the member for Albany has been reading my material. I will send him more copies.

Mr P.B. Watson: I read *The West Australian*.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: That is good. If members opposite had been reading my newspaper articles, why did they not act on them?

Several members interjected.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Why did they sit on one of the largest bubbles in history and do nothing? I thought they looked after the working class.

Several members interjected.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: This is what happened during the period in government of members opposite. Revenue from land taxes and conveyancing fees increased from \$500 million to \$2.5 billion. If we subtract \$500 million from \$2.5 billion, what does it equal? It equals \$2 billion. That is the surplus. The former Labor government earned its surplus in a housing bubble. Where did this money come from? How did people pay conveyancing fees? They borrowed for it! The government had a Clayton’s surplus. Yes, it was a surplus in the government’s books, but the debt was pushed onto households.

Mr E.S. Ripper: Do you describe the five budget deficits out of eight under the previous government as Clayton’s deficits?

Dr M.D. NAHAN: No. They were caused by a recession, remember?

The Labor government created a housing bubble and increased taxes on house and land, which brought in an extra \$2 billion. That is where the surplus came from. Now what is happening? The housing market is collapsing. Members opposite blew the housing bubble too high and now it is in free-fall.

Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Vincent Catania; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Peter Abetz; Dr Mike Nahan; Acting Speaker; Mr Eric Ripper; Mr Bill Marmion; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Mick Murray; Mr Joe Francis; Mr Peter Watson

Mr P. Papalia: Was that just coincidental in Perth?

Dr M.D. NAHAN: No other state had a bubble like the one in this state. Western Australia's housing market changed from being the most affordable to the least affordable. That is based on a comparison with all other states.

Several members interjected.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: It is true. When something is blown up, as occurred under the former government and money is ripped off, it collapses.

Several members interjected.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Members opposite have criticised us for threatening housing affordability in this state, when their government destroyed it. When that happens, it takes a generation to get it right. When the cost of housing is too high, it takes a long time to fix. Members opposite claim to have cut property taxes, but, again, they were Clayton's cuts. In the first few years of the Gallop government's term it increased conveyancing fees. As members opposite know, that government relied on bracket creep. The rates and the base of the conveyancing fee had not been increased since 1982, when the average price of a block of land and a house was in the vicinity of \$60 000 to \$70 000. That average has since increased to \$450 000. The whole basis of the state's economy was based on a bubble. Now the government has to suffer with and manage its way out of that collapsing bubble. It will create great pain for many Western Australians and it will lead to a great deal of trouble. Of course, it was not just the \$2 billion in surpluses. If the opposition looks at the forward estimates of its last budget, the surplus was going down very rapidly. That was not the fault of the previous government. It did forecast declines in conveyancing fees and other land taxes. What it quite rightly forecast was that the money was being ripped away by Canberra—its mates in the Rudd government.

Several members interjected.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Members opposite should just listen. The former Treasurer rightly complained at almost every budget time that the system of grants allocation and the way the goods and services tax was allocated was unfair to Western Australia. As the state's income grew, the state received a lesser share. In fact, it is forecast over the next few years to decline by 40 per cent per capita, and that is a large cut. The Liberal-National government will have to deal with it.

What the previous government did not do, and this was forced on to it, was systemically argue for a change to the system. It sat back and whinged during budget time and whinged at the Council of Australian Governments, but it did not put forward a reform agenda.

Mr E.S. Ripper: Did you hear about the Garnaut review?

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Yes, I heard about it.

Mr E.S. Ripper: It was part of our reform agenda.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Did the previous government push it; it was led by New South Wales and Victoria.

Mr E.S. Ripper: And Western Australia.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: The previous government put a bit of money into it, but it did not lead the charge. It knew very well that the revenue from GST would collapse and it sat back and whinged but did nothing. It did not have a reform agenda. It relied on a tax bubble and a Clayton's surplus.

What will this government have to do? It will have to deal with the previous government's mess by developing a reform agenda. Somebody has to do something.

Several members interjected.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: We have to develop it by working with the opposition's mates in Canberra. We will have to develop it.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr V. Catania): Members, the member for Riverton has the call. It is hard enough for members to hear and Hansard does not need members to interject at once.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: The history that we have to deal with is one of lost opportunity. Over the past seven years Western Australia has experienced the largest boom in the state's history; in fact, the nation's history. We are coming through that with a decline in budget surpluses, high taxes, a huge demand for infrastructure and a collapse in revenue from GST. That is the previous government's legacy and what the Liberal-National

Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Vincent Catania; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Peter Abetz; Dr Mike Nahan; Acting Speaker; Mr Eric Ripper; Mr Bill Marmion; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Mick Murray; Mr Joe Francis; Mr Peter Watson

government must deal with. It is a real challenge and a legacy that the previous government should be ashamed of.

MR E.S. RIPPER (Belmont — Leader of the Opposition) [5.13 pm]: I have in my hand the Liberal Party's plan for its first 100 days in government. It is a short document; it is only a bit shorter than Julie Bishop's course at Harvard. Even though it is a short document, it is, nevertheless, an important one because it was used in the election campaign for a particular purpose. It was used in the election campaign to try to demonstrate that the new government, if elected, would be somehow more effective, vigorous and competent than the existing government. It was both a negative attack on the then government and an attempt at positive reinforcement of the Liberal Party's credentials. This Liberal Party, under this Premier, campaigned on a platform of honesty and integrity in government; it campaigned on a slogan of "better government; better state".

The 100-day plan should not be reviewed as an ephemeral document written by Deidre Willmott three or four days before the election and put out without much endorsement by the Premier. It should stand for what it is and what it was; that is, a key part of the Liberal Party's election campaign.

I now come to the government's performance against the plan. This is a government that campaigned on honesty and integrity. It has a contract with the people and in its first 100 days in office it is failing to deliver. This is day 72 of the first 100 days and I have a copy of the government's record as it relates to each minister. The Premier made five promises and kept two; the Minister for Police, promises made four, promises kept one; the Minister for Education, promises made four, promises kept one; the Attorney General, promises made seven, promises kept one; the Minister for Health, promises made six, promises kept three; and the Minister for Regional Development—the Liberals would like this one so they should stay quiet and listen—nine promises and two kept. I will now deal with the Treasurer. He made three promises and kept two. I now come to the real stars. The Minister for Transport, known in our circle as "windscreens", made three promises and kept none; the Minister for Environment, known mainly for conflict of interest issues to date, made four promises and kept none; and the Minister for Child Protection, made five promises and kept zero.

Point of Order

Mr W.R. MARMION: The Leader of the Opposition is using the word "kept". He cannot conclude whether the promises have been kept until the 100 days are up.

The ACTING SPEAKER: There is no point of order.

Debate Resumed

Mr E.S. RIPPER: What a pathetic attempt from a new member who should know better. I will give the member for Nedlands a bit of a lesson: a debating point cannot be made as a point of order. It is an abuse of process to do that. If he keeps doing that, he will find that the Speaker will not take his points of order, and that would be the right response to somebody who seeks to abuse the parliamentary process in that way.

Mr R.F. Johnson: Would you take an interjection?

Mr E.S. RIPPER: Does the Leader of the House take interjections?

Mr R.F. Johnson: Yes, I am renowned for it.

Mr E.S. RIPPER: That is the only way the Leader of the House gets his speeches to last for 60 minutes.

Mr R.F. Johnson: When we get to the 100 days, do you think that you might have a lot of egg on your face?

Mr E.S. RIPPER: I know that that will not be the case because so many of the Liberal Party's promises relate to legislation. This is the last sitting week of this Parliament and the government has not introduced legislation for fixed parliamentary terms; it has not legislated for a proper register to monitor the activities of political lobbyists; and it has not repealed the prostitution legislation.

Several members interjected.

Mr E.S. RIPPER: The member for Jandakot should take this seriously. The government made a promise to repeal the prostitution legislation by taking a bill through both houses within its first 100 days in office. The member for Jandakot heightened awareness of the prostitution issue in his campaign and the government has not done a thing about it. A bill has not been brought to the house and the government has not released any drafting instructions. It has done nothing about it. What the government has done is sold out on its most rusted-on supporters. The members of the Bible Belt opposite, who campaigned on the question of prostitution, have let down their constituents because they campaigned on a promise to repeal the prostitution legislation within this government's first 100 days in office and the government has not touched it.

Mr R.F. Johnson: It's probably because you didn't bother to proclaim it.

Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Vincent Catania; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Peter Abetz; Dr Mike Nahan; Acting Speaker; Mr Eric Ripper; Mr Bill Marmion; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Mick Murray; Mr Joe Francis; Mr Peter Watson

Mr E.S. RIPPER: The Liberal Party has not touched it. It promised to repeal it within 100 days and it has not happened.

Let us move to something on which there might be more community unanimity. The Liberal Party promised that within its first 100 days it would increase penalties for hoons, including confiscation penalties. It went out there on a sensitive law and order issue, knowing that everyone is disgusted and angered by the activities of hoons, and said, "We'll roll up our sleeves within 100 days and increase the penalties by providing for the confiscation of vehicles of repeat offenders." However, the Liberal Party has not done a thing. The bill is not before the house. There has been no press release, as far as I am aware. That legislation has certainly not been passed through the house, which was the promise it made. The Labor Party will go out to the member for Jandakot's electorate and say that the Liberal Party has broken its 100-day commitment on the issue of hoons.

Mr R.F. Johnson: What were the actual words? Tell me what the words were.

Mr E.S. RIPPER: I will quote the words for the member. The words are in dot points, so I will read from the preamble to begin with. It states —

If elected this Saturday, a Liberal Government will move quickly to implement all our election commitments. Parliament will be recalled as soon as possible to allow early consideration of the Liberals' legislative agenda.

This document outlines some of our priorities for the first 100 days of a new Liberal Government.

While it is not intended to be an exhaustive list, it does give an indication of the first major activities to be undertaken if there is a change of Government in Western Australia.

That is in the preamble; I will be fair about that. Under the heading "Law and Order", it quite simply states —

- Increase penalties for hoons — including confiscating the vehicles of repeat offenders.

That dot point, in conjunction with the preamble, can be read only as a promise to introduce in Parliament legislation that will increase the penalties for hoons and to take it through Parliament within the first 100 days. Even if the Liberal Party were to argue that it did not really mean that and it just meant that it would introduce the legislation, it has not even done that. On that very sensitive issue —

Mr R.F. Johnson interjected.

Mr E.S. RIPPER: These are four pieces of legislation that the Liberal Party promised to get through Parliament. It promised to introduce legislation for fixed parliamentary terms, legislate for a lobbyists' register, increase penalties for hoons and repeal Labor's prostitution legislation. Those were all key commitments that the Liberal Party made. That is its contract with the people. Quite frankly, I find it appalling to witness the insouciance with which the Liberal Party deals with the problem. I find appalling the way in which it is dismissive of this issue. The Liberal Party campaigned on the issue and made solid promises to the people, all the while self-righteously preaching that it would be honest in government and would be a government of integrity. However, once it got into government, it has been light-hearted about the 100-day plan. The Liberal Party thinks that it can get away with it. It is already demonstrating arrogance in government. The next election is not until 2013 and it thinks that the people will have forgotten about the first 100 days by then, so it does not matter if people find that they were conned and that the Liberal Party does not deliver within the first 100 days. Liberal Party members are saying to themselves that eventually they will deliver and the people will forgive them then.

The thing that really appals me is that the Premier is an experienced politician. He knows how Parliament works. The Premier knew when he endorsed this plan during the election campaign that a lot of this stuff would not be deliverable. He knew that, and it has been demonstrated in practice. While he was preaching honesty and integrity, he was campaigning in a very cynical way. That is the sort of thing that will come back to haunt him.

I must respond to some of the provocative comments of the member for Riverton. I warn the people of Western Australia that as homeowners stare at a set of economic circumstances that will result in a decline in the value of their houses, the member for Riverton advocates that and thinks that is a good thing. We will tell the people of Riverton and Willetton that he is giving speeches in Parliament calling for the value of their houses to be reduced just as they start to worry about what the overall global economic circumstances will do to the value of their houses. If he thinks that falling house values is a good thing in the current economic circumstances, he is not the economist I imagined him to be. He is certainly not the analyst of state finances I imagined him to be.

Dr M.D. Nahan: Take credit for the conveyancing fees you have imposed on people. You did it, Mr Ripper.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order, member for Riverton!

Mr E.S. RIPPER: What I take credit for is a 30 per cent cut in stamp duty since 2004.

Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Vincent Catania; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Peter Abetz; Dr Mike Nahan; Acting Speaker; Mr Eric Ripper; Mr Bill Marmion; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Mick Murray; Mr Joe Francis; Mr Peter Watson

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order, members!

Mr E.S. RIPPER: It is interesting to listen to the sound and watch the fury from those on the other side of the house on this issue, because now the other side is responsible for the finances. We will see whether there is a cut in stamp duty in the life of this government. We have already heard the Treasurer describe our budget surpluses as obscene and then watched him go to the election with a set of costings that had forecast exactly the same level of budget surpluses. We have already seen the Liberal Party adopt our financial settings. If members want to talk about a legacy, I will give them a legacy. Under our government there was \$30 billion worth of investment in capital works and infrastructure and state debt was \$900 million lower than it was when we were elected. Of course the Liberal Party has the capacity for a big infrastructure program in the current economic circumstances; it has inherited that capacity through the \$900 million worth of lower state debt. It also has the ongoing benefits of projects such as the debt-free New MetroRail project, the debt-free Perth Arena and the debt-free Fiona Stanley Hospital. All of that legacy of infrastructure is for the future.

Of course, the Liberal Party has some new economic circumstances to manage, but that is no excuse for not delivering on the legislation that was promised in the 100-day plan. There is an easy way to deal with this. The Parliament could sit next week and the week after, and the Liberal Party could do what it promised the people of Western Australia in its 100-day plan.

Mr C.J. Barnett: We could sit on New Year's Eve!

Mr E.S. RIPPER: Does the Premier think that this is just a slight matter and the public will forgive him? Does he think, "Yes, we conned the people in the election campaign but it doesn't really matter"? Is that his attitude, because that is the attitude that is coming across in the debate? Whenever we question the Premier about the 100-day plan, he does not seem to have any sense of shame or guilt that he has not provided additional funds for school upgrades, he has not done anything to increase the authority of school principals, and he has not done anything to recruit additional school chaplains or psychologists. He does not seem to have any sense of shame or guilt that on day 72, with only 28 days to go, he has not provided an immediate additional \$10 million to reduce hospital waiting lists, he has not established the office of the hospital waiting list advocate, and he has not appointed an independent mental health and wellbeing commissioner. The Premier does not seem to have any sense of shame or guilt that he will not deliver free public transport for pensioners.

Mr C.J. Barnett: When were you going to do it?

Mr E.S. RIPPER: The Premier made a promise; that is the issue. It is not what we promised; it is what he promised. He made a promise; he has a contract with the people and it is his duty to deliver on that contract. He has not delivered the cost of living rebate for seniors. As far as I am aware, he has not done anything on the review of the WA Seniors Card eligibility criteria. He has not created a seniors ministerial advisory group. He has not identified the location for the first five disability respite facilities.

Dr G.G. Jacobs: That's not true.

Mr E.S. RIPPER: The government has done that? What is the location?

Dr G.G. Jacobs: The processes are being put in place.

Mr E.S. RIPPER: The processes are being put in place! I love it when the Minister for Mental Health makes a contribution. He is a huge asset to the government, and I encourage him to answer as many dorothy dix questions during question time as he can organise! I ask him to please participate in every debate that he can.

The government promised to upgrade the Greenbushes railway and create a blueprint for an integrated public transport system. The blueprint was going to be done within the first 100 days, and it has not been done. I ask the Minister for Police: where is the rural crime squad? That was to have been instituted within the first 100 days.

Mr R.F. Johnson: Watch this space.

Mr E.S. RIPPER: Watch this space! The trouble is, I have been watching that space for about eight years and at most there is a vacancy. Occasionally we get the odd joke or the odd quip, but very little else.

Mr R.F. Johnson: There will be egg on your face on New Year's Eve, my friend.

Mr E.S. RIPPER: Egg on my face? If the government delivers on every one of these 100-day commitments by day 100, I will say so. Where is the increase to the living away from home allowance for regional students? Where is the additional funding for the patient assisted travel scheme? Where is the fast-tracked work on Albany Regional Hospital, member for Albany?

Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Vincent Catania; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Peter Abetz; Dr Mike Nahan; Acting Speaker; Mr Eric Ripper; Mr Bill Marmion; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Mick Murray; Mr Joe Francis; Mr Peter Watson

Mr P.B. Watson interjected.

Mr E.S. RIPPER: There has not been any progress on that. There has not been any planning for the Nickol Bay Hospital upgrade. I am told in our party meetings that that is an extremely important issue. That was a 100-day commitment that does not seem to have been delivered. I could talk about every one of these 100-day commitments, but I think I have done enough to demonstrate the argument.

The electorate of Western Australia has been subject to a con. The Liberal Party went out there and pompously and self-righteously said that it was honest, that it had integrity and that it would deliver better government. "Have a look at our 100-day plan; we'll show you what a real government is." That was the message that the Liberal Party sent to the people of Western Australia. The government has not delivered. It can talk the talk, but it cannot walk the walk. It is a weak, disorganised government, and it does not have any sense of shame about its failure to deliver on its promises to the people of Western Australia.

DR K.D. HAMES (Dawesville — Minister for Health) [5.32 pm]: It is a shame that I have not yet heard the shadow Minister for Health have a go at me about these things that he so self-righteously —

Mr M. McGowan: Why doesn't the Premier have a go?

Dr K.D. HAMES: He probably would, but I wanted to have a go first! I want to make sure that I can get some time to go through this ridiculous assertion that after 72 days we have not kept to our 100-day promises. What a load of nonsense. That is like asking the member for Albany, when he is three-quarters of the way through a 400-metre sprint, why he has not yet won the race. Shame on the member for Albany for not winning the race after 300 metres! He should have been across the line 100 metres ago!

Mr P.B. Watson interjected.

Dr K.D. HAMES: I think I would need a 200-metre start to beat him!

Nevertheless, we have not yet reached 100 days. I want to go through the health items in the 100-day plan. I am, in fact, disappointed that there are only six health items in the plan. I would like to have encouraged the Premier to put a lot more in, because by the time we get to 100 days we will have achieved a lot more than just six items. I will go through the six health items and give the opposition an update on them.

The first dot point is the promise to introduce the Royal Perth Hospital Protection Bill 2008. The opposition knows we have done that. The legislation does not have to be very clever or detailed. We are making sure that the government cannot do what the Minister for Health under the previous government did, which was to make a unilateral decision to close down the hospital. That was the wrong course of action. If any future government wants to change that direction, it will have to come back and face both houses of Parliament and gain support to pass the legislation. That is all this legislation is required to do, and that is what it does. That commitment has been met.

Mr P.B. Watson: Are you going to knock down half the hospital?

Dr K.D. HAMES: I am going to do with half of the hospital exactly what the member's Minister for Health was going to do. We will build a new west wing, which will form part of the new hospital; and the old H block and the old emergency department will be knocked down when the new west wing is constructed.

Mr R.H. Cook: Where will the state trauma centre be?

Dr K.D. HAMES: I am going through my six dot points, if the member does not mind. That is another space.

The second dot point is the promise to appoint a permanent Director General of the Department of Health. That has been done, but we are not paying \$600 000, as the Labor Party did. That is two from two.

The third dot point is the promise to invest an immediate additional \$10 million to pay for more surgery to reduce hospital waiting lists. That has been done. That is the dot point for which I had been given zero by the opposition, but it has been done. The establishment of the Office for the Waiting List Advocate will definitely be completed well within 100 days. That is a half-tick for that dot point; I will wait for the Leader of the Opposition to pat me on the back on New Year's Eve for dot point 3.

The fourth dot point is the promise to reintroduce the Surrogacy Bill. It has been done, as promised. In fact, it was reintroduced in a manner better than was promised, thanks to the member on the Leader of the Opposition's left, who made a suggestion that helped get the legislation reintroduced and hopefully passed through this Parliament.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr V. Catania): Members!

Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Vincent Catania; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Peter Abetz; Dr Mike Nahan; Acting Speaker; Mr Eric Ripper; Mr Bill Marmion; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Mick Murray; Mr Joe Francis; Mr Peter Watson

Dr K.D. HAMES: So far, we are up to three and three-quarters out of four.

The fifth dot point is the promise to provide additional funding for the Royal Flying Doctor Service. That has been done, and the press release was put out today.

The next dot point is the promise to fund the patient assisted travel scheme. That will be approved well within 100 days.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members!

Dr K.D. HAMES: I have to say that I might be in trouble with that commitment. I thought the dot point said that I would start it within the first 100 days, but the reality is that I will start it on day 101, so I apologise for that!

Another promise was to fast-track work on new hospitals. The member for Albany is particularly interested in this. The promise was made to bring forward additional funding for the Kalgoorlie Regional Hospital—that has been done—and commence planning for the upgrade of the Nickol Bay Hospital, including staff housing. That is in process. The member for Albany has been carrying on with local media down there and saying that I have been doing something wrong.

Mr P.B. Watson: No, I haven't. I will fully support you if you get the hospital done, and I will compliment you on it. But you said that you would do it within four years for \$135 million—you keep saying that—but it is going to be at least \$190 million. All I am saying is that I will give you the opportunity. But there has been no planning done. If you made that promise during the election, you obviously had plans. Now you're saying you've got no plans.

Dr K.D. HAMES: Let me tell the member how it works in opposition. When in opposition —

Mr P.B. Watson interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order, member for Albany.

Dr K.D. HAMES: When we were in opposition, the only way to get plans done was to nick the ones that had already been made by the government. We got those.

Mr P.B. Watson: Two years ago.

Dr K.D. HAMES: We did not get those two years ago.

Mr P.B. Watson: Yes, you did. I saw the website.

Dr K.D. HAMES: We got those plans, which were made by the former government two years ago and which the then Minister for Health said no to. If the member for Albany had read the recommendation, he would know that the best option was the construction of a new hospital. The Leader of the Opposition failed to do that; he said no.

Mr C.J. Barnett: That is 730 days of inaction.

Dr K.D. HAMES: After seven years in government. Every time the poor old member for Albany turned around, he announced a new hospital. I think he did it three times.

Mr P.B. Watson: We never announced that we would build a new hospital at the election. It was always going to be an upgrade.

Dr K.D. HAMES: The member is right. Now it is a major upgrade of the old hospital.

Mr P.B. Watson: I agree that we did not deliver.

Dr K.D. HAMES: The Labor government announced it three times, and after seven and a half years it did not deliver. People have told me that the former government was going to start work in October this year.

Mr P.B. Watson: We were.

Dr K.D. HAMES: What was the former government going to start work on in October? It was going to be a patch-and-paint job. A patch-and-paint job is nowhere near what was needed for Albany Regional Hospital. The former government chose the middle-of-the-road option in the end. The Department of Housing and Works and a private consultant recommended that by far the best option was to build a new hospital, and we committed to do that. During the election campaign the Labor Party knew that the member for Albany would lose his seat if the government did not change what was happening.

Mr P.B. Watson interjected.

Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Vincent Catania; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Peter Abetz; Dr Mike Nahan; Acting Speaker; Mr Eric Ripper; Mr Bill Marmion; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Mick Murray; Mr Joe Francis; Mr Peter Watson

Dr K.D. HAMES: Yes, the day before. The Premier knew that he was going to announce it. The Premier rushed down there because all the polls showed that the member for Albany was in deep trouble. The Labor Party knew that the member would lose his seat if the Labor Party did not change its policy. On the day before the election, the Labor government announced a new plan. It was still nowhere near what we were going to do.

Mr P.B. Watson: Yes, it was. It was in two stages. It was much better.

Dr K.D. HAMES: It was to be done in two stages and would have cost much more and be finished in 2015.

Mr P.B. Watson: What are you going to do with the operating theatres when you build the new ones? Are you going to operate on the people in the street?

Dr K.D. HAMES: That is a great point, member for Albany. He really must listen.

Mr P.B. Watson: We were going to build one stage and shift everyone over.

Dr K.D. HAMES: The member for Albany must give me a go. He was going to begin the old plan in October but on the day the then Premier announced the new plan, I was told by the Department of Health and the Department of Housing and Works that the Labor Party had to start again with a totally new design and a totally new business plan. If the Labor Party were still in government, it would not have started construction in October because it had to undertake a major new plan and a business development plan.

Mr P.B. Watson interjected.

Dr K.D. HAMES: No, it had not. I am happy to sit down with the member —

Mr P.B. Watson interjected.

Dr K.D. HAMES: On the back of an envelope—that is where the plan came from. The member for Albany said, “We will build an extension here and a bit there. How much is the Premier giving us this time, because I am scared of losing my seat? We will add on some extra, just in case.” Our proposal is much better. I am fast-tracking it. I discussed it at a meeting today. Every week I have been going through the progress of what is happening and I will deliver on it—the member for Albany can trust me on that. We will deliver.

Mr E.S. Ripper: You can’t trust the Premier, though.

Dr K.D. HAMES: The Leader of the Opposition says that the Liberal Party cannot be trusted to meet the commitments it made in its 100-day plan. People could not trust the Labor government’s commitments. Dr Gallop said that he would fix the hospital system during the 2001 election campaign. What a lot of nonsense. The Labor government did absolutely nothing to fix the health system.

Mr E.S. Ripper: Will you fix the health system?

Dr K.D. HAMES: I will make it a lot better than it was under the Labor government.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order, members!

Dr K.D. HAMES: It was a silly comment to make.

Mr E.S. Ripper: Will you not promise to fix the health system?

Dr K.D. HAMES: I will be judged on my performance as Minister for Health. Look at the health system after the next four years in government—in fact, after the next two years in government—and compare that with the Labor Party’s eight years in government. I bet my bottom dollar that we will come out miles ahead of the former Labor government. Look at the commitments we have already made and achieved in our first 100 days in office, and look at what we will have done over the next six months. Wait and see how it turns out. The Leader of the Opposition will come to me and say, “Minister for Health, I apologise; you have done it.”

MR M.P. MURRAY (Collie-Preston) [5.45 pm]: I am glad to have an opportunity to speak. My speech will be quite different from that of other members. The Collie electorate is bleeding to the tune of about \$1 million a day since the government was elected, which is an absolute disgrace. Previous projects have either been withheld or taken away. The government has taken away \$9 million in funding for the coal future fund, which was to be used to improve the image of the coal industry, upgrade the technology and work with Worsley Alumina, Wesfarmers Coal and Griffin Coal to achieve a sustainable future for the coal industry. That money has been taken away and the good research that was being done has collapsed. That is a disgrace for this state and for a town that has spent more than 100 years providing power for Western Australia, and still does. If it had not been for Collie when the explosion on Varanus Island occurred, the state would have been in a total blackout. What did Collie get for that? Absolutely nothing! For a long time the Premier has harboured a hatred in his heart for Collie. That has

Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Vincent Catania; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Peter Abetz; Dr Mike Nahan; Acting Speaker; Mr Eric Ripper; Mr Bill Marmion; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Mick Murray; Mr Joe Francis; Mr Peter Watson

been proven whenever he goes there. He is ignorant about the people there. He rarely shows his face there and does not want to show up at all when he is asked to go to a meeting. I remember the day when he said in Parliament, "How many rapes and how many murders have occurred in Collie in the last day?" That was witnessed by people in the public gallery. Thank you very much. That helped me get re-elected. It went around the town like wildfire.

The government has taken away \$60 million or \$70 million in funding for projects in the past 72 days. That is a disgrace to this state and it is stifling Collie's economy. The government has withdrawn \$20 million for the upgrade of the Wellington Weir on the grounds of safety concerns. The project is no longer feasible or possible. The government says it does not want to do it for safety reasons. I wonder whether it is really about safety or because Collie is a very strong Labor town. The Premier's vindictiveness is coming to the fore. The Minister for Water Resources just walked out of the chamber. The state has worked with the federal government on the salinity project in the Collie catchment area. Many programs have begun there, including the planting of trees over many years. The federal government put in \$50 million for that, yet the state government has taken out its funding and the federal government's money is collapsing to the tune of \$30 million. That is an absolute disgrace. We have watched the Murray-Darling River system collapse and we are going to watch Collie River collapse. We have a chance to save Collie River but the government has reneged on its promises. The salt water has been run off into the mine voids to be desalinated and then pumped into Harris River Dam or used by industry around the area. Some of the desalinated water was also put back into the river to revitalise it. Those programs have absolutely collapsed under this government.

I will say it again: we are bleeding by \$1 million a day in Collie. It was great to hear the Leader of the National Party talk about new houses and housing methods for country towns recently. However, he did not mention the six units in Collie that have been empty for eight or nine months. They will be bulldozed and will not be replaced. Why are 70 people in Collie on the waiting list while this government is bulldozing houses? The government must look at that process.

Dr G.G. Jacobs interjected.

Mr M.P. MURRAY: Do not talk about salinity. The member does not even know where Collie is. He went there and would not answer the questions put to him by the *South Western Times*. The member reneged on that. He still has not answered the local paper about what will happen to the salinity recovery program and the water allocation from that area. It is about time the minister got off his high horse and went there and had a look. The minister will be responsible for environmental vandalism in that area—absolute environmental vandalism! The town is crying out for that money to be utilised, but the minister has taken it back. It is my understanding that the new Treasurer is scraping together money to put into marginal Liberal seats. The Treasurer is willing to take that money out of any Labor seat at any time to prop up those marginal seats. Have a look at Logue Brook Dam! The government has thrown away \$10 million so that the Premier can go there next week and have a swim! Who would want to drink that water after that? The member for that area was not able to hold his mouth shut for long enough, and he announced it before the Premier was ready, because he wanted to big-note himself! The member might be six foot six, but he still has a big yap, and he got out there and he certainly had his two bob's worth before the Premier was ready.

All I ask for in this 100-day plan is fairness. The government has taken \$60 million out of that plan in just over 60 days. That is an absolute disgrace. I was quite angry when the Premier came into the town of Collie for seven and a half minutes to announce the election promises for Steve Thomas, because they mirrored mine. I thought: what a lazy mob of sods they are! However, thank goodness they did mirror my promises, because now that they are in power, they can deliver on those promises! However, they are not doing that. An amount of \$5 million was promised for Donnybrook High School. The government also promised \$500 000 for Dardanup Primary School, \$500 000 for Boyanup Primary School and \$500 000 for Wilson Park Primary School. I am asking that at least the planning be put on the ground. The parents and citizens organisations are ringing me on a daily basis and asking what is happening, but we cannot get an answer. We have seen that in this house. When we asked for a list of projects to be tabled, we got a list of what might be done over the next four years. There was no timetable, and there was no planning. The people of Western Australia—not just in my electorate, but across the state—deserve to get that information, but it is not happening. We have a very average Minister for Education sitting over there. We have seen the minister propped up by notes that are handed across to her day after day. The government should get on with the job and get the planning done. The government has had its honeymoon. The honeymoon is over. I wonder about honeymoons! I believe the Minister for Health is going on another one, when he should be working. His honeymoon has been extended. He does not want to work. He is going to Phuket. I hope he is not going to Bangkok; he may not get out. Those schools need the planning to be done. The people in those communities need to know at which schools they will be able to place their children into the

Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Vincent Catania; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Peter Abetz; Dr Mike Nahan; Acting Speaker; Mr Eric Ripper; Mr Bill Marmion; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Mick Murray; Mr Joe Francis; Mr Peter Watson

future. That planning has not been done. I am really disappointed about that, because some of those schools are in very conservative areas.

I come back now to the housing units that I was talking about earlier. I ask the king of the regions—I bow to him—to please get some housing built to replace the housing that has been knocked down. That was liveable accommodation. Those housing units were knocked down, in good faith, because we were told that 15 new housing units would be built there. That has now been canned. People in this small country town are living in cars and in the toilets in the main street. I am not joking. Many of these people are young people with social problems. We need that work done immediately.

I know that it is difficult when we first come into government. When we first came into government, I sat there with my mouth open, in the same way as some of the new members. However, some of the old boilers here —

Several members interjected.

Mr M.P. MURRAY: There is the Minister for Police! He has lost his noose! I remember that when he was sitting on this side of the house, he was going to hang them, shoot them, kill them or run them over, but now that he is sitting on that side of the house, he has shut up and has done absolutely nothing! I say to the government, “Get off your butt and get moving; your 100 days is nearly up!”

Mr J.M. FRANCIS (Jandakot) [5.54 pm]: I have listened to the hypocrisy from the nightwatchman of the Leader of the Opposition, because that is what he is—he is the nightwatchman! Absolutely! I know that the member for Victoria Park is the next in line. Members opposite speak about good government and accountable government. I thought I would cast my mind back over the past eight years—as someone who has not been a member of this house for very long —

Several members interjected.

Point of Order

Mr P.B. WATSON: Mr Acting Speaker —

Mr J.M. Francis: It is okay. Members opposite can give it but they cannot take it.

Mr P.B. WATSON: Mr Acting Speaker, I thought we were talking about the 100-day plan.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr V. Catania): Order! The member for Jandakot has the call. There is no point of order.

Debate Resumed

Mr J.M. FRANCIS: What was the Labor Party’s campaign in 2001? Does anyone remember?

Mr R.F. Johnson: No new taxes, and no increases in charges. What did they do? They brought in the premium property tax! Do members remember that?

Mr J.M. FRANCIS: They said that Labor would be a better government! We had seven and a half years of what they said would be a better government, and they dare criticise us! I ask the Premier: for how many days have we been in government now?

Mr C.J. Barnett: Seventy-two.

Mr J.M. FRANCIS: What do members think the Labor government had done by day 72 in 2001? The house had not even sat! The house did not sit until day 79! Yet they have the hypocrisy to come in here and condemn us!

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order, members! It is difficult to hear. I am very interested in the debate, and I am sure the Hansard reporter is as well. The member for Jandakot has the call.

Mr J.M. FRANCIS: The house did not sit until day 79. That was Labor Day—1 May. What did the Labor Party achieve in those first 79 days?

Mr E.S. Ripper interjected.

Mr J.M. FRANCIS: The Leader of the Opposition has had his turn. He may not like this, but he should listen to it! What did the Labor Party do in its first 79 days?

Mr P.B. Watson interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order, member for Albany!

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY - Wednesday, 3 December 2008]

p879b-897a

Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Vincent Catania; Ms Lisa Baker; Mr Peter Abetz; Dr Mike Nahan; Acting Speaker; Mr Eric Ripper; Mr Bill Marmion; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Mick Murray; Mr Joe Francis; Mr Peter Watson

Mr J.M. FRANCIS: It abolished the graffiti task force. That was a good move! What else did it do in its first 79 days? It shut down three regional police stations. That was before the house had even sat. I have to go through some of these things. In 2001, the greatest achievement of the Australian Labor Party in this state was to abolish the graffiti task force and shut down regional police stations. In 2002, what were the big issues? What were the Labor Party's great achievements in 2002? What did it do? The Labor Party watched as the hospital waiting lists in this state grew to Third World standards, yet it did nothing! How many murders were committed in Western Australia in 2002? Ninety murders were committed in this state in 2002, yet the Labor Party did nothing. The Labor Party watched as the nurses went on strike for the first time in years, yet it did nothing. In 2003, the teachers in this state went on strike for the first time in 10 years. That was under the Labor Party's watch, when the former Premier was the Minister for Education and Training. A bit of *deja vu* is coming up here. The Labor Party could not negotiate a pay deal with the teachers. In 2003, Western Australia was rated as the worst state in this country for the incidence of burglary. In 2003, what was the government's response to law and order issues? It introduced the truth-in-sentencing legislation. What a great move that was! That automatically gave prisoners who were guilty a discount! That was nothing but a cancer on the justice system in this state. That is what it was.

I now come to 2004. I remember 2004. It was great. I remember that because I built my house in my electorate in 2004, and what happened? This state was plagued by power blackouts, and the Labor Party did nothing. It caused them, and it did nothing to fix them. We lived in the dark, with blackouts and energy shortages.

I now come to 2005. What a great and memorable year that was for the Labor Party in this state!

Several members interjected.

Mr J.M. FRANCIS: Do members opposite know why they won that election? They had to wait for Mark Latham—the disgraced federal leader of the Labor Party—to resign before they could even call the election. That is what happened in 2005! They were too gutless to go to the polls while Latham was the leader. That is the reality. They nearly lost that election, after one term in government. They waited until Latham had resigned. They were too gutless to call the election before then. The number of assaults in Western Australia increased by 15.3 per cent in that year, and the government did absolutely nothing.

Mr R.H. Cook interjected.

Mr J.M. FRANCIS: The member for Kwinana can interject as much as he likes. Do members know who the saddest and the poorest people in the state of Western Australia are? They are the residents of Kwinana!

Debate adjourned, pursuant to standing orders.

Sitting suspended from 6.00 to 7.00 pm