

PERTH MARKET (DISPOSAL) BILL 2015

Consideration in Detail

Resumed from an earlier stage of the sitting.

Clause 10: Effecting disposal —

Debate was interrupted after the clause had been partly considered.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Before we were interrupted by private members' business I asked the question about where the Perth Market (Disposal) Bill 2015 separates land and then the operations. What security does the government have over the operations? If there were two separate companies, what security does the government have over this operating company in respect of its obligations under the sales agreement?

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Here is how we would operate it if this thing is being used. All the assets are in one business. The other one has no assets. It would be in and out; that is, money comes in from the growers and dealers on the floor and goes out. All the assets are in one, including the land assets and the leases in one company. That is the one we take the lien over. The other one has no assets to take a lien over, effectively. If it was to be used, that is how it would be structured.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The point is: how does the government oblige the company with no assets if it has no security over any of the company's assets?

Dr M.D. NAHAN: If, however, the company came to us—this is hypothetical—and company one had most of the assets and company two had some assets, generators or something like that, we would take a lien on it. If it has assets upon which we could take a lien, we would do so.

Mr B.S. WYATT: Will the right to take a lien be part of the contractual documents?

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Yes.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 11: Disposal of land —

Mr B.S. WYATT: The minister may recall my question to him in respect of the definition of "Perth market site" on page 9, being the two certificates of title, which the minister confirmed is the entire 51 hectares. In respect of those two certificates of title, the land that can be disposed of comprises both crown land and freehold land. What percentage of the Perth Market site is crown land versus freehold?

Dr M.D. NAHAN: It is all freehold.

Mr B.S. WYATT: Why are we worrying about giving the power to disclose crown land if there is no crown land involved?

Dr M.D. NAHAN: It is an omnibus position. I think they are cut and paste—to be simple in a non-complicated manner. This is being used as a template for future such transactions. In this case there is no crown land.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 12: Land subject to unregistered leases with terms exceeding 5 years —

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Can the minister explain the purpose of this? From my reading of it, it is in relation to unregistered leases and how they are treated as part of the sale.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Please correct me if I am wrong, but this is that provision I mentioned earlier. There are a number of leases for tenants that are not documented adequately. They are on there, often for terms exceeding five years. They have their long-term tenants; the tenancy is not well documented. What we are trying to do here is grandfather all the leases; that is, the new purchaser has to recognise all the leases that are existing on this. Some were not adequately documented, so we are going with this clause on leases, even those undocumented over five years; they are recognised. There are more than 50 unregistered leases over five years. There are about 120 leases altogether; 40 per cent of those are undocumented and that is why this is a very important clause.

Mr B.S. WYATT: This is quite interesting. Obviously these agreements or leases have been around for a while, I would have thought. What process do the people who hold these prior unregistered leases have to go through to prove their entitlement? Do they have to go through some process of proving their right or the existence of a prior unregistered lease, or is it just simply possession?

Dr M.D. NAHAN: It is mainly executed but unregistered leases.

Mr B.S. Wyatt: They all have documents?

Ms Rita Saffioti; Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Paul Papalia; Ms R. Saffioti: Both ways.; Mr Peter Abetz

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Yes.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Then the maximum term is five years for unregistered leases? Is that right?

Dr M.D. NAHAN: The minimum will be five and up.

Mr B.S. WYATT: The minimum will be five and up, so this will include leases that I assume are probably on a rolling basis; they do not have set terms.

Dr M.D. Nahan: They are a mixture.

Mr B.S. WYATT: Will it apply to leases that are currently shorter than five years?

Dr M.D. Nahan: They do not require them to be registered for less than five years—leases and the property.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 13: Approval of Planning Commission not required for leases with terms exceeding 20 years —

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Could I please have an explanation of the purpose of this clause?

Dr M.D. NAHAN: There are three leases at the Perth Market Authority that have terms of over 20 years. We have to override the planning authority as we cannot find the planning approval for those three long leases. We are trying to recognise them in this case.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Will they be three of the commercial properties?

Dr M.D. NAHAN: The advisors would rather not say, because one of them would be commercially sensitive if it got out in public. That is all I can add; I am not involved in this.

Mr B.S. WYATT: This is correcting the fact that the existence of the leases—they cannot be found?

Dr M.D. NAHAN: These are very long leases. I am just trying to give the information. This is an anomaly we found and we are trying to fix it up and ensure these tenants have a long-term lease. There are only three, and my advice is if we mentioned their names, they are sensitive to it.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: That is an interesting little thing, is it not? I suspect that the service station and the tavern would be two of the three buildings.

Dr M.D. Nahan: We couldn't possibly answer that. I can tell you that the Perth Market Authority has wanted to get rid of the tavern for a long time because it is a notorious skimpy bar. I think if it could, it would have got rid of it a long time ago.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: There are three buildings, which I suspect are commercial buildings—they would have to be—that development approval cannot be found for. That is quite interesting at this stage. As a result of there being no existing development approval, some protection has to be given to those leases because they would not have any protection under any existing regulations. This legislation protects those leases even though no approvals can be found. Is that correct?

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Yes.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 14: Development and building work —

Mr B.S. WYATT: In respect of the approval process, can the Treasurer clarify whether the ordinary planning laws of the local government will apply once the sale has taken place? I assume that is what we are dealing with in the definitions of “approval” et cetera in this clause.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Yes.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: This clause defines all the development and building works. Can the Treasurer confirm that that will come under the jurisdiction of the relevant council, the City of Canning, and that all the normal approval processes will be included? I suspect that many of the proposed buildings will have to go through the joint development assessment panel process as well. Can the Treasurer clarify that all this clause does is define what the building work is and make that subject to the normal processes that would apply to other sites?

Dr M.D. NAHAN: That is correct; however, it also provides retrospective planning approval for actions that might have been received. There might be some developments on the place that have not had all the papers, and this clause retrospectively gives them approval.

Mr B.S. WYATT: Is the Perth Market Authority required to follow local government laws around development currently?

Dr M.D. NAHAN: It has been doing it for a number of years, but going back in history they were not very precise.

Ms Rita Saffioti; Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Paul Papalia; Ms R. Saffioti: Both ways.; Mr Peter Abetz

Mr B.S. WYATT: Does the Treasurer have any idea how many illegal developments have taken place on the location over the years?

Dr M.D. NAHAN: This problem applies to the PMA and some of the tenants that might have undertaken unauthorised work, work that the PMA did not authorise or has authorised. I guess it is an example of them being a power unto themselves. Obviously, this is not unique to the Perth Market Authority and there is a precedent in the City of Brisbane Market Act. In Brisbane they found the same problem as we have found here. This clause clarifies everything.

Mr B.S. Wyatt: I wish I could put a few of my constituents' houses in a shed; it would sort a few things out.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I might get that front fence fixed and put in a few amendments to this about a few building works I know about.

This clause and the previous clause relate to a number of buildings—I suspect they are commercial buildings—that do not have any development approval and therefore do not have valid leases. Section 13 gives tenancy certainty to what I suspect are the commercial enterprises and then there are, primarily, building works that have been undertaken on the rest of the site, including the central trading floor and the warehouses, that may not have gone through any development approvals. Will this provision ensure that those building works have the appropriate approvals under the Planning and Development Act?

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Correct. The commercial buildings are not necessarily just the pub and the petrol station; there is a whole building there.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I mentioned those because they are the two stand-out buildings.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Yes.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 15: Use as public market —

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I thank the Acting Speaker (Mr P. Abetz). I know that he is quite excited by this clause; probably as excited as we are.

The Treasurer will not be shocked that we will be moving an amendment to this clause and I want to set out our argument. During the briefing I asked why 20 years had been chosen and there was not a lot of science behind the answer that I was given. That is not a criticism; there is not a lot of science on that. There is no particular reason that 20 years was chosen. We believe that 20 years is not long enough; it is as simple as that.

I think the markets started in the CBD around the Perth Town Hall in about 1844. In 1926, state Parliament passed legislation to create the Perth Market. We believe that there will always be a role for wholesale markets. I know that people talk about the use of technology, but throughout history there has always been a need for a wholesale market. I believe that the 20 years in this legislation is not a long enough time frame. If, as a Parliament, we really believe that we are selling the market as an ongoing concern, then 50 years is a better time frame. Again, to be blunt about it, there is not a lot of science around the choice of 50 years, but we believe that 50 years is significant time to give some security and certainty to industry. In saying that, when Labor decided on 50 years, I looked at some industry analysis, and many industry participants also believe that 50 years is an appropriate time frame.

I want to make the point that in 20 years—if we have not guaranteed that the market will operate for more than 20 years—I have no doubt that, depending on the purchaser, there will be a push to develop that land whether for industrial or residential use. I think it will be for residential use because of its proximity to major infrastructure and proposed commuter train lines. There will be a push for that to happen. We all know how this happens; we saw it with the tier 3 rail lines. Twenty years ago, the government privatised the wheatbelt freight network. At the time, no-one thought that any portion of those train lines would be closed or that any government would accept the closure of those train lines. A conservative government sold the rail lines and, incredibly, less than 20 years later, a conservative government accepted the closure of those train lines. It was unthinkable at the time that those rail freight lines would be privatised. I believe this is a very, very similar situation.

Another point was put to me about the 20 years. Twenty years ago, many high schools in the Western Australian suburbs were closed on the basis that the demographics of the area had changed and there was not the throughput of children to justify the number of schools throughout Perth and the western suburbs. Twenty years later the state government is searching for land for a new school and the cost will be significant because land costs in particular increase over time. It has been put to me also that perhaps the government could buy some land somewhere else now or create its own land bank for future markets. I ask: why do that when we have existing markets? They are in a great position, they have the ability to expand and they are well located on major infrastructure routes. I honestly believe that 20 years is too short a time. We do not want a situation in which

state taxpayers miss out. It was put to me on radio today that this may affect the sale price. Ultimately, that is not my concern. My concern is certainty for industry and certainty for consumers and to reduce risk to taxpayers later. I am very keen that the length of time guaranteed is longer than 20 years. The Labor Party wants to make sure that we can secure the future of our markets for more than 20 years. Four out of five and now three out of four bidders are in a sense developers and investors.

Mr P. PAPALIA: The member for West Swan is making a crucial point and I would like her to conclude her observations.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: As I said, we do not want to see in 20 years the government selling the markets at a particular price, significant wealth being transferred to the private sector and state taxpayers having to purchase land somewhere else. We know how difficult it would be in 15 or 20 years' time to find 51 hectares at a reasonable price that would serve the growing community. We do not believe that we should do something that will jeopardise the wholesale markets into the future. As I said, the key point for me is to secure certainty for industry. We have conducted ourselves in a more cordial manner today, but I —

Mr B.S. Wyatt: You don't want to agitate.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Yes, but I resent the claims about the growers. The Treasurer said that the majority of growers support this. They do not; every grower I have talked to believes the Treasurer has not consulted them or taken on board their views. Let us face it; the government would not be doing this to any other industry. He would not take any industry's whole operation and sell it without consulting it. As I said, this amendment will safeguard the future of our wholesale markets for the next generation. I move —

Page 10, line 13 — To delete “20” and substitute —

50

As I said, I do not think this amendment should be too controversial. I know that not a lot of science is behind choosing the 20-year period, but I think 20 years is too short a time. We need to give some security to the growers and the consumers in this state. Honestly, we know it will happen. As much as the Treasurer says people will have to get plans approved, he knows that if the period of 50 years is not guaranteed, in 20 years the developers will be at the government's door saying, “We've got 51 hectares of prime residential land; we could house X number of people; it will be close to new train stations and good infrastructure.” We know that will happen if we do not put in this provision. This amendment is a no-brainer. It is something that industry is calling for and that Labor supports. As I said, I do not think it attacks the integrity of what the government is trying to do, and we could have been far more obstructionist. In assessing this, we went through all the pros and cons and the key aspects of what the Treasurer is proposing. I still think there is a lot of risk with rent issues, but we went through it and we believe this is a feasible, practical amendment that will not bring down the government; it will give security to industry and make sure that in 20 years a future government will not have to borrow money to find more land for new markets when an excellent market is already operating. We believe that we should secure their future for more than 20 years. I disagree with the member for Moore; 20 years is not a long time. As I said, within 20 years, we have had to reverse a policy around high schools. In 20 years we have seen a complete change in the operation of our rail network. I believe 50 years is a far more appropriate time when we are looking at markets that have had a very long and proud history in WA. I believe that at the very least, we can give them a 50-year life. I think 20 years is far too short.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: I understand the member's argument and she is not alone, as I understand it, but let me put our arguments. We are providing for 20 years. There was not a great deal of precision in coming to that nor is there a great deal of precision behind 50 years. We are trying to make sure of some conditions. Our intent is to keep the market going. I think everyone here thinks that there will be a wholesale market of some form going forward, but it will change; it will be different. All markets have changed, as the member for Southern River indicated about the wool market.

We have done a couple of things. First, we are in the bidding process. Seventy per cent of the weight is towards the bidders showing an understanding of and commitment to the market. Of those five bidders, some are clearly predominantly land developers. Without question, one is not, and another one is, in part. I do not know the firm very well but it has honey farms, cattle farms, substantial media outlets and shopping centres. It is not just a property developer. To call it that is to apparently understate what it does. My understanding is that one of the aspects of the bidding process is to invest substantial amounts of capital to lock it in as a market, going forward. A proponent will not make a substantial amount of investment in a market to wipe it out in 20 years. Second, as part of the lease we will require the proponent to give five years' notice to the government of the day if it wants to change the purpose of the central trading area. If the government of the day disputes the altered use, it can take appropriate action. It can rezone to a market status and, of course, the owner will have access to courts to dispute it if they wish or the State Administrative Tribunal if it exists in that form. The state will have five years' notice to take action to stop the transfer to an alternative use if it thinks that is appropriate. As the member for

Ms Rita Saffioti; Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Paul Papalia; Ms R. Saffioti: Both ways.; Mr Peter Abetz

West Swan knows personally, the geographic locations of our fruit and vegetable growers around the city have changed dramatically and moved further from the city, as land has become more valuable for redevelopment, and gone further south.

Ms R. Saffioti: Both ways.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Yes, both ways. The north has not changed as much. There has been a great deal of movement of both fruit and vegetable market gardens to the south. Although there have been changes, the share throughput for the market has not grown much; the volume is still about 40 per cent. The value is higher. That is because of Coles and Woolies going outside, directly to distribution centres. Exports are not as large as they used to be, and the produce still goes directly out. There is a substantial change in the market structure that might lead to another market that would diminish the need for this market. We do not know what will occur. We have safeguards around substantially investing in infrastructure that the small users will be able to enjoy. The people who are bidding for the market are committed to maintaining the wholesale market into the future. With five years' notice, the government also has the ability to question, alter or override the decision of people to move out of the market if they so wish. I think those are great safeguards. I think 20 years is a good, reasonable outcome. I understand that when the Brisbane Markets were sold, people were given only seven years' notice. The owners have no intention to change it to anything else.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: When we compare this situation with that in the other states, I think the structure of the sale and ownership is a bit different from what is being proposed here in Western Australia.

I want to make a couple of key points in response to the Treasurer, who said that the new owner will pretty much be obliged to undertake substantial investment. The new owner is unlikely to want to bowl over the market in 20 years. If that is the case, a 50-year requirement should not scare the government. If the government truly believes that the market will be there in 50 years, this amendment will have no impact. Why does the government not just accept it? That will make the opposition happy. I am not sure, but it might make the Nationals a bit happier and it will make industry happy and give long-term security to the industry. If the government truly believes that the markets will be there in 50 years, it should accept the amendment.

I want to make a second point. The Treasurer said that there may be changes and there may be another market down south and maybe one up north. Who will pay for that? Would it not be better to build in some leverage so the government requires this land to be used for markets for 50 years? For whatever reason, in 30 or 40 years, there may be a Myalup market or a Gingin market, or whatever. I doubt that will happen, unless we dramatically change volumes out there. If that happened, would the government not like to have some leverage? The government is not always on the defensive side of the strategy. The defensive side is that in 20 years, when the developer or maybe the third or fourth owner from today says, "We really want to develop" or "We have to move on and sell", the government will not know who will own it. All the goodwill in the world today will change and evaporate. We have seen it so many times. We have seen it with the pipeline. We have seen the changes in ownership, the deals that are done, the prices that are paid and the guarantees that are made. They impact with each transaction. We have seen it with Westrail Freight. All the goodwill in the world from that sale did not amount to anything in the end. Why does the government not build in the leverage?

Ultimately, this is legislation. If in 30 years the whole world as we know it completely changes and we do not need a wholesale fresh food market, the government can deal with that in Parliament. I do not think that 20 years is long enough. As we know, it is a perfect land banking opportunity for a developer. This is prime land for a developer. A developer can pick it up, start planning and carry out environmental assessments. Consultants will come in. It will take 20 years to get it ready anyway. Also, we will get volume and an ongoing funding stream.

Let us ensure that we keep the markets operating for as long as we can. We believe that 50 years is a fair compromise. It is consistent with what industry wants. As I said, the 50-year figure was derived separately from industry but we arrived at the same point. If the government truly believes there will be all this investment and no-one will bowl it over in 20 years, it should accept the amendment. As I said, let the future government worry about changing legislation. We should not let the future government worry about having to pay for a new market site. Why do we always have to be on the back foot with the private sector? Why do we always have to beg it to give us a break? Ultimately, why do we not put ourselves in the driving seat on behalf of industry and growers in WA? As I said, we should be doing what we can to support our existing growers. I know that the government's policy is to try to grow food in places where it is very difficult and costly, but why do we not support the existing industry? I do not believe that this change will have any material impact on the budget, but it will give the industry more certainty and growers will have more security for the next 50 years.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: I wish to make a couple of points. First, the sale of the Brisbane Markets occurred exactly like this. It went out to open tender. I think the Queensland Chamber of Fruit and Vegetable Industries Co-op won the bid. Second, we are supporting industry by making sure that the market will have substantial new investment and longevity. That will help everybody who uses the market.

Ms Rita Saffioti; Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Paul Papalia; Ms R. Saffioti: Both ways.; Mr Peter Abetz

As to whether the market space will be used for residential development, we cannot predict what will happen but this land is in the middle of an industrial zone. It has all sorts of uses that are incompatible with residential usage. Residential development is not allowed in this area. Across the road is Soils Aint Soils. It is a bit smelly. Up the road is a composting plant that has had odour problems. Unless we change the zoning—I am sure there is an act covering the Canning Vale industrial zone—there will be no residential developments in that area. They are prohibited by the Department of Planning. Otherwise, we would have residential areas in the Kwinana industrial zone. We fought for a buffer zone in that area. There has been a 10 per cent encroachment of it. Will we get residential properties right down by the Alcoa refinery? No, we will not. Perhaps there is potential for more non-residential commercial development. There is already some in that area.

I suspect that the purchaser will redevelop that whole area quite substantially whilst keeping the market. The government's considered view is that we have enough safeguards in this legislation. We have also ensured that there will be substantial investment, the market will run for 20 years, we will not prohibit market change and the state can give five years' notice before any proposed alteration of use, and the owner can take appropriate action on that. I accept the member's arguments but we differ.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I have a further comment and question. Firstly, there is residential development in close proximity.

Dr M.D. Nahan: Outside the area.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Yes, outside the area but not in the market.

Dr M.D. Nahan: Outside the industrial zone.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Yes, of course. I am not sure whether the Treasurer is aware of what is happening in Forrestfield. To say that changing industrial land to residential land has somehow never been seen before is completely false. The government is doing it now in Forrestfield. In the middle of an industrial area, the government is changing the zoning from industrial to residential because of the train line. It is not that foreign. All the issues the Treasurer raised about proximity to freight lines and other industrial areas exist in High Wycombe now, and that is what the government is doing. I do not think it is a crazy theory that we could have residential development given that there is residential development in the southern part, along Ranford Road, and also it is happening right here, right now. I think last night the Treasurer said to the Leader of the Opposition that people would be put in jail if they tried it. Let us face it, with the right processes, this can be changed. I do not think the Treasurer should paint it to be a crazy idea, given it is happening in Forrestfield as we speak. Residential zoning is there. I have the map here. I know the Ranford Road area. It is the way I used to go from Roleystone to Fremantle Oval to watch South Fremantle play football. I used to go down that road all the time and know it pretty well. Of course, it has changed dramatically over the past 20 years, particularly the extent of the residential developments. I do not think it becoming a residential area is as crazy as the Treasurer thinks. That being said, I still think that 50 years is an appropriate time frame. We truly hope the government supports us on this. I hope the National Party—or the government, whatever it is today—supports us on this.

Mr R.S. Love: We are the National Party.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I hope the National Party supports us on this. I read the member for Moore's comments when he said he agreed with everything that the head of Vegetables WA said.

Mr R.S. Love: No, I did not say that.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Yes, he did.

Mr R.S. Love interjected.

Mr P. Papalia: It depends what audience he is talking to at the time.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Of course—chameleons. Members of the National Party are green but they change to blue pretty quickly! We truly hope the National Party supports it.

There are issues about the sale price. I do not think it will have a material impact and it is not something I am concerned about. I am concerned about industry and consumers and protecting taxpayers for the longer term.

Mr B.S. WYATT: I will be brief. The member for West Swan has outlined the opposition's view and the minister has outlined the government's position. I want to make a few comments in support of the amendment moved by the member for West Swan. The key question raised by the member was: why have we always had to create a position in which ultimately, in 20 years' time, the government is on the back foot. I think the Treasurer said that Soils Aint Soils is across the road. Who knows whether that will still be there in 20 years?

Ms Rita Saffioti; Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Paul Papalia; Ms R. Saffioti: Both ways.; Mr Peter Abetz

The first time I had ever had any experience of that area was in 1988. My mate Enzo's parents built a house not far from there. There was not much around there in 1988. The Acting Speaker (Mr P. Abetz) and the member for West Swan know better than I do that there is now a vast expanse of suburbs around there. Twenty years will come around pretty quickly. I heard Mr Mercer on radio this morning make the point that he now sees as a brief period the changes that have happened since they first moved to the current location over 20 years ago. The opposition is hoping to simply make the point: let us protect the position of the government. We do not know what zoning will be like in 20 years or whether various smelly things around it will still be there, but we can protect the position of the state and the growers by approving this amendment. The Treasurer made the comment—I agree with his point—that if the remaining four bidders are committed to large capital investment in that location and if they are committed to the long-term future of the Perth market for up to 50 years, they will be comfortable with it. I think the Treasurer said it was \$250 million for coolrooms —

Dr M.D. Nahan: That was what the Perth Market Authority currently thought we needed to invest.

Mr B.S. WYATT: It needs \$250 million for the development of the site. I think the Treasurer confirmed earlier that it was not just for coolrooms. The return on that investment, I would have thought, would be over a period of time—probably longer than 20 years. I do not know what these various companies require as a return on their investment. If they are indeed committed to the long-term maintenance of the Perth market at that location in 50 years, okay, they will still have a property that is returning an income, but without the suspicion that it is simply a land bank; that they will bank that land while getting an income from it. That suspicion is shared by many people and I think it is a legitimate concern. This amendment protects the state and it protects the growers. Hopefully, it does not put us in the same position as we are in with the tier 3 rail in which, years after the sale, we are having to find public money to fix the inadequacy of a sale made long ago.

Mr P. PAPALIA: I, too, want to make a couple of quick points about the Treasurer's last contribution. The suggestion that the Brisbane Markets Ltd model could easily result from this process is deceptive. It is not true. Yes, Brisbane Markets did end up in the hands of people predominantly associated with industry. Looking at the website, it has the number of shares, and it states —

... in excess of 160 industry-related shareholders, including growers, wholesalers, secondary wholesalers, retailers and the industry organisation Brismark.

That is true; that is what has happened in Brisbane. The Treasurer has received expressions of interest predominantly from property developers. They have not participated in, and have no interest or experience in, growing, selling or distributing food. If a property developer is involved in investing in a shopping centre, that does not in any way suggest that it is likely to retain or have an interest in pursuing expansion or retention of a marketplace as the primary use of the site. That idea is just ridiculous. There is only one expression of interest that could result in a model like the Brisbane or Sydney models. If the bid from the Chamber of Fruit and Vegetable Industries in Western Australia is successful, yes, that is true—it might possibly have an interest, but not necessarily. I do not know for sure. At least some of its people are associated with the industry. One could potentially make a leap to suggest that a consequence of that organisation winning the bid might result in the sort of outcome seen in Brisbane. But it is not what would happen here. Sydney Markets Ltd is the benchmark. When I talk to industry players, Sydney is always extolled as the benchmark to aim for because all of its 2 200 shareholders own a bit of that floor space. They all have a vested interest in keeping prices low. They want to keep the costs down. They do not have an interest in increasing rents, because they have to pay them. The only people they can sell to are other participants in that industry. That is the model the Treasurer should be aiming for if he intends to retain this market for the benefit of the state, consumers, growers and industry. He should be trying to construct an outcome that looks a lot like the Sydney model, not any other model.

The process the government has engaged in will certainly not achieve that. If it did, it would be completely by accident. I have every expectation that this sale will establish an opportunity for a property developer to invest in a land bank, which it has to hold for only 20 years—not very long in the scheme of things for property developers—with a dedicated revenue stream to service its capital costs whilst it goes about getting its plans together and pursuing its ultimate objective of changing the use of this site for a much more lucrative outcome in the form of a property development. In 20 years' time, the state will face the much higher cost of finding an equivalent land space somewhere within range of the metropolitan area to replace the wholesale markets' role. The people of that time will be confronted with an excessive cost imposed on them by this government. It will be yet another cost, because they will probably still be paying off the debt that this government has imposed on the state. It is extraordinary that the Treasurer can stand here and suggest that the outcome reached will somehow resemble what is seen on the east coast. I think the Sydney model is the one that the government should have been talking about, not the Brisbane model. That aside, this is unlikely to achieve an outcome that looks like the Brisbane model.

Ms Rita Saffioti; Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Paul Papalia; Ms R. Saffioti: Both ways.; Mr Peter Abetz

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I want also to make a couple of points about what the Treasurer said when he spoke about the industry bid. I will follow on from what the member for Warnbro highlighted. The industry bids in Queensland and New South Wales were very different. The Treasurer may have set the same process but one criticism I have heard about what has happened in WA is that the length of time has not allowed a lot of little to medium-sized growers to get the equity behind their bids to participate. Although it is an industry bid, we cannot by any stretch of the imagination say that all growers or wholesalers are involved, so it is different from the Queensland example in size and in the number of participants.

The second point I want to make clear is that the Labor Party has the support of key industry groups such as Vegetables WA, the Hills Orchard Improvement Group and the Swan Valley Wine Region Grape Growers Association; and, as I said, I have not spoken to the Wanneroo growers, but I suspect they would be on board too. The amendment to subclause (2) to change “20 years” to “50 years” is supported by industry. As I said, I have not spoken to the industry consortium, because I did not think it was appropriate. The opposition’s position has industry support. We do not believe it will impact the sale. All it will do is provide more security and certainty for industry. It is a commonsense approach that will provide more security for the industry, for growers in WA and for wholesalers, consumers and taxpayers. I find very absurd what this government tends to subsidise and give money to in agriculture; it tries to create new agriculture and horticulture in areas, which will cost it a lot of money. In the meantime, we have all these great regions on the outer fringes of Perth, in the south west, the Gascoyne, and through Gingin and the Wanneroo district, where it could be putting much effort and focus into promoting food and agrifood. This government spends money in areas that probably should not be producing food. Why not concentrate on supporting the growers that we have, comprising families that have been out there for generations? Why does not the government support those growers and regions that have a long history in horticulture? Instead, the government is doing something to jeopardise the future of the provision of fresh fruit and vegetables in WA when it does not need to.

The amendment represents a very pragmatic approach. The opposition believes that keeping the site as a market for 50 years will provide a better outcome. I do not think the Treasurer should compare the industry bid in Western Australia with the industry bids in Queensland and New South Wales, because he does not know the number of players or the size of growers involved in the local bid. As I said, I understand that a lot of small to medium-sized growers have not been involved in the bid, primarily because of a lack of time for preparation. The Treasurer cannot talk about the Queensland situation, because it is not directly comparable. The proposal in this amendment has been put to us by a number of groups. It is well supported and, frankly, the Treasurer could adopt it, given he believes the markets will be there for a long time, so let us pass the amendment and make sure we can give security to the wholesale fruit and vegetable markets into the future.

Division

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

Ayes (17)

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

Noes (32)

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

Pairs

Mr W.J. Johnston	Mrs L.M. Harvey
Mrs M.H. Roberts	Mr J.H.D. Day
Mr P.C. Tinley	Mr V.A. Catania

Amendment thus negated.

Ms Rita Saffioti; Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Paul Papalia; Ms R. Saffioti: Both ways.; Mr Peter Abetz

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I just want to give the Treasurer a second chance! I also want to put on record again my complete dismay for what has just happened. I cannot believe some of the sensible people on the other side of the chamber—I put the member for South Perth in the sensible basket.

Mr B.S. Wyatt: Do you?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Yes, I do. I think he has a good eye for the public. He is in touch with public thinking.

Mr B.S. Wyatt: He is betting online!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: He is betting that we will not get 50 years, I think. No, he is collecting from his bet that we will not get 50 years. I think the member for Belmont is a sensible member of Parliament. I will put the member for Swan Hills in that same basket—or maybe fifty–fifty, depending on the day.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr P. Abetz): Members, I just want to remind you that we are dealing with clause 15.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Yes. I thought the member for Moore was in that sensible basket as well. I cannot believe that the Liberal–National government does not want to secure the future of our wholesale markets for 50 years. I cannot believe that is what the Liberal–National government just voted for. It does not care, beyond 20 years, what happens to our wholesale fruit and vegetable market. Remember, this clause guarantees it for only 20 years. We wanted to guarantee it for 50 years.

Mr D.A. Templeman interjected.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I was trying to see whether we could get 40 years, but apparently we cannot move the amendment. Is there any love for 40?

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members, let us have a bit of order.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: As I said, to be quite serious, I cannot believe the Liberal–National government. Members have crossed the floor for other reasons and I cannot believe they did not cross the floor for this reason. I cannot believe it! Again, it is one of those bits that they would have walked into their respective party rooms—I am not sure what they do in their party rooms, but I do not think they discussed the proposed legislation —

Mrs G.J. Godfrey: Someone keeps telling you what goes on in there.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Actually, the member is right. I was misleading. I do know what goes on in the party rooms!

Mrs G.J. Godfrey: You’d better tell them to get their stories straight.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I do not know; I think we were pretty much on the money today. Given the Premier’s reaction to that word, I think we were pretty much on the money today—nailed it today! I think I know more about what goes on in the Liberal Party room than in our party room. As I said, I want to put it out there that National Party members have very much disappointed me on this because, yet again, they did not stand up for the people they believe to be their constituency. I cannot believe it, some of the key issues confronting growers in WA. It is a supply chain; there is no doubt about the dominance of some of the majors, but it is also about costs and certainty. These are key challenges for growers in WA. On retail trading hours, National Party members said, “Oh, no, it will impact growers in WA”, using growers as a reason for its policy stance, yet they are letting their government colleagues sell the markets with only a 20-year guarantee of operation. It is unbelievable! I honestly do not think the cabinet members care, because I question some of their links to the land, frankly. If their hearts were honestly in it, they would care. If they really cared about growers in WA, they would be in here trying to protect them in the future. But I can tell that their hearts are not in it. They are absolutely interested in other things.

Mr B.S. WYATT: I am very keen to hear more of what the member for West Swan has to say.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Victoria Park, are you aware of the seriousness of misleading the house about the member for West Swan?

Several members interjected.

[Member’s time extended.]

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The member makes much funnier jokes when he is in the chair than when he is in his seat!

As I said, I cannot believe government members have not supported us. I seriously hope it goes to the upper house and possibly a committee has a look at the impact of this legislation on the industry. I think it is worthy of some analysis. There has been no analysis, frankly, before this. Remember, this sale has not come after a review of any formal process. It just came about because the government saw 51 hectares near some good infrastructure and thought, “Let’s sell this land first.” It was probably one of those times when the Premier was in the car and went past it and thought, “Let’s sell that bit!” I do not think there was any analysis. There was really little or no

Ms Rita Saffioti; Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Paul Papalia; Ms R. Saffioti: Both ways.; Mr Peter Abetz

recognition of the industry that the wholesale markets support. I hope that in the other place, members on the other side understand —

Mr D.A. Templeman interjected.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Are we calling them the “Real Nationals”? The “Real Nationals” in the upper house —

Mr D.A. Templeman interjected.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The “Urbanised Nationals”—very nice. I hope that they have a look and send it to a committee. Let us try to get an outcome that, first of all, industry gets consulted on, because it has not been consulted.

Mr J.E. McGrath: Because they don’t support it.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Who said that?

Mr J.E. McGrath: The Treasurer.

Mr P. Papalia: He’s got no cred; he couldn’t name anybody.

The SPEAKER: Thank you. Are you trying to have a disruptive influence, member?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Go and grab some fish and chips.

Mr D.A. Templeman interjected.

The SPEAKER: Thank you. Come on; let us keep going.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: As I said, I hope that in the other place the government parties—the National and Liberal Parties—have a close look at this. I believe it is worthy of more consideration and that they will agree with us that 50 years is a good option.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 16: Development condition relating to warehousing —

Mr B.S. WYATT: Before I make some comments on the time frame, I would like the Treasurer to explain to the house what this clause will do.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: This requirement is basically one of the key issues of the functions of the cold storage and storage and warehousing facilities; they are not all cold storage, I might add. This condition requires the developer to have a minimum of 46 500 square metres of storage facility.

Mr B.S. Wyatt: For 20 years?

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Yes. If the developer wants to make any more developments on the property, they will need to have the planning capacity for an extra 24 000 square metres.

Mr B.S. Wyatt: The Treasurer said “any more developments”. Can the Treasurer explain it? If there is a requirement to develop anything, does that trigger the requirement to increase the central trading lot by at least 24 000?

Dr M.D. NAHAN: It is any development application.

Mr B.S. WYATT: So is this the clause in the legislation that requires the purchaser to invest in the actual central trading lot? If the purchaser wants to do anything, does this come with it?

Dr M.D. NAHAN: This is a requirement to have a minimum level of warehousing on the land. If the purchaser wants to expand it in any way, they first have to make sure they have capacity for an extra 24 000 square metres. I might add that separate from this is the bid that they make in their contract, which could augment this, potentially. I just want to clarify something. Schedule 1 shows an area that is hashed. That hashed area is the existing commercial building, where the fish and chip shop and the law firm are located. The requirement to have the extra 24 000 square metres does not include the redevelopment of this area. This is basically an office facility.

Ms R. Saffioti: A petrol station.

Mr B.S. Wyatt: No. That is on the other side.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: This is a drainage area. This is basically an office complex for multi-use right now. The 24 000 extra square metres that have been set aside is if they alter this, not this.

Mr P. PAPALIA: Can the minister explain what is meant by the term “for the purposes of warehousing to support the public market”? What sort of warehousing are we talking about here? Is it specifically cool rooms or is it something along the lines of what is currently there? “Warehousing” could mean anything. It could

Ms Rita Saffioti; Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Paul Papalia; Ms R. Saffioti: Both ways.; Mr Peter Abetz

essentially just be a shed. If whoever wins the tender determines that they could meet this obligation by having lockup storage facilities, would that satisfy that obligation?

Dr M.D. NAHAN: This requirement relates to warehousing to support the public market. “Public market” is defined as the wholesale market. Therefore, they cannot have a rental storage facility. Most of this is cold storage.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Again, it should be no surprise that we will be moving an amendment to this clause as well. This has a 20-year guarantee. We believe it should be 50 years. I have outlined the case for this amendment before. However, I make one last plea to members opposite. It is very, very good policy to make it 50 years. It will provide greater certainty to the industry. Ultimately, that should be our key concern when considering this legislation. When this issue was discussed in the party room, there might have been a couple of people who realise how the markets operate. However, many probably saw it as just a big lot of land that the government wants to sell. That is basically how it was put to them. It is a budget measure. So, let us be real about this. Let us give the industry some security for 50 years. As I have said, if the government really believes that the markets have a long-term future, this should not be an issue, and the government should support the amendment to 50 years. I therefore move —

Page 11, line 6 — To delete “20” and substitute —

50

The purpose of this amendment is to create a 50-year guarantee rather than a 20-year guarantee.

The SPEAKER: The question is, first of all, that the figure “20” be deleted and substituted with the figure “50”.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Yes, Mr Speaker.

Mr B.S. WYATT: Can I just ask for a point of clarification because I had a bit of confusion with the previous one? The motion at this point is, firstly, to delete, is it not? That is what we expect to do.

The SPEAKER: Yes.

Mr B.S. WYATT: Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The question is that “20” be deleted.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Putting it again, we are deleting “20”; we want to make it “50”. We believe it gives industry security. As I said, it is supported by many industry growers. The member for South Perth said that growers support the legislation; they do not. They want more security. Fifty years is something that we can give them to give them more security. The government is privatising the growers’ asset and selling an asset that they use on a daily basis. The government should give them more security. We could have gone into other issues about rent. We believe that the pragmatic approach is to replace “20” with “50”.

Mr P. ABETZ: I wish to speak against the amendment. As I pointed out in my contribution to the second reading debate, we need to face the reality that the situation can change. This amendment will lock in a provision that the market must have a certain amount of central trading area. If a market were to develop in, say, Busselton, it might become a major market and the central trading area in Canning Vale might be only half utilised. The opposition is saying that it has to be maintained for the next 50 years. The fact that nobody is using it does not matter. How stupid is that? The whole fruit and vegetable market situation might change, as it has in, for example, Tasmania. In Tasmania there is no wholesale fruit and vegetable market. Growers supply directly to wholesalers who have their businesses scattered around. If for some reason the industry in Western Australia were to move in that direction and only a small amount of the central trading area continued to be used, why would we want to lock that in for 50 years? It just does not make sense. If it is being utilised, the operator will maintain it because it brings in money. It is as simple as that. This amendment just does not make sense.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Again, this is our key point. Privatisation puts the government and future governments on the back foot. Let us take the member for Southern River’s scenario. Let us say there was a new wholesale market in Busselton. Who would pay for it?

Mr P. Abetz: Private enterprise —

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The old private enterprise will go and establish a new market.

Mr P. Abetz interjected.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The government would do it? Of course, the government would be asked to do it. The government always gets asked to do things. It paid for saleyards a couple of years ago. Of course the government would be asked to do it. What leverage does the government have? None. The private sector owns the

Ms Rita Saffioti; Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Paul Papalia; Ms R. Saffioti: Both ways.; Mr Peter Abetz

Perth market and it can basically do whatever it likes with it after 20 years. If there is a requirement for a new market down south, what leverage will the government have? Zero. Again, we will sign away our rights—taxpayers’ rights into the future—through the Perth Market (Disposal) Bill 2015, and the government will always be on the back foot into the future. Let us give some future government some leverage. Let us give future taxpayers some rights and let us give industry some certainty. It is all about, “Oh, look, this new developer can do whatever they like with their land. If it’s downsized, fair enough; good on them”, but who is going to pay the cost of the new markets? The industry will not be able to afford it and the private sector will not do it; it will be taxpayers. Again and again the Liberal Party wants to transfer all the risk back to government. I do not know why the government wants to jeopardise future taxpayers; I do not know why. All we are saying is that a 50-year provision will give government leverage through legislation if things change. If there was another market to be established, the legislation could be changed, the owners might be requested to develop that new market or there might be a trade-off. However, the government is signing off all the powers now and that is the point. The government will always be put on the back foot in the future. I hope to still be around in 20 years’ time and I would bet anything that there will be a debate about the future of the market site and that developers, prospective buyers or whoever it is will be going to lobby government. I can see the future lobbyists now in their driverless cars rocking up to Parliament.

Mr D.A. Templeman: McGrath and Sons!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I can see the McGrath and Sons lobbyist in his driverless car rocking up here to Parliament House saying, “Look at these markets. They are prime residential development.” He will say it is all about housing affordability, to quote the episode of *Utopia*. The industry is not being secured into the future and taxpayers will be given an additional burden in 20 or 30 years’ time—mark my words. As I said, honestly, the provision in this amendment is supported by wholesalers and growers including the Swan Valley grape growers, hills orchardists and Vegetables WA. They are basically some parts of the industry, but I have not talked to everybody. Those I have talked to all support a 50-year provision; it is well supported. It is not controversial out there. The only place it is controversial is in here because the government cannot see it and it did not think about it when it drafted the legislation. The government set the sales process underway without having the legislation in place. The government has in a sense ripped away the authority of Parliament, because it started a sales process and only told potential bidders there was a 20-year guarantee for the markets, and now government will be on the back foot on this issue.

Division

Amendment put and a division taken with the following result —

Ayes (16)

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

Noes (30)

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

Pairs

Mr P.C. Tinley	Mr V.A. Catania
Mr W.J. Johnston	Mrs L.M. Harvey
Mrs M.H. Roberts	Mr J.H.D. Day
Mr M. McGowan	Mr R.F. Johnson

Amendment thus negatived.

Mr B.S. WYATT: Clause 16(3) states —

Subsection (2) applies —

That is, the conditions for the CTL —

Ms Rita Saffioti; Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Paul Papalia; Ms R. Saffioti: Both ways.; Mr Peter Abetz

despite the *Planning and Development Act 2005* or any planning scheme or interim development order under that Act.

How is proposed subsection (2) inconsistent with current planning laws?

Dr M.D. NAHAN: It will ensure that local government does not implement a planning scheme that will be inconsistent with the construction of a warehousing facility.

Mr B.S. Wyatt: It will override any inconsistency?

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Yes.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Will clause 16(4) ensure planning decisions will not be taken to the State Administrative Tribunal?

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Yes.

Mr B.S. WYATT: I assume that is to stop any local government taking this to SAT?

Dr M.D. NAHAN: That is right—or the landowner who could potentially object to our requirements. This will do two things: firstly, subclause (3) will prevent local government making a planning arrangement that is inconsistent with subclause (2); and, secondly, subclause (4) will prevent a local government or the landowner from taking this to SAT.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: In relation to the central trading lot as described in schedule 1, can the Treasurer clarify whether the areas outside the central trading need to go through local government processes and whether they are reviewable by the State Administrative Tribunal?

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Yes; refer to schedule 1, which shows the member what that is.

Mr B.S. Wyatt: It's that map again.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Yes, that map again. Outside that area is already an urban development—a business office and whatnot—and that will be subject to, which I think it probably currently is, the Local Government Act. We are not going to change that arrangement and therefore issues relating to it are subject to SAT.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: In relation to development land, has the government ever received a valuation of that development land outside the central trading area?

Dr M.D. NAHAN: The government has done some cash flow analysis of that development land. The advisers do not know exactly what the outcome of that was. The member's question was about whether the government had tried to acquire that land. It has done some, I guess, rough cash flow estimates of its value. Whether that would be an accurate statement of the land value and the transfer, I do not know. It has done it, but I cannot relate to the member what the estimates were.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Was there consideration of separating the development land from the sale of the market? Was retaining the development land something that the government considered? I am talking about the development land to the south; not the land on Bannister Road, but the land near the rail line. Is that something that was considered?

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Amongst other things, the government thought about subdividing that land and selling it separately, but my strong view is that we should sell it as part of the market for the expansion of the market because that is the objective here; to ensure we have plenty of land to expand the warehousing facilities. Again, one of the problems has been a lack of warehousing on the site. There has been some expansion around the area and I have been lobbied quite heavily about putting some more investment into the site. Although it would not come to me, I think there would have been resistance to selling off that land for an alternative use than the market. It should be integrated, as we have done, in one package.

Clause put and passed.

Debate adjourned, on motion by **Mr J.M. Francis (Minister for Emergency Services)**.

House adjourned at 7.32 pm
