

PARLIAMENTARY HISTORY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

and

STATE LIBRARY OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA

Transcript of second series of interviews with

MAXWELL TRENORDEN

b.1948 -

Access

Research: Open

Publication: To be advised of request to publish

STATE LIBRARY OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA - ORAL HISTORY COLLECTION

DATE OF INTERVIEW: March 2014 – April 2014 (Series 2)

INTERVIEWER: John Ferrell

TRANSCRIBER: Hansards – Parliament of Western Australia

DURATION: 2 hours and 7 minutes

REFERENCE NUMBER: OH 3570/1

COPYRIGHT: Parliament of Western Australia and Library Board of
Western Australia

NOTE TO READER

Readers of this oral history memoir should bear in mind that it is a verbatim transcript of the spoken word and reflects the informal, conversational style that is inherent in such historical sources. The Parliament and the State Library are not responsible for the factual accuracy of the memoir, nor for the views expressed therein; these are for the reader to judge.

Bold type face indicates a difference between transcript and recording, as a result of corrections made to the transcript only, usually at the request of the person interviewed.

FULL CAPITALS in the text indicate a word or words emphasised by the person interviewed.

Square brackets [] are used for insertions not in the original tape.

TIMED SUMMARY

The two sessions recorded herewith follow **nine one-hour tapes** recorded in 2008, before Max was elected to the upper house. These new recordings are digital, using .wav format. Therefore new terminology will be necessary to identify the files. ie. Session 10 will use the codes **TRE-10T01** (meaning Trenorden Session 10, Take 1) and **TRE-10T02**.

Session 11 will use the codes **TRE-11T03** and **TRE-11T04**.

File **TRE-10T01****[Duration 18m17s]**

00m00s	Identification	Max Trenorden to John Ferrell, 31 March, 2014.
00m57s	Personal Details.	Married in 2009 to Veronica.
01m53s		Now no longer involved in politics. [Shots from Swanbourne rifle range or the SAS audible. Also some bird calls in the background.]
03m50s		Travel. Imminent visit to New York and nearby Appalachian Mountains, and to the Kentucky Derby Race Meeting etc.
05m50s	Election to Legislative Council	Wendy Duncan, then President of National Party, tried to dissuade Max from running in Central Wheatbelt seat of Legislative Assembly. He acquiesced with regret, only because to have run would have been divisive for the party, forcing Brendan Grylls into the upper house. So he contested the upper house seat himself.
08m08s		Motivations for remaining in parliament included the need to <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • fight for traditionally national/country party issues, • enquire into deaths of babies at King Edward Memorial Hospital, • support public service whistle-blower Michael Moodie against unfair treatment by the CCC, • protect the role of the public service from arbitrariness and incestuous process. [Motor mower heard outside.] • continue promoting mining in the mid-west.
12m40s	Campaigning for the Upper House 2008	Differs from lower house in that a prospective member must satisfy the party rather than constituents, leading to lack of accountability. Max designed his own campaign, attending public meetings in the wheatbelt, public events, local government meetings. Result was pleasing with four Nationals in the upper house. (Max, Philip Gardiner, Mia Davies and Colin Holt, plus Wendy Duncan continuing.) This number

justified differentiation from Liberals where that was significant. [Plane heard overhead.]

16m29s **Working in the Upper House**
Chair of Public Administration Committee.

[end of TRE-10T01]

File **TRE-10T02** **[Duration 41m20s]**

00m00s **Comment on Election Statistics**
[Motor mower still audible in background]
Trenorden, Gardiner, Davies from wheatbelt; Duncan from the mining and pastoral district; Holt from south-west.

00m40s **Differences Sitting in Council v. Assembly**
Less interjecting in upper house.
Calmness and routine greater, due to fixed hours.
Its role is to review legislation from the assembly.
03m30s Max admired Norman Moore for his understanding of the role of the Council and attempts to keep it to that.
Barry House and others have attempted to change the under-developed committee structure.
Longer speeches, less interruptions, strange archaic processes. Some of the latter were reformed in 2012.

05m59s **Significant Colleagues**
Peter Collier for his listening. Nick Anticich, chair of CCC, acts according to conscience. Ken Travers, Adele Farina worked very hard. Giz Watson prepared and researched thoroughly, always relevant in debate. Michael Mischin developed over time. Helen Morton passionate about her work. Barry House was a fair president. Matt Benson was a very practical person. John Ford a good individual.

10m00s Objected to the Greens constant over-statement of fault to gain attention to an issue.

10m41s **Aims Expressed in Inaugural Speech/Issues Embraced**
Desire for diversity in energy policy. Visited Germany, UK and USA (Hawaii) to research the issue, examining geo-thermal power and wave power. Both pose problems of getting sufficient capital to develop them. Favours wind power as a small component of the overall sources of energy. Fears there was a lost opportunity in not pursuing geo-thermal. Strongly supported encouraging solar panels on roofs. These

have greatly reduced the amount of peaking power needed throughout the state. WA has great potential to develop wave power as is being pioneered by Carnegie.

17m12s

Adding consumer value in food production. Supermarkets including Coles and Woolworths obstruct the achievement of this by controlling the capital capacity of farmers. Max was disappointed with ban on exports of live cattle which amounted to arbitrarily turning off food supply. Knows the scene in Indonesia first hand. Feels Australia could have intervened to help develop better processing in the small communities where our cattle are distributed. Also visited Singapore, Malaysia. Favours 'slow food' and eating seasonally. Advocates educating the public to know what is in season and when.

22m17s

Advocates expanding agriculture into the tropics as a counter to the effects of climate change. The north-west affords great opportunities, especially the Fitzroy River valley, to develop irrigated crops for a growing market in South-East Asia.

25m32s

Electoral reform: 'one vote one value' is not in accord with the Australian Constitution. (Quotes *The Economist* asserting that USA is no longer a democracy.) Canadian Supreme Court ruled that though 'one vote one value' may be a valid principle, it must be countered with weightings. Max remains convinced that in Australia this is also necessary to counter the disproportionate influence of populous city votes to those of sparsely populated country regions.

28m15s

Rail services for transport of grain. Tier 3 rails run in the wrong direction. Distance, however, is not the significant factor when comparing the economy of rail and road transport. Because of its larger carrying capacity rail is more economical than road despite travelling over longer distances. Side issues like the number of deaths on the road add weight to the desirability of fostering rail, maintaining which is also cheaper than roads. Philip Gardiner was a talented colleague in the upper house. Max regrets that the party did not see fit to employ his expertise in a ministerial capacity. (Philip Gardiner, BSc Agric Hons, MBA). Explains that the state controls the railways, but has Brookfield and CBH (private entities) competing within the contracts to cart grain, with no-one making contribution to maintaining the condition of the tracks.

31m47s Deplores the error of those who say 'the wheatbelt should be shut down' due to difficulties attributable to climate change. He advocates using 'crop mitigation insurance' as a key way to encourage farmers even in declining climatic conditions. This would preserve return of capital to farmers, enabling continuance of annual plantings. Places like Mukinbudin and Bencubbin have been able to sustain farms over many decades despite being in marginal climatic zones. Farmers have the survival skills if their capital could be guaranteed.

34m13s Max believes that amalgamation of local government authorities is not a satisfactory policy. This prompts his memory of colleague Nigel Hallett, who accompanied Max on a trip to South Australia and Queensland to examine reforms to local government. In South Australia, neighbouring councils can amalgamate intellectual activities for whatever term is productive. Forming groups around shared issues such as waste treatment, or common interests in development of rail lines has been very successful without the need to abolish councils. The Queensland example has found that physical amalgamation increased rather than solved problems. He advocates the SA model for WA.

38m15s Bush-walking in water-catchment areas. Max is proud of what the committee he was involved with was able to achieve to resolve the conflict between policy of recreational authority and water supply authority. Irrigation and recreation can share a water resource, as in Wellington Dam and Harvey Weir, because human pollution is not at issue. But drinking water supplies must be off limits to recreational use because the dangers to health are massive and Queensland has found that purification costs are prohibitive where this is allowed.

[end of file TRE-10T02]

File **TRE-11T03**

[Duration 39m08s]

00m00s
2014.

Identification Max Trenorden to John Ferrell, 7 April,

00m43s

Issues of water supply. Max believes there should be a complete inventory of all quality water resources in the state, to allow for development of commercial agriculture to meet demands of an increasing Asian

TIMED SUMMARY

market. Aquafer between Augusta and Geraldton is broken in three places from seismic activity.

03m30s

Max as Deputy President (till 18 May, 2007)

Attributes ability to preside successfully to training in chairmanship with Rostrum. Rules are similar between houses and clerks are present to help. [Passing motor bike audible.]

06m20s

Max as Deputy Chairman of Committees

Enjoyed being on the Privileges Committee. He despairs of the lack of understanding among members about what a parliament is. Complains that colleagues tend to back up those who are guilty of misdemeanours instead of insisting on penalties where the dignity of the house has been infringed.

08m20s

Member of the Procedure and Privileges Committee from June 2009 to May 2011. During this time there was a massive re-writing of the procedures of the Legislative Council. There were 12 members on the committee, which Max feels was too many which impeded progress. When numbers were reduced, Max was no longer on the committee.

09m30s

Max Chaired a Standing Committee on Public Administration

Max recalls it as a good group of members who worked together really well. A major achievement of that committee was to change the way Western Power ran. The CEO resigned following their report, having 'taken the committee on' and showed lack of respect for parliament, by refusing to answer questions – allegedly on the advice of the Solicitor General's Department. The Office of Energy and Safety had given the right advice but the Auditor General had not pursued some of the issues raised by that office. Subsequently the board and management of Western Power was changed to correct the faults. Western Power had been acting to protect the minister concerned, rather than accepting its responsibility to serve the parliament as a whole.

Committee members included Jim Chown, John Ford (ex minister and deputy chair), Ed Durmer and Ken Baston.

14m15s

Member of Joint Standing Committee on Racing and Wagering Acts

Currently a hot issue with the government deciding whether or not to privatise the TAB. The racing

industry is a major employer of people, many of whom may not be able to get jobs elsewhere.

Max himself has owned race-horses, following the example of his father who had interests in both trotting and racing.

Max volunteered to go on the Racing and Wagering Board, but he understands that his membership of that board was barred by the Premier and Brendan Grylls, which he finds disappointing.

16m19s

Items Max wants to mention.

Philip Gardiner and Nigel Hallett worked closely with Max on a number of matters. **Muresk** is a very important issue for Max. When Curtin University closed agriculture courses there, Max and Phil worked hard to get Muresk reopened. Under the influence of Ron Sayers, Muresk has taken on a role in training for the mining industry. This serves the rural community well, because many farmers' off-spring take on work with mining companies whilst continuing to be involved in farming as well.

Phil Gardiner and Max managed to stop a **bill on retail trading hours** in the upper house. The bill would have favoured large supermarkets at the expense of small-traders in shopping centres. The latter bear a disproportionate load of the costs of running the centres.

22m04s

Nigel Hallett and Max opposed the government's **proposals to amalgamate local government authorities**. [See previous mention of their trip to South Australia and Queensland.]

Opposed an act relating to **Retirement Villages**, which was based on the false assumption that units in such villages would always increase in value. Is also concerned about the plight of owners in **Strata Title** situations, especially where a jointly-owned high-rise building is beyond repair.

Max supported Philip Gardiner and Nigel Hallett in relation to promoting **Crop Mitigation Insurance**, to insure farmers against capital loss when crops fail. This would transfer the risk from banks to insurance companies, and thereby allow lower interest to be charged on farm loans and keep people on the land. The three travelled to Zurich, Munich and London in researching the viability of such insurance. Risk

assessment is commonly calculated worldwide, which local banks cannot do.

29m25s

Max also spent a lot of time considering the **Oakajee Project**. He wants to see a power grid developed for the mid-west, with its own generating capacity, perhaps using some of the emerging energy sources. This would help get mid-west mines up and running. Also he would like to see rail lines from the mid-west mines to the coast near Geraldton should be linked to north-south lines from the goldfields to Esperance, forming corridors for running water and other services.

32m22s

In the parliament, Max was concerned about the **beginning of secondary education at year 7**. This will inevitably take children away from home at too young an age. And the service population of country towns has difficulty funding city education for their children.

34m26s

Max is not happy to see **fracking** opposed in WA. He claims there is no evidence that it is a danger in this state, where deep seam coal is involved, way below the aquifers.

36m30s

Though he became an upper house member, Max remained a lower house man at heart, concerned about the constituency which had always been his area of interest. And the people would continue to come to him with the issues that worried them. This included those who were concerned about asylum-seekers being housed at Northam. But in relation to that matter, Max says that there was only a small number of citizens who were worried by this. Many people remember that Northam was a centre which successfully housed over 30,000 displaced persons in the period following WW2. So they were not overwhelmed by the presence of foreigners.

Max criticises the media for playing up the few complaints that were made on this issue, and likens it to what they did for Joe Bjelke Petersen and Pauline Hanson years ago. They have done the same for Clive Palmer in the recent re-run of the Senate election in WA.

[End of TRE-11T03]

File **TRE-11T04**

[Duration 29m03s]

- 00m00s **Media Matters**
Most Northam people could see the advantage to local store-keepers of having the asylum-seekers housed locally.
- 00m49s **Health**
Max bemoans the lack of gain out of the large sum of money which was put into regional WA for improvement of health services under the 'Royalties for Regions' policy.
- 02m15s **Information Technology**
Every time the state government embarks on a new project involving IT systems, there seems to be difficulty getting them to work effectively. For example, he quotes the situation at the new Fiona Stanley Hospital. 'Shared services' didn't work, so each agency ran a second system of its own, which duplicated services and thus costs over a four year period. He cites the success of systems in Canada up to fifteen years ago which demonstrated what can be achieved, but in WA we don't seem to have learned the lessons.
- 07m17s **National Party since 2008**
There has been a whole raft of young people coming into the party, led by Brendan Grylls, with great enthusiasm but little experience. This takeover has left older members like Max virtually ignored, despite their long service to the party and years of experience in rural matters. Traditional policies valued for some seventy years have not been accorded priority in recent time.

Max feels that Brendan in particular did not pay sufficient heed to his role as representing a constituency. Rather, he visited the electorate as a representative of the government, not listening to the electors. 'Royalties for Regions', though, was a very good idea, pre-dating the new leaders, but picked up by Brendan Grylls and Wendy Duncan to good effect.

Mia Davies, too, does not seem to understand the role of being a representative of the people: one who listens and takes their concerns to the parliament.

He also thinks the party should have given Philip Gardiner a ministerial role as he was highly qualified to serve as such.

14m39s

Decision to Leave the Nationals

Max eventually felt he was no longer in the party he had known for so long. He and Phil Gardiner could not get support for issues which had previously been key National matters. There was a lack of democratic process in the party room. A community voice had been replaced by party mechanisms in the selection of candidates. Max was not preselected as first or second in the process leading up to the 2012 election. He had been approached by numerous constituents to run, so decided that his only course was to become an independent candidate.

17m25s

Election 2012

In the subsequent election, with Phil, they got 8,000 primary votes, which was a strong showing. However, without preference votes, they did not succeed in being elected. The exercise was worthwhile, however, because it enabled them to highlight the issues about which they were most concerned. Overwhelmingly, they had been supported by the central wheatbelt whose issues they had addressed.

18m50s

In absentia

Max considers it illogical that following an election where a candidate has lost the vote, he is expected to attend the house for another six months or so, as happens in the upper house. Therefore, he decided to highlight that issue by not attending the council following the election. During that changeover period, there is no government business being attended to. The time is devoted to maiden speeches and retirement speeches. Thus Max never made a valedictory speech. His only regret is that in so doing, his thanks to many supporters was not placed on the record.

He deplores the fact that no energy now comes from the grass-roots in politics. Everything is decided by party hacks.

24m33s

Contemplating Retirement

In retirement Max is still involved with some public service. He is on a board for the disabled in Northam, serving east metropolitan and central wheatbelt areas.

He would have enjoyed being on the Racing and Wagering authority, but was thwarted in his attempt to be nominated. Inspired by Benjamin Franklin, he wants the next phase of his life to be meaningful and concerned with himself and family. He and his wife will travel. Grand-children and family will get more attention than was possible when he was in politics, and he will play more golf. He admires those previous politicians and members who stay completely out of the political scene once retired.

28m00s

Thanks and farewells.

[end of TRE-11T04, end of series.]

Contents	Page
Introduction and technical notes	1
Marriage to Veronica Lee	2
Life after politics –trip to USA and Kentucky Derby, etc	3
Contesting the 2008 election in the Upper House/ Campaigning/Attendance at public events, local council meetings, etc/ Electioneering for the National Party	4, 8
Deaths at the King Edward Memorial Hospital and Michael Moodie	5
Thoughts on the Public Sector and role of the Commissioner	6
Chair of the Public Administration Committee	8
Quota system for the elections of 2008 – 5 members elected for the National Party	9
Difference between the procedures for the Legislative Council and Legislative Assembly.	10, 11
Views on Members of significance to him.	12
The Greens Party	12, 13, 14
Energy Policy and need to diversify energy fields/ gas/wind, geothermal, wave	13,14
Opportunities in agriculture and overseas trade / monopolies-Coles, Woolworths and effect on agriculture	15, 16
Live cattle export; fresh food issues – eating seasonally	16
Climate change and effect on WA; opportunity of Fitzroy flood plain for agriculture	17
Need for better representation for country population; Upper House dominated by the big parties	18
Rail service for carting grain.	19
Crop Mitigation Insurance	20, 33,34
Local Government changes in WA and other states	21
Water supplies – quality, quantity, future needs, aquifers, salinity, keeping water pure in the dams and bush walking in the catchment areas	22,23, 24
Need for honesty of Parliamentary members	26
President of Legislative Council (2 years) and Deputy Chairman of Committees; Member of Procedures and Privileges Committee; Joint Standing Committee of Public Administration;	25, 26, 27, 28,
Joint Standing Committee on the Review of Racing and Wagering (WA Act)	29
Agricultural tertiary education – Curtin University Muresk –inclusion of mining industry	30
Retail Trade hours; Influence of Coles and Woolworths in shopping centres	30, 31
Retirement Village Act – Strata titles	32
Oakajee – source of power for Geraldton and Mid West area	34
Prostitution Bill	35
Year 7 students in rural areas leaving for boarding school	35, 36
Fracking –coal and non-coal	36,37
Asylum seekers in Northam	37
Media influences	38
Health issues for the country regions	39
Information Technology and costs' comparison with Canada	39, 40
Brendan Grylls; changes in the National Party	41,43,44
Royalties for Regions	42
Need for change in how Parliament is configured; need for more input from grass roots level	45,46,47
Retirement from Parliament – family, travel, Disability Board in Northam	47,48,49

Introduction to Series 2

Mr Maxwell Wayne Trenorden won the seat of Avon in the WA Legislative Assembly at the 1986 election. He was subsequently re-elected on five occasions. In late 2007 it was expected that Max would retire from Parliament at the end of the term, so I was asked to interview him about his career in politics. We recorded nine hours of reminiscences early in 2008. This forms what I refer to as Series 1 of his oral history recordings.

However, contrary to expectations, Max decided to stay on in Parliament, but at the bidding of his party contested and won a seat for the Agricultural Region of the Legislative Council. His career in the upper house forms the subject matter of Series 2 of the oral history recordings.

Toward the end of his period in the upper house, the dynamics and personnel of the National Party had changed markedly from the situation in 1986. Issues which Max believed were core to his rural constituency were given low priority in policy discussions, to the extent that in November 2012, with a further election pending, Max left the party to contest an upper house seat as an independent member. Despite a creditable performance, Max was not able to win back his seat, so retired from politics. Series 2 includes discussion of the issues which motivated his rift with the party.

Technical Notes

In keeping with modern practice, Series 2 was recorded digitally, using a *Sound Devices 722* recorder teamed with two *Røde NT3* microphones.

Files were recorded in .WAV format at a frequency of 24 bit 48 kbps.

Files are identified by a code which reflects the name of the interviewee (TRE), the number of the session including Series 1 (-10) followed by the 'take' number within Series 2 (T01, T02 etc).

(John Ferrell, August 2014)

START OF SESSION 1

[Nine previous sessions comprise Series 1, completed in 2008.]

File TRE-10T01 Duration 18m17s

[NB: We were recording under a patio at the rear of the house. From time to time extraneous noises penetrate the recording. These include shots, bird-calls, lawn-mowers, passing traffic and Max's dog etc.]

JF It is Monday, 31st March 2014, and this is the tenth session in a series of interviews with the Honourable Max Trenorden, [see comment below] former MLA and MLC. The interview is being recorded at his home, 4B James Street, Swanbourne. Max is speaking with John Ferrell. This series carries on from the series of nine tapes which were recorded in 2008.

Now, Max, to begin with, I thought ...

TRENORDEN Well, we'd better drop the "Honourable" to begin with.

JF Oh, yes; all right.

TRENORDEN Because I think you've got to do eight years or something or other to be "Honourable".

JF I see, right.

TRENORDEN Or be a minister, so I am pleased not to be "Honourable".

JF Right. I always get confused with those things. Thanks for putting me right. [Shots audible in the distance, from Swanbourne Army Barracks]

TRENORDEN It's a minor, minor thing, but it's the system.

JF I wondered if, just to start with to get you talking, your personal life has changed somewhat since we last met, I think.

TRENORDEN Yes, greatly.

JF So, tell me a little bit about that to begin with.

TRENORDEN There's a lot changed in the time since we spoke. One of them (I've just got to count back) is marriage. So I married on March 13th, 2009, I suspect. [Married Veronica Anne Lee] I'm glad my wife is not here; I'd be in trouble. But I got the date right. Big change, because I'd been single or whatever the term should be since 1982. As we said before, I brought up my own children. So, getting married again was important to me and very pleasing, but also the sponging of politics from my soul is another one. And I'm very pleased with that. I won't ever not be a political animal, but running as an independent in the last election in the upper house with almost no chance of winning was a bit of a purifying bit, because I was able to put my name up and argue for the things that people wanted me to back, but in not winning it is no longer my responsibility. At 65 I was getting tired of carrying those issues. I was very passionate about them, but chances of winning then were pretty close to nil, unfortunately. We'll talk a bit about that, because I still can't see why they weren't winnable. But the climate of the time just made it very difficult to be a part of the Nationals ... and a good friend of mine, Phil Gardiner . . . so we did run and losing was just an end.

JF A final?

TRENORDEN And I was not unhappy to see that end come. In fact, I'd be pretty unhappy if I was in the Parliament right now. [Shots still to be heard]

JF Yes; they're not having an easy run, are they?

TRENORDEN No, and making silly elementary mistakes. It's amazing, chatting about history as we were a little earlier, it's amazing how people can't seem to learn from the past; from past mistakes.

JF History teaches that history teaches nothing.

TRENORDEN True, but it's a bit sad to see it all happening. But, on the other hand, I'd have to be arguing against many of those issues and it would be a very unhappy time.

JF Tell me, have you done any travel in the time since we met?

TRENORDEN Not a lot, because my wife has a 91-year-old father who's living in his own home; a lovely old fellow and an ex-minister of religion [Rev Maurice Clifford Lee]. Living by himself, he's not as competent as he thinks he is, but he won't move out of the house, so it's a bit of an anchor on us. But in a few weeks' time I'm off to America, and I really enjoy America. I think Americans are very badly represented in people's attitudes. When you go to America, they are great people. I'll be spending five weeks doing a few things that I want to do. One of them is spending a week in New York, because the last couple of times I haven't appreciated New York, but we're going with a local who can show us things and maybe my view of New York will change. But I'm looking to head up to the Appalachian Mountains. I'm not a city person. I like small towns and hillside. I enjoy doing that. But I've missed out the real reason I'm going. I'm going to the Kentucky Derby. I've always been a racing person and I've always thought the Kentucky Derby was the icon of all thoroughbred horseracing. But it's not just the Derby we're going to; we're going to several studs and seeing the most famous horse sale in the world, and just watching that will be of interest to me.

JF I'll just say while we are pausing that the shots in the background are very real. They are coming from the Swanbourne rifle range.

TRENORDEN No; probably the SAS more likely.

JF But they are not endangering us.

TRENORDEN We're not running, no.

JF Going right back then to 2008, and leaving the personal side of things and going into the political, what considerations did you have in mind when you decided to contest a Legislative Council seat right back in 2008?

TRENORDEN Well, that was a very unhappy time. Wendy Duncan was the President of the National Party and she rang me countless times to try to convince me not to run in the seat of Central Wheatbelt. I, in the end, agreed not to run in the Central Wheatbelt, but for one reason and one reason only, that I saw it destructive

to run in the Central Wheatbelt. So, being at that stage in my early 60s, Brendon Grylls in his early 30s, I would have won the seat either as a National or as an Independent. I don't think there's any doubt about that. But it would have pushed Brendon Grylls to the upper house and we would've had a different history in the last four years. But that didn't come happily to me, and particularly seeing that the deal (or whatever you call it) with Wendy Duncan and the National Party was never kept. Soon as they got what they wanted, they dropped all pretence of being pleased that I would step aside for Brendon. So, I have regretted that ever since, even though I don't regret being in the upper house. It was an interesting period, and the upper house has a particular role, and maybe we can talk about that.

JF We will go onto that, yes.

TRENORDEN But, personally, I will always regret doing that.

JF The alternative was to resign then, wasn't it?

TRENORDEN And leave Parliament. But, again, I was 60 and I still felt very fit and very keen to go on, and the issues that we'll talk about were burning hot and the National Party weren't showing any interest in the things that you'd expect the National Party or the old Country Party to do, they just wouldn't do. It's an amazing period and quite interesting, so I did want to fight for those. But there were two other burning issues for me. One was I was very interested in the King Edward disaster where, off the top of my head, and this is not meant to be history, something like 59 children died at King Edward. It was buried by the state. The parents who were victims of the process had to sign legal documents declaring they wouldn't talk about it. It's just an issue that in my view just stinks. I really detested that whole process, and I felt that that should come out in the open. I still think today it should come out in the open, because even though there were some very high profile doctors, and I think probably very decent people, who would get somewhat damaged in the argument, what actually happened should be recorded. [Bird calls in background]

JF Should be on the public record.

TRENORDEN Because, in my view, not the deaths but the practices that led to the deaths are still happening right now.

JF Really?

TRENORDEN And nobody seems to want to change it. So, I was very angry about that. I was very angry about Michael Moodie, who was the whistleblower, and the way he was treated. He was treated abominably, just terribly. You just can't describe how badly he was treated. That was because the system, the public service, didn't want to upset a few other people. Same thing. So, a person who exposed and did great service to the state got crucified, which is a common story we all know, but it's not something that makes me feel too good. But also the role of the public service. I was always concerned about the role of the public service, and when I was on the back bench I spent a lot of time with Colin Barnett and Liz Constable and we used to talk about it a lot. I'm surprised at Colin Barnett and the way he's gone. The public service, the way it's structured in Western Australia, looks after the public service. If you look at the UK or Canada, the public service is set up and administrated by private enterprise. So, they're bringing in people on a part-time basis to sit on a commission to drive the public service on private enterprise principles, where here we've got one individual who's answerable to nobody. In fact, Justice Wayne Martin brought a paper out not long ago pointing these facts out. He's accountable to no-one. It's not about the person. It's about ...

[Lawn-mowing audible in the background]

JF Having control.

TRENORDEN ... having the role, the set-up. So, accountable to no-one; and if you look at the decisions, looking after what's deemed to be right for the public service, not what's deemed to be right for Western Australians or for good general practice. Mixed amongst all of that, to make it even worse, the committee that I used to chair and the CCC [Corruption and Crime Commission] committee last year, but this Parliament, brought out a report and others have talked about it where the commissioner of the public sector calls in the core individuals for accountability (the Auditor General, the Ombudsman, you run through the full list) and has meetings with these people in secret. In reality, their jobs are reliant on the commissioner for public service. Really incestuous, very ordinary process. Should be stopped. I was

passionate about trying to get some movement there, but I got ... a lot of people supported me verbally but no action.

JF So that was motivating you in the 2008 attempt to get into the Council?

TRENORDEN Along with a range of Central Wheatbelt issues and Geraldton issues too, the issues around the mines of the midlands – the midwest. So, there was a range of issues that I was hot about and current about, and I'm still hot about it in 2014. The difference was that it was impossible to achieve anything.

JF As it turned out, of course, your side of politics won the election and you were catapulted into the upper house. First of all, talking about the actual campaign itself, was it much different campaigning for a Council seat as it would have been for an Assembly seat?

TRENORDEN Very, very different. Again it is something that worries me about Western Australian politics. To win a seat in the upper house, you don't have to have anything to do with any constituents. It's all about getting the tick from your party. Whoever gets the tick from the party gets the job, no matter how good you are or how bad you are. To a degree, the constituency is too compliant about it. They could really do things differently if they wanted to. But, yes, very different. There's no accountability in being elected into the upper house. Very different. Felt very strange.

JF So what did you do as a means of campaigning?

TRENORDEN I would go to places where other people could not make. So, where the lower house members could not get to and where my colleagues could not get to, I would go to places where I could be by myself. I dislike sitting behind leaders nodding my head and that sort of stuff. I couldn't stand doing that. No-one told me, or a few people tried to tell me what to do, but I ran my own process. I'd look for places I could go and be of influence where I'd be the only National there.

JF Such as?

TRENORDEN Public meetings in the wheatbelt, events, meetings of local governments; there's a whole raft of things that happen.

JF Did you use anything in the way of radio or TV appearances?

TRENORDEN A little, but you've got to be a bit careful. It's true that you can't say too much as an upper house member because the lower house members make government, and if you happen to say something in contradiction, it's a problem. So, no, I didn't do much of that at all.

JF And the usual sort of things like posters and letterbox drops, was that all similar?

TRENORDEN Very similar. There were posters and there were six, I think, in the campaign trying to get elected from the National Party, and four got up. It was a very, very big effort. So there were posters of that team put around places and posters of Brendon with that team. But not an enormous amount, not like you do with a lower house seat.

JF So, you were very happy, I suppose, with the result.

TRENORDEN It was a very good result and I went there full of hope, because for the first time in the time of the National Party (if you go back to the Country Party it's a bit different) we had four members in the upper house, and four members of some note, particularly seeing that the Greens also had four and Labor and Liberal made up the rest. So, it was an interesting mix in the Council and despite the view of some, Phil Gardiner and I made sure that the National Party weren't the photocopy of the Liberal Party. We took things on issues only and argued on issues only and quite a few times upset people, but looking back I don't [think] we were wrong on any single case.

JF That sounds a nice position to be in.

TRENORDEN It was enjoyable, and being chair of the Public Administration Committee gave me the opportunity, even though I was not keen to do it because I did many years in the Public Accounts Committee and it was really a bit of déjà vu, but we were still able to achieve a fair bit in that committee.

JF I'll come to that committee service in a little while. But tell me about the quota system for getting over the line. I mean, I think the Nationals got 35 per cent of the votes in the first count, didn't they?

TRENORDEN I can't remember. I'd have the details here somewhere, but yes very high. So it is the number of votes in the electorate divided by seven to get six people. So the one seventh is never counted, but the other six are. So, people are getting fairly noisy about this election coming up on Friday, [Federal Election 2014] but I don't have any problems with it. The fact that somebody's thought about how they could use it is hardly a surprise, and the Greens used to do that for years. They used to muster up all the small parties, and to have someone else do it on the opposite side changed things. But in this particular election, we got a very strong primary vote and didn't need too much in the way of preferences.

JF Yes. There was you and Philip Gardiner and Mia Davies, I think, was there too.

TRENORDEN Mia Davies and Colin Holt, and Wendy Duncan was already there so we had five.

JF Actually, I've got a record of that here.

[End of File TRE-10T01]

File TRE-10T02 Duration 41m20s

TRENORDEN Just looking at the figures, you're right. We won three out of the Central Wheatbelt area, which was myself, Philip Gardiner and Mia Davies, and then we had Wendy Duncan out of the Mining and Pastoral and then Colin Holt out of the South West, so it was a very strong result for the National Party.

JF It was, yes. Once you'd got into the Legislative Council, what were some of the obvious differences you found between sitting there and sitting in the Assembly?

TRENORDEN Despite people's view (and I used to really enjoy interjecting in the lower house) I think interjecting and what people say they don't like actually is important in the lower house because it tests the character of people, tests the mettle of people to see how quick they are, to see how they actually understand, because the problem with asking questions and those sorts of issues, you don't get answers, so the best way to get answers is to try to put people under some sort of pressure. I enjoyed all that but in the upper house that doesn't exist. It does, but on a very, very minor basis. So that was one big difference. The calmness of it and the routine of it was a shock because the upper house has fixed hours and goes through those fixed hours. But it is a very different house and still is trying to establish its place in the world, the upper house. I've argued for many, many years that it shouldn't exist and doing four years there has mellowed my view on that. The reason I used to argue it shouldn't exist is that people like the Greens try to make it the lower house. They have had one person ... in that election they had one in Fremantle, but because they don't have a voice in the lower house, they try to make the upper house the lower house and try to make decisions and drive things from the upper house, which is not the intention of an upper house.

JF No; it's a house of review, essentially, isn't it?

TRENORDEN Yes, and very few members of Parliament understand that, particularly the ones sitting in the room because they are there for their own personal reasons, but a lot of them are there for party reasons. But many of the better and

more stable members up there understood it. You could always see an edge in several of the senior Labor Party members and Liberal Party members of the understanding of where they were and how they carry themselves a little differently. Even though I had a lot of arguments with Norman Moore, I admired him because he was genuinely very protective of the Council and understood the Council better than any other of the members. [Lawnmower audible again]

JF He'd had a few years to do it, hadn't he?

TRENORDEN He did, but he had a true appreciation of what a Council was meant to do. He would often talk to the President and members of the staff about the procedures because he was a bit overdriven on procedures. Procedures are important to make anything work but sometimes they get in the road. It was a big credit to Norman Moore. The upper house will miss him because, even though he would you use the system obviously at times to annoy the opposition and crush the opposition, he still had a strong view of what a Council should be. Many of the other members had no idea what it was meant to be and it's still got an underdeveloped committee process, which Barry House and others have been trying to improve. Certainly, the quality of the staff up there is excellent, but in the end, it's down to the members. If the members won't take their hat off and go into a closed room and work collectively for the good of Western Australia, then there are problems, or (and this is probably the biggest failure) it's not that they won't do that; they don't see it as being politically useful, so they don't want to spend the time on it. I think that's a problem for the upper house which they'll have to try to solve over a period of time. It was a very different chamber with very different attitudes, longer speeches, less interruption in speeches and some very strange operating processes that have been around for a long, long time. On the opening day (this was changed in the last year I was in the Council) you could stand up and move motions. The motions would go onto the notice paper in order and you'd work through those motions, so two years later you're still working on the motions that were moved on the opening day of Parliament, which were often about issues of the election. Urgent issues were way down the notice paper.

JF Is there no way the man in charge of business in the house can bring those forward?

TRENORDEN They can but it's got to have agreement. Agreement is the way to go but why would the government of the day agree to have something that they don't want debated, if they don't have to? But that has been amended and that has been changed and they have now got a process. I don't know how it's working in this Parliament but there were restrictions on the process of government that were a bit strange. But there was a major overhaul of the standing orders in 2012 so, hopefully, that will help the Council a bit as well.

JF Yes. Now, you've mentioned Norman Moore and you mentioned Philip Gardiner in particular. Tell me about some of your colleagues that were of most significance to you in the Council? [Light plane overhead]

TRENORDEN It's interesting, sitting back here, having a different view. If you go through the Liberal Party, I liked Peter Collier because you could go to Peter Collier as a minister and put a point of view and he would listen. Not many ministers actually do that. Many ministers give you the time but not many listen. He would listen, so I had a fair bit of time for him. Nick (what's Nick's surname? Liberal; I'll have to come up with that in a minute) [surname Goiran] chairs the CCC and is an outstanding individual. He won't do super well because he doesn't play the game. Perhaps I saw a bit of me in him, but I like him. He is an ex-lawyer, a high intellect, but also is very keen to do it to his own conscience. I had a lot of time for him. There were very hard workers on the opposition side, like Ken Travers, who worked very hard. Adele Farina worked very hard. I always had a lot of time for Giz Watson. Giz Watson prepared and researched; she must have had good staff. She was always relevant when she debated. I had enormous arguments with Michael Mischin, but over the four years he developed. He was a lawyer and I was sitting behind him and he used to get really angry with me but I'd say to him, "You're doing this wrong; your job is to get the legislation through. You're not here to win every argument. If the argument is relevant to the legislation, yes, but if it's an argument for argument's sake because you don't like the other person's argument, you're just wasting the time of the chamber." He didn't like me for that, but in the end he turned out to be a very good minister. He just took a little bit of time to settle down to it, so I had a lot of time for him. Helen Morton, I had a fair bit of time for. She was very passionate about

what she did. Barry House was a good, very fair President. Matt Benson, I had a lot of time for him, a very practical individual, but I'm starting to run out of them.

JF That's a good rundown anyway on the people that meant most to you, I suppose.

TRENORDEN I guess I'm a bit hard on some of the Greens. It always annoyed me that they had a view that it was okay to exaggerate positions deliberately to scare people. Their argument was that because they were right, by scaring people and over-exaggerating they brought issues to a point, where I just felt that was going over the top. Another one I missed out and had a lot of time for was Jon Ford. Jon Ford was a very solid, very good individual, and I really appreciated Jon. I might be being a bit hard on the Greens but I just didn't like the method of debating.

JF But at least you countered that by saying that you had great respect for Giz Watson.

TRENORDEN Oh, definitely, definitely. Giz was a very good member of Parliament.

JF In your inaugural speech, you set out quite an elaborate plan of obviously what was important to you. I would be interested to know whether you thought you really made any progress over the three or four years you were there in achieving any of those things. You started off by talking about the importance of the regions and awareness that farmers have of sustainability issues and so on. But then you went on to enunciate various policy areas, and energy policy was one. I think I've read it right in thinking you wanted diversity within the energy field.

TRENORDEN And I still do. That was a passion that was something we debated a lot. I actually spent some of the taxpayers' money and went to Germany and UK and USA on that issue and looked at geothermal power and looked at wave power, which were the two ones that really interested me, and I still like to be in that argument. But the problem with getting diversity in power, and I saw this in Germany, where the German government gave substantial subsidies for individuals bringing on things like ... and I saw some amazing geothermal activity and the government

paying for it heavily. But right now the German people resent that because the cost of bringing it on has made German power more expensive than anywhere else in Europe. The fact that one of the drivers was that Putin had one hand on the lever that supplied them the gas and oil, and that worried them. So the problem with getting diversity is getting over the hump of supplying the capital to develop it.

You can see now that wind power has gone through that process and is a cheapish process in which to introduce diversity in power. But wind power has got a lot of shortcomings. It's good to have a percentage of wind power, but not overwhelming amounts because it makes it very hard for the technology to work; it's intermittent, it varies instantly, so there's a lot of technical problems with wind power. But I am disappointed about how things have happened. I think Australia missed the boat. When things were good, they could have, for example, in geothermal (not really picking on government, but I just make the statement) the money was handed out to areas where the votes were most likely to come in, not to where the most efficient geothermal argument was. That happens in every government, every day, so I'm not ... but that still means it was a lost opportunity. I had a long and hard look at solar, and I think solar has a long way to go, and I argued very heavily in favour of panels on roofs, and I still do, even though that has dropped the revenue to the generators. What the government doesn't say, and it's not easy for government, but it's dramatically reduced the amount of peaking power that the state needs. So, even though that's not money in their pocket, it's money they don't have to spend. They don't have to go and get another 300 megawatts of power to find the peaking [power], because the panels have found that, but it has cut revenue. I'm disappointed the way it's gone, but I think it's gone more by economic circles. When you read now that Germany's gone back to their dirtiest brown coal, very poor emissions, because they have to, for a price. Even the people who are passionate about it, 70–80 per cent of Germans still say they want the old system, but they won't pay for it, and I think that's the problem.

JF The old economic issue ruling everything again.

TRENORDEN Well, people always say the government should do it. But the old saying that the government doesn't have money is true; money's got to come out of people. Power won't be the problem into the future as it was; it will settle down a bit. But I really do hope that there's a geothermal group up in Dongara which could supply a lot of power to those evolving mines in the mid-west. It would be the perfect

way, because it's base power; it knocks out the same power every minute. Once you have the enormous cost of putting the drill holes down, it'll run for a hundred years. The geothermal processes I saw in Germany were amazingly efficient.

I went to Hawaii and watched a wave power generator generating power for a Marine base in Hawaii, the same thing. So wave power, I think, is of enormous value. Carnegie here is working away with it, but I think wave power can be introduced with less capital cost. But we have very strong energy because of the width of the Indian Ocean and we could generate all the power we needed just from wave power. I'd like to see a lot more happen in wave power, but that didn't develop, apart from Carnegie. I'm very pleased to see Carnegie going and I hope they can be successful.

JF So, energy policy was one of the things you'd nominated and you say there are mixed progress on that. Food production: you talked about adding consumer value to food. Do you think that's happened over the period?

TRENORDEN Yes, I do. I think it's happening and happening. I must admit I said to a couple of friends yesterday, I've never hated anything in my life, and I still don't hate anything in my life, but if I did hate something, it would be Coles and Woolies [Woolworth's]. They are actually stopping the process. They are not assisting it. It just annoys me to see the advertising they do, because they actually control the capital that farmers have got, and they just screw them down to the base. Even though they are saying they're dealing locally and all those sorts of issues, they are just keeping farmers afloat. For us to meet our opportunities in agriculture, farmers are going to have to make a profit and put that profit back in developing. We all now read, and it's true, you see milk, China's buying milk at \$20 a litre when they can produce it for \$1.50 themselves at home, but it is often so full of poisons at home that ...

JF Nobody wants it.

TRENORDEN Nobody wants it. So, people will buy quality, and they'll buy Australian and New Zealand and other milk, because they're absolutely convinced it is what people say it is: it won't kill their children or make their children sick and so forth. So the opportunities are immense, but they are coming into breakthrough. I was really disappointed with the live cattle ban and how politics could just react to that. Many years ago I went to Indonesia and was shown around by some

Indonesian parliamentarians of how they handle Western Australian cattle. They give cattle to farmers on one-acre, half-an-acre, two-acre lots to fatten up these cows and put into the local production. But unfortunately they do get killed as those films show because they only kill four or five of them. They don't kill a hundred. They don't kill a thousand or 10 000. They do it locally like used to happen here 30 years ago. Now, it's not a good method, but we'd be better off trying to assist them with their method, particularly where they are doing very small numbers of slaughter for local village consumption. We need to understand just how important that money is for those local communities for getting a cow from the North West of Western Australia, fattening it up and doubling its price, and keeping those Indonesian farmers viable and keeping their political or social process (or whichever way you want to describe it) stable is actually quite important. To argue that chilled beef or other beef ... you'd instantly do that if you could, but the locals couldn't afford it. An Indonesian worker gets something like \$2 to \$5 a week. An Australian worker in a slaughterhouse gets a thousand. I'm not arguing he shouldn't get a thousand, but you can understand the Indonesian family in not being able to buy the meat. They need the protein; they've made it clear they need the protein. I went to Malaysia at the time and I was sitting with an official there who was a young lawyer. After sitting with him at a meal for about half an hour or so, he said to me, "What gives you the right to turn our food off?" which is a question I couldn't answer.

JF Yes, of course.

TRENORDEN Are we running out of time?

JF No, that's fine.

TRENORDEN I found that very disappointing, because it's not really about the cattle, although the cattle are very important to the Western Australian regional community; it's about how we deal with a neighbour. So, if we'll turn the food off on beef, what other food are we going to turn off, and for what other reason are we going to turn it off? And food security for the world is such an important issue that we've got to be able to look people in the eye and do what we say we're going to do, otherwise we'll never be able to deal with them.

JF So you think we have made some progress in that area?

TRENORDEN More than I thought we would, actually, and I'm a big fan of slow food and that process of eating seasonally, and I would like the system to advertise it. It does happen a little bit in the weekend papers, but I'd like it to be more that made city people appreciate when apples are actually fresh and not coming out of the coolroom and when strawberries are actually growing, and when things are in season, even lamb, when lamb's in season. So they understand when they're buying something that's coming out of a coolroom or a freezer truck as to being fresh. I mean real fresh, not the advertising fresh.

JF Yes. I noticed you admitted climate change was an important factor, and I think you've said there that expanding into the tropics might be one way of dealing with that problem. Do you want to enlarge on that?

TRENORDEN Well, you can see I'm a great believer in one year, five years, 10 years, 100 years being a blink in the system. I was just watching on TV last night about the ice ages; things move slowly. But, last year, the nor' west of Australia had more rain than ever before, and reading about the time, just last night watching the ice age (even though I know it's a TV program) they're saying when the ice ages came down right through Europe and Northern America, what actually happened, it stopped the snow and there were vast fields of grass, so the climate just moved somewhere else and the animals and the people moved somewhere else. That's what's going to happen. We're going through the same process. Climate change is real. It is going to change. Unfortunately for the world now, we're not nomads anymore; we just don't pick things up and move somewhere else. But we should comprehend where things have changed.

JF I think you were suggesting that we've got the luxury in WA of a wide range of latitudes.

TRENORDEN Well, the Fitzroy has enormous potential, and you can use agriculture in the Fitzroy and not damage the ecology up there. People have been arguing for some time (they've been up having a look) that you could put banks on the flood plains of the Fitzroy River and when it flooded, which is regularly, you could siphon some water off for agriculture, so that would be held in dams and would be used that way. So, there is enormous potential in the nor' west of Western Australia for food, and there's a whole South Eastern Asia that is going to be very rich who

needs it, and we need to make up our minds as Australians whether we are actually going to feed those people.

JF Okay, so we've seen a little started perhaps on the Ord but not a great deal in your time in the Council.

TRENORDEN No, but I think there's a growing appreciation by the system. By "system" I mean by a variation of governments and agencies that the opportunity is there. You read a lot about it. What worries me is that Australia has never done it, so what are we going to do different to enable us to do things we've never done before? So I'm worried about that, but the opportunity is there, and people seem to see the opportunity. It's whether we have the capacity and the intellect to take the chance.

JF To do anything about it?

TRENORDEN And it's not about raping the world and all the other things. It makes me angry. It's about feeding the world and being sensible about it, and there's opportunity there.

JF Yes. The last thing that you mentioned in the inaugural speech related to the need for electoral change, and you had a bit of a complaint about one vote, one value. I was very interested in your rationale there that it doesn't accord with the Australian Constitution.

TRENORDEN No, it doesn't. If you look at the Canadian Constitution and see what the Canadians have done. Like a lot of people (I don't buy it all the time) but I enjoy reading *The Economist*, and there's an article in *The Economist* basically saying that America is no longer a democracy. You start to worry about all those processes. In Canada, they took it to the High Court (I can't remember when, but it wasn't all that long ago in terms of history) maybe 30, 40 years ago and established that one vote, one value is the principle (which I'd agree with) but with weightings for disability; and that's what they do. I believe that's what we should do, because the disconnect between city (even though I'm sitting in the middle of the western suburbs) and country is growing and growing and growing and some of the arguments why things can't happen aren't based on a lot of logic. I shouldn't say "logic" perhaps, but on a lot of understanding. I believe that there should be a

weighting given by people who go out there. You go to some of these places in regional Western Australia and look around and wonder why people live there. They don't have too much in the way of medical services; they don't have too much in the way of schools. Even though some of these towns only have a thousand people and 500 people, they are still there, and they are still delivering a service, and they are still punching above their weight, which is a great cliché. I still passionately believe they should be better represented than they are. The upper house, as I said, really should be looked at, though. To have a house that's really dominated by parties is not appropriate.

JF We've taken quite a bit of time to go through that, but I thought it would be a good basis on which to talk about what's been achieved.

TRENORDEN Bringing back memories.

JF And to get to how you're thinking now, too. Now, looking at some of the things that appeared on the internet, the specific things that you had to deal with in the Parliament in the last three years, there's been quite a few mentions of the rail services for carting grain, which I think both you and Philip Gardiner took on ...

TRENORDEN Just about everyone!

JF Tell me about that issue.

TRENORDEN I find it very, very disappointing. The basic argument about what they call the tier 3 rails is they run in the wrong direction, which is true. They were put there a hundred years ago and for a range of reasons, particularly seeing that road transport in those days wasn't what it is today. But what that argument doesn't allow for is the efficiency of rail. Once you put something on rail and start it moving, the fact that it goes a hundred kays [km] further than the truck, rail does prove to be more efficient. That has a range of other side issues that are important as well, like deaths on roads. It is a lot, lot cheaper to maintain a railway line than trying to maintain a major highway. So, for me and for Phil ... and I can't believe I didn't mention Phil in the bit about colleagues. I've got an immense amount of time for Philip Gardiner. He's a remarkable man, and the fact that the National Party didn't make him a minister and didn't recognise his talents is just amazing. But, still, that's the way it turned out. We could talk about this for an hour, and I'm just wondering

how to summarise. But, basically, the state controls the rail. The state controls the contracts, and therefore the state can do what it likes. In the situation now, the state has got two private parties competing with each other, Brookfield and CBH, who in the contracts have no place; the state is the only player. So, the state can fix this problem up for very little money by giving the authority to one or the other of those two individuals. I'd favour CBH, but it would work with Brookfield as well. Brookfield do have the power under the contract, but only because the state keeps on reducing its responsibilities. The state actually reduced the compliance required by Brookfield to basically nothing.

So, these rail lines have had very little spent on them for a long, long time, which I think is my greatest fear of politics in Australia full stop. No government of any persuasion wants to do any maintenance. The current argument about schools, ports, roads, rail, you name it, governments want to spend money on new things and will leave maintenance till next year. Well, if you maintain rail, it'll just keep going for a long, long time. So, a very small amount of money would have made those lines available.

The other thing that worries me in the argument, in an aside to it, is the range of good and well-intentioned people who basically say all of the wheatbelt should be shut down; it has no future, which I think is absolute nonsense. Even though climate change is here, is real, climate change doesn't happen on a year-to-year basis. Sometimes, like a mini-ice age in Europe, it is 300 years. So, there is no reason why (there is another issue there in crop mitigation insurance) with the right sort of settings, and it is not anything to do with giving farmers money, that you can't keep on going. With the right sort of settings, with crop mitigation insurance, means that when they don't have a return, they can insure themselves against getting their inputs back, so they can go again the next year on their own money; it doesn't need government money. So, if you add that in with good infrastructure, time will decide which areas will be viable and which won't, but the vast majority will remain viable. People out in the areas that people talk about, the Mukinbudins and Bencubbins, have been farming in that marginal situation for decades. As a young man, I used to go out there and play football and marvel at the times when they seemed to know when not to put a crop in and when to put a crop in. They were skilful people, and remain skilful people. Going back to the argument, with three-tier rail, which I and Phil Gardiner argued strongly for, which I think is an absolute lay-down misère, there is 99.99 per cent chance that we were right, and will be right. I just couldn't

understand why Brendon Grylls ... or I do know why Brendon didn't like it; he had a personal dislike of CBH . . . but his job is to be a minister. The rest of the National Party fighting against it, I just never, ever comprehended. I just don't understand and I still don't understand why they did that, but it is important for those regions. Rail is going to prove to be more and more important. Now that CBH have brought in new engines, new rolling stock, they proved without doubt that it is efficient; it is more efficient than road, and it is not as destructive. Yeah, that's a big disappointment, and it is THE number one reason why Phil Gardiner and Max Trenorden and the National Party parted.

JF Which we'll come to in detail later, but just a couple of more things that came up on the internet. Proposed changes to local government: I think that concerned you quite a bit in this period.

TRENORDEN I just believe what they're currently doing is lunacy, absolute lunacy. Again, I have another one! Nigel Hallett, another upper house member who I have a lot of time for. Nigel Hallett is definitely one I need to throw into the mix. Nigel Hallett and I (he's a Liberal) went to South Australia and Queensland and looked at what those states had done. The South Australian model of local government is head and shoulders above everything else. Basically, they have a non-descriptive act. The act says all the things you're not allowed to do fiducially and those sorts of issues, but they don't try to run local government in detail in the act. What they can do in South Australia is amalgamate intellectual activities and decouple when they want to. For example, when we were in the South Australian hills, they were working on amalgamations ... or councils collectively together, on issues of waste and waste management and so forth. The state government announced an intention to run light rail up into the hills, so they reformed themselves around the logical areas so they could be in the right place to argue about the transport. There is no legal getting rid of each other; they just, by agreement, part. In Queensland, we went to one particular council where there was one strong council and three weak councils amalgamated, and the amalgamated council said, "We had three cot cases and one strong council; now we've got one cot case." So amalgamation in itself physically doesn't prove anything, but you don't want 140 councils in Western Australia, but if you allow the intellectual activity to amalgamate, to allow them to come to a legal agreement of how they operate, and allow a lot of those small councils to use each other's skills to work for the better; for example, there's an area which was Cunderdin, York, Beverley, Brookton and

Quairading, all agreed to come together, and one of the shires was going to take on road management, one was going to take on employee management and one was going to take on medical so, collectively, they would have come up with a good result. But the government wouldn't let them do it. They said, "You've actually PHYSICALLY got to amalgamate." In Queensland, the cost per council was \$2 million plus. I know we can't go on forever, but what actually happened was, even though you have the same hardware and you've got the same software packages, when you pay people in each shire, doing the same job, different amounts and different conditions, and when you have shires that have an open, free-range for sport and the next shire charges you for sport, it takes years to amalgamate those things into a working process, and costs a fortune. Colin Barnett has got that very badly wrong, and people aren't going to like it. I went to a meeting just down the road here just out of interest. Four hundred and fifty people turned up; they voted, I think, seven for amalgamation and the rest against, because people love their community. So let them keep their community; make them amalgamate the intellectual effort, like South Australia does. But, yes, again, I think they are very disappointing and I think that's a very foolish process that Colin Barnett is going through and it will be unsuccessful.

JF Just before we knock off for today, there were two smaller matters: bushwalking in water catchment areas.

TRENORDEN That was one of the areas that I did with the committee, and I was very proud of that report. It just shows what a committee that's working properly can do. We got given the charter to do it by one of the ministers because there's dispute between recreational activities, so you've got a department for recreation and then you've got a department for water, and their issues clashed violently. The argument was that water should be kept pure for water, but the argument is beautiful places should be available for people to use for recreation. Both arguments are very logical. But without any doubt at all there's no question that you need to keep your water pure, and it's not dead animals and so forth; it's humans who pollute water. People defecating within half a kay [km] of water and storms and all those things cause enormous problems with water. What actually happened when we actually put the agencies together and banged their heads together, they came to agreement and our report wrote itself. So that was a very good outcome, even though the fishery people didn't like it and so forth, but they were doing it from their understanding of the world. But people pollute water, and there's many, many examples. Just human

particles pollute water, and there's many examples in the United States where there have been dreadful outcomes [and] in Queensland, where they have to pay a fortune. Where they allow recreation on the major drinking areas, they pay a fortune trying to purify it. They describe it themselves as "bum soup". They say there's a disaster coming which they won't be able to stop, because that's just the nature of mother nature. So, I admit that some dams are released from water catchment areas like Wellington Dam, and Wellington Dam should have been released even though it's got a potential for drinking water, but it's also THE major irrigation dam in Western Australia. So irrigation and using water for recreation don't clash, so with just a bit of common sense, some reasonable rules, and those agencies came to agreement. Harvey Dam was another one they worked on, so I was pretty pleased about that. It shows when a committee has got its act together and is focused, it can make changes, and that is one that didn't make much noise in the public but was a very good outcome.

JF Max, I think we'll call that a day for now. Thank you very much.

TRENORDEN Okay, John. Well, sorry I ramble on a bit.

JF No worries.

END OF INTERVIEW, Series 2, Session 1. [End of File TRE-10T02]

START OF SESSION 2

File TRE-11T03 Duration 39m08s

[Max's dog is heard panting nearby]

It's Monday, the 7th of April 2014 and this is the eleventh session in a series of interviews with Max Trenorden, former MLA and MLC, the interview being recorded at his home at 4B James Street, Swanbourne. Max is speaking with John Ferrell.

JF Just last time we were speaking about things that were of significance to you, issues that were of significance when you were in the Council. You've told me you'd like to talk about the water issue.

TRENORDEN Yes, I just skipped last week, water. Phil Gardiner and I spent a lot of time with the Department of Water and others and we had a very strong belief (and I would still have it today and it worries me) that the state should know where its quality water is, even though the resources might be too small to be potable. But as you can see in the last two, three years agriculture has taken a steep climb in interest, and good quality water, even if it is in a small area, can be very useful for high-grade agriculture. So we believed very strongly at the time that that should be done. I think the Department of Water had a high interest in doing it too, but we just couldn't get the budget; we just couldn't get the funds.

JF So you were talking about water for irrigation as well as water for community drinking and so on.

TRENORDEN Exactly. We need to look at the conflict between the requirement for now 2.3 million, or whatever we have got now, people and agriculture. Interestingly, the water for agriculture will be for Asia, hopefully. But, nevertheless, if we are going to meet the needs of Asia, and a lot of that will be vegetables and stone fruit and dairy and those sort of things, then water is going to be important.

JF Yes, yes. And you say that you're not talking about ordinary groundwater and so on such as a farmer might tap or ...

TRENORDEN No; looking at all sources of water. Interestingly, the aquifers are a pretty important source and the aquifer between basically Augusta and Geraldton is broken in three places from seismic activity. But we are drawing out of the northern section of that too much for the mining industry. The Department of Water hasn't had the resources to go east of the mines and find a water source east of the mines to bring it into the mines, and that's actually what we should be doing, and hopefully sometime in the future that will happen.

JF Because miners don't usually need particularly good water quality, do they ...

TRENORDEN No.

JF ... if it's mainly for cooling and sluicing and that sort of thing?

TRENORDEN Yes. Often it can be reasonably saline, depending on what we are talking about. We need to realise people get excited about saline water, but our soil from millions of years of rain is fairly saline anyhow, so as long as you are not increasing the content of that, but watering roads and a lot of other minor but important issues use a lot of water.

JF Yes. Just before we go on, at one stage I think you were Deputy President of the Council.

TRENORDEN No, no; I was one of the Acting Presidents.

JF Sorry; yes.

TRENORDEN They do call it Deputy President.

JF Yes. I just had this letter which ...

TRENORDEN Sometimes it's titled that, but what it was is I was one of the members who assisted the President in sitting in the chair and running the chamber.

JF And I was going to ask you about that because coming from one chamber to the other, I guess there's slightly different standing orders and so on. Did you have any problems mastering that?

TRENORDEN No, no, not a lot. One of the great things I did in my youth was I went to Rostrum and Rostrum was very strong on chairmanship; it is chairmanship. With two Clerks sitting next to you, it's very hard to make a mistake, but the rules, even though they're different, they've got the same intention. So long as you follow the rules, keep the rules in front of you, it's not that hard. And also it is important that you have a certain attitude up there. It's about being fair and it's about letting members know what you'll take and what you won't take, and in the upper house, interjections are frowned upon. [Motor-bike heard, passing]

JF Does that mean they're minimal?

TRENORDEN Well, actually, they're good; they're intelligent, probably more intelligent than in the lower house, because members know the Chair will allow them to interject and say something as long as it's not repetitive. It's the repetitive interjection that the upper house object to, so members do tend to be a bit more circumspect about what they say; even though it might be cutting or blunt or whatever, they don't do it as often. [Bird calls in the background]

JF Did you have that Deputy President post from the beginning of your time in the Council?

TRENORDEN Yes, but I gave it up about two years or ...

JF Yes; it was the 18th of May 2011 that you wrote the letter resigning from it.

TRENORDEN Yes. Well, I found that it actually cut into the things I wanted to do. You'd see the list. The switch[board] tell me I was THE busiest backbencher in the Parliament, so I had a lot of people coming to see me. When you're sitting in the chair for long periods of time, it cuts your opportunity to do ...

JF Yes, you can leave the chamber, but you can't leave the chair.

TRENORDEN That's right. An experienced member of Parliament, but members of the public don't understand perhaps, but you do have an ear on the audio and you do have an eye on the TV set and you can easily tell when you should be back in the chamber.

JF Now, you were also Deputy Chairman of Committees. Is that part of the same role?

TRENORDEN It was part of the same role. I enjoyed being on the privileges committee because that is the committee that actually recognises the authority of both houses. We said something last time, so no need to say a lot of it, but I do despair in the lack of understanding in members of Parliament of what a Parliament is. If you look at the English, for example, there was a case some five or six years ago where an English Conservative was selling his questions to industry and all sides of the house voted to penalise him. In Australia, both in the federal scene and the

state scene, the colleagues tend to back them up no matter what they've done, which is wrong. When you've done something wrong in the chamber, like Craig Thomson, [Federal MHR] (not to carry on forever time wise) in my view [he] has two separate things to answer for, whatever the law says. But he must answer to the Parliament. If they think he's lied to the Parliament and if they think he's misled the Parliament, then he must face that. I read in the paper a few days ago that there was double jeopardy. No, it's not; there's two different cases. The Parliament may not decide to do anything about it, but at least they can recognise and name him and put what they think he's done on the record.

JF Yes; it's really just a matter of making sure they do work by their rules.

TRENORDEN Exactly. Every time you let someone off, you run the risk (I'm not too draconian in these things) but every time you let someone off on the high end of the scale, then you do weaken the rules.

JF Now, you were a member of the procedure and privileges committee from (what was it?) June '09 till May '11. What were some of the major issues that that committee reported on or that you had involvement with?

TRENORDEN THE major thing was a massive rewriting of the procedures of the Council, and that was just an enormous job. They had too many members on it; 12, I think, or maybe 10. But whatever the number was, it was far too many and they couldn't progress with it until they reduced it a bit, so they reduced it to the leadership groups, so Wendy Duncan stayed on for the National Party and I went off that. I wasn't all that unhappy even though I had some fairly strong views about some of the things that happened, because it just wasn't progressing; it wasn't going forward.

JF No; it's often the way with too many people on a committee, isn't it?

TRENORDEN Definitely.

JF So that was the major thing that came out of that. You were chair of a Standing Committee on Public Administration.

TRENORDEN That was a very good committee. Every now and then, and I had it in the lower house ... but we had a very different group of people on that

committee who worked together really well, and we did some outstanding inquiries in my view. We talked a little bit about the water one last week. We were going to inquire into the public service, which we talked a little bit about last week. But the major one that had an impact, I would say, for the first time in living memory, or I am not sure it has even happened before, the committee I chaired changed the way Western Power ran. Our report was of enormous influence. The CEO resigned, but that does not make me smile; no-one likes to see people ... but he did take the committee on, which was a foolish thing to do, and he did show, again ... and a lot of public servants do it, they don't see us respecting Parliament, so they don't respect Parliament. He actually came in and told us he wasn't going to answer questions, because he thought he could. In fact, the Solicitor-General told him, or someone of the department of the Solicitor General told him, that he could not answer questions, and he got chewed up and lost his job. But that wasn't the issue; the issue was we'd worked on that committee for a couple of years, I mean, a long time. We'd looked at the issue of poles, a lot of deaths, unfortunately, a lot of destruction of property and a lot of threat, into the future, of the same. When we were able to force the point, the regulator, the Office of Energy and safety, to their credit, had been saying all the right things about safety, but because they had a view about their role, they weren't very vocal about it. We were very critical of the Auditor General. The Auditor General didn't pursue quite a few of the issues that were raised by the Office of Energy and we pursued him on that and he had a very poor response to us, we thought. We basically gave him a cross in our report; it probably hasn't happened to an Auditor General before. But it has changed the board of Western Power, changed the management of Western Power, it forced a severe look at the operation of Western Power and gave Western Power an opportunity to reset its objectives.

Basically, and it is important to say this, the way they looked at was their job was (and this is what their CEO said to us) his job was to look after the minister. His job's not to look after the minister at all; his job is to be responsible to Parliament. The minister's a part of that process, but only a part of it. So they were writing up reports and actually clearly influencing auditors to get the outcomes they want, so the minister wouldn't be embarrassed, so Treasury could be placated with not wanting to give them money. So they were setting their messages to suit THAT instead of saying what actually was necessary. That is what we said to the new CEO. The responsibility is to come out and say, "This is what's required." If government says no, government says no, but at least it's clear and open, and that can be judged by people. It was a pretty substantial outcome. It's probably amongst half a dozen things

that I really thought made me feel good about that term in the upper house. That was a good committee, everyone pulling their weight and all on tune. Even though we obviously debated amongst ourselves, we had good outcomes.

JF You were chairing that one, weren't you?

TRENORDEN I was chairing that committee, yes.

JF Just for the record, who were the other people on it?

TRENORDEN Jim Chown, Jon Ford, ex-minister; he was deputy chair, but having that experience of being ex-minister and being around for a while was useful—Ed Dermer and Ken Baston.

JF One that was more perhaps along the lines of something you were interested in in private life. You were a member of the Joint Standing Committee on the Review of the Racing and Wagering Western Australia Acts.

TRENORDEN Yes, I was, and that's a very big disappointment. That's currently a hot issue at the moment now with the government considering whether they should privatise the TAB or not. The racing industry is always difficult because it's full of vested interests, not only individuals, but between codes, but it's a major employer of people, and a very substantial employer of people. People argue about whether it's the third or fourth biggest employer in Western Australia; it really doesn't matter where it stands, it's just a big employer of people. But to me, even though it might sound something I shouldn't say, it's also an employer of a lot of people who wouldn't get jobs in too many other places, and people who love the animals. Yes, it is an interest of mine and I've owned a few racehorses and I've enjoyed being in the game, but mainly it goes back to my father's influence. He really enjoyed trotters, in particular, but he had an interest in racehorses. Where I grew up there were horses everywhere on farms in those days, so there were always horses around me. But it is a disappointment where it is going at the moment. That's something I would've liked to have got involved in, and I might as well say it here. I put myself up to go onto the racing and wagering board, but I had been told by some members of the Liberal Party I was barred by the Premier and Brendon Grylls from going on it.

JF Well, well.

TRENORDEN Which I find disappointing. I could understand, you know, politics is politics, but even if I say so myself, there's not too many better people qualified to be on it than myself, but that's it. That's just the way it is.

JF Now, I haven't got anything else in the way of committee work that I wanted to draw you out on. Is there anything I've missed?

TRENORDEN There's a few things that I would really like to mention, and a lot of these things I did with two other members, with Phil Gardiner in particular (a lot of work) but also Nigel Hallett. Muresk was the other one, a very important issue to me. We worked hard to get Muresk up, and, basically, Phil Gardiner and myself did that single-handedly. Though Brendon Grylls did, some years ago, put \$20 million up from royalties for regions to make it available for Muresk, which was critical.

JF What you are talking about is Muresk taking on a tertiary function, are you?

TRENORDEN The history of it is (I shouldn't just jump over things, John) Curtin University basically shut agricultural tertiary education down. They argued that it should be moved to Perth because no students wanted to live in the country, and I think off memory they got five people to apply for it. The first time this year, as they reopened, they had 29 apply for it. Many of the students that I spoke to at the ag. [agricultural] colleges were very keen, had association with Muresk, wanted to keep Muresk going. The ag. colleges had been bulging with students for a long time; the numbers just keep going up. Even though five years ago the future of agriculture looked bleak, and that was really why people weren't putting their hands up to go into the courses, today it is the opposite. So it's a matter of helping these things survive. But also, Muresk has now got a different focus. A chieftain of industry, if that's the correct way of putting it, a fellow called Ron Sayers, got involved in looking at using Muresk for a teaching process for the mining industry, arguing that tractors, prime movers and diesel mechanics ... not much difference in the industries. He was very influential also in the activities in trying to get Muresk up, and getting it up. He will start putting people through Muresk on an issue other than agriculture, and that'll help sustain Muresk, because a lot of those first and second sons and daughters of farmers have an opportunity to take up mining and still remain in farming. A lot of people work a week on, a week off, those sort of circumstances, can do deals with

mining companies to make sure they can get their farming duties done, even though with a possibility of the family and the father still being on the farm. But also, the mining industry tell me very clearly and very loudly they much prefer country kids than city kids; they start with a bit of natural knowledge. That was good, not to run for hours.

One of the other things that Phil Gardiner and I did was the retail trading hours [issue] that came into the house, which they didn't bother to brief Phil and I on, which we stopped in the upper house. Absolutely ridiculous legislation. We had a serious fight there, which upset the minister of the day and upset the Liberal Party.

JF What did it propose, the thing you were objecting to?

TRENORDEN Well, we could go on for hours about this, but basically Coles and Woolies and the like (the key anchor people in shopping centres) have monopolies and they have protection. Unbelievable, but they pay very little of the rates; they pay very little of the outgoings. The small shops in all of those centres pay those costs, and this legislation just was helping the big operators to maintain that set of circumstances at a time when you looked at the world, at Tesco and the English and American supermarkets are under enormous pressure, with people wanting to buy fresh and people less inclined to go to shopping markets. The legislation was actually further entrenching, oh well, the privileges that the large get against the small. For example, at the time, in the argument about Sunday trading, there was one shopping centre that decided to open, and a chemist decided to go along with it and opened on Sunday. The chemist got the full amount of bills for the Sunday: the security, the power, everything. That's the sort of thing that's going on in that industry, and is still going on today.

We were arguing about some ability to expose what people were actually paying in rents, including the large. Like, if you want to check the price of your house, you can go to an internet site and see what everyone's house sold around you, but you can't do that with leases in shopping centres; because, the shopping centre owners, if that happened, leases would drop and they would lose money. There was a reflection back to Western Australians in that, too, because a lot of people's superannuation funds are in those large corporations that own those shopping centres. But they shouldn't be protected. Like everyone else, if there's fewer people going through the

shopping centres, if retailing is less attractive, if people aren't making as much money, rents should go down, and there should be a capacity for rents to go down. Now, that's basically what it was all about.

Major argument over local government: Nigel Hallett and myself this time travelled to South Australia and Queensland and looked at local government. South Australia have got an open act that allows people to act a lot differently. I just believe what Colin Barnett's trying to do now is just foolish. You can achieve the same sort of outcomes that HE wants by amalgamating the intellectual properties of councils and not the physical properties. We won't go on about that because we've talked a little bit about that.

JF Last week, yes.

TRENORDEN But we started to get involved in things like the Retirement Villages Act, which came in at the same time. We let the minister of the day know we weren't happy about that, because in the case of Queensland, and what's happening here, is there was an assumption, as always (the American governments did this as well, unbelievably) that when you put up a retirement village, property value always goes up, so there'd always be a capital gain in those villages. So the people who bought the units would always sell those units or, after they passed, the family would be able to sell those units for a profit. Lo and behold, that all changed, and legislation didn't reflect those changes and it needed to.

JF There was actually quite a lot of charges and so on which, if you left a retirement village, penalised you.

TRENORDEN Correct, and we were involved in all of that and how that should be made open and how they should be dealt with very quickly, within a three-month time frame and not years in some cases, and just keep the amount of money growing. So that was actually quite an issue.

JF Were you successful in getting things your way?

TRENORDEN I think we will, but it's not gone through yet. Going back, one of the things our committee did, which was a very important inquiry, was strata title. I

don't think the government's going to do the right thing about strata title either, but it's the same sort of questions. When you're in a building that's got 20, 30, 40 owners, how that runs is really quite important, and it's not running well at the moment. In places in the western world and places in Queensland, people haven't thought out what happens when a building's 70 years old and has to come down and has got 100 owners; what do you do? There are some very large unanswered questions there, and about the openness; it's not as open as it should be.

One of the issues I would like to mention, which I was a third player in (I wasn't as important a player as Phil Gardiner and Nigel Hallett) is crop mitigation insurance, which is really quite important. Basically, what we were attempting to do, and I think it will be achieved this year ... the problem, if you're a farmer, it's easy for many farmers to put a million dollars of risk out and have a bad year and get a portion of that back, or very little of it back. So what crop mitigation insurance was designed to do, and it will happen, is that you can insure against that loss. So that means that if you have the year and your outgoings are a million and you get \$300 000 back, the insurance would pick up the \$700 000. But what it also does, which is equally important, is put the risk on to the insurance companies and takes it away from banks. With the fiduciary requirement of banks, farmers are paying a higher interest rate than they need, and that's for two reasons. One is because banks decide they're going to do it, but the other one is if you're a banker and you've got a risk, under the new laws you must put an extra amount aside to meet that risk. So that actually is making the interest rate for farmers go up. So at the moment many farmers are paying double-digit rates for their loans, which is THE biggest reason why they're in trouble. Now, people can survive a bad year or two, but when you've got a half-million dollar loan or a \$300 000 loan and you're paying 10 per cent on it, it takes a big slice of ...

JF Of your profit.

TRENORDEN ... your profit if you've had a poor year.

JF Or your return?

TRENORDEN Yes, if you've had a poor year. So crop mitigation insurance would fill that gap, put the risk on the insurance company, take the risk off the books

of the banks, so the banks would no longer be running that risk. They'd be just running a business risk, not the loss of land and it would be just a trading risk, and banks would be a lot happier with it. It would also mean that people would survive in the industry. There were a lot of people very negative about it, but people were arguing, and even a few members of Parliament who didn't bother to check their facts, railed against it and said, "Oh well, if you had two claims, the insurance company wouldn't cover you." But the three of us travelled to Zurich, Munich and London and heard clearly that this is THE most profitable form of insurance in the world. They do their risk assessment on the world, not on someone's farm, So they wouldn't even do the assessment on Western Australia-wide; they do it worldwide. So they're looking to make a profit over the world, not over the Shire of Wyalkatchem, which is what a lot of people think it was going to be about, and it won't be. Western Australia, since we started agriculture, hasn't had a drought like some states like Queensland have where everyone's involved in the drought. We've always had a situation where some people are doing well enough to get their profits back. So it's a very good thing. It'll sustain agriculture. It'll mean that some of the places that are considered marginal now won't be marginal, because even if places like Mukinbudin, where I've heard the department of agriculture and a few of the scientists in the state argue that people shouldn't be farming there. But people have been farming there with one good year in three for 20 years or more, but if you have this sort of cover it means that even though your premiums will be larger, the good years will give you a profit, and the years that you don't do well you'll get your money back, which means you survive ...

JF And you can put another crop in the next time.

TRENORDEN ... and put another crop in and go again. I asked a few people, when we were doing public meetings on this, and there was a young farmer from Bruce Rock and others with young families. I said, "You've got outgoings of ..." (and I think he said \$800 000 or \$900 000) "why would you add another \$40 000 to that?" He said, "Max, it'd be the first bill I'd pay, not the last, because I'd get my \$900 000 back."

So that was very interesting and very important and, as time goes by, it will be very substantial to the agricultural content.

JF Industry, yes.

TRENORDEN Another thing I did a lot of time on was Oakajee, and I won't talk a lot about it, but I really believe that we need to do a special power deal for around the midwest where they have their own grid, their own generation, because there is a long way to run power from Perth to Geraldton. The loss on the way is quite substantial. The cost of the power line going up there was something like a billion. So there's a whole raft of gas, geothermal we spoke about last time, emerging solar, a whole raft of alternative ... wave power would be another one, plus the standard generation where the Geraldton area, or the midwest itself, could do its own grid. There's going to be an expansion east. There's prospective mines all the way east out to Wiluna and other places, and there should be a corridor stuck between the railway line around about on the line that runs up from north of Kalgoorlie to the line that runs north of Perth; they should be joined together, so the ports of Esperance and the ports of Geraldton could be used by miners and give them an option but also have a corridor down which you could run water, which we talked about before, power and other services. That was something we were quite interested in. I would like to see that happen sometime in the future, but who knows?

JF So there haven't been any concrete plans taken up at all that'll work towards that?

TRENORDEN No, there's not even a plan. It was pretty clear. I understand how governments go. Oakajee was a big, strong argument, and the Labor Party had a view on Oakajee and the Premier had a view on Oakajee, but you could see what they intended to do with Oakajee wasn't going to work. It just meant that plan wasn't going to work; it didn't mean another plan wouldn't work. So, if you look at Australia and how ports and mines have been developed, it is the close-in mines that start the ports and that's what should be happening. To rely on mines that are 400 and 500 kays [km] away from Oakajee was always making it a risky ...

JF Project.

TRENORDEN ... proposal, but there are mines that are within 200 or 300 kays of Oakajee which will make Oakajee go. One of those mines is Chinese owned; the others are not. But there's others wanting to start. That's what'll start

Oakajee. Oakajee will get going; it will be an important growth prospect in Western Australia, and the Chinese will want the iron ore.

There were some minor things. We could go on forever and ever and ever, I guess, but there were some minor things in the Parliament I was really worried about in terms of the future. Things like the Prostitution Bill was going through, which we spent a lot of time on, which always seemed very sad to me. Another very painful issue was the year 7 students in the country areas. A lot of parents out there, particularly mothers, were horrified with the mid-school and year 7 because their children leave home too early already and this makes them leave home another year early.

JF Yes; all right. So those who were going to go to city high schools or so on were leaving early.

TRENORDEN Yes. What always worried me about the argument all the time, the 20-odd years I was in Parliament, people would say, "Oh, but you're going to Scotch College and so forth anyhow." That's the wealthy sons and daughters. It's not the people living in the towns, it's not the shire worker, it's not the general population of regional areas [that] can't afford to send their children to Perth. People say to me, "It's no different than sending your child to a residential in Perth. It costs no different than keeping it at home." But that's not true, but also just doesn't allow for some of the skills of these people. They live week to week, so [to] ask them to find \$2 500 a quarter ...

JF In a lump.

TRENORDEN ... in a lump sum, they can't do it. So I worry about what's going to happen to the education processes of the youth in the regions. If you look at the Western Australians who've done very well, many of them come out of the regions. My mother always raved about her school, which had one teacher that taught all classes, and she told me about the people who did extremely well from that tiny, little school. So I worry about how that's going.

Another issue that I think is a bit like ... whatever's happened to the psyche of people at the moment . . . but fracking, for example. There is no evidence that fracking is a danger in Western Australia. There's overwhelming scientific evidence that it is not.

What worries me is the people who get the vendetta going between fracking on coal and non-coal. Coal fracking IS a problem, because the coal and the water are at the same level. That's identifiable and there are some of those that should just not go ahead, but the general fracking of seam coal is way below the aquifers and for many, many years they've been safely run. To mix the two together, I just think it's people just not being honest.

JF Or else uninformed.

TRENORDEN I think more not being honest. I think people do fear the future. People have always feared the future, so a fear campaign is easy to run. So, to repeat myself, fracking and where the source of fracking is close to the water, yes, definitely [is] an issue, but in 90 something or other per cent of the cases in Western Australia, it's not the case and it's actually quite safe to frack. I still hear people on radio saying they keep the chemicals a secret. That was not true. There's an open website where you can read what chemicals are being used. That's an issue that worries me because energy for Western Australia is going to be important. Small population; large resources. We need to make sure that we have some resource in Western Australia that gets to ordinary Western Australians cheaply.

JF Now, you've exhausted your list of issues you wanted to speak of, have you?

TRENORDEN No; there're many things. The interesting thing about myself going to the upper house, John, was my constituency didn't allow it. I remained the lower house member, no matter what I tried to do, which is fair enough because I'd been dealing with them for many years. They'd ring up and we'd say, "Well, you should be speaking to Brendon Grylls because he's your lower house member", but they didn't want to do that.

JF I think you had to have something to say about asylum seekers in Northam. Is that an example of the locals still expecting you to do a lower house job?

TRENORDEN Exactly. There were some issues, but that was greatly ... most of the people in Northam were unperturbed about the asylum seekers going there. What people tend to do is forget history very quickly. Thirty thousand plus disabled ... Disabled! What was the ...

JF 'Displaced' persons.

TRENORDEN Displaced people; that's what I was trying to get, John. Displaced people went to Northam after the Second World War and they came from everywhere. So the community of Northam, it was not new to them that someone foreign might be turning up on their doorstep. It was more concern about the security of it and also whether the community itself would get some gain in terms of employment and in terms of supplying services to the centre. There were some people concerned about safety, but as we've seen, there's been three or four breakouts and people have just wandered around and done no harm to anyone. So I think that's another good example where media and issues sort of get out of hand. Like, this last election on the weekend and Clive Palmer. I just can't believe that the media just doesn't get it. I mean, for years they kept Joh Bjelke-Petersen in power by attacking him. Then they created Pauline Hanson by attacking her, and those famous statements of hers saying, "Please explain" or "I don't comprehend" or whatever she said, and the ABC attacking her violently for being ignorant actually made her. I've got no doubt that's what happened to Clive Palmer here; the more the media attacked him, the more likely he was to get votes. So I think there's some sort of disconnect with the media and history, I think. So some of these issues, they just don't get right.

JF I think, would it be true, the media are really looking short term?

TRENORDEN Just for today's story.

[End of File TRE-11T03]

File TRE-11T04 **Duration 29m03s**

TRENORDEN So where were we?

JF Actually, that's good question! I think you were saying that although you were an upper house member ...

TRENORDEN No, we were talking about the media, I think.

JF Yes, the media; that's right, the media with their short-term creating ...

TRENORDEN I was saying the majority of my people were concerned about it, but they weren't over the top about it. Most could see jobs, most could see the butcher getting a bit of meat up there and the bakery getting a bit of bread up there and maybe a bit more medical attention into town.

JF Yes. Okay. If we've covered all the issues that you thought were relevant to talk about while you were actually a member ...

TRENORDEN Well, I'll mention one more and we'll move on.

JF One more, will you?

TRENORDEN Righto? So, ready to roll?

JF Yes, ready to roll.

TRENORDEN The other one is health. The National Party and Brendon [Grylls] and 'Royalties for Regions' put nearly \$600 million on the table over a four or five-year period to improve country health, and next year that period is going to go and there's going to be almost no gain out of it at all. That's not because the National Party was terrible or the ministers were terrible, but it was because the agency is terrible. Country Health have put the foot on the hose, manipulated the system to suit themselves, spent a lot of money on formats which will not be able to be sustained because there's not going to be another \$600 million. So that is disappointing. There was absolutely nothing wrong with coming up with the idea; the idea was right, but it's another case where the bureaucrats get control, members of Parliament and others, not just members of Parliament but a lot of other people, haven't got enough inside knowledge to follow what is happening, and it goes.

Another one I will mention, John, is one that really worried me. In the last 10 years that I was in Parliament, the state government lost about \$2 billion in IT and I tried to get the Auditor General and the Treasurer at the time to do something about focusing on it, but they just refused to do it, and every time the state deals with IT, it's a disaster. You've got a current one coming up with Fiona Stanley Hospital; they can't open the hospital because they haven't got the IT right. Every time IT comes up in

THIS state, and probably every other state perhaps, but this state's the one we need to worry about, they make a mess of it. When Shared Services was brought in, the industry came and spoke to me and I said to Eric Ripper at the time, "This will fail." We spent a billion on it that we know of, but that doesn't account for the fact that all the agencies ran duplicated systems, because Shared Services didn't work, so they had to have another system. So they duplicated all the way through, and that's not counted in the loss, and it ran for four years and lost a fortune. We were told from day one it would not work, but some bureaucrats decided that was the way to go and they're making that decision, seemingly, the same way, John, now, and we continue on. As I say, Fiona Stanley Hospital is completed and it will be a year before they'll be able to get in there, and a part of that reason is the IT.

JF That's incredible and it's not generally known, is it?

TRENORDEN I went to Canada 15 years ago and the Canadians were doing what they want to do at Fiona Stanley then, in path; that is, every Canadian is on a register, so if you ever [have an] accident or have a heart attack somewhere away from home, they can access your information immediately. I know there's privacy issues in that, but they've dealt with that, and they do it with education as well. All teachers' assessments or students' assessments are on a nationwide database, not so the nationwide data can run it, so if those kids move or the parents move or family split up or whatever, the information is there. They were doing telehealth 15 years ago, or whenever it was, and it's just a simple, easy way to deliver health services [over] long distances. I watched a nurse with a person in a mine in Alberta. He had some damage; he'd been crushed a bit. The nurse had him in bed and 2 000 kays away, or miles away, in the Alberta University there was a specialist looking at him and the specialist said, "Just leave him in the bed, put all the monitors on him, we'll monitor him from here and if we need to take him away from there, we will." They saved 50 per cent of what we call flying doctors' fees by just doing that; mountains of money. But we won't do it here, won't look at it. It's as if for some reason this serious look of IT just gets messed up by people probably who don't know what they're talking about. Not that you'd want to give it to me to run, but you can see that other people have done it and done it for a lot of years and done it successfully, but we seem to have to recreate our own and we fail 100 per cent of the time.

JF And you don't really see a solution?

TRENORDEN Well, there are solutions. There should be a small group of people with the intellect. I mean, they tried it years ago with an agency called DOCEP, which crashed as well, which had a similar sort of idea. But there needs to be a small group of people who have rigour with the setting up of these processes. Just a few years ago, five years ago, the Health Department (again, the Health Department) decided they need to do this program which is now still trying to go. They had some people constructing the program, they had people designing the program, they had people auditing the program and they had people implementing the program, and they were all the same people. Unallowable! Just NOT ON! But they did it. To their amazement, it didn't work! [chuckles] But how stupid can you be? Just the basic rules, in particular if you're going to do an audit, you don't have the people who are putting the program together to audit it, but that's what that they did. There should've been major fallout over that; that was another Michael Moodie process. Michael Moodie reported all that to government; got shot for it. It is outstandingly poor. I'm on my high horse; I should get off my high horse!

JF [laughs] Well, we'll come down off the high horse then! I want you to sketch for me ... the last time we talked about the party, essentially, was when we spoke in about interview nine or 10 or so on, which is five or six years ago, and I wondered if you can give me a quick sketch of what's happened to the National Party since we spoke about it in 2008.

TRENORDEN Brendon Grylls is a likeable person with a good IQ, but not a lot of experience; he's got a lot more experience now, no doubt, but that at the time he didn't have a lot of it. There was a whole raft of young people coming in to the party, and I guess this has been a cry of people for 10 000 years, and I'm not anti-young at all, but they decided to basically take the party over. So many of the people who didn't preselect me back in whenever it was didn't know me; most of them would've never met me. They would've seen me standing in front of groups of people, but they weren't interested in me because I was old and gone, and there was a raft of people in their midst who they wanted to promote. So that's really what's happened to the National Party, but I understand from speaking to other people it's not much different than the Liberal Party. It might be a fair bit different than the Labor Party because it's controlled by ... 60 per cent of the votes and in the Labor Party are controlled by the unions. But there is a mood for youth to prevail and we oldies have ruined the world and all those things, and that mood has been around forever, and I think I said it before; Aristotle wrote about that a couple of thousand years ago. So

nothing's new, so I'm not actually angry about that; I understand the process. I would've liked to have had another year because there were a few things I wanted to do. What's happened is, what was valuable to the National Party for 70 years got thrown out; which was unfortunate, because you would've thought it would've been clever to put the two together, but that's not what happened. The agriculture issues, they just did not want to know about. Brendon's operation in his own electorate, well, he just didn't know the difference between being a member and being a member of Parliament.

He would not go into his electorate as the local member; he would only go into the electorate as minister. He'd speak to them, and I was at many, many meetings where he did this, as a minister, and not as their representative. In the end they didn't like him. Part of the reason why he decided to run in the Pilbara was it was highly unlikely that he'd win his seat. He was very, very unpopular and he was very crude and blunt to them in many, many meetings. It just amazed me that a local member would treat people like that. Your first responsibility in my view (my view's very minor in it) but I would've thought in any text book is that you're elected by the people and you're a representative of the people. Well, the National Party forgot a lot of that. 'Royalties for Regions' was a very good idea. It was actually born a bit before Brendon's time, but Brendon and Wendy Duncan and others picked it up and ran with it, which was really good, a major tick to them. But without that I think they'd be in a lot of trouble. This election [federal election 2014] that just happened on the weekend, their vote went down by nearly half. They need to be worried about it, because once people think you're not representing them, you're in trouble. At the moment, their view is somewhat different. Mia Davies, who went through my office and [from] the family farm right beside us. I've got a lot of respect for the Davies family and I like Mia a lot, but she doesn't act as a local member still. When people ask her questions, she always says, "I'll go back and ask Brendon and ask the party what our position should be and I'll come back and see you." That's not what people want to hear. You're elected to represent them; what are YOU going to do? She hasn't got that yet. Hopefully, she'll get that; she's only young, so hopefully she'll get that into the future. People get very angry.

I found in my career on many, many occasions, you can argue with your constituency, you can have different points of view, but in the end they need to know you're representing them at least 50 per cent of the time. If you're not doing that, well, I don't think you've got a right to be there, parties or no parties. You're a very

foolish member of Parliament if you don't listen to your constituency because it's not about staying in Parliament; it's actually doing what your constituency wants. So the National Party have lost that. To throw someone like Phil Gardiner out ... he was a founding partner in Macquarie Bank. He ran several very successful processes in Sydney, was the most qualified person in the National Party to be a minister but never looked like getting a ministry for all the wrong reasons. A bit like today's paper with the Labor Party; it's become a clique, the National Party. Hopefully, in a period of time that'll broaden a bit and it'll go back to being what it was, but at the moment it's run by a very tight group of young people. Wendy Duncan, who you would've thought would've been the next minister, didn't get a look in because the young group within the National Party put a young person up. As I say, I like Mia, but you look at the experience of Wendy Duncan to the experience of Mia and say, "Who should've been elected?"

JF How did it come to that point? I mean, there were quite a few people retiring and getting out of politics, I suppose, at a crucial time, was there?

TRENORDEN No; very hot and sometimes ferocious arguments about things like three tier [rail]. A lot of the supporters of the National Party just stopped turning up because they're going to conferences and going to state councils, arguing things that were important to them they knew weren't important to the new National Party. So it wasn't just that these young people turned up and overwhelmed things; they actually turned up into a vacuum, because a lot of the people who'd been around for many, many years were getting very disillusioned with the direction of the party.

JF All right. Now, come to your own story in relation to deciding to quit the party. Tell me how that came about.

TRENORDEN Well, to be honest, to be flatly brutally honest, I just didn't feel like a National anymore. I just didn't think having myself and Phil Gardiner going into the party room arguing points which we were ... I don't think you can find that any of the points we argued were wrong. Some of them might have been slightly off the mark, but none of the things that we tried to promote were widely wrong, never got supported. The whole functioning of the party, the party room operated differently. It operated like a president; like a president comes in and says. 'This is what we're

going to do.' as against a democratic process. Over a period of years, all that died off. I just felt like the party that I'd spent all the years with ... and it's not the party; I'm not a party person. Perhaps I should put it a different way; the things that I think that should've been happening with a like group of people ... we always used to say the old National Party and the Country Party were a group of like-minded people who came together. There was a weakness politically in that, which 'Royalties for Regions' proved, but morally there was a big strength in it because we used to go to electorates, we often picked people to run for the National Party who'd never been a member of the National Party but were people with the right sort of credentials for the community, not for the party, for the community. That's why we got them elected. Now that's all gone. The party does all the selecting and the community doesn't. It just wasn't the same group of people. You see, that's not right either, because I'm not really worried about the people. It's just that what it was representing was not what I stand for. So it wasn't a hard decision to go. But I had to go to run as an independent, obviously.

JF Yes, and that came to a head for you, didn't it, at a particular meeting or series of meetings?

TRENORDEN Preselection. I didn't get preselected first or second in the process and I pulled out at that stage. But at that stage, I wasn't going to resign from the party and all the rest; it was more that, in my constituency, large numbers of people constantly approached me to run. Phil and I didn't do too badly; we got 8 000 votes, primary votes, and that's all the votes we got. We didn't get a single preference from anyone. On the preference-whisperer process, he was involved; Durie was involved in our election, but I don't oppose Durie. Durie's just using a system that currently exists. We did pretty well in terms of the primary vote. If we'd got even some small flow of preferences, we would've probably got elected. But I'm not sure that would've been a good thing. As I said earlier, I'm pleased not to be there. But it gave me the opportunity to stand for and say the things that ... and Phil (Phil and I are close friends) and a range of other people who stood with us, to say 'These are the things that are important to us.' We did that. We didn't win. That was, to me, not a bad way to finish.

JF Where was your support coming from mainly?

TRENORDEN The central wheatbelt; overwhelmingly, the central wheatbelt. Much of it was around 3 tier rail lines and issues related to the central wheatbelt.

JF One last thing that I came across: apparently, you decided at one stage to not bother to turn up at the House after the election; playing truant, Max! What was behind that? [laughs]

TRENORDEN Yes, playing truant! Well, I have very strong views about Parliament and I have very strong views about what a Parliament is. I just think it's strange that you lose an election and turn up for six months, so I didn't.

JF Yes. This happens only in the upper house, doesn't it?

TRENORDEN In the lower house, the correct procedure happens; you lose and you're gone and the new person's in. But it doesn't matter in the upper house because the full time that I was truant, all they did was speeches, the maiden speeches, and, for the people who were retiring, their retiring speeches.

JF Yes.

TRENORDEN Well, I listened to, in my time, a lot of retiring speeches and the vast majority of them was why I misunderstood and why the things that I didn't do, like we are doing right now, John.

JF [laughs]

TRENORDEN I didn't want to give one of those speeches. What I didn't do (but not doing it and perhaps should've done it) was thank a whole thousands of

people who not only worked hard for the things that I believed in, but also were good friends and close friends, but I preferred not to do that. That was my choice not to do that. I did go in and listen to Norman Moore's, but I didn't go into the chamber; I sat in the gallery. But there was no business conducted in that period that I was there. If there was responsibility for me to vote on something, then I would've gone. But I was making the point that politicians run both houses of Parliament. They run it for politicians; they don't run it for the people. Many of them don't even think about the people. I mean, that's probably pretty harsh, but in reality they don't give conscious thoughts to what they're doing, and the upper house needs to be a different house than it currently is. There's a range of people trying to make it different, but they are not elected members of Parliament. The only people who could really make it work are elected members of Parliament, and there is an argument that the Council has done what it's done for so many years because of Norman Moore, but Norman Moore is no longer there. Norman Moore, it can't be argued that . . . He fought the Liberal Party regularly on issues to do with the Council, very much to his credit; whether he was right or wrong, very much to his credit. Can't see that happening at the moment but it may happen; that may develop. Being truant really was about I was no longer a member of Parliament. I'd been defeated at the election. I shouldn't be in Parliament in my view. No sour grapes in that; that's just what I think a properly functioning Parliament should do. But I've got no qualms about the one ones who turned up, like my good friend Phil Gardiner, who did give a valedictory speech, but, as I said, I didn't want to do that.

JF I couldn't find one on the *Hansard*. [chuckles]

TRENORDEN Well, I never had any intention to do one because ... we've

rattled on for hours. But you do what you can do, but in the end, you're a part of a team and people say that's right, but the team is the Parliament; the team isn't the Liberal Party or the Labor Party or the Greens or the National Party or whoever. The team's actually Parliament, so the first team you should be a part of is the Parliament, and you can see (and we spoke a bit about it last week) people writing about America now, and you see Afghanistan strongly going to vote this weekend. What should happen in a democracy is someone wins government and then is allowed to govern for the period of the term they are elected; sure, with criticism from the opposition, but that's not how democracies are run now. Oppositions are very damaging and, under the current process, it's hard to see how it's going to change. Where it's all changed, John, in my view is, when I first started 25 years ago, the great number of ideas and motions and emotion came from the grass roots. Almost none comes from the grass roots now. So the party hacks decide the policy; the party hacks decide who's going to be nominated, not just in the Liberal and the Labor Party but all parties, including the Greens. So the general process of going to a public meeting and facing 50 people, or, in my time, 200, 300, 400 people, and being a member in front of those people, I just thought were really important times, but they don't happen anymore. As I said before, whenever I called them, the people who turned up were the ones who'd just want to say hello to me. The developing of issues and the developing of attitude and culture, I just worry about.

JF As a final word, what does retirement hold for you?

TRENORDEN I am on a disability board in Northam, which I am interested in doing, but I have got a fair bit of experience and they seem to like me there, so that's something I can do to keep my conscience going. It's a very large body; it does the

central wheatbelt, plus the eastern sector of the metropolitan area, so it covers a large area. It's quite successful and so I am on that. I would have liked to have got onto racing and wagering because it's something I thought I could do, but I was barred from that, which is a disappointment, but still. So, with those things not there, I read a book a few years ago on Benjamin Franklin, and Benjamin Franklin really didn't get going until he was into his 50s. In his 40s and so forth, I gather he was a fairly obnoxious person which people didn't like very much. Later in life he developed a better attitude, not that I'm saying that I'm going to get a better attitude and go back into politics, but I want to have a clear third term to my life that's not associated with politics. I really want to wash my hands of politics. I will always have an interest in it, but I just want to have a different life for whatever is left of my life. So my wife and I are packing up to go America for a number of weeks, which I am looking forward to. I've always travelled. There are many places that I've wanted to go to, but grandchildren and family all suffered a lot while I was in politics. Well, now's the time I can put a bit back and enjoy putting it back. Do things like playing golf. I want to make it the third phase of my life, so I won't be attending party meetings. Well, I'm not a member of the National Party anymore, and I won't ever re-join the National Party. Again, people will say that's out of spite, but it's not really out of spite. It's about moving on. I've had my time. I had a fantastic run. Many people don't get the period of time I had. It didn't finish the way I'd like it to, but 90 per cent of pollies would probably say that or some large percentage of people in politics. I can't complain, John. Life's good, got a fantastic wife, got a fantastic family. My son got married at 42 years of age two weeks ago; going across to that. Life's good. I'm happy doing what I'm doing and I keep on saying to people, even though it's an oxymoron, I always have Bismarck in mind. Bismarck, you know, united Germany and did magnificent work but couldn't stop putting his nose in the pie. I admire many

of our previous Prime Ministers (not that I met any) who do keep out of the public argument. I think once your time has come and gone, it should come and go, and I should use whatever experience I've got for whatever my last bit of my life's going to be, but mostly I've got to say it's going to be selfish; it's going to be about myself and my family.

JF Thank you very much. You've spoken very well.

TRENORDEN No, John, I'm very pleased to meet you over this process over a lot of years now and I've enjoyed it. I hope it's some value to people. People will probably gather when people read it, perhaps, that I'm a sort of a glass-half-full person. I've always liked looking on the positive side of life. Obviously, negatives come and go, but I've been very fortunate to serve a great group of people for a period of time, very fortunate they elected me for a long period of time. It'd be very ungracious of me to be upset for not getting elected the next time, but I am genuine in saying I'm pleased not to be there now. I just would find I'd be too much of an anchor in the process at the moment. I still remain concerned about the functions of the state and the way the state operates. I'm still highly concerned about members of Parliament and the way they treat Parliament, but that's all been said before.

JF Okay. Thank you very much. That's it.

TRENORDEN No, John; thank you for the opportunity.

End of File TRE-11T04, End of Session 2.

END OF INTERVIEW SERIES.