



Parliamentary Debates

(HANSARD)

FORTIETH PARLIAMENT
FIRST SESSION
2019

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, 13 March 2019

Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, 13 March 2019

THE SPEAKER (Mr P.B. Watson) took the chair at 12 noon, acknowledged country and read prayers.

LAVERTON HEALTH CAMPUS

Petition

MR V.A. CATANIA (North West Central) [12.01 pm]: Mr Speaker, I have a petition containing 132 signatures that conforms with the standing orders of the Legislative Assembly. It states —

To the Honourable the Speaker and Members of the Legislative Assembly of the Parliament of Western Australia in Parliament assembled.

We, the undersigned, agree that the construction of a new Health Campus in Laverton is vitally important for the town and surrounding communities to ensure the people of the region receive the medical treatment and attention required. The upgrade will offer a range of services, including a new emergency department, a general practice area, home and community care services, clinical services for visiting specialist, overnight beds for patients awaiting transfer to other facilities and a six-bed aged-care facility.

We therefore ask the Legislative Assembly to inquire into the reduction of funding which was allocated for the construction by The Nationals Royalties for Regions for the new Laverton Health Campus, and reinstate the \$19.5m of RfR funding to deliver the upgraded Laverton Health Campus desperately needed.

[See petition 127.]

LOCAL GOVERNMENT LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL 2019

Notice of Motion to Introduce

Notice of motion given by **Mr D.A. Templeman (Minister for Local Government)**.

ECONOMICS AND INDUSTRY STANDING COMMITTEE — FOURTH REPORT — “WESTERN AUSTRALIA’S SMASH REPAIR INDUSTRY: STRUCTURAL CHALLENGES”

Government Response — Statement by Speaker

THE SPEAKER (Mr P.B. Watson) [12.03 pm]: I have a statement about noncompliance. I advise that in relation to the recommendations contained in the fourth report of the Economics and Industry Standing Committee, “Western Australia’s Smash Repair Industry: Structural Challenges”, which was tabled on 29 November 2018, no response has been received from the government by the required time.

CRAIG PEACOCK — CORRUPTION AND CRIME COMMISSION INVESTIGATION

Statement by Premier

MR M. MCGOWAN (Rockingham — Premier) [12.04 pm]: The Corruption and Crime Commission findings into WA’s Tokyo Office and the conduct of the former trade commissioner, Mr Craig Peacock, are shocking. The CCC has revealed significant misuse of the state’s resources and serious misconduct by Mr Craig Peacock. The administration of the Tokyo Office was previously the responsibility of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, before the public sector changes of my government resulted in the office being transferred to the Department of Jobs, Tourism, Science and Innovation. This systematic rotting overwhelmingly occurred during the term of the last government and only came to light as a result of the machinery of government changes made by this government.

It was the transfer of the Tokyo Office accounts to JTSI that led to a JTSI employee first suspecting serious misconduct in late 2017. I commend the work of those officers for initially uncovering the issue. The matter was then referred to the CCC. The JTSI director general commenced disciplinary action against Mr Peacock in September 2018 and terminated his employment on 1 February 2019. As Mr Peacock’s employment was terminated for misconduct, I can confirm that annual leave entitlements were not paid out to him.

The State Solicitor’s Office has taken steps to protect the state’s financial interests by commencing recovery proceedings against Mr Peacock for approximately \$500 000 plus interest and costs. The SSO has also obtained freezing orders from the court, which freeze Mr Peacock’s assets, or prevent him from disposing of those assets in either Australia or Japan. I was briefed about this investigation by the CCC commissioner on Monday afternoon and subsequently asked the director general of JTSI to refer the matter to the WA Police Force and the Australian Taxation Office.

Western Australia’s eight overseas trade and investment offices assist in delivering a strong and diverse economy that drives job creation, but we need to know that they are working in the public interest. Recently, JTSI has

strengthened internal controls over travel, gifts, hospitality, allowances and expenses within the overseas offices. The director general also commissioned an independent review to consider the effectiveness of current arrangements. The review panel is led by an eminent public administrator, Helen Williams, AC. Ms Williams is joined by two esteemed panel members, Jane Madden and Geoff Leeper, PSM.

An audit of each office will be conducted simultaneously to assess the controls and compliance with regards to credit cards, expenses, remuneration, entitlements and travel of all commissioners and the Agent General. It will also consider the adequacy of existing controls to prevent and detect fraudulent transactions. In addition to this, the director general of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet has asked the Public Sector Commissioner to coordinate an independent review into the governance arrangements in the Department of the Premier and Cabinet between 2008 and 2017 in administering expense claims, other entitlements, and asset management in overseas offices. The commissioner will advise of any changes or improvements to management practices that could be implemented in the department and/or may be relevant to the review and audit being led by JTSI. It is very important that we leave no stone unturned in getting to the bottom of why this occurred and that we do our utmost to prevent it occurring again.

PUBLIC MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES — REVIEW

Statement by Minister for Mental Health

MR R.H. COOK (Kwinana — Minister for Mental Health) [12.08 pm]: I rise to inform the members of the house that the consultation period has opened for the review of the clinical governance of public mental health services. This consultation forms part of the review of the clinical governance of public mental health services that I announced in May 2018. This review was established in response to recommendations made by the 2017 “Review of Safety and Quality in the WA health system” and the 2018 “Sustainable Health Review Interim Report”. Over the next three months, health professionals, community and industry groups, consumers and carers are invited to share their views via an online survey.

The McGowan government is committed to ensuring our mental health services provide the best possible care to Western Australians. This review will inform the changes that may be necessary to the clinical governance of our mental health system. We must continually strive to ensure that clinicians are engaged, the needs of consumers are met, and our services are accessible.

The consumer is at the centre of how we design our mental health system. Consequently, the panel will engage with consumer groups to ensure that the needs of the consumer are at the forefront of the panel’s considerations. We understand that it is not enough to provide services. People need to be able to find those services and easily navigate a system that can be confusing and prevent people from accessing the services they need. The independent panel will meet with a range of stakeholders to seek feedback on clinical governance in our public mental health services, including roles and responsibilities, processes, system integration, and effectiveness and culture. The independent panel comprises a consumer and carer advocate and industry experts, each selected based on their experience and expertise within the field of mental health. Panel members include Dr Martin Chapman, chair; Professor Bryant Stokes, AM, special ministerial adviser; Ms Margaret Doherty, consumer and carer representative and advocate; Dr Peggy Brown, AO; and Dr Grant Sara. Each panel member was selected based on their experience and expertise within the field of mental health. This review, led by a team of experts, will provide much-needed recommendations to allow necessary improvements to be made. I thank the panel members for agreeing to participate in this significant and far-reaching review.

A final report, including findings and recommendations, will be delivered by 30 June 2019, providing much-needed recommendations to allow the necessary improvements to be made.

DRAFT HERITAGE REGULATIONS — PUBLIC CONSULTATION

Statement by Minister for Heritage

MR D.A. TEMPLEMAN (Mandurah — Minister for Heritage) [12.10 pm]: It gives me great pleasure to advise members that on 5 March 2019, I released the draft heritage regulations 2019 for public comment. This is one of the final steps on the road to enacting the Heritage Act 2018. The legislation was passed by Parliament on 12 September 2018 and received royal assent on 18 September 2018. It replaces the outdated Heritage of Western Australia Act 1990. The new legislation ensures better protections for important heritage places, streamlines processes and will provide greater certainty for owners wishing to adapt and develop their heritage places.

The act came at the end of an eight-year journey involving bipartisan support from both sides of the house. I would like to again acknowledge all the individuals and organisations that helped shape this important and contemporary piece of legislation, and their continued input is encouraged as we finalise all the elements that will ultimately bring the legislation to life. The heritage regulations 2019 have been drafted to support proclamation of the act. They cover a number of matters raised in parliamentary debate on the legislation and I would encourage members to consider them and provide comment.

As part of the state government’s commitment to deliver the best possible outcomes for Western Australian communities, public consultation on the regulations will be open for an eight-week period in line with the state

Local Government Partnership Agreement. The consultation period closes on 3 May 2019 and I would appreciate the support of members in promoting this opportunity to their constituents. There will be a special round of regulations to deal with a number of remaining issues which are not essential to proclamation of the act and which will also be subject to future consultation. The government will soon also be calling for nominations from experienced heritage professionals who are interested in becoming members of the Heritage Council. The Heritage Act 2018 moves away from requiring that council members represent certain interests or groups, and instead sets out criteria for skills and expertise. The new Heritage Council will play a key role in the implementation of the new act and I again encourage members to promote this opportunity to their constituents.

WESTERN AUSTRALIAN CONSUMER PROTECTION AWARDS

Statement by Minister for Commerce

MR J.R. QUIGLEY (Butler — Minister for Commerce) [12.13 pm]: I rise to inform the house that on Wednesday, 6 March 2019, in my new capacity as Minister for Commerce, I had the pleasure of attending and presenting the fifteenth Western Australian Consumer Protection Awards. These awards give us the opportunity to recognise and reward significant contributions in advancing consumer protection in Western Australia. I will use my brief remarks today to congratulate the winners of each award. Firstly, the Kidsafe WA Award was awarded to Skye Quartermaine and the Bolt it Back for Reef campaign, which championed the law changes that would allow tenants to anchor furniture without requiring landlord approval. Ms Quartermaine lost her 22-month-old son, Reef Kite, in October 2015 when he was crushed by a heavy set of drawers at the family's rented home. I remain committed to implementing the coroner's recommendation to amend the Residential Tenancies Act 1984 to allow tenants to affix furniture to the walls of their rental homes. The bill to amend that act passed through this chamber last night and is off to the other place. Secondly, the Rona Okely Award went to Glennys Marsdon, the operator of The Customer's Voice, for giving her time, energy and experience for the betterment of Western Australian consumers. Thirdly, the Richard (Dick) Fletcher Award for a local government, non-government organisation or group of individuals for their services, initiative or project was awarded to the Street Law Centre WA Inc. Lastly, in the media category, ABC Broome reporter Erin Parke was awarded the Ruby Hutchison Award for her reports on the operations of a cruise company that was subject to consumer complaints and eventually went into liquidation.

I would also like to thank all the nominees, and their nominators, and the Consumer Protection division of the Department of Mines, Industry Regulation and Safety for their passion and enthusiasm for consumer protection in Western Australia. It was a true pleasure to be involved in the awards and I look forward to continuing the work in this important space.

PUBLIC TRANSPORT AUTHORITY — RADIO SYSTEMS REPLACEMENT PROJECT

Statement by Minister for Transport

MS R. SAFFIOTI (West Swan — Minister for Transport) [12.15 pm]: I rise to update the house on the status of the Public Transport Authority's radio systems replacement project. The project involves the design and construction of a new digital radio system for the PTA. The project was separated from a broader proposed automatic train control project in 2013–14, with the then cabinet approving the project definition plan in March 2015 based on a business case for the more limited project. A key factor for this project was the pending expiry of the PTA's licence of analogue radio spectrum from the Australian Communications and Media Authority. An expression of interest was advertised on 1 February 2017 and the EOI period closed on 1 March 2017. The EOI did not preclude any companies from bidding.

In July 2018, the PTA awarded contracts for the project's design, build and maintenance for an initial term to a joint venture between Huawei and UGL Limited. In late January 2019, the United States Department of Justice unsealed two indictments against Huawei Technologies. At that time, I committed to confirming with the contractor whether they would be in a position to deliver on the contract as a result of these indictments. On 7 February 2019, at my request, senior PTA staff met with eight senior Huawei and UGL staff, including John Lord, Huawei Australia chairman, to discuss the delivery of the contract. The Huawei and UGL representatives confirmed they would be able to source equipment required for the project. Further confirmation was subsequently received by the PTA. The state government is committed to delivering this project, and making sure that the proponents deliver on their contractual obligations. To that end, the state government will continue to monitor this contract, with the involvement of other key state agencies. As a result of ongoing contractual monitoring, the agency advice is that we are unable to table correspondence at this stage.

I will end on a word of caution. Many people in this house believe that they are cybersecurity experts and experts in international relations. The ever-changing international policy positions of the Trump administration are demonstrated by that administration's dealings with the technology firm ZTE. As stated before, the state government has undertaken an independent procurement process that started under the previous government, sought and followed advice from relevant commonwealth agencies, and is working with other key government agencies on the project's oversight. Ultimately, the state is seeking to provide a value-for-money project of high quality that will meet the operational requirements of the Public Transport Authority and the future needs of our rail network. That is what I intend to do.

TEMPORARY ORDERS 40, 101, 146, 147 — STANDING ORDER AMENDMENTS*Amendment to Notice of Motion*

MR D.A. TEMPLEMAN (Mandurah — Leader of the House) [12.18 pm]: I seek leave to move my motion in an amended form.

Leave granted.

Motion

MR D.A. TEMPLEMAN (Mandurah — Leader of the House) [12.18 pm]: I move the motion standing in my name on the notice paper as notice of motion 1 under “Business of the Assembly”, with the date amended to 19 March 2019 —

That for 2019, the following temporary orders be adopted and commence from 19 March 2019 to the end of 2019 —

- (1) Standing Order 40 be amended by inserting the following sentence at the end of the standing order: “A stranger does not include a member’s baby being breastfed by that member.”
- (2) (a) The sections on “Motions” and “Other Bills” in Standing Order 101 be amended by —
 - (i) deleting “60” as the allocated time for the “Mover”, the “Premier or one member deputed” and the “Leader of the Opposition or one member deputed” and substituting “45”; and
 - (b) The section on “Third reading” under “Other Bills” in standing order 101 be amended by deleting the words of the section and substituting the following —

Third reading —

| | |
|--|-------------|
| Mover | 30 minutes |
| Premier or one member deputed | +30 minutes |
| Leader of the Opposition or one member deputed | #30 minutes |
| Any other member | 15 minutes |
| Mover in reply | 30 minutes |

+ If not a Government bill

If not an Opposition bill
- (3) (a) Standing Order 146 be amended by —
 - (i) deleting “Four” and substituting “Five”; and
 - (ii) inserting the following sentence at the end of the standing order: “The fifth grievance will alternate between government and opposition each week.”; and
 - (b) Standing order 101 be amended by deleting “7” and substituting “6” in the section “Grievance debate (S.O. 146)”.
- (4) (a) Standing order 147 be amended by deleting “Once” and substituting “Twice”, by deleting “six” and substituting “five”, and by deleting “90 seconds” and substituting “two minutes”; and
 - (b) Standing order 101 be amended by —
 - (i) deleting “90 seconds” and substituting “2 minutes” in the section “Members’ statements (S.O. 147)”; and
 - (ii) deleting “Maximum of 6 members.” and substituting “Maximum of 5 members, twice weekly.”

Obviously, we are commencing the debate on the proposal for changes to the standing orders of this chamber, influenced, of course, by the report that was handed down late last year by the Procedure and Privileges Committee. Of course, Mr Speaker, the report, which all members will have read, was the result of a consultation process that I understand was undertaken by you and members of that committee. The results of the survey and consultations were presented in the form of a report that was presented to the house late last year. The government has considered the various recommendations and comments in the report. The response is set out in today’s notice paper. It is always interesting when we seek to alter the standing orders of the chamber. Changes to the standing orders have occurred over time. There are more experienced members than I who perhaps will reflect on that later in the debate. Standing orders are amended from time to time to reflect various needs and changes. I am aware that some amendments will be proposed as part of this motion, and I am looking forward to that debate. The debate will, potentially, be strongly put.

I will move quickly through some of the key elements that are presented to members via the proposed temporary orders. I need to highlight an important concept: one of the strong issues that has been raised from time to time, and was acknowledged in the report but is not captured in the proposed changes to the standing orders, is the culture of this place in terms of being a family-friendly place, particularly a welcoming place for children. It is very important for us to consider the uniqueness of this Parliament. Parliament is a unique place. This chamber is a unique part of this place. Considerations need to be weighed up as to their merit. We need to perhaps remind ourselves that when we are talking about being family friendly, we are talking about the Parliament in total. It is also important that we acknowledge that the modern world is different from what it was 20 to 50 years ago when this place was populated predominantly by males. We also must acknowledge that the Parliament itself contains a significant number of employees who of course have important jobs to carry out as staff of the Parliament. From my perspective, as a father of four young children, I would hope that the Parliament would always be cognisant of those people who have younger children, including teenage children, who might from time to time need to be here for a whole range of reasons. I am sure that that will be canvassed as part of the debate today.

Part of the Procedure and Privileges Committee's considerations involved giving consideration to providing a room to accommodate family members, particularly young children or babies. Those of course are not captured in this because they are not related to the standing orders of this chamber, but I believe they are very, very important considerations that should be pursued further. As Leader of the House, I am very keen to progress those issues because I think it is important to look at how we can provide a safe and welcoming place if needed by members and their families, particularly those with young children. I would like to see that pursued. I am very happy as Leader of the House to work with some members to achieve that. I am aware of course that the availability of rooms in this building is an issue, but I think there is an opportunity to explore the possibility of having a lounge-type room that caters for people who have those needs. From time to time members' children, including teenage children, need to come to this place to be with their parent. Those considerations also should be part of the discussion. Again, those are not captured in this motion because they are not related to the standing orders of this place. It is important we understand that the standing orders of this place is what we are seeking to amend via these temporary orders.

The date amendment—I thank the opposition for granting leave—means that if amended temporary orders are passed at the end of this debate, they will commence at next week's sitting on 19 March 2019. I will now briefly go through these. I will not speak in great length about the particular items; it is more appropriate in some respects for others in this place to do so. Part (1) of the motion is to amend standing order 40 to essentially allow a member to breastfeed their baby in this chamber. Part (2) relates to speaking times on motions. The proposed speaking time changes are tabled on the second page of the notice paper, under which the mover of a bill will be required to deliver that speech in 45 minutes and the response by the lead speaker or member deputised as lead speaker will also be 45 minutes. The proposal also highlights a reduction in third reading speaking times. It is important to note with regard to second reading debates that there was some discussion in the report to delete the 10-minute extension of time. That was not supported. For various reasons, that will continue and will not be amended as part of the second part of this temporary standing order.

I highlight that the temporary standing orders will be in place, if passed by this chamber, for this calendar year only. Obviously, there would need to be a process either at the end of this year or the beginning of next year to assess the effectiveness or otherwise of these changes. That is up to the house to consider at the end of this calendar year.

The third proposed amendment relates to grievances. Standing order 146 currently allows four grievances, with seven minutes for the grieving member and seven minutes for the responding minister or parliamentary secretary. The proposal is to reduce the speaking time by one minute for each, so that would reduce to six minutes for the grieving member and six minutes for the responding minister or parliamentary secretary. There is also a proposal to increase the number of grievances held on a Thursday morning. The government's position is that the extra grievance created should alternate between government and opposition. I expect to be lambasted of course by the leader of opposition business because of a so-called deal. The government has considered that it is appropriate that the extra grievance be alternated between the government and the opposition. We also note the current pattern of behaviour of the opposition, which was exposed towards the end of last year and has occurred every single sitting day this year, to seek to suspend standing orders after every question time. By the way, those suspensions have been agreed to. In fact, there was an extra one after question time during the last sitting week. Effectively, the opposition has gained an extra 45 minutes to an hour, which interrupts government business. I do not think opposition members have a strong point to put if this is their practice. It has been a habitual practice since the end of last year and they are continuing the pattern this year to seek to suspend standing orders after every question time. Government business time is then taken up. I know there will be a discussion about a so-called deal or whatever. Quite frankly, the government believes that opposition members' current practice demonstrates that their position will be to seek to suspend standing orders, so we do not believe we should also give them an extra grievance and not alternate between government and opposition speakers. It is also important to note that the number of members in this place reflects that the opportunity to deliver a grievance alternately should be given to the larger government membership. The proposal that stands on the notice paper would mean, as I said, five grievances a week of six minutes' duration and the extra grievance alternating between government and opposition members.

The next part of the motion, part (4)(b), relates to what we fondly call 90-second statements or private members' statements. Of course, these private members' statements currently occur at 12.50 on Thursday afternoons before the lunchbreak. The proposal is to increase the number of statements from five to 10, and, obviously, there will be an equal number for opposition and government members. However, the time for members' statements will be increased from 90 seconds to two minutes. The extra five statements will be scheduled under the order of the Speaker. Mr Speaker, we would strongly recommend, and I have discussed this with the opposition, that those extra private members' statements be scheduled at 7.00 on a Wednesday evening, immediately once private members' business has concluded. I agree with the opposition that even though we could argue that they are private members' statements so they should be in private members' time, I am happy to support the opposition's view that they be heard after private members' time. I would strongly suggest, Mr Speaker, as this is something you will make a decision on, that Wednesdays at 7.00 pm is the appropriate time for these extra private members' statements to be taken. That will remind members to be ready for them. I would not like to be the Whip, quite frankly. I have been the Whip on both sides of the house for a significant part of my career in this place. The Whips will now be responsible for not only seeking extra grievances, but also seeking extra private members' statements. I hope we do not get to a situation at seven o'clock on a Wednesday when the Whip suddenly finds that members have either forgotten or they suddenly say they are not ready. That is something for you to consider, Mr Speaker, but as I said, I would strongly recommend it and I think the opposition agrees with me. That is all I wanted to say at this stage. I will make some closing comments at the end of the debate on the motion.

I want to remind members that my view is that standing orders and conventions are very important in this place. I think it is also important that we recognise the importance of the pairs system, which, in some respects has in the past been a little—not abused, but members need to be reminded that the pairing system is there for very important reasons, such as a member's personal need to be absent from this place. Legitimate absences should always be accommodated. I think we take for granted the importance of the pairing system, but it is actually very important. Of course, it becomes even more important when numbers in this place are much closer. I will not labour the point but I had an experience when I was due to attend and give a eulogy at a funeral early on in the Gallop government period, and a pair was not granted from the other side. I will not go into the detail of that but I was very disappointed. I think we should be very mindful that the pairing system is an important convention in this place that we should not take for granted.

Mr I.C. Blayney: Could I ask you a question?

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: I really enjoy interjections from you, member for Geraldton; I am happy to do that.

Mr I.C. Blayney: You are too kind. The practice of pairs being able to be called off at any time—I have seen that happen —

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: That is what happened to me.

Mr I.C. Blayney: That's the unfairness of it. If you've got out the door and switched off your mobile phone, nothing can happen, but when pairs are called off, it gets to the point at which there is no point in having pairs if you're not going to give them out.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: Everything is treated on its merits and depending on certain circumstances, but I think, generally, from my experiences as a former government and opposition Whip, the convention is important, certainly for issues related to ill-health and personal family circumstances. These considerations should never be canvassed for why a pair should not be granted.

I am also mindful that we have to be a little bit careful sometimes that we do not become wound up in talking about ourselves. The general punters out there do not really —

Ms R. Saffioti: Care?

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: I think, in general, they would not consider some of the things that we get wound up about as being of priority or importance. I think that is a reality. When we perhaps talk about ourselves all the time, it does not necessarily increase the status of how we might be perceived by the general public.

With those words, I am happy to have moved the motion. Obviously, there will be some debate about the issues that are proposed.

MS M.J. DAVIES (Central Wheatbelt — Leader of the Nationals WA) [12.38 pm]: I thank the Leader of the House for those comments. I do not intend to speak at length on the amendments to these standing orders or belabour the point but there is a motion on the notice paper in my name and we intend to move it. I thank the committee members for their work, including the survey and the feedback that they sought: the member for Albany, Mr Speaker; the member for Maylands; the member for Geraldton; the member for Pilbara; and the member for Roe. The committee report made some pretty commonsense observations and the member who spoke previously outlined that it will be a trial and that we seek to test some of the things that might make this a more

family-friendly environment. Things can be done slightly differently and we do not always have to do exactly what we have always done. That being said, this place has significant convention and history and we need to be respectful of that.

The amendment on the notice paper in my name simply reflects the viewpoint that the Procedure and Privileges Committee put in relation to breastfeeding and bottle-feeding. It is one that is shared by our party room, which is why we made the decision to draft an amendment and put it to the house.

The committee report refers to allowing members' babies to be fed in the chamber and reads —

Question 2 of the survey proposed:

- (a) Breast feeding to be permitted in the Chamber.
- (b) Breast feeding mothers to lodge a proxy vote with the Whip

The report states that in response to the survey —

Part (a) of this question received a 'Yes' response of 31 and a 'No' response of 14.

Part (b) of this question received a 'Yes' response of 37 and a 'No' response of 9.

Obviously, the current practice is that babies are not fed in the chamber because they would be viewed as a stranger in the house. It would appear that the conclusion of the committee is that the survey received a strong positive response from members, even to the point that it states that the inability to feed babies in the chamber is currently a barrier to young women entering Parliament. I am not sure that I entirely agree with that, but certainly I agree with the sentiment that there could be a widening of allowances for mums and dads or primary caregivers in this place as part of a trial. The final paragraph of this section reads —

Accordingly, the Committee recommends the first option

That was for breastfeeding to be permitted in the chamber. However, the committee went further and said that it had several responses that bottle-fed babies should also be included. The report reads —

The Committee concurs that not only should bottle-fed babies receive the same consideration as breast-fed babies, but that bottle feeding would also enable fathers who are members to engage more actively in parenting their children.

That is the key passage. There is one element that I think the committee may have overlooked; that is, there are mothers who cannot or choose not to breastfeed, so that is another group of people who will be excluded from participating in this in the chamber if we are trying to create a family-friendly space. It is not only the fact that since the standing orders were created, fathers are very much more engaged in their primary caregiving role. Different types of families are far more common in our community these days, and that is reflected in the desire of our party room to make sure that we do not discriminate against or exclude people who have a family and might not be able to participate in this trial. Any mother—I am not one—knows that being able to breastfeed or not being able to breastfeed is a very sensitive issue for families. There are women who cannot breastfeed their babies or who choose to bottle-feed their babies. If that is the case, they should not be excluded.

In this trial we are seeking to make this place more family friendly. As I said, I do not think the proposal reflects the reality of modern-day families. In discussions outside this place, there has been consternation about this proposal in general, not just the breastfeeding versus bottle-feeding debate. A viewpoint has been put that this chamber is simply not a place for a child. I think that we are all grown-ups, although our behaviour sometimes belies that fact, Mr Speaker. We should all respect the space in which we conduct our business on behalf of the people of Western Australia. I come to this place—I am sure everybody does—with that starting point. It should not be a place for members of Parliament to exploit their families for electoral favour or to make a point. I am sure that not one parent or caregiver would do that if they were given the option of utilising the amendments to the standing order. We would expect—we must expect—that all the provisions would be used appropriately and with good judgement. I cannot imagine that any parent would expose their children to something that is detrimental to them or their colleagues as we conduct our business in this very important place.

I believe and have faith that we can approach this matter from a sensible and reasonable position. I am unsure why we would trial an amendment to the standing orders without trying to make it as inclusive as possible. Certainly, that was the discussion that we had around our party room table. Two young fathers in the National Party participate significantly in the care of their family, and young children at that, and that point was made strongly when we were discussing this issue.

The amendment that I will move shortly seeks to create a level playing field for all primary caregivers with dependent children. We hope that members of the house consider the matter favourably. It is in line with the committee's recommendation or observation, and I can see no harm—in fact, only positives—for the house if it is supported.

Amendment to Motion

Ms M.J. DAVIES: That being the case, I move —

In part (1) —

To insert after “breastfed” —

or bottle-fed

MRS L.M. HARVEY (Scarborough — Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [12.45 pm]: The Liberal opposition is very much supportive of the Nationals’ amendment on the notice paper for the reasons that the member for Central Wheatbelt outlined. However, I will put a few comments on the record. The Liberal Party room was unanimous in agreeing to support these amendments to the standing orders, but it has concerns about particular aspects of them.

With respect to breastfeeding a child in the chamber, the argument can obviously be made that anybody could bottle-feed a baby but we cannot extract a breast from a woman to have that baby fed elsewhere. A mother needs to have her baby beside her when breastfeeding is required. Having breastfed two children, I have to say that this chamber is often a very adversarial place—when we are in a division, for example—and babies absorb emotion, so to bring a baby into this chamber during debates in which people are getting fired up, particularly during a division when there is a lot of movement and activity, would be somewhat counterintuitive in supporting a child. In fact, in certain times I would actually call it almost akin to child abuse given the way some tempers flare during particular debates in this place. But that said, I completely and absolutely support the sentiment of providing whatever may be required to help women and men nurture their children while they continue to perform their duties.

It is true that not every workplace provides this opportunity for people, but the argument can be made that Parliament needs to set the example to the rest of community about having family-friendly work practices. Certainly, the standing order about a stranger being in the house precludes a baby from being present with their mother in this place. That is discrimination against a woman who may be breastfeeding her child by disallowing them access to this place of work with their child who is 100 per cent dependent on them for food and nurturing. That needs to be corrected. I acknowledge that not every workplace provides that privilege for women. Perhaps there may be a time when those opportunities will be available without there needing to be a discussion in this Parliament about whether it is a good or a bad thing. It should just be an expectation that women who are breastfeeding their children should have an opportunity to do so in every place of work in Western Australia. That is not the case.

I heard members make reference to the member for Darling Range, who has been heavily criticised by some members opposite because of her stance. The point that the member for Darling Range has made repeatedly—unfortunately, she is not here to participate in the debate today—is that she does not believe it is appropriate for female members of Parliament to be afforded a privilege that is not afforded to women in other workplaces. That was her point, and it is a valid one. By an amendment to the standing orders, we are going to provide the opportunity for members of Parliament to breastfeed or bottle-feed their children in this chamber. That privilege is not available to every other female worker in the workplace, and that is a shame. I accept that it would not be practical in some workplaces. It is a shame that that opportunity does not exist, but we do have an opportunity to set an example.

Last week, I pointed out—this is part of the reason that we agree with the Nationals WA’s amendment—that the other chamber was debating the Human Reproductive Technology and Surrogacy Legislation Amendment Bill, which enables single men and same-sex male couples access to surrogacy. That bill passed through this house on the voices and is now being debated in the other place. The fact remains that if a single man or a same-sex male couple accesses surrogacy and has a baby, they will have 100 per cent responsibility for the care of that child and the child will need to be bottle-fed. On the one hand, we will have laws that allow for equality of access to surrogacy for same-sex couples, which is a fine thing, yet they will be discriminated against in this chamber because they will not be allowed to feed their children, should they need to, unless we agree to this amendment that allows babies to be bottle-fed as well. We find ourselves in a bit of an anomalous situation.

Several members interjected.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I am sorry. I will take the Minister for Transport’s interjection.

Ms R. Saffioti: What age is bottle-fed—what is the limit?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Minister for Transport, I will respond. There is no age limit for breastfed babies. Some women breastfeed their children until they are four or five years old. That was not a practice that I chose for my family, but the fact remains that there is no limit on what age a baby or an infant —

Ms R. Saffioti interjected.

The SPEAKER: Minister, you will have your chance to speak.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: The temporary orders do not include an age limit for a breastfed baby, neither is there one for a bottle-fed baby. If a baby has to be bottle-fed from birth because someone cannot breastfeed them, that baby's requirement for nurturing and bonding is exactly the same as that for a baby who is being breastfed. When babies are being fed and held, that is a very important time for children to bond with their parents. We make that point because we are trying to make this a level playing field. The amendment is not anti-women or anti-breastfeeding—that is ridiculous. It is about providing mothers and fathers an opportunity to nurture their dependent children in this chamber free of any discrimination.

I have no further comment to make on this issue. I think I have rounded out a range of different views. However, I put it on the record again: our party room was unanimous in its support of members to be able to breastfeed their babies in this chamber, including women who cannot breastfeed, to bottle-feed their babies and, indeed, single dads or same-sex couple dads, or any fathers who may have sole responsibility or shared responsibility for raising their child.

MS R. SAFFIOTI (West Swan — Minister for Transport) [12.53 pm]: I will speak to the amendment. Initially, I endorse the comments of the Leader of the House; Minister for Culture and the Arts, on the Labor Party's position on this issue. There is one consistent message in relation to this issue in this place; that is, members on the other side are playing politics with this issue. When the times are of need, they play politics, and they continue to play politics. I am not going to sit here and listen to the hypocrisy of the other side.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members on my left, you were heard in silence. I expect the same for those on my right.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I am not going to listen to the hypocrisy of the other side. The National Party and the Liberal Party when there was actually a test, when there was actually a need, laughed in our face. That is what they did. To come in here and to try to play politics on this issue is an absolute disgrace. Members opposite do not understand that again it shows how they have not considered this issue seriously over time. Let us go through it. Their hypocrisy is breathtaking.

On 7 January 2010, I had my daughter Grace. People may recall that. I went to the then Speaker and asked that if there was a division and I was breastfeeding my daughter in my room, would I be able to come into the chamber. Note that I did not have leave, so I was in here in February. I had a young daughter. You were talking about bonding—this is what you denied me, member for Scarborough. This is what you denied me. I went to the Speaker and I asked: if I was breastfeeding my daughter in the corridors or in my room and there was a division—not for a normal debate—would I be allowed to bring her into the house? That is what I asked, and not for general debate, not for question time, but if that situation arose. He said no.

Then the comments by the then member for North West —

Mr V.A. Catania interjected.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Honestly! The former member for Jandakot, Vince Catania, said in *The Sunday Times* —

Mr S.K. L'Estrange: Jandakot?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Both of them—the National Party and the Liberal Party. There were articles and articles. One article states —

But National Party MP Vince Catania argued that the Assembly was no place for a baby.

“My son comes to Parliament House, but I don't know that bringing a baby into the chamber is a wise move,” Mr Catania said.

“Often, when there is a vote, there is a lot of disagreement and tension—it can be an emotional time where you are debating legislation that ultimately changes people's lives.

“There is a lot of shouting and I'd think the loud noise would frighten the baby.

“Imagine have a screaming baby in the chamber when you are trying to debate vital legislation.”

That is what he said. While I was at home struggling with my firstborn, you guys had a field day and went on the radio and in the paper. The former member for Jandakot, Joe Francis, said that he would be happy to call out a stranger in the house if I were to take my baby into the chamber. He said that he would do it because taking a baby into the chamber is against standing orders and the baby would have to be taken out. He could not think of any working mother who got to take their baby to their place of employment for the day and that he knew many struggling parents who had to pay for child care if they wanted to keep working. He asked why should politicians be different!

When there was actually a test, when it was not a hypothetical with you playing politics, you actually insulted a new mother and walked away from your responsibility. So I am not going to sit here and be lectured by any of you on this issue, because time and again you have demonstrated an inability to take this issue seriously. You play politics with it all the time. That is all you are trying to do here; and in relation to the bill in the upper house, I know the right and left factions of the Liberal Party are struggling on all these issues.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The member for Scarborough stood up and said, “Our support was unanimous.” I wish the member for Darling Range was here. On 27 September 2018, she said —

‘Community expects 100 per cent attention, not breastfeeding’

...

She said WA’s Parliament was already “extremely family friendly”, ...

“My question is—do you expect someone who’s in a court, defending you, standing on their feet, to breast feed?” ...

“Do you expect someone at Coles or Woolworths standing at the cashier scanning your groceries to breastfeed? Do you expect a doctor giving you a medical consultation to be breastfeeding while doing that?”

“My assumption and my view, and I believe many other people in the community’s, would be no.

“You would expect that person to give you 100 per cent of their time.”

The member for Scarborough has just stood up and said that the vote was unanimous, yet a member of her party in recent months has completely rejected it. Where were the Nationals, the Liberal Party members and all these so-called promoters of rights at that time? They were laughing. Then the member for Scarborough stood up today and said, “We want to support men nurturing their children.” She has mocked the Premier’s wife and children through social media—absolute vile attacks, in the gutter—and now she has stood up and said that she supports men nurturing their children. She has not apologised for using social media to attack the wife and children of the Premier.

That is what she has done.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: In the gutter!

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The member for Scarborough has been attacking his wife and children. That is what she has been doing.

Mr S.K. L’Estrange: Prove it.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Prove it? Okay.

Liza Harvey, the member for Scarborough, said on the radio —

I mean, isn’t she in a privileged position? She is volunteering in the community like hundreds and thousands of Western Australians do every day ... The reality is those positions have been created by this government, and by virtue of Mrs McGowan being in those positions, she then has a justification to be travelling with the Premier more often than not.

The member was attacking her role! She was undermining the importance of literacy —

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members!

Mrs L.M. Harvey interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Scarborough, you had your chance to talk.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: She went on —

Mrs L.M. Harvey: I commended her. Read that bit out.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: No, no. I will talk about how —

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Members opposite have to be kidding. The member for Scarborough has been on TV and social media attacking the children of the Premier. That is not acceptable.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members! You had your chance to speak.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: She comes in here and talks about people nurturing. On social media, she stated —

Taxpayers should never be forking out for the Premier and Ministers to take their kids on holidays!

The member for Scarborough retweeted a picture of his wife and kids—attacking them through social media.

Point of Order

Mr W.R. MARMION: I think that we are talking about an amendment to the motion to do with bottles. How long can this member go on?

The SPEAKER: It is not a point of order. The member for Scarborough went a bit to the side. I think it is just a general debate and I think the minister is doing the same.

Mrs L.M. Harvey: Went down what?

The SPEAKER: You talked about other issues around this and this is what I think the minister is doing. She is putting her point of view on a motion, and we will hear it. But she will get back to the point.

Debate Resumed

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The member for Scarborough talked about fathers being nurturers of their young children. This is exactly the point that I am going on about. She talked about the need for fathers to bring their children to work and then she went after his wife and children. That is what she did—she and the Leader of the Opposition. She absolutely did. If we had done that to her, all hell would have broken out.

Mrs L.M. Harvey: No, it wouldn't.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Yes, it would. Do not come in here and lecture us about family when the Liberal Party and the Nationals WA attacked me. Some members opposite are laughing, because they never cared. When I had my firstborn and the test was there, they mocked me and they loved it. They loved the pressure I was under.

I will give members another example. I was on a standing committee—the Public Accounts Committee—with the former member for Jandakot. The member for Gosnells remembers it. The former member for Jandakot purposely did not rock up to meetings so we would not have a quorum to finalise the Serco contract for Fiona Stanley Hospital. He purposely did not do that! When my babies were a few weeks' old, I had a teleconference from my study with the two of them to try to make sure that we had a quorum so that we could do the committee's work. The former member for Jandakot purposely did that. Do not lecture and take the high ground in here. When the true test was there, members opposite failed. They laughed and they mocked. They made it very difficult. They talk about bonding, but their actions impacted me and my child.

Dr D.J. Honey: You're making it up.

Withdrawal of Remark

The SPEAKER: I beg your pardon, member for Cottesloe. I ask you to withdraw that.

Dr D.J. Honey: What? That she's making it up?

The SPEAKER: Do not push your luck!

Dr D.J. Honey: I withdraw.

The SPEAKER: I call you to order for the first time.

Debate Resumed

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The member for Cottesloe—sexist, sexist. That is what it is.

Withdrawal of Remark

Dr D.J. HONEY: That is an offensive personal comment that I would ask that the member withdraw.

The SPEAKER: What was offensive?

Dr D.J. HONEY: Calling me a sexist. She said the member for Cottesloe —

The SPEAKER: Who said it? I did not hear it.

Dr D.J. HONEY: The minister.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I do find the comment sexist.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members! We have a point of order. Minister, can you withdraw?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I withdraw.

Debate Resumed

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: This shows that when the test is there—do members see what they do? They attack the women talking about their emotional time when they had their children. That is what happens.

Mr I.C. Blayney interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Geraldton!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: This is the double standard that is always in this place.

Ms M.J. Davies: You've got more front than Myer.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Pardon?

Ms M.J. Davies: You've got more front than Myer—seriously. I stood up and said that this is not a political issue. It is a debate for the house.

Mr B.S. Wyatt: That wasn't what you said on this side of the house.

Ms M.J. Davies: I had absolutely no idea what was going on—absolutely no idea.

The SPEAKER: Treasurer and Leader of the Nationals, I call you both to order.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The member said she had no idea. What was the National Party doing?

Several members interjected.

Point of Order

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: The Treasurer continues to badger the Leader of the Nationals across the chamber.

The SPEAKER: They were both doing it and I called them both to order. Treasurer, enough!

Debate Resumed

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: When I stood up and basically poured out the issues that I was facing when I had my newborn—my firstborn, after months of IVF—what did we get? We got the member for Cottesloe completely denigrating me when I explained my experience as a new mother. He said that I was making it up—that it was not a stressful time and that it is an easy time having a newborn when you are a member of Parliament without leave, as if that was an easy time.

When members opposite try to lecture us about family or anything, I do not accept it. I will not accept it because the living proof is that they turned their back on this issue when they needed to stand up. They enjoyed it, and they still enjoy it.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members, you were heard in silence. Minister, are you getting near the end?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Yes. I support the Leader of the House's motion today. I think it is a sensible way forward that gives breastfeeding mothers the ability to come into this place.

Mr W.J. Johnston: A right you were denied!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: It is a right that I was denied and then mocked for. Members opposite can think what they like. The Leader of the Nationals has not been in that situation. She does not know what it is like but she let her colleague mock me.

Point of Order

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: I seek your clarification, Mr Speaker. Are we debating the amendment, which is to add the words "or bottle-fed"?

The SPEAKER: Yes, we are.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Yes, we are. I am explaining why I am not supporting the amendment.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members! When you are on your feet, you want the protection of the Chair, but you are just sitting there talking. Minister, can you bring this to a close, please.

Debate Resumed

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Sure. We do not support the amendment. We support the proposals being put forward by the Leader of the House.

Point of Order

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: Mr Speaker, we are not debating what the Leader of the House has put forward. We are debating the amendment. The amendment is whether the minister agrees —

Ms R. Saffioti: I just said it.

The SPEAKER: She has already said what she thinks. She is supporting the Leader of the House's motion.

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: Not "bottle-fed", though.

The SPEAKER: Yes.

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: Can we find out why?

The SPEAKER: I think she has just explained it.

Debate Resumed

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: As I said, and we may be speaking on this later, there are wider issues across Parliament. Although the focus has been on the chamber, many of us have experienced this situation with our young children. As I said, I have three children and they are not the quietest of children. I wonder who they take after! When I bring them to Parliament, it would be great to have a family room that can contain their energy and excitement so it does not spill over and infect everybody in this place, which tends to be the case. I do think a family room is needed and is very important. I have argued for that for a long time. The member for Morley will raise issues about the treatment of dependent children in this place regarding access and other issues. I am very happy with the sensible, commonsense proposals being put forward. In relation to bottle-feeding, it is important to note that the survey never contemplated that.

Ms M.J. Davies interjected.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Pardon?

Mrs M.H. Roberts interjected.

The SPEAKER: Minister for Police!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The survey did not contemplate bottle-feeding; it only included a question about breastfeeding.

MR V.A. CATANIA (North West Central) [1.10 pm]: Is it not wonderful that both sides of politics agree with allowing women to breastfeed in this house and allowing members of all genders to use a bottle to feed their children? The Minister for Transport said that we do not support breastfeeding or support women in the workplace who want to breastfeed. We heard the hypocrisy that came out of her mouth. Members on this side of the house are ensuring that we have balance, and a fair and equitable workplace that encompasses fathers, mothers and people in same-sex relationships being able to bring children into the chamber to be bottle-fed or breastfed. I think we have come a long way in allowing that to occur.

The Minister for Transport's speech was the most political speech going around, given the fact that both sides of the house agree with the way forward. We on this side of the house are saying that we need balance. Perhaps one day we can allow the member for Perth to bring a child into the chamber and bottle-feed him or her.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Be careful, member, making comments like that.

Mr V.A. CATANIA: It was okay for the Minister for Transport to say that because the Leader of the Nationals WA does not have a child, she would not understand. That is what she said. Members opposite should not stand on their soapboxes and give us a lecture. We are moving away from politics and political parties here. We all agree with the proposal. I do not know the circumstances of the Minister for Transport. Why would I know about her circumstances?

Mr D.J. Kelly interjected.

Mr V.A. CATANIA: Hang on a second; I gave you the courtesy.

The SPEAKER: Members!

Mr V.A. CATANIA: When we are on the opposite side of the political divide, we do not often know what the other person is going through. Did we know that the Minister for Transport had a baby? Yes. We did not know whether there were any other personal circumstances. The journalist asked whether I would allow children to be present in the house. I do not know. Given the passion of this debate and the loudness in the chamber, I do not know whether it is right to have a child here. If I was a father and I was able to bottle-feed a child, I would not do it in this house. That is my choice because I do not believe that that is the right thing to do for that child. I certainly would not listen to what the Minister for Fisheries has to say, so do not jump in, mate.

Mr D.J. Kelly: You're not my mate!

Mr V.A. CATANIA: I would not be your mate; you are right.

The SPEAKER: When you address a member, you address a member by his proper title.

Mr V.A. CATANIA: Okay. We are really descending here.

The SPEAKER: What was your comment?

Mr V.A. CATANIA: I said that we are descending with the debate that is occurring here.

The SPEAKER: Just get on with the debate.

Mr V.A. CATANIA: It is my personal choice not to bring a young infant into this house. That is my choice because from time to time we have heated debates when members have to get up and down. That is my personal view. That was my comment in *The West Australian* that the Minister for Transport referred to. That is my personal choice. There are certain circumstances, as the Minister for Transport explained. If she was breastfeeding in her room, watching the debate on TV and a division was called, the argument that she put forward is fair and reasonable—that she be allowed to bring her child into the chamber.

Mrs M.H. Roberts: You've changed your mind.

Mr V.A. CATANIA: No. I am providing an explanation. It has not been explained before. I will go back to the question that was asked of me by the journalist. That was the response I gave. I think I made that quite clear.

The government is trying to make this political. It is trying to create a divide between the Labor Party, the Liberal Party and the National Party. What we see here—I hope the media reports this—is that we have consensus. We are saying, “Let's make sure that it is balanced. Allow everyone to be in the same position.” If the Minister for Transport wants to debate the age at which a child—a stranger—can be brought into the house, let us cap it. Let us amend the age limit. That is what we should be doing in a mature way. We should not have a dig at everyone, because we do have general consensus.

When she brings up the Premier and the trouble with her family, I agree with the Premier.

Ms S.F. McGurk: Who is “she”? Who are you talking about?

Mr V.A. CATANIA: I am talking about the Minister for Transport. The government is trying to create an argument and trying to make us look like we do not want this. That is not the case. When the Minister for Transport put forward her argument, she spoke about the Premier and having her family come into this place. As a regional member, I know how hard it is to see my family. I agree with the Premier. I fully support the Premier and every member trying to bring their family with them wherever they go, because sometimes we may not see them for weeks on end. That is not what we are debating; we are debating something that we all agree with. We all agree with these changes. The Procedure and Privileges Committee made the recommendation to allow members to bottle-feed. Government members are the ones who want to make it political by saying that only women can breastfeed in this chamber. That is not where we are in this day and age. The member for Scarborough also said that we are in the process of changing the surrogacy laws to allow people in same-sex relationships to have children. What happens in that case? We are encompassing everyone in a balanced way because every parent who has a young child deserves the right to look after their infant. The argument should be around the age cap, not whether a mother should be able to breastfeed and parents should be able to bottle-feed.

The Leader of the Nationals put it quite clearly, and I know a lot of mothers who are not able to breastfeed so they have to bottle-feed. There are a lot of reasons we should take the politics out of it and do what everyone basically agrees with. We should change the standing orders and let us trial it for 12 months and see how that goes. The only people making a political stand on this seem to be those members on the government side. This is one issue on which we have general consensus. Let us all be mature and support a family-friendly workplace. I am a father who had a young child stuck in a special care nursery for four weeks and was hassled by the Whip back in 2007 to hurry up and get back to Parliament. If members want me to talk about personal issues and the attitude of the Whip of the day and the pressure that was put on me by the party that I used to belong to back in 2007, I will. Undue and unnecessary pressure was put on me as a young father who had a child in a special care nursery for four weeks. A lot of members did not know that.

Ms R. Saffioti interjected.

Mr V.A. CATANIA: The Minister for Transport might want to talk about her personal issues but I am just relating my personal experience.

I agree with the Minister for Transport that this place needs to be a family-friendly environment. I remember that we talked about turning the old billiards room into a nursery for children. I cannot remember when that was. It was years ago. I think it was during the Carpenter government, back then. We have all had an opportunity to change the workplace environment in which we have all worked for a long time but it has not happened. We now have general consensus to allow this to start to become a friendly-family environment, so let us all work together. Would that not be something novel? Let us all work together because we have general consensus. Let us take the politics out of it, people, and support this amendment. If someone wants to move another amendment to cap the age, let us have that debate after we vote on this amendment.

MRS M.H. ROBERTS (Midland — Minister for Police) [1.20 pm]: I oppose the amendment put forward by the National Party. The problem with the member for North West Central is that, although he says that he wants there to be some consensus, he does not come into this place with clean hands, does he? We have heard the comments he made a few years ago. For the member for North West Central, it is all about him; he asks us to look at his particular circumstance and whatever. If he were genuine about raising his circumstance back then, I would have thought he would have had a little more empathy with the Minister for Transport when she faced her circumstance, when she was a mother who had given birth to a child she was breastfeeding. All that was obvious, not something that needed to be communicated to her. She came in here pregnant month after month, then she wheeled the baby around.

Several members interjected.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: It was pretty darn obvious. It was also pretty darn obvious that she had chosen to breastfeed her child. Put one and one together and do not come in here with that falseness, because I cannot stand it. It is not all about the member for North West Central. He perhaps finds himself in different circumstances now that he is a dad and has kids and wants to make his own comments because he has a different perspective. I hope he has grown up a bit because the comments he made back then were repulsive and juvenile.

The member for Scarborough's whole argument centred on the theme of having an opportunity to set an example. In our work environment at Parliament we can set an example for Western Australia and all other workplaces. To me that says, "I'm all right Jack; we can look after ourselves better than other workers in Western Australia." Why should we have it better? Why should we set this very high bar when we say it is okay for men to bottle-feed in here when that is not permitted in most other workplaces in Western Australia? It simply is not. Is that allowed at police stations, fire stations, schools and hospitals? No, it is not. We are proposing a very minimal change that respects the biological function of women. That is the point I want to draw to members' attention.

Mr D.C. Nalder interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members! Member for Bateman!

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: As one of the only people ever in this place to have had a child and brought the child here without having had time off work and breastfed the child, I think I have a right to comment on this matter. I therefore say this: this place is already a very family-friendly workplace in which to have a pregnancy and a child. I had no difficulty with it. When people talk about breastfeeding in Parliament, the community reads that as the whole work environment. We are talking today about just the chamber. As a mother—not my first child—I was able to breastfeed in the courtyard, in my office, in the corridor, in the dining room, in the library; right throughout this building with the exception of the chamber. That already provides more privilege than most other workplaces. I do not like members of Parliament talking about their entitlements and I certainly do not think we should have entitlements better than those that other workplaces have. However, the reality is that we often hear comments in the community and from members of Parliament that we do not get sick leave; we do not get maternity leave; and we do not get long service leave, as some other workers have. That is all true, but when someone here is sick or has a baby, they have time off on full pay. Although I did not have maternity leave, I also did not—as I did with my earlier children—have to take time off without any pay at all. As it turned out, for the child I had when I was in Parliament in early July one year, I had no time off from Parliament. I do not want an award or a medal for that. I had great support from my family and friends. My husband came here on many days through the spring session of Parliament that year and he and others assisted me. Did I find not being able to breastfeed in the chamber a huge impediment? I think that is an issue.

I would say first about breastfeeding that I am a hugely strong advocate of breastfeeding. My private member's bill clarified for all time that women could breastfeed in public places. In this chamber at that time I was belittled by the then Attorney General, now the federal member for Pearce, as was the then member for Fremantle, Adele Carles, because we wanted to clarify this matter and we thought it was important. The then Liberal Attorney General thought that a breastfeeding mother should take a test case if she thought the law was in doubt. Imagine that! A woman has just had a baby; she is feeding in a cafe; she is asked to leave —

Ms S.F. McGurk interjected.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: It was a total misunderstanding of the mother's emotional vulnerability, her financial situation and a range of other reasons that a mother would not be out there taking a test case. This is an issue I have considered over many years. I have supported breastfeeding mothers' groups in my electorate and elsewhere. It is very important. I will not give a lecture here about the huge benefits of breastfeeding for children, including the health-protective benefits. There are also benefits for the mother not just in bonding but also physiological benefits. I will say this: we want all women, whether in Parliament or elsewhere, to be able to breastfeed and continue to breastfeed where possible. The fact is that if feeding a baby is supplemented with bottle-feeding, it is sometimes hard to get the child back onto the breast. That is a fact. Although I might not give members the best medical explanation of it, sometimes a baby will feel fuller and find it easier to get milk from a bottle than from the breast, so they start to prefer the bottle over the breast and will no longer take the breast. I think it is unfortunate to have to push a woman into that situation.

If I can perhaps go back to my experience and how I found it. There were times—I would say rare times—when the bells rang that I was either breastfeeding or about to commence breastfeeding. I made the choice, in accordance with the then standing orders, to delay the breastfeeding for two or three minutes if I was about to commence. If I was in the process of breastfeeding, I would detach the baby, give the baby to my husband or someone else, come into the chamber, vote for a few minutes and then go out. If the standing orders had been changed to permit breastfeeding, I would have had the option of bringing the child into the chamber, continuing to breastfeed and, in all likelihood, leaving straight after the vote. I think that is a sensible option that should be allowed in this place.

The National Party's motion suggests that the same should apply to bottle-feeding. The fact is that it is not the same. I am more than well aware that some women have difficulty breastfeeding; indeed, for medical reasons, some women cannot breastfeed. There may well be a circumstance in the future in which there are two fathers and not a mother. That is fine, too, but if those individuals found themselves in the same situation I found myself in, there would be no danger in not being able to sustain either breastfeeding or bottle-feeding in the longer term.

Someone else can bottle-feed the baby. Indeed, once a mother's baby is off the breast and using a bottle because they are perhaps six or eight months old and she has decided to wean them, often her partner will enjoy having that bonding time to feed the baby. From my perspective, the importance of allowing breastfeeding in the chamber is to allow for properly sustained breastfeeding. That is what is really at issue here, and that is why I strongly support allowing breastfeeding in the chamber.

The same principle does not apply to bottle-feeding. I do not think a lot of people have thought about individual circumstances, but as I have explained, if I were bottle-feeding my baby in my office or in the corridor and the bells rang, I could easily give the bottle and the baby to another person who could quite happily feed the baby for two or three minutes, and then I could go back and continue to bond with the child. The truth of the matter is a combination of two things. One is that I do not think the people who have put forward this amendment have actually properly thought through the issues; that is where I give some people the benefit of the doubt. With regard to some others though, I think they have seen an opportunity for cheap political gain, where they think they can out-Labor the Labor Party and somehow be more politically correct or whatever by saying that we should offer this opportunity to men.

At the end of the day, I come back to what I think is commonsense, fair and reasonable. I have explained today a clear biological difference. I have quite deliberately talked about the importance and benefit of sustained breastfeeding for the mother and the child. The same does not apply to bottle-feeding. We are talking about a division or a small amount of time during which a member will be away. They can either desist, as I did with the breastfeeding, or they can have somebody else fulfil that role for a few short minutes if necessary. I think that is reasonable and very much a step forward.

Beyond that, if we are going to allow bottle-feeding in the house, that is a different level altogether, and I think it would put us out of step with community expectations. I want to reiterate, loudly and clearly: we can breastfeed or bottle-feed anywhere in this place, other than in the chamber. This is a friendly environment for doing that. We can do it in our offices, the library, the courtyard, the dining room—wherever. It is not an issue of not allowing opportunities for bonding or family time here.

I am disappointed that this amendment to the motion has been moved, because I see it largely as just being about cheap politics. I think some members have jumped on the bandwagon without properly thinking it through. Those members should reflect upon what is appropriate and what occurs in the rest of the community. I do not think it is our job to set an example of having better working conditions than others in the community. We are privileged to serve in this house, but we come in here knowing full well what the expectations are. I remind members that we generally sit for only 22, maybe 23, weeks of the year, so there are many other weeks during which members are in their electorate offices and other places where there are no restrictions on either bottle or breastfeeding.

I conclude by referring back to the survey. Just because a majority of members surveyed on a particular issue want certain conditions, does it mean we should have those conditions? I would say not. I could survey a lot of police stations and hospitals; I could ask workers what they want. We could survey a workplace and ask, "Do you want to be paid more? Do you want better working conditions? Do you want to work fewer hours?" Most workplaces would say, "Yes, I'd like that, and that, and that." "Do you want some other perks?" People would say, "Yep, that sounds good." Just because people have been surveyed and a response has come back to say, "This is what we'd like", it does not mean that it is the right or proper thing to do.

We have to be very mindful that we are in a privileged position. As members of Parliament we do not give every other worker in every other workplace the conditions of employment or the pay that they would like. Ultimately, a balanced decision has to be arrived at. What is proposed in the motion moved by the Leader of the House is a balanced decision. I do not think that amending it is a balanced decision. I do not think it is necessary, and I do not think it is in line with community expectations.

MS A. SANDERSON (Morley — Parliamentary Secretary) [1.35 pm]: With lived experience of having a baby while a member of Parliament, I also rise to contribute to this debate. It is important to put on the record the experience of those of us who have done that, and those of us who will seek to do that. I am not supporting the amendment moved by the other side, and I ask the other side: where were members opposite during their eight and a half years of control of both chambers of Parliament? This issue arose at least twice over the two terms of the last government and no changes were ever made. I ask members opposite where they were then.

I had my second child while I was a member of the Legislative Council and it was extremely challenging, I have to say. It was not an easy experience for me. Of everything I have done in my life, one of the best things I have ever done is breastfeed my two children. I have been really fortunate to have been able to do that and to not have had any issues with it. My daughter breastfed until she was almost a year old and she weaned herself, and that was great. Upon returning to Parliament, we return to our duties very quickly; there is no maternity leave, so we need to return to our duties quickly, which is fine. I knew that and I knew what I was getting myself into. I was politely reminded before I returned that no strangers are permitted in the house. A chair was provided for me in the first-aid room to express, and that was considered adequate preparation for my return to Parliament.

My experience with my son of being a breastfeeding mother and expressing was that I spent hours and hours trying to express. As part of that, I had to undress and there is a whole lot of paraphernalia and material. It is a pretty private event. I shared an office with the member for Gosnells and often when I would go to the first-aid room to try to express in between debates or divisions, after having worked out with the Whip whether it was a good time for me to go, there would already be someone there because it is used by many people, so it was not available. The member for Gosnells was very, very accommodating—and probably a little scared to come into the office!—so I would use my office and have to send him a text to say, “I’m expressing, sorry. Just stay away for a little while.” I would then get dressed and go back up. Sometimes I was not even able to use my office or the first-aid room, so I would have to use the retired members’ room, which does not have a lock, so I would be waiting for some former member to walk in while I was pumping. I worked really hard at keeping my son breastfed, but after a couple of months he stopped breastfeeding because he got used to the bottle. He was about four months old when he stopped breastfeeding and it broke my heart because I had so little of that early time with him, so that was taken away from us.

The motion moved by the government is about supporting members to go back to their duties early on in that time when they are intensively breastfeeding, and people can be intensively breastfeeding every 30 minutes or every two hours; it depends on the baby. There is no set time frame. It is about supporting mothers and not discriminating against mothers in their duties as members of Parliament and in their roles as breastfeeding mothers.

That is what this amendment is. I am disappointed with the approach taken by the other side, particularly given its track record. I raised a number of times in the Council the issue of loosening the arrangements for returning mothers. The response ranged from the now member for Darling Range making lots of “tuts” and huffing and puffing and saying, “She’s raising this issue again”, to absolute objection from the other side. To be faced with this kind of hypocrisy and game playing is really quite galling, frankly. Instead of this being a celebration of progress in this place, it has turned into this—and that is because of your actions. It is not a bipartisan issue when you ring up *The Sunday Times* and tell them what you are going to do; that is what you did. It was on the front page of *The Sunday Times*. They did not bring this issue to the chamber or to other parties; they rang *The Sunday Times*. Let us not pretend that this is anything other than playing politics. I support the motion put by the government. It is absolutely the right motion with the right balance. A number of workplaces allow breastfeeding. We are example-setters. We are here to set examples to the community. Frankly, we often set a very poor example with our own behaviour and practices.

The point has been made a number of times about the overall work environment. What happens in the chamber is limited in terms of our ability to make changes. It is about the building and the culture of the building that we need to make change. I want to provide a current, live example for members to consider of how we can support working mothers and working parents in their roles as members of Parliament and as parents as well. My daughter is 12 years old. She has just started high school in the city. I also have shared custody of her, so she is not with me all the time, which makes sittings particularly challenging. I am not the only person in this place to have shared custody of children, but it makes sitting weeks particularly challenging. You really do not see them for long periods. I requested a security pass for her so that she could come up here on some Thursday afternoons after school—not every Thursday. She could catch the CAT bus up to Parliament, come and see me, do some homework and have a snack. We usually finish at a reasonable time on a Thursday; it is pretty predictable. It is so she can spend some time here. Under the current arrangements, she has to sit in my room and she cannot go to the toilet. She cannot go anywhere because she cannot get back into my office, and she cannot access the toilets. I requested a security pass for her so that when I am in the chamber, she can go through, go to the toilet, do homework and do what she needs to do. I was denied —

Mr V.A. Catania: Who denied that?

Ms A. SANDERSON: I am not going to go into details. I will not give my true feelings about the full response that I got, because I actually hope to work through this issue. But it was essentially, “No, there’s a security issue, a security risk”—with a 12-year-old girl. This is the kind of stuff that makes it really hard. The reality is that for that week, I had functions on Monday night, worked here late on Tuesday night, I got home at 7.30 pm on Wednesday and Thursday afternoon was the only time I would see her. Friday she goes to her father’s. That is the reality of when I could see her. I am not alone in that circumstance. Examples have been given of when some children have done this or that—and where do we draw the line? We cannot make policy because of one or two bad experiences. You cannot do that and you should not do that; it is bad policy if you are. I do not drink in the bar. I do not host guests in the bar for hours on end and let them rampage around the Parliament, as we hear occurs occasionally. I do not hold big, boozy events. This is the request that I have made. This is a request that would be a practical step for all working parents, not just women. That is the kind of cultural change that needs to happen, not just in the chamber, where we need to support parents. This issue has become particularly prevalent in this Parliament, because, with the huge changeover we saw in this chamber after the last election, I think we lowered the average age of parliamentarians by at least 15 years. If we actually did the sums, we would see that it is a younger cohort with more women and more younger men with families as well, so the demands are greater, and the Parliament is not responding. This is not just about what we want and looking after ourselves. It is about how we encourage diversity and women and people from different backgrounds to say, “I can do that and it’s workable for my circumstances.” Single parents, same-sex parents and people from all different backgrounds need to be able to say, “This is workable and I can do it. That is a place that I can see myself making a contribution to.”

I do not want to take up all my time because I know that other members feel strongly about this issue. There are so many other things that we can also do and that we need to do. I support this motion from the government and for the reasons outlined by me and previous speakers, I do not support the amendment from the Nationals WA.

MS S.F. McGURK (Fremantle — Minister for Women’s Interests) [1.45 pm]: I would like to make a contribution to this debate. I thank the previous speakers, particularly those on my side who made some excellent contributions largely drawing from personal experiences. Quite obviously the vast majority of those experiences were not good ones. That is something that this Parliament really needs to take into account as we lead into next year, which will be the centenary of women being able to run for office in the Western Australian Parliament. Women have been able to stand for Parliament in Western Australia for 100 years and we are still grappling with these fundamental issues about how we make Parliament and this chamber a place that welcomes women and gives them a right to fulfil their duties as young women and, in some cases, mothers. That is fundamentally what this debate is about. It is well overdue and I am glad that we are in agreement about that.

This provision that we are now adopting is well overdue: women who are breastfeeding and are required to come into the chamber have a right to come in here. This Parliament should look like our community. It still does not. I am very proud of my party that dealt with this issue 25 years ago. In 1994, the Labor Party started debating affirmative action; the other side is still grappling with it. Where there is a will, there is a way. If you wanted to deal with it, you would deal it, and that is what you need to confront in your own party.

Mr D.C. Nalder: We are dealing with bottle-feeding. Where are you going now?

Ms S.F. McGURK: I do not need your interjection, thank you very much. I do not need your lectures about how I contribute to this debate, thank you very much.

Mr D.C. Nalder: How about talking about it?

Ms S.F. McGURK: I am talking about making sure that this Parliament sends a message to women in our community that they are welcome—that young women in this Parliament are welcome, and that we welcome people who have family responsibilities to continue their tether to their working lives. That is what we are talking about in this debate.

Obviously, we support breastfeeding for all the reasons that have been given. It is an important public health message that for a lot of reasons we support: women who can breastfeed should be encouraged every step of the way to breastfeed and to do so, frankly, wherever they want to. I find it highly offensive the notion that people who choose to bring their children into perhaps a noisy environment are committing some sort of child abuse. It is an incredibly offensive notion and has —

Mr D.C. Nalder interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr I.C. Blayney): Thank you, member.

Ms S.F. McGURK: The point was made by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition that for women or anyone to bring babies into this chamber at times when it is rowdy could in fact constitute child abuse. It is an absurd proposition and insulting to women and parents.

Mr D.C. Nalder interjected.

Ms S.F. McGURK: Why don’t you just keep quiet for once?

The ACTING SPEAKER: This has at times been a rather touchy debate, but I think it can go on quite happily so long as we do not get a lot of interjections. I would like to hear the minister out, thank you.

Ms S.F. McGURK: I do get angry when men from the Liberal Party start to lecture me about how I should address this particular point in the debate.

Several members interjected.

Ms S.F. McGURK: “Boys will be boys”, remember that. Do not give me any lectures —

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr I.C. Blayney): Thank you. Minister, will you refer your comments directly to me?

Mr D.J. Kelly: Or call him for interjecting.

The ACTING SPEAKER: I will call you, Minister for Fisheries. This debate has gone on quite well until now, so could all sides please keep their interjections to themselves, thank you.

Ms S.F. McGURK: Mr Acting Speaker, emotions do get a little heightened around this debate because women from our side have given some very practical experiences of when the other side, both Liberal and National Parties, had an opportunity in the past to act on this issue and they failed. They had an opportunity to support women who were new mothers in this place, and they failed. Our party is not perfect with all matters equal opportunity. I would not be the first to say that it is, but we are grappling with this issue, and we have done that for the last 25 years. As a result, I am very proud that we have more women on our side of the chamber and this Parliament is dealing with making this place a family-friendly environment, as much as is practical in the environment that we have. I understand that that is an important debate that most workplaces are grappling with at the moment. I spend much of my time as Minister for Women’s Interests talking to corporations, leading businesspeople, organisations and employees about how that can be achieved in the workplace and, frankly, I find this Parliament a little wanting in that area. It was very eloquently put by the member for Morley. This issue needs to be seen. The issue about whether we only allow breastfeeding in this place needs to be considered in light of this Parliament dealing with women in the workplace, supporting family-friendly practices and attracting a broad range of people into this Parliament, as we should do. It is obviously the case that breastfeeding by its nature can only be done by the mother. If we want to attract women into this place, we need to ensure that we send the message that we want them in our Parliament and that young mothers who have feeding responsibilities have a right to be here and that their right to exercise their vote will not be impeded by their decision to breastfeed. That is essentially what we are talking about. That is why it galls us to—what we consider the other side to be doing—play politics with the notion of bottle-feeding as well. Obviously, bottle-feeding can be done by other people and it can be done outside the chamber. That is why we are not supporting the amendment today.

It has been an important debate, but I hope it is the beginning of a debate in which this Parliament starts to grapple with how it ensures that it is attracting a broader range of people to stand for office and spend their time as they raise young families in this chamber, or indeed, as they have various caring responsibilities through their lives. I know that is difficult. We have security issues in this Parliament and the constraints of an old building, but notwithstanding that, where there is a will there is a way. That is the message that this government is sending out to private industry. It needs to attract more women into the workplace, it needs to tap into the resource that is the women of Western Australia and it needs to accommodate modern workplaces as family-friendly to attract not only women, but also young men who, rightly, want to play more of a role in parenting their children.

MR Z.R.F. KIRKUP (Dawesville) [1.54 pm]: I will make a very quick contribution on the amendment that has been moved by the Leader of the Nationals WA—one that is very important. I listened with consideration to contributions made by members on both sides, and appreciate at the outset of my contribution those lived experiences that have been spoken about by, in particular, the members for West Swan and Morley. The circumstances they faced is disappointing. I was not part of any decision, or anything like that, but it is unfortunate to hear those, and I am certain there are experiences on both sides of the challenges that working mothers have faced. Time and again it is thrown at the opposition that this has been made into a political argument, that somehow the Leader of the National Party has moved an amendment that is a political one in nature. I will make members aware of page 3 of the Procedure and Privileges Committee report, which says —

The Committee concurs that not only should bottle-fed babies receive the same consideration as breast-fed babies, but that bottle feeding would also enable fathers who are members to engage more actively in parenting their children.

This is not a political decision, I do not believe, from members of the Nationals WA and indeed the Liberal Party in supporting it. This is simply reflecting a government-dominated committee and its recommendations to this place on standing order changes. It is a representation of that committee, which comprises more government members than it does opposition members, and, indeed, the government members on that committee suggested that bottle-feeding should also be allowed. That is all the National Party leader’s amendment makes reference to, and one that all of us should support. I find it surprising that given it was a government-dominated committee that made that recommendation that the government will vote against its own recommendation. That is very disappointing to me.

Ms S.E. Winton: It's not a government recommendation; it's a committee recommendation.

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: Quite right, member for Wanneroo. It is a committee with government members in the majority.

Ms S.E. Winton: So you're saying every committee recommendation is a government recommendation?

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: Again, member for Wanneroo, I am going to continue.

Ms S.E. Winton: Is that what you're saying, member for Dawesville?

The SPEAKER: No, what I am saying is I call you to order for the first time and a second time. The first was before I stood, and the second was when I was standing.

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: I know the member for Wanneroo is passionate and I look forward to her contribution on this debate, shortly. I think the point still stands.

Ms S. Winton interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Wanneroo, I call you to order for the third time.

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: I have been disappointed with the tenor of debate in this case. I have heard interjections, in particular the member for Kalamunda, I think it was, who said it was in the Liberal Party's DNA for us to be anti-women, and I previously heard the member for Wanneroo attack the member for Vasse for the position that she has taken on this amendment. We could do without the personal attacks in circumstances such as this, I suspect.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members!

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: It is very important for this debate to be conducted on a plane of dignity and discipline, and that is not something that we have seen when gender identity and politics are being played and members on our side are attacked for the position they put in making this amendment today.

Mr T.J. Healy: In 100 years, it has had 14 female members.

The SPEAKER: Member for Southern River, you have only just come into the chamber; I call you to order for the first time. It has been a good debate until now.

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: I appreciate the point the member for Southern River is making. The point is that we now have an opportunity to change the course of this chamber to be more embracing of new families.

Several members interjected.

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: We do. So much of the political discourse is about what happened previously, how bad that was, and the previous government. We have an opportunity here and now to draw a line and say that this is a new chapter that we want to write, and that we want to make sure that we see progress.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members!

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: The point stands. The Leader of the National Party has moved an important amendment that is reflected in the government's own committee's recommendations. It is an amazing situation that we are attacked on this side for our positions, and in particular the female members of the opposition are attacked for the positions that they have put because they have the temerity to back in recommendations that have been made by a government-dominated committee and its report on changes to the standing orders of this place. I find that very disappointing. The discourse could have been conducted much better. The contributions from many members, in particular as I said before, the members for West Swan and Morley on their lived experiences here, has imparted on me something that is very important. I understand that, and it is now important for us to draw a line under what has happened in the past, recognise that and make those changes going forward. The point stands. The Procedure and Privileges Committee made the recommendation on page 3 that states that bottle-fed babies should be given the same consideration as breastfed babies. The Minister for Women's Interests also raised the point, which I appreciate, about young fathers and the role that they can have in participating in the family unit. I cannot speak at all of having children, that is not something that I am in yet, but we are likely in that phase of our lives.

Mr P.A. Katsambanis interjected.

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: Thank you, member for Hillarys, but we are likely in that phase of our lives when that will be a consideration of ours. It will be a consideration of ours about—hopefully, if I am blessed enough to have children—what that will look like regarding my participation in this place. By no means will it come close to the experiences of members who have spoken before; not at all. I do not make any assertions —

Mr F.M. Logan: He owns 500 votes!

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: Thank you very much. Once again —

Mr D.A. Templeman: No; it was 343.

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: It was 343 votes, member for Cockburn; not 500. Once again, we could do without that kind of attack in consideration of important standing order changes. I make the point, I would like to end my consideration —

Mr D.A. Templeman interjected.

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: I would like to end without interjections from the other side, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Members!

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: I am very lucky that I am surrounded on all sides in this place by women who are strong and courageous and who fight for what they believe in. I am very, very lucky.

Debate interrupted, pursuant to standing orders.

[Continued on page 1126.]

VISITORS — PERTH COLLEGE

Statement by Speaker

THE SPEAKER (Mr P.B. Watson) [2.00 pm]: I would like to welcome the girls from grade 6 at Perth College, in the member for Mount Lawley's electorate. Let us hope that members behave as members should during question time today.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

HUAWEI — METRONET CONTRACT

119. Dr M.D. NAHAN to the Premier:

Thank you, Mr Speaker.

Mr M.P. Murray: Have you been to Japan?

The SPEAKER: Minister for Sport and Recreation, you will be going home; you won't be going to Japan!

Dr M.D. NAHAN: I refer to the revaluation of the government's Huawei Metronet contract. Will the Premier inform the house whether he sought and received updated national security advice as part of this revaluation; and, if so, will the Premier tell the house which specific national security agencies provided this advice and the nature of the advice, or will the Premier continue to keep the WA public in the dark on this critical national security issue?

Mr M. McGOWAN replied:

I heard the Minister for Transport's statement earlier to the house when the minister set out what the government has done, which is to determine whether the company is capable of delivering on its obligations under the contract. The minister said, and I quote —

The Huawei and UGL representatives confirmed they would be able to source equipment required for the project. Further confirmation was subsequently received by the PTA.

Obviously, the government will continue to monitor the contract as it goes along.

HUAWEI — METRONET CONTRACT

120. Dr M.D. NAHAN to the Premier:

I have a supplementary question. I take it the answer was no. Can the Premier confirm that this time he followed due process and took the revaluation to cabinet, like he should have done initially?

Mr M. McGOWAN replied:

There was no revaluation. I do not know what revaluation the Leader of the Opposition is referring to.

Dr M.D. Nahan interjected.

The SPEAKER: Leader of the Opposition!

Mr M. McGOWAN: Once again I say to members of the Liberal Party that it is a very dangerous course to continue to undermine Western Australia's relationship with China. As our largest trading partner, it is responsible for hundreds of thousands of jobs in Western Australia and it is irresponsible of the Liberal Party to continue to —

Dr M.D. Nahan interjected.

The SPEAKER: Leader of the Opposition, I call you to order for the first time.

Mr M. McGOWAN: It is irresponsible of the Liberal Party to continue to undermine the important trading relationship—the largest trading relationship in the country—that Western Australia has with China.

CRAIG PEACOCK — CORRUPTION AND CRIME COMMISSION INVESTIGATION

121. Ms A. SANDERSON to the Attorney General:

Can the Attorney General outline to the house how seriously the government is taking the findings outlined in the Corruption and Crime Commission report that was released yesterday?

Mr J.R. QUIGLEY replied:

I thank the member for Morley for her question. The government wishes to inform the house that we take the findings with the utmost seriousness. Despite some media commentary and people commenting in the media that it should not be couched as corruption and that there has not been a trial, and undermining the findings of the Corruption and Crime Commission, let me remind the house that in section 4 of the Corruption, Crime and Misconduct Act the definition of misconduct is a public officer who acts corruptly. In finding that Mr Peacock had acted corruptly, the CCC was doing no more than that it had been charged to do under its legislation. Mr Peacock had lawyers present at the hearing. He received a draft copy of the report and he did not take issue with the fact that he had taken vast sums of money from the taxpayers of Western Australia in circumstances that amounted to corrupt conduct.

I was asked how seriously the government is taking this. Firstly, all this happened under the previous Liberal administration. This only came to light during the advent of the McGowan Labor government when the Premier introduced the machinery-of-government changes and brought these trade offices under the Department of Jobs, Tourism, Science and Innovation. The department did a reconciliation of all expenses and was alarmed to find out that there had been this defalcation. Under the McGowan government, the department immediately went to the CCC and requested a full investigation, which there has been. Once the inquiry was on, as the minister within whose portfolio the CCC sits, I was informed of the nature of the findings. As soon as that transcript could be released to us—not to me personally, but to the State Solicitor—I instructed that a writ be issued immediately claiming \$650 000, and to make an application before the Supreme Court for a freezing order on all of Mr Peacock’s assets, both here and in Japan.

The government accepts the finding and it accepts the opinion of corruption. No-one is taking issue with that fact, despite people trying to undermine this finding of corruption in the public media. We accept the fact, and no-one takes issue with the fact, that he took over half a million dollars. No-one takes issue with the fact that he wiped out the government car whilst drunk and was jailed, and then put in a false invoice for an end-of-lease balloon payment to pay for the repairs. No-one takes issue with that—that is corrupt. We take this very seriously. The taxpayers of Western Australia are very, very fortunate to have elected Premier Mark McGowan as the Premier who reorganised the lines of accountability that caused a reconciliation to happen so that the defalcation was identified. The Premier’s department is also undertaking an audit because, as members will see from the report, the defalcation so far concerns the last two years. None of us know the extent of this. This Parliament, including the opposition, have all been played for mugs by this man. The previous government fell asleep at the wheel.

REGIONAL ROAD INFRASTRUCTURE

122. Mr K.J.J. MICHEL to the Minister for Transport:

Mr Speaker, I refer to the —

Mr M.P. Murray: They have just been told about being asleep at the wheel!

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members!

Mr K.J.J. MICHEL: I refer to the McGowan Labor government’s record funding for job-creating road projects in regional Western Australia.

- (1) Can the minister outline to the house this government’s commitment to road projects across Western Australia, including the Albany ring-road and the Karratha–Tom Price road, that have never been funded by a state Liberal–National government?
- (2) Can the minister outline to the house whether she has received any support for these projects from the federal Liberal–National government?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI replied:

- (1)–(2) I thank the member for that question and his commitment to regional WA and, of course, the Pilbara. The McGowan Labor government is spending record amounts on road funding in regional WA. The approach by the former leader of the National Party, Brendon Grylls, was, “We haven’t spent a lot of money on roads”. Basically, he could spend it and no-one sees it, so the National Party did not care.

Other comments have been flying around in recent weeks. The member for North West Central said that the Karratha–Tom Price road would have been built using royalties for regions funding if the Nationals were still in government! I am not sure whether anyone can remember, but they were in government for how many years?

Several members interjected.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Eight and a half years.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Eight and a half years, and they did not do anything on the Karratha–Tom Price road—absolutely nothing. Since we have come to government, we have invested in and put money aside for these very key projects. But, of course, we would like some federal government support. One would think that the federal Liberal–National government would be interested in regional road funding. One would think that that would be a priority for it. What did we see last week when the Prime Minister came over? We did not see one cent for the Albany ring-road despite the local federal Liberal member talking about it and saying that we have not done enough. We have done the business cases, we have put the money on the table, and we want support from the federal Liberal–National government—and the same for the Karratha–Tom Price Road. We will not stop; we will keep fighting for regional road funding because it was neglected under the previous government. All around the state, the focus on regional road funding is very, very clear whether it is in Collie, the Pilbara, Kalgoorlie or Albany. The spending is across the state and we will continue to improve road safety and road conditions in regional WA. That is our priority.

The SPEAKER: Member for Churchlands.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members, he is eventually on his feet. We are going to hear his question.

PUBLIC HOSPITALS — FUNDING

123. **Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE to the Premier:**

I refer to comments from the WA president of the Australian Medical Association who, through social media, offered the Premier and the Minister for Health the following advice. He said that they should listen and respond to senior doctors if they tell them that lives are at risk, the system is under stress, and that it is not just the staff who suffer. He asked them to “Help us help our patients”. As the Premier of Western Australia, when will the member for Rockingham act on the advice of medical professionals and reverse cuts to the health budget to make sure our hospitals are properly resourced?

Mr M. McGOWAN replied:

The premise of the question is incorrect. There are no cuts to the health budget in Western Australia; in fact, it is going up significantly across the forward estimates. As I understand it, there was some reference to the emergency department at Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital. Activity there has increased and clinical staffing at the emergency department has increased to meet the demand.

PUBLIC HOSPITALS — FUNDING

124. **Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE to the Premier:**

I have a supplementary question. With regard to the Premier’s last comment, why is he defying the legitimate concerns of our medical profession; and, given that they have warned of avoidable deaths, how many avoidable deaths are required before the Premier steps up to properly fund the health system?

Mr M. McGOWAN replied:

That is an appalling thing to say and an appalling statement to make in this Parliament. The advice of the Department of Health is that the activity within emergency departments across the state goes up and down and resourcing is applied across individual hospitals to meet demand. I urge the Liberal Party opposition not to come in here scaremongering.

WANDOO REHABILITATION PRISON

125. **Mr Y. MUBARAKAI to the Minister for Corrective Services:**

I refer to the state’s first drug and alcohol rehabilitation prison, which is a key part of the McGowan Labor government’s Methamphetamine Action Plan. Can the minister update the house as to how Wandoo Rehabilitation Prison is supporting female prisoners who are dealing with addiction as well as the cycle that leads to drug-related crime, which surged under the previous Liberal–National government?

Mr F.M. LOGAN replied:

I thank the member for Jandakot for his question. Of course, with three large prison institutions in his electorate, he certainly knows a lot about this issue.

I am very proud to stand and give the house an update about Wandoo Rehabilitation Prison—the first of its kind in the whole of Australia, which has been specifically designed for women—and the graduation program that I attended the other day for the first cohort of women leaving the rehabilitation prison to either complete their sentence or leave prison completely. Ten women, two of whom are Aboriginal women, celebrated their graduation from the six-month therapeutic community program, which is run by Cyrenian House. Another four women, three of whom are also Aboriginal, received stage completion certificates. Three of the women who had already been released back into the community returned to prison—this is very unusual—in order to get their graduation certificates. One such woman is a mother of seven and a grandmother of five. She said she had been in and out of jail since she was 18. According to my notes, she said —

The program run with Cyrenian House was hard work and this is the first time I have graduated from anything in my life. In this prison I have learnt to forgive myself, to be civil, assertive and mindful. As a repeat offender, I am sick of going to funerals handcuffed at the grave site. I'm going to get out of here and shine.

I think that basically says an awful lot about the graduation. One of the graduates, as I said, returned to prison to get her graduation certificate. She was with her father and she spoke about the addiction that she had battled for years, alone and trapped and too ashamed to ask for help. She said, “I was a lost young girl and now I am a powerful woman.” This shows the work that they have been doing out there. These women are leaving prison stronger and more powerful and they are dealing with their addictions. Time will tell whether we have started the process of breaking the cycle of drug crime. However, the McGowan government is committed to this innovative way of dealing with drug addiction and, of course, the corollary of drug crime. I look forward to next year's opening of the male alcohol and drug facility at Casuarina Prison.

MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT — FOI REQUESTS**126. Ms M.J. DAVIES to the Minister for Planning:**

I refer to the freedom of information documents regarding a call-in notice for the Bay Village FIFO camp in Karratha that I received from the minister's office at 7.50 this morning, 47 days overdue and subject to three extensions and a scope reduction.

- (1) Is it a coincidence that I received this information less than 24 hours after I tabled a motion in this place condemning the minister for constant delays in responding to FOI requests?
- (2) Are the handwritten notes from a meeting on 15 November 2018 in the FOI pack, which state that Woodside would like the call-in option and want the minister to call it, accurate?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI replied:

I thank the member for the question.

- (1)–(2) I know that the National Party does not understand this, but it is not all about them. Today, we announced again our commitment to regional roads in WA, roads that were neglected under the National Party when it was in government. It purposely did not invest in roads. In relation to the specific query about FOIs —

Point of Order

Mr R.S. LOVE: The question was asked of the Minister for Planning.

The SPEAKER: What is the point of order?

Mr R.S. LOVE: The point of order is that this is completely irrelevant. It is not about planning whatsoever.

The SPEAKER: That is not a point of order.

Questions without Notice Resumed

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: My office receives a number of FOI requests. The opposition, both the National and Liberal Parties, do not do any work so its FOIs are quite broad. For example, an FOI may request everything to do with Matagarup Bridge from 1 March to now—everything! As a result of the massive scope of these FOIs, we have to work through them. I had to refine my FOIs to two or three days in some instances. I had to keep narrowing them until the exact hour that a document was presented. We are far more generous with our FOI process.

Several members interjected.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: We are.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members! Your own minister is on her feet.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Opposition members, many of whom have not been in opposition before, do not understand the FOI system that we have all gone through, both in opposition and in government.

I do not have those particular notes in front of me, but we understand that the Leader of the National Party does not support gas coming onshore in the north west—we understand that. We understand that she does not support job-creating industries in WA. That has been her position —

Mr D.T. Redman: You don't support regional communities.

The SPEAKER: Member! Your own leader has asked a question; hear the answer.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: There is evidence and evidence of all that we are doing in regional WA. The National Party's members' evidence is bumper stickers. That is what they have got. All that they have ever done is good bumper stickers, basically. We are supporting gas development in WA. We are supporting Woodside in trying to make sure it gets more projects to create more jobs and prosperity for WA.

MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT — FOI REQUESTS

127. Ms M.J. DAVIES to the Minister for Planning:

I have a supplementary question. I have the notes here if the minister would like them. Given that the notes were written one day before the minister issued the call-in —

Mr P. Papalia: What is the question?

Ms M.J. DAVIES: Does the member want me to start again?

The SPEAKER: The question is, Minister for Tourism, I call you to order for the first time.

Ms M.J. DAVIES: I have the notes right here, minister; I can provide the minister with a copy of them. Given that the notes were written one day before the minister issued the call-in notice, can the minister confirm who made the decision to call in the appeal before the State Administrative Tribunal—Woodside or the minister?

Mr D.T. Redman interjected.

The SPEAKER: Let us hear the answer, member for Warren–Blackwood.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI replied:

I made the decision. I think I have said that on numerous occasions. If that is the biggest issue that members of the Nationals WA have today, they are completely disconnected from regional Western Australia. They do not live in the regions. They do not represent the regions. I am out there investing —

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members, please. I want to hear this.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Members of the Nationals WA keep interjecting, but when I respond to their interjections, they do not like it. They should stop interjecting. We are investing in regional WA and spending more on roads than members opposite ever did in their eight and a half years.

YOUTH — UNEMPLOYMENT

128. Mrs A.K. HAYDEN to the Minister for Youth:

I refer to the recent report into Australia's youth unemployment hotspots that highlighted Western Australia as the state with the second-highest rate of youth unemployment in the country at 14.5 per cent.

- (1) Can the minister confirm whether he was consulted on the Premier's 150 000-jobs plan?
- (2) What was the minister's recommendation for youth job numbers?

Mr P.C. TINLEY replied:

I thank the member for Darling Range for the question.

- (1)–(2) I want to refer the member to the fact that we are in the chamber of the Western Australian Parliament. The unemployment matters that the member talked about —

Mrs A.K. Hayden: Youth unemployment in WA—yes.

Mr P.C. TINLEY: It just defies —

Mrs A.K. Hayden interjected.

The SPEAKER: Just wait.

Mr P.C. TINLEY: I cannot understand the logic between what the member is suggesting—that this chamber, this minister and this government is responsible for national figures on unemployment for youth. Newstart or Centrelink—do any of those things ring a bell with the member, and about the national agreements for the employment of young people and getting them into work?

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members!

Mr P.C. TINLEY: Is any of that ringing a bell for the member about what chamber she ought to be asking that sort of question in?

Several members interjected

The SPEAKER: Members!

Mr P.C. TINLEY: The member is so out of her depth, it is beyond comprehension.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Warren–Blackwood and member for Mirrabooka, I called you both to order. It is not a shouting chamber.

Mr P.C. TINLEY: I will respond to the point about my contribution to the employment figures of the government of Western Australia under Mark McGowan.

Ms J.M. Freeman interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Mirrabooka, I call you to order for the second time.

Mr P.C. TINLEY: I was indeed consulted, like every member of the cabinet. Indeed, a lot of time and sweat went into the numbers and the arrangements by which we would undertake the recovery of this state to bring it back from the abyss—the fiscal reef that members opposite left it on and that we inherited not two years ago.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members!

Mr P.C. TINLEY: I can tell the member for Darling Range that one thing we are doing to contribute to any unemployment and getting Western Australians back into work is, firstly, putting the books back into order and creating some sort of budget repair and fiscal system that will give us the capacity to create better circumstances for Western Australian businesses—the private capital that members opposite seem to ignore. The party says it represents business but has no evidence for the claim. It is asleep at the wheel and it was asleep at the wheel for eight and a half years. It is very good at planning in a boom and spending the poultice of cash that came through the door, but they were very poor at planning for a boom. It is okay because the adults are on the right side of the chamber. The grown-ups will take care of this for you! We will get the state's finances back on track.

Ms L. Mettam interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Vasse!

Mr P.C. TINLEY: We will create the balance that is required in the budget to allow for the sorts of programs that will get young people back into work and allow young people to take the full opportunity of the natural endowment of the state. Nothing that members opposite did ever contributed to it.

YOUTH — UNEMPLOYMENT

129. **Mrs A.K. HAYDEN to the Minister for Youth:**

I have a supplementary question. Given the minister's very strange response, can he confirm that he has obviously not read the report on Australia's youth unemployment hotspots that highlighted WA as the state with the second highest youth unemployment rate in the country?

Ms J.J. Shaw interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Swan Hills!

Mrs A.K. HAYDEN: Has the minister sat down with the Premier —

The SPEAKER: It is a supplementary question, member; it has to be a continuation of the first one.

Mrs A.K. HAYDEN: It is, Mr Speaker.

What is the minister's strategy with the Premier for their 150 000-jobs plan?

Mr P.C. TINLEY replied:

One thing I will tell the member is that these things take some time.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members!

Mr P.C. TINLEY: Firstly, we had to overturn some of the very poor decisions made by the government that the member for Darling Range was a member of.

Mr D.C. Nalder: Like what?

Mr P.C. TINLEY: I refer to the 500 per cent TAFE fee increase. We froze TAFE fees—the very thing that young Western Australians need to find a way into the workforce. Metronet has more than \$2.5 billion worth of urban rail infrastructure of which 14 precincts will create those sorts of construction jobs and the sorts of jobs around the design and infrastructure support that are required for young people to get apprenticeships and traineeships. The member for Darling Range is out of her depth. Can she come back with something more cogent next time?

POLICE — PROTECTIVE EQUIPMENT

130. Ms C.M. ROWE to the Minister for Police:

I refer to the decisive action taken by the McGowan Labor government to improve community safety and deliver our commitment to expand the opening hours of the Belmont Police Station. Can the minister update the house on how this government is ensuring that Western Australian police officers have the proper equipment they need to serve the community?

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS replied:

I thank the member for Belmont for her question and her keen interest in supporting the community safety of her electorate. She campaigned to have the hours of Belmont Police Station expanded. I was delighted that within a few months of obtaining government, we were able to expand the opening hours so that Belmont Police Station is open until seven at night. That is something that her community had wanted for years, but the former government had denied.

I also commend the member for her support of our police officers having the protective equipment that they need to do the job. Every day we see in the media the difficult and dangerous jobs that police officers are turning up to with situations occurring in the city, suburbs, and regional centres on a daily basis.

I have always been very keen to ensure that police officers have the protective equipment they need to do the job. That is why the Gallop government rolled out a universal firearm so that all police officers would have a Glock firearm. It was for clear safety reasons. The former government had a 20-year plan of a mix of Glocks and Smith and Wesson firearms as they gradually got off the Smith and Wessons and onto the Glocks. We had the stupid situation of officers going to a unit that used Glocks then two years later being sent to a location or unit where they would have to go back to the old Smith and Wesson firearm and be retrained. We also rolled out tasers and pepper spray to support our police officers and make sure that they are able to defend themselves while they are protecting and defending the community. Unfortunately, the last Liberal government did not do that.

Police around Australia have gradually been issued with stab-proof vests, but in Western Australia the project was put on the backburner by the former government. Indeed, its members talked the talk but they never walked the walk. An article by Grant Taylor highlighted the issue in June 2015. It said that the government was going to have a trial and, hopefully, roll out the vests by the end of the year. The government said it would trial 50 vests—in fact, it trialled 42 vests—but it did not put anything further in place. There was no real plan to roll out any vests. The government did not choose a vest and had no needs analysis. There was no preferred or suitable product. It did not make basic decisions about whether they would be personal-issue vests or a station would have a limited number of vests and officers would have to share them. This is one of the many unfunded problems that the former government left sitting. It spent big and blew the state budget, but left these necessary projects that we have had to start from scratch. The former government had plenty of time. This need was highlighted in 2015. Did the government do anything in 2015? No. Did it do anything in 2016? No. Did the government go to the election with a midyear review that had money in the budget? No. There was nothing in the budget and no proper plan.

The member for Belmont asked what we are doing and I am more than happy to inform her. In the middle of 2017, I asked Deputy Commissioner Dreiberger to convene a meeting with the police union to start scoping the project and working out what was required in order to get the union on board to get its input on what it believed its officers needed to be able to protect themselves. In October 2017, we put out an invitation to register interest, which I am told is called an ITRI. That was released through Tenders WA. That was done to find a suitable body armour configuration for review and so that the technical requirements of a tender could be drafted. A number of suitable suppliers replied to that ITRI process and they provided sample products—products that the union and the police force have been able to look at. In February 2018, the scope of that project was finalised and it was progressed towards procurement. The Commissioner of Police has recommended personal issue protective vests. That is something on which I certainly support him, for a variety of reasons that I will not go into now. Sharing vests is not appropriate given the kinds of vests that police officers want and need. A procurement plan was then submitted to and approved by the State Tender Review Committee. That was published in September 2018. That tender process closed in November last year. Those tenders are now in the process of being evaluated. I am now very confident that we will be able to progress towards a rollout of protective vests for our Western Australia Police Force. That is another shining example of the neglect of WA police by the member for Scarborough and the former government. We had to step up and put a proper project in place because although they talked about support for police, they did not give them any.

ANIMAL ACTIVISM

131. Mr R.S. LOVE to the Attorney General:

I refer to the answer the Attorney General gave in the other place yesterday that the Criminal Code adequately deals with the issue of trespass, which is in direct contradiction to the Premier's remarks in this place yesterday that he was seeking to review legislation related to trespass laws for farming properties.

- (1) Why is the Attorney General at odds with the Premier on this issue?
- (2) Was the Attorney General aware of the Premier's intention to review trespass laws?
- (3) Will the Attorney General now fall into line and commit to reviewing trespass laws with a view to increasing penalties for those who trespass on farming land?

Mr J.R. QUIGLEY replied:

- (1)–(3) The member did not read out the whole of the answer. He should read out the whole of the answer. In the answer, I said that we are contemplating changing the Restraining Orders Act 1997. We have the trespass act. He had to clip the answer because it did not fit the frame-up. As the member will know—I hope his supplementary question will go to the full answer—I am contemplating changing the Restraining Orders Act. Here is the deficiency. A person could be charged with trespass and be taken before the court and fined. It does not matter if we keep doubling or trebling the fine; there is a discretion that they will be fined. What the farmers want and what the community wants is a cessation of this aberrant conduct. While we are thinking about contemplating changing the Restraining Orders Act, we need to make it like some other offences so that when one is convicted of trespass, the court can impose a misconduct restraining order under the Restraining Orders Act to bar anyone from trespassing on any property in Western Australia for the next five years. If they commit any act of trespass in the next five years, they will then be arrested, thrown in the cells and brought before the court. The trespass penalty is adequate but it is insufficient in that it does not bind an offender from repeating the offence. When these no-gooders trespass on the farmers' property and livestream from their stock sheds, the farmers want those persons permanently banned. We are going to do it. That is what I am contemplating. I have never been at odds with the Premier. The Premier and I are at one on our strict law and order agenda.

ANIMAL ACTIVISM

132. Mr R.S. LOVE to the Attorney General:

I have a supplementary question. Will the Attorney General now acknowledge that without this question today, the Premier would not know what the hell is going on?

Mr J.R. QUIGLEY replied:

I will answer that question by asking a rhetorical question of the Leader of the Opposition: does he concede that his member is a fool? He did not even go to the end of the answer, which I have directed him to. Of course the Premier knows everything I am doing. I speak to him all day about what we are going to do.

Mr R.S. Love: Why didn't he know what you were doing yesterday?

Mr J.R. QUIGLEY: Did the member not listen to the answer? We are not going to change the penalty for trespass. We are going to give the courts the power under the Restraining Orders Act to prohibit these people from future acts of trespass on pain of arrest. The member should just listen. It has to be in his answer somewhere.

ABORIGINAL HERITAGE ACT — REFORMS

133. Dr A.D. BUTI to the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs:

I refer to the proposed reforms to the Aboriginal Heritage Act 1972.

- (1) Can the minister outline to the house why reform is needed and what steps he has taken to ensure that there is proper engagement between stakeholders?
- (2) Can the minister advise whether he has received feedback from the industry on the process so far?

Mr B.S. WYATT replied:

- (1)–(2) I thank the member for Armadale for the question about the Aboriginal Heritage Act, an act he knows well. As members know—some more than most—this is a very old act, some 47 years old. Indeed, the Aboriginal Heritage Act went through Parliament well before the Mabo decision and the passage of the Native Title Act through the commonwealth Parliament in 1993. I certainly hope to either amend or replace the Aboriginal Heritage Act, a position we took to the state election. I make the point that I will not be the first Aboriginal affairs minister who has wanted to reform this act to have it cruelled by opposition to and suspicion of the proposition.

We started the consultation process a year ago. That led to the release of a discussion paper last week, with a series of specific proposals about a potential new act. To be honest, an amendment is no longer required; we are looking at replacement legislation around the heritage act. Looking around, there are no former Ministers for Aboriginal Affairs in this place. When it comes to section 18, it does not matter whether that is something that is already agreed with the relevant Aboriginal group and there is no impact on a heritage site versus a section 18 process over a heavily contentious site where there is great disruption—the process is the same. There has been a desire to perhaps have different processes streamline those that do not have an impact, for example, on Aboriginal heritage sites. That is something that has been broadly supported at this point by Aboriginal groups and industry groups. Importantly, it also reflects the fact that we now have—I think this is an opportunity—a very thorough understanding of traditional owners in some parts of Western Australia, as we discovered through the native title process. I think that a future Aboriginal Heritage Act should acknowledge native title. To be fair, when Hon Peter Collier tried this in the term of the last government, he did not seek to bring the native title processes into the Aboriginal heritage process, which ultimately was a big problem.

One of the other issues that we are also proposing is to give Aboriginal people equal appeal rights to non-Aboriginal groups—miners usually. Again, that was something that Hon Peter Collier thought was not appropriate—to give non-Aboriginal people the right to appeal—but he did want to give that right to Aboriginal people. I think we have now come up with a position that, by and large—so far I say with some trepidation—has been broadly supported. I want to thank the Association of Mining and Exploration Companies. It has made some very positive contributions, as has the Chamber of Minerals and Energy and a range of Aboriginal groups—the Kimberley Land Council and the Yamatji Marlpa Aboriginal Corporation. At the moment we are slowly, slowly bringing groups along on what I hope is broad support for a new Aboriginal Heritage Act. Anyone who has been in this space, whether it is a local government authority, a miner or any organisation that has had to bump into the heritage process, would know that it is frustrating, time-consuming and difficult to navigate. It does not acknowledge the fact that organisations, including local governments, for example, already have heritage arrangements with Aboriginal people that are not acknowledged in the current legislation. I think we can come up with a new act that can do all of that and, in the end, empower Aboriginal people to take more control over their heritage because, after all, it is the Aboriginal people who own it.

WESTERN ROCK LOBSTER FISHERY — REFORMS — GREG POLAND

134. Mr I.C. BLAYNEY to the Minister for Fisheries:

I refer to the minister's botched nationalisation of the crayfishing industry.

- (1) Can the minister please outline to the house what involvement Greg Poland had in his decision to attempt the nationalisation of the industry?
- (2) Has the minister had any contact with Greg Poland beyond his letter of August 2018, the meeting with him in November and the aquaculture consortium in 2017?

Mr D.J. KELLY replied:

- (1)–(2) Thank you, member, for that question. I am aware of reports that Mr Poland claimed to be, I think, the architect or to have engineered the policy. I am aware of media reports. I have not heard direct comment from him, but I am aware of media reports that he has made those claims. Those claims are completely false. As I have outlined to a number of media outlets, Mr Poland attended an aquaculture consortium. The government had consortiums on a number of industry issues. He attended to talk about aquaculture at that meeting. Lobster was not discussed. He then wrote me an unsolicited letter in, I think, August 2018, in which, as a restaurant owner, he expressed an interest in having a number of licences so that he could provide lobster at his restaurants. He expressed the view in his letter that as a restaurateur, he simply could not access lobster for his restaurants. That was the extent of the content of his letter. He did not outline any greater plan for the industry; he simply expressed an interest in having lobster made available for his restaurants. By the time I received his letter, we were quite well advanced in thinking about what we might do in this industry. When we received that letter from him, it was just one of a number of representations that we had received from a variety of people in the restaurant and hospitality industry saying that they would like greater access to lobster. I asked, I think, my chief of staff to contact him, as we had contacted other people who had contacted us. I said, "Let's arrange a meeting with him to hear what he's got to say." That meeting took place in early November. By that stage we had already arranged for negotiations to begin with the Western Rock Lobster Council on a new policy, so any suggestion that he had engineered the process is, I suggest, a made-up boast by a businessman here in Perth. It was reported to me that he was cranky because I did not actually do what he asked me to do. That is the interesting thing. I did not do what he asked me to do. The plan we announced was something quite different. That is the only contact I have had with him on this issue of lobster.

WESTERN ROCK LOBSTER FISHERY — REFORM — GREG POLAND

135. Mr I.C. BLAYNEY to the Minister for Fisheries:

I have a supplementary question. I refer to the minister's media announcement with a seafood restaurateur at Hillarys Boat Harbour espousing the virtues of the minister's proposed nationalisation. Did he know that Greg Poland owned that restaurant or was he unaware of this?

Mr D.J. KELLY replied:

After we had announced the policy, which as the member for Geraldton knows, was after about five weeks of negotiations with the Western Rock Lobster Council, we looked, as you do, for media opportunities to promote the policy—so to have an event at Hillarys seemed logical. Yes, we were —

Mr P.A. Katsambanis: You didn't invite me!

Mr D.J. KELLY: There were lots of other locals there.

When we organised that event, I was aware that that restaurant was owned by Greg Poland—absolutely aware—because, remember, he had written to us in August saying that he either owned or controlled 40 or 60 restaurants throughout Western Australia and he just could not get access to lobster. After we had negotiated the policy with the Western Rock Lobster Council, we were looking for a venue to hold a media event. Hillarys is a pretty logical place. There are 21 restaurants up there, but none of them had access to western rock lobster. Yes, we were perfectly aware that he owned that facility. However, as I have indicated, that was well after the policy had already been announced.

The SPEAKER: That is the end of question time.

TEMPORARY ORDERS 40, 101, 146, 147 — STANDING ORDER AMENDMENTS*Amendment to Motion*

Resumed from an earlier stage of the sitting on the motion moved by Mr D.A. Templeman (Leader of the House), to which Ms M.J. Davies (Leader of the Nationals WA) had moved an amendment.

MR Z.R.F. KIRKUP (Dawesville) [2.46 pm]: Mr Speaker, thank you very much for allowing me to continue my remarks post-question time. I will wrap up very quickly. All I would like to reiterate is that we fully support the amendment moved by the Leader of the Nationals WA that, of course, reflects the majority opinion of the Procedure and Privileges Committee and its recommendation on changes to standing orders. I would like to impress on all members to consider the importance of taking on board that committee report and to vote according to the wishes of that majority.

The SPEAKER: Excuse me, everyone; can you be quiet so I can find out what is going on.

MR R.S. LOVE (Moore) [2.47 pm]: I would like to comment on this amendment.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members! Attorney General!

Mr R.S. LOVE: We had quite a lengthy discussion before question time on this amendment to the motion by the Leader of the Nationals WA regarding the proposed temporary change to standing orders. There were many speakers, I think, on the other side who were quite interested in making comment. I listened quite intently to the Minister for Police, and thought some of her commentary was valuable, at least insofar as the mechanics of breastfeeding are concerned and the need to ensure it is not interrupted by procedures in this house and that the ability to breastfeed is not in any way impinged upon.

Nothing about the amendment the Leader of the Nationals WA put forward in any way detracts from the ability of any woman in this house who has a baby to breastfeed that baby. That is not the intent whatsoever, nor is it intended to in any way seek to, I suppose, lessen or belittle the status of breastfeeding as opposed to bottle-feeding. It is not about that at all. The member for Central Wheatbelt was putting forward a proposition that there should not really be discrimination between the sexes. If a parent has a need to look after a baby at that time, they should be able to do that. We know also that circumstances can arise in future in which same-sex male couples may have babies, and they will be parents.

A bill is going through the upper house at the moment to actually allow that to happen. We have to move with the times and the amendment that was put forward was a very inclusive change. It was not meant in any way to upset anybody; it was not meant in any way to exclude anybody.

Mr D.J. Kelly interjected.

Mr R.S. LOVE: You just be quiet for a while, because I would like to have a say.

Mr D.J. Kelly interjected.

The SPEAKER: Minister for Water, I call you to order for the second time.

Mr R.S. LOVE: Some female members of the house have had unfortunate experiences in Parliament when they have had young children, and they felt that they had been slighted by the Parliament of the day. I am sorry that that happened to them. I am also sorry that the member for North West Central, as a parent, had to go through some difficult times as well, and he outlined those circumstances to the house. Nobody imagines that it is not proper for the house to change its views over time. Some of the events we heard about were 10 years ago or thereabouts. In fact, most of the people in this chamber now were not in the chamber at that time. I know the people who were adversely affected still harbour some hurt and perhaps some resentment about that, but it is not really relevant to the debate today because today we are talking about 2019, changed circumstances and changed personnel in the chamber.

I thought some of the comments descended at times into personal comments that hurt some members on both sides of the chamber. Some of the comments I heard were particularly hurtful to the member for Central Wheatbelt, and I think members should reflect on their own interjections and the words they have used in this house today. The member for Central Wheatbelt is a most well respected member of the community—in her own electorate, in the region she used to represent, the Agricultural Region, and throughout the state generally. I thought those comments were inappropriate. I want to put it on the record that she has my very strong support for the amendment she has put forward today, and I am sure she has the support of many, many women across her electorate and across the state. Contrary to what we have heard today, I do not think the Parliament should be a place where differences on matters like this are brought to the fore in any sort of party-political way. I do not believe that everyone on that side of the house actually supports the position that has been taken by the government today. In fact, we know that that is not the case because the majority of the Procedure and Privileges Committee that made the recommendation that babies should be allowed to be fed —

The SPEAKER: Attorney General, I call you to order for the first time. I have warned you about four times: have your meetings outside.

Mr R.S. LOVE: The majority of that committee are members of the ALP—members of the government.

Mr D.A. Templeman interjected.

Mr R.S. LOVE: No, I am not interested; thanks.

Mr D.A. Templeman interjected.

The SPEAKER: Leader of the House!

Mr R.S. LOVE: Here is the report, recommendation 2. Does the Leader of the House want me to read it out? The Leader of the House knows very well what is in the report. I will read it out. Recommendation 2 states, in part —

The Committee recommends —

Standing Order 40

That as a trial for 2019, Standing Order 40 be amended by inserting the following sentence at the end of the Standing Order: ‘A stranger does not include a member’s baby being fed by that member’.

It does not make reference to breastfeeding; it says “fed”, so if the Leader of the House does not mind, I would like to continue what I am saying.

Circumstances in our society are changing; everybody knows that. I was at Kalgoorlie last week and met with a group of women who are desperately trying to get child care because that town has a very high employment rate; it does not have a very high unemployment rate, but a very high employment rate. The mining companies are desperate to get the partners of their workforce back into the workforce—women who have had babies and also men who are parenting—and child care is a real issue in that area. Having spoken to women out there who are working in mining professions and cannot do their job every day because they have to run around and make arrangements for their children, it occurred to me that that sort of thing is not a very productive way for a community to be.

Similarly, within this chamber we should be seeking to be a workplace where parents—including men and women, although I know that at the moment women take most of the burden of that relationship—should be allowed to contribute fully in the Parliament. What is proposed by the member for Central Wheatbelt will enable that to occur. It does not discriminate, whether or not a person is physically breastfeeding a child. Children and babies need to be nurtured whether they are being breastfed or bottle-fed. I do not subscribe to the proposition that a parent can just hand the baby to anyone and say, “Here, take my baby while I run inside and vote.” That is preposterous. We would have to have a support network here in the Parliament for that to happen, and that has not been provided. We know, for instance, that electoral staff cannot work in the Parliament, so who will look after the baby while the person runs in? Are they just going to give it to one of the staff members out there, such as someone in the tearoom? Will they be appropriate to do that? No, they will not be. We would need to have a support network if that were the case. Babies, whether or not they are being breastfed, need to be nurtured, loved and looked after. This amendment will enable that to happen.

Throughout this debate the ranks on the other side have been pretty thin. I do not know whether that is because some members on that side actually do not support the way the government has butchered this recommendation of the Procedure and Privileges Committee by making it political and trying to exclude certain parents from being able to participate by feeding their babies when they are in the chamber. I do not see the need for any discrimination, either between the sexes or between women who can or cannot, or who choose to or choose not to, breastfeed their children. I do not see why that should be an issue.

Mrs M.H. Roberts interjected.

Mr R.S. LOVE: I am sorry; I did not laugh at the minister when she was speaking.

Mrs M.H. Roberts interjected.

The SPEAKER: Minister for Police!

Mr R.S. LOVE: I did not laugh at the Premier.

Mrs M.H. Roberts interjected.

The SPEAKER: Minister for Police, I call you to order for the first time.

Mr R.S. LOVE: What we are seeing is the typical pattern of behaviour by members on that side. They become nasty, they become personal, and they politicise a situation that should be a matter of humanity—something that we can all share in because we are all people, whether or not we are parents, grandparents, aunts or uncles, or whatever we are. We all have some appreciation of this issue.

We also heard it suggested that some members on this side should not have been speaking to this matter because they happen to be men. As dads, I am sure they understand family situations. Why should they not speak? We all have to vote, we all have to contribute on these matters. These are matters for the Parliament; they are not matters for a select group within the Parliament. They are matters for everybody in the Parliament to discuss and debate. Why would anyone try to limit anyone's right to do that? I do not understand what the mentality is behind somebody wanting to do that. This is not a matter of life or death; this is a matter of inclusion, and I do not know why the government is trying to limit that inclusion. I do not know why the government is choosing this path of not being progressive. I thought the Labor Party was the party that prided itself on being progressive.

Its members are starting to sound like a certain Prime Minister I remember from their side who said a few years ago that marriage was between a man and a woman. That person was the former PM Julia Gillard. We know that this country changed the law with overwhelming support from most Australians to ensure that marriage was not just a matter between a man and a woman. Strangely enough, that happened under a Liberal–National coalition government—amazing! Once again, we see a very strange set of circumstances in which the members on that side of the house, who hold themselves out to be so progressive, are actually the ones who are trying to limit social inclusion. I do not understand it. I do not understand why they have become such a negative, nasty, catcalling group of people on such an issue of common, decent humanity for both sides. The member for Central Wheatbelt's amendment to this motion is admirable and I urge everybody to support it. I will be interested to see how many government members are on the government's side when this amendment comes to a vote.

MRS A.K. HAYDEN (Darling Range) [3.00 pm]: I am pleased to make a contribution to the debate on this amendment. I note that at the moment we are not talking to the standing order motion that is before us. We are talking to just the amendment to standing order 40 that was put by the Leader of the National Party to insert after the word "breastfed" the words "or bottle-fed". I make my contribution on the note that the recommendations put forward by the committee who considered the standing orders are not being reflected in the standing orders that we are being asked to debate, and that I support the amendment put forward by the National Party. I apologise that I did not hear the contributions to the debate that occurred prior to mine, but I will make sure I go back over *Hansard* and have a read. I believe that some accusations were made in this place, but the very reason that certain accusations were made today and hurt people is what we should consider when making decisions on standing orders. As I have said in this place many times, I wonder if this is an appropriate place for children, let alone babies, to be, but I will put that in my contribution to the debate on the motion. At the moment, we are debating the amendment put forward by the Leader of the National Party.

I want to congratulate the member for Moore for putting forward a very positive and respectful contribution that plays a bigger role in this place than the yelling and screaming that occurred across the floor earlier.

Mr D.A. Templeman: You were not here; you wouldn't know.

Mrs A.K. HAYDEN: Let me tell the member that I have been told —

Mr D.A. Templeman: So you were hiding. You were here but you weren't participating.

Mrs A.K. HAYDEN: I heard it from outside the chamber when I was coming in.

Mr D.A. Templeman interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr T.J. Healy): Members! The member has heard your interjections.

Mrs A.K. HAYDEN: I rest my case on why it is an inappropriate place for children. Perhaps there are more children in this place than we realise.

Mrs L.M. Harvey: Just rise above the disrespect, member.

Mrs A.K. HAYDEN: Yes, absolutely—show respect.

My guess is that the whole point of members from the other side putting forward this motion is to try to show equality. They have put forward an amendment to what the committee has recommended, and I will read it out for the sake of *Hansard* and those who are tuning in. The recommendation put forward states —

Only the Speaker may admit strangers onto the floor of the Chamber. When a division is called, strangers will withdraw. Members of the Council will be admitted to the Chamber in the area behind the Chair and may remain there during divisions. A stranger does not include a member's baby being fed by that member.

We are debating whether to include the words “or bottle-fed” after the word “breastfed”. Regardless of whether a person is male or female, they should not be alienated and treated differently from a female who is breastfeeding. We all know that not every woman has the privilege of being able to breastfeed. For medical reasons or otherwise they may not be able to breastfeed. For us to say that only those women who have the privilege of breastfeeding may be on the floor of the chamber to do so, is not equal. It does not align with the argument being put forward by the opposition about being equal and setting an example by delivering better for this society. For women who cannot breastfeed, it is further alienating them than they have already been alienated by many within our community. A very good friend of mine tried to breastfeed for a very long time and was unable to do so. She was distraught that she could not do it. As a woman and as a mother, she saw it as a failure to not be able to breastfeed her child. She took that on without the added assistance of people putting her under pressure. But when mothers get that added pressure, how do members think they feel? We are meant to be setting an example for our community and our society. Although members on the other side say that they are doing this for equality and to provide mothers with rights, we should provide that right regardless of whether a mother is breastfeeding or bottle-feeding. We should not discriminate against a woman who simply cannot breastfeed.

Standing orders are meant to reflect the way in which we conduct ourselves on the floor of the Legislative Assembly and how we go about our business to make sure we deliver on democracy, which is why we are here. The standing orders are not to be manipulated. They are not to be changed to send a certain message out into the public. The standing orders operate fairly and evenly for every single member who sits in this place, no matter what side of the chamber they sit on. The member for Moore highlighted in his speech that comments were made that have offended members in this place. Comments have been made on this very topic to bully or intimidate or to insinuate that males have no right to make a comment —

Mr V.A. Catania: Or females who don't have children.

Mrs A.K. HAYDEN: Yes, or females who do not have children.

Mr P. Papalia: So you weren't here and listening to any contributions, but you are making accusations.

Mrs A.K. HAYDEN: Did the member not just listen to me? I suggest he listens to me and stops interjecting. I actually said, “Referring to the member for Moore's comments —

Mr P. Papalia interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member, do you seek to take interjections?

Mrs A.K. HAYDEN: Absolutely not.

Mr P. Papalia interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Minister, please allow the member to make her contribution. Can the member please direct her comments to the Chair.

Mrs A.K. HAYDEN: As I was saying, I was referring to some very intelligent comments made by the member for Moore. He referred to comments that were made across the floor to certain members saying that if a member is a woman who has not had children, or a man, they do not have the right to make comments in this place on these —

Several government members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members!

Mr D.A. Templeman interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Leader of the House, the member has indicated that she has decided to not take interjections.

Mr P. Papalia interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Minister!

Mrs A.K. HAYDEN: We are debating the standing orders and how we are meant to operate in a place that is meant to be above all law and above all standards, yet I cannot even make my comments without being interjected on in a nasty, bullish way, as to be expected from government members over and over again.

I will make reference to those comments later on in my response to the debate on the standing orders. Members might then start to change the way that they comment and interject. However, the comments made by the member for Moore have actually —

Mrs M.H. Roberts interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Minister!

Mrs A.K. HAYDEN: Oh please! Can people just be quiet.

Point of Order

Dr D.J. HONEY: The member can barely get a word out without being interjected on by ministers on the other side.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr T.J. Healy): I understand what the member is trying to say. Members, please allow the member for Darling Range to make her comments. Can the member please direct her comments to the Chair.

Debate Resumed

Mrs A.K. HAYDEN: I will start again. We are in this place to set an example. We are here to make sure there is equality across our state that we represent. The standing orders are here to make sure that every member in this place has the same right and ability and is treated equally. Today's debate has shown that that does not happen and that we are in a very sad place when people cannot debate an issue without going to personal references and making personal comments. Yesterday, the Premier asked that personal comments not be made towards him and his family, yet a day later members under his government are making awful accusations across the floor. I believe that we need to stand up and start lifting the bar in this place and start acting like the leaders and representatives of the community that people vote us in to be.

The government is taking the position to change the committee's recommendation, which is to allow breastfeeding and bottle-feeding onto the floor of the chamber. If this government is serious about changing the way people see women and mothers in the workforce, why did it not adopt the full recommendation? Why did it amend the recommendation? That is the question before us: why was that recommendation amended and diluted to allow only breastfeeding mothers the right to come onto this floor and feed their children? The questions are not: Should women be able to breastfeed on the floor of the chamber? Should bottle-feeding be allowed? The questions are: Why has the government chosen to dilute the committee's recommendation? Why has this government broken it down and made it only about women who have the privilege to breastfeed their children, isolating those women who cannot? That is the question before us right now and I support the Leader of the Nationals WA's recommendation and amendment to change this standing order.

Division

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

Ayes (18)

| | | | |
|-----------------|---------------------|-----------------|--------------------------------|
| Mr I.C. Blayney | Dr D.J. Honey | Mr R.S. Love | Mr D.T. Redman |
| Mr V.A. Catania | Mr P.A. Katsambanis | Mr W.R. Marmion | Mr P.J. Rundle |
| Ms M.J. Davies | Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup | Mr J.E. McGrath | Ms L. Mettam (<i>Teller</i>) |
| Mrs L.M. Harvey | Mr A. Krsticevic | Dr M.D. Nahan | |
| Mrs A.K. Hayden | Mr S.K. L'Estrange | Mr D.C. Nalder | |

Noes (35)

| | | | |
|-------------------|------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Ms L.L. Baker | Mr M. Hughes | Mr M.P. Murray | Mrs J.M.C. Stojkovski |
| Dr A.D. Buti | Mr W.J. Johnston | Mrs L.M. O'Malley | Mr C.J. Tallentire |
| Mr J.N. Carey | Mr D.J. Kelly | Mr P. Papalia | Mr D.A. Templeman |
| Mrs R.M.J. Clarke | Mr F.M. Logan | Mr S.J. Price | Mr P.C. Tinley |
| Mr R.H. Cook | Mr M. McGowan | Mr J.R. Quigley | Mr R.R. Whitby |
| Mr M.J. Folkard | Ms S.F. McGurk | Mrs M.H. Roberts | Ms S.E. Winton |
| Ms J.M. Freeman | Mr K.J.J. Michel | Ms C.M. Rowe | Mr B.S. Wyatt |
| Ms E.L. Hamilton | Mr S.A. Millman | Ms R. Saffioti | Mr D.R. Michael (<i>Teller</i>) |
| Mr T.J. Healy | Mr Y. Mubarakai | Ms A. Sanderson | |

Pair

Mr K.M. O'Donnell

Mr D.T. Punch

Amendment thus negatived.

Motion Resumed

DR D.J. HONEY (Cottesloe) [3.16 pm]: I wish to briefly address a couple of matters. The first one is directly to the Minister for Transport. I want to make it very clear to the minister, through the Chair, that in the conversation we had today, I do not pass any comment about the minister, how the minister felt about matters or the minister's experience. That is purely a matter for her to discuss; however, the matter that I was referring to very directly in my interjection during that matter was that members on this side were laughing and mocking her because of those feelings. I do not believe that to be true at all. I do not believe that members on this side were laughing and mocking her. Equally, I fully respect the way that she feels and I do not seek to in any way decrease the validity of the minister's statement of those emotions.

I get to the substantive topic of breastfeeding. I strongly support this part of the changes to the standing orders. I think this is a very important inclusion to our workplace. The reason I say that is that my wife and I had six children and my wife was able to breastfeed all our children for extended periods, much more than a matter of months. She did that because she had a work environment that in some way allowed that. She was an academic at a university, and that enabled her some flexibility in the way that she could do that. It was an extremely onerous and difficult thing for her to do, but she was determined to do it because she felt very strongly that that was very important in raising our children. And she was able to do it. In fact, can I say more generally, all workplaces should seriously look at this issue. The reasons for not allowing breastfeeding in workplaces I think, in large part, are made up. If there is a genuine safety issue for the child, then there may be a case. If they are in the middle of a refinery, that may be the case, but if they are in a workplace or an office environment such as this, there is no reason whatsoever that a woman should not be able to breastfeed her child.

Breastfeeding is unique. It is patently obvious that I have never had to breastfeed; however, having been a father very involved in the raising of his six children I do at least have some reasonably close association. What is very clear and obvious for mothers who feed their child is that the mother and child become completely in sync. When the child is hungry and wants to be fed, quite typically the mother has an urgent need to feed the child. It is not something that can be put off, delayed or put aside, and for the mother it can be extremely painful if they cannot feed the child when the child needs to be fed. I can see no practical reason that a woman should not be able to feed her child in this chamber. There is an opportunity for this place to show leadership and guidance in this area for other businesses; businesses such as law firms, accounting firms and engineering firms where people do not have an unsafe environment, they have a safe environment.

In relation to the comment on noise, there are very few occasions I disagree with some of my colleagues, but on this one, I might say that our babies grew up in a very noisy household. There were eight people in our household, six of them now, and they are passionate about politics. Some have very diverse political views, not necessarily mine, and they are happy to express those views vociferously.

Mr D.J. Kelly interjected.

Dr D.J. HONEY: The member will be pleased to know they all vote for me, but they may not always agree with me!

Our babies seemed to thrive on a noisy and boisterous environment. They were quite content. They seemed more content in that environment than in a quiet and more serene environment. I think there are some leading lights in this area. Because this is an opportunity to do so, I want to recognise Professor Cheryl Praeger at the University of Western Australia. I am not sure how many members know about Professor Praeger. She is an outstanding and world renowned mathematician.

Mr W.R. Marmion: She lives in my electorate.

Dr D.J. HONEY: Yes, she lives in the member for Nedlands' electorate and is still regularly seen in the electorate. In the late 1970s and early 1980s, Professor Praeger had a very famous tricycle that she used to take her babies and small children around the campus in. She kept her children with her much of the time. She really was a leader in showing that someone could perform at an international level and at a very high level whilst still being, in essence, a full-time carer for her young children and not having to make that choice. I am certain that Professor Praeger had to make certain changes and compromises that she would have preferred not to have made, but I recognise her as a leading light and as someone, at a practical level, who challenged some of the notions around the ability for children to be in workplaces.

That is my contribution. I am very strongly supportive of this. This is a very important symbol more generally and I think it is very important for workplaces that young women, like my three daughters, will not have to make the agonising choice whether to breastfeed or participate in a workplace.

MR S.K. L'ESTRANGE (Churchlands) [3.22 pm]: It is not every day we come into this place to vote on a motion to essentially change the standing orders. I know there are a few standing order boffins in this chamber! Often, the Minister for Mines and Petroleum loves digging right into the standing orders in some detail.

Mr W.R. Marmion: He's always right!

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: We can see why: they go back some time; one only has to see some of the references made in the standing orders. Some date as far back as 1931, such as the one on page 18. One on page 22 dates back to 1903. When we decide as a Legislative Assembly to come into this place and make changes to what is essentially the rules that determine how we debate very important matters on behalf of the people of Western Australia, matters that become legislation, legislation that impacts on lives, it is that gravity, importance and significance of this chamber that sometimes gets lost when people drive passionate opinion attached to certain discussions. Ultimately it comes back to what is decided in this place impacts on the Western Australian community. When we choose to change the standing orders, albeit the changes we are making here are temporary changes to be adopted from 19 March 2019, it is important that we think very carefully about what those changes are and how necessary they are.

Fortunately, the Procedure and Privileges Committee did a fair bit of work on this. It tabled a report called "Enhancing the Legislative Assembly's Procedures". No doubt that committee would have taken this matter pretty seriously. Fortunately for us, it is a highly qualified and experienced committee. Chairing that committee is the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly, the member for Albany, and the Deputy Chair is the Deputy Speaker of the Legislative Assembly, the member for Maylands. The committee also comprises the member for Geraldton, of course, a member of the Liberal Party in opposition; the member for Pilbara, a member of the Labor Party on the government backbench; and the member for Roe, a member of the National Party, also forming part of the opposition. In total, it comprises three Labor members, one Liberal and one National. All of those people brought considerable experience, no doubt, to the deliberations that would have gone into making these changes to our standing orders.

What also should be recognised and acknowledged in this place is that the committee staff have a fair bit to do with how those deliberations on changes take place in committee meetings. The committee's principal research officer is Dr Isla Macphail. Dr Macphail has a Bachelor of Arts with Honours, a Master of Philosophy and a PhD. No doubt she is a very, very well credentialed and qualified person to have on the secretariat of that committee. It also has Ms Kirsten Robinson who has a Bachelor of Arts with Honours and a Master of Arts, and is the Clerk, no less, of the Legislative Assembly.

Mr W.R. Marmion: Highly esteemed.

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: She is the highly esteemed and experienced Clerk who fully understands the ins and outs of the standing orders.

Mr D.J. Kelly: No-one doubts their skills.

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: I am glad to hear it, because I will get to the importance and significance of this, if the minister would let me.

The committee also has Mr Scott Nalder, BJuris (Hons), LLB, BCL and Deputy Clerk of the Legislative Assembly. This group came forward as a collective to bring in "Enhancing the Legislative Assembly's Procedures". I dare say that we would have entrusted in them, given their experience and qualifications, to put to the Assembly what they think would be the best recommendations for us to consider. I think they would have taken that job pretty seriously.

Page 1 of the report gives a little background about how the committee went about its business in recommending these proposed changes. The committee states in its first paragraph —

Some of these initiatives are geared towards providing enhanced opportunities for private members and the public to raise matters of concern regarding their electorates or to question Government policy and administration ...

That is a key aspect in the opening paragraph of why this committee set about making changes.

Under our Westminster system, which of course this Parliament bases a lot of its traditions and processes and procedures on, a key role of the opposition is to hold the government to account. A key role of the opposition is to represent the people of Western Australia to make sure that their concerns are being heard in Parliament. We know that under a Westminster government, the executive government—which is cabinet members; backbenchers are not members of government, they are members of Parliament—is often bound by its party rules. For example, we know that government backbenchers are not permitted to cross the floor on issues if they disagree with the government. We know that to be a fact. It is part of the rules of their political party. That puts more of an onus on opposition members of Parliament to do some of the backbench Labor members' jobs for them in holding the government and its ministers, who are the executive under our system of government in Western Australia, to account. That is essentially what this committee was referring to and how important it is that we enhance the procedures of this Assembly to make the government more accountable to Parliament. That was a key aspect of what this committee put forward.

Let us not be lost on this: three of the five members of that committee are Labor members. Two of those Labor members are the most senior people of this chamber. Let us remember, we are talking about the Speaker and the Deputy Speaker of this chamber. We are not talking about government but of the conduct of procedures in the

chamber. The two most senior representatives in this chamber are on that committee, and both are Labor members. When they are putting forward recommendations, they are putting forward recommendations as Labor MPs. Two of those three are the most senior members of this chamber. The considerations of that committee should be taken very seriously.

The approach taken by the Procedure and Privileges Committee, as outlined on page 1 of its report, was to compile a survey, seek members' feedback and invite members to provide further suggestions and comments. The report says that the survey received a strong response. The committee was embarking on being inclusive because all members of this place have the right to be heard on this matter and have a say in shaping the changes to the rules of the chamber, because the standing orders are what we all have to comply with when representing the views of our electorates, our political parties, our shadow portfolios or whatever. It is important that the committee be inclusive, and it was. When the committee formed its recommendations, it took into consideration the views of all members of Parliament regardless of what side of the political divide they sit. The report went on to say —

The Committee has decided to recommend a trial of those proposals which received overwhelming 'Yes' responses ...

That is important because it also shows that the committee took the views of all MPs seriously, regardless of where they sit politically. It is a good thing it did that because if members go back and look at *Hansard* from when standing order changes were made in the past, they will find that on all occasions—members can correct me if I am wrong, if they wish to look—the opposition and the government agreed to the changes that would be made well in advance of the changes being brought into the chamber. It is disappointing that on this occasion there are two examples of amendments having to be moved in the chamber because agreement was not achieved before the changes were brought into the chamber. That is unfortunate because, as I say, the minute we have disagreement on something like this means that it is more likely than not that it will be decided along party lines. That is not in the spirit of what changing standing orders is all about and it is not the intended outcome of the committee that wrote the report. That committee, with the Speaker and Deputy Speaker as its Chair and Deputy Chair, both of whom are Labor MPs, never intended putting forward recommendations that the government, which is on their side of the political divide, would set up to debate along party lines. That is not appropriate and should never have occurred. Unfortunately, this sets a very, very irresponsible precedent. Given that disagreement, the motion to change standing orders should never have been brought before the chamber. It should have continued to be negotiated outside the chamber until an agreement was made and then brought forward so that this chamber, which sits above the government—it is the Legislative Assembly of the Parliament of Western Australia—could have had a reasoned discussion to support the agreed changes. That opportunity was lost, and it was lost under this government's watch. That is disappointing because the government has gone against the advice of its own Speaker and Deputy Speaker and the committee that was formed to make the recommendations. It is unfortunate that that has occurred.

I bring members' attention to one of the amendments that have been put to us today, paragraph 3(a), part 2, that I would like us to look at seriously in the context of what I have just said. I ask all members to look it. I also refer members to page 5 of the committee's report. So that we are all clear, I will read parts of the committee's report that deal with changes to grievances. It says —

Question 7 of the survey proposed:

Five grievance debates (six minutes per speaker) with the extra grievance going to the Opposition.

This question received 32 'Yes' responses and 15 'No' responses.

Again, getting back to something that the committee saw overwhelming support for, the committee supported it. The report continues —

Grievances are a particularly valuable opportunity for members to raise matters of interest or concern to them and/or their electorates without the restrictions imposed on Questions (with or without notice) or the need formally to propose a motion. Equally valuable, the member receives a response from the relevant minister, unlike, for example, the House of Representatives where members grieve and ministers very seldom respond.

The Committee is of the view that reducing the grievance and response to six minutes each would still provide adequate time for a member to put their case and for a minister to make a considered response. Making a one-minute reduction to the time limit of each grievance and response would enable an additional grievance to be made and responded to each week. Over a parliamentary year, this would provide approximately 20 additional opportunities for Opposition members to raise a matter of importance with a Minister.

The highly qualified, highly experienced Procedure and Privileges Committee, with a highly experienced secretariat supporting it, made a recommendation to this place that more opportunity be given to the opposition benches—given the context of what I said earlier, government backbenchers are rarely allowed the opportunity to

vote against the government; in fact, we know that they are not allowed to cross the floor—which is made up of members from the National Party and the Liberal Party, two parties independent of each other in their structure and organisation, to share from one week to the next an extra grievance. Essentially, this would lead to more accountability and transparency in this Parliament by holding cabinet ministers, the executive, accountable for the way they go about their business on behalf of the people of Western Australia. That is what the committee recommended. We thought that was a pretty solid and sound recommendation. Before this recommendation came into the chamber, there was some discussion about it. We tried to tell the Leader of the House that this is what the committee is recommending, and we support the committee's recommendation. We do not think that going against the committee's recommendation is in keeping with the process, and that is how we have found ourselves in the situation we have today.

I will discuss another interesting aspect of grievances and a statement I made at the time about the goodwill of the government. I refer to my comments in this place at 4.42 pm on Thursday, 21 February because it is important that those members who were not here at 4.42 pm that day understand what happened. On that day, just before we rose for the day, I highlighted something that had occurred that day. The *Hansard* reads —

... at the start of the day, the government Whip approached the opposition ...

It went on to say that if the opposition were —

... to get the Waste Avoidance and Resource Recovery Amendment (Container Deposit) Bill done by 4.00 pm ... the motion on the temporary orders changes that was to be debated ... would state —

(i) deleting “Four” and substituting “Five”; and

As is the case now. The key difference is —

(ii) inserting the following sentence at the end of the standing order: “The fifth grievance will be allocated to the opposition each week.” ...

That agreement was made by the Whip, who approached me. I did not approach the Whip. The government Whip came to me as the manager of opposition business and said, “Excuse me, Sean, I need to talk to you.” I said, “Yes, Whip, what is it?” He said, “We want to do a deal.” I said, “What’s the deal?” Again, it is not us going to them. He said, “If you guys help us get the container deposit bills done by 4.00 pm, you get the fifth grievance each week.” I said, “Are you sure about this? Is this 100 per cent?” The member for Balcatta knows this, because I saw him three or four times that morning to reconfirm that the deal was on. He said that it was. He repeated it several times. Correct me if I am wrong, member for Balcatta. Feel free to stand up or interject at any time, because I am happy to be corrected on this. He confirmed with me clearly that as long as we got that container deposit legislation all done by 4.00 pm, that fifth grievance would be ours, and that was the government’s position.

What did we do? We honoured the agreement presented to us by the government. It was not easy to honour that agreement because there are several members on this side of the chamber who were extremely keen to talk at length on the container deposit bills and to go into some detail during consideration in detail. As manager of opposition business—as all members know, not a paid position—I had to go and have conversations with fellow members of the opposition to say, “Look, guys, can you rein it in; can you pull up on what you really want to say and can we speed up consideration in detail?” That was because we—I mean me, in discussions with the Leader of the Opposition, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and my colleagues—determined that the offer made in good faith by the government was more valuable. We decided it was more valuable because we agreed with the committee who put out the recommendation. We agreed that it would give more opportunity for the scrutiny of government. That is why we agreed to pull back on our keen and motivated members who wanted to speak in detail on the container deposit bills but were stopped. Some of them were not happy, members. I mean that, member for Balcatta. Some of them were unhappy. The Whip and I had to work it in. It was not easy, but we honoured what you presented to us. We said, “Okay”, and we got it done.

Today we find that that agreement has not been honoured. Today we find that what was agreed in good faith, presented by the government to us, would have actually complied with the recommendation of the committee in its report “Enhancing the Legislative Assembly’s Procedures”. What members were doing by giving us that deal was complying with the committee recommendations anyway. On both counts, what they were doing was probably at the time taking advantage of the situation to try to get the container bills through, when members knew in their hearts that they should have always been complying with the recommendations of the committee anyway, as I outlined at the start of my speech. Anyway, we were not going to play around with that.

Today, to have a motion on the *Notices and Orders Of The Day* that does not include the recommendation of the committee and does not include the government’s own pledge to us in good faith is not a gentlemanly thing to do. I am sorry for sounding gender specific there, but it is not. It is not appropriate, and I do not know why the members opposite did it. I think they seriously need to sit down and have a conversation with themselves. For goodness sake, if we make a deal, it is like shaking a hand on something and then saying, “We have what we want; now we have changed our mind”, because that is what they have done.

I know a lot of members opposite. I have worked with a lot of them on committees, and we see each other in and around the Parliament when we are not in the throes of fighting out some policy issue in here. They are decent people. A lot of them are decent people; there are a few with question marks over their name. But the people involved in this know in their hearts that what they are doing here is wrong—the member for Mandurah knows it and the member for Balcatta knows it—because they made a deal, they shook hands on it, they got what they wanted and then they changed their minds. That is completely unacceptable. If their kids did something like that, they would have them on the mat in front saying, “Hey, sunshine, that’s unacceptable”, and they know it. When we teach children about ethics and values, the first thing we teach them is to honour their commitment. That is what we teach. We teach them to be accountable. When I have my nine-year-old or 11-year-old in front of me because they have done something wrong and they try to argue back, I tell them to stop. My 11-year-old son is often a better debater than I. I say, “Stop, James. What did you do? Have you gone against what should have been done?” Once they reply, “Yes, dad”, they are accountable. Here is the Leader of the House’s opportunity to be accountable for his government Whip coming to us and doing that deal that we agreed on, and here is the Leader of the House’s opportunity to make sure that he is not only honouring the agreement, but also honouring the committee that put forward the proposal in the first place, which was that the fifth grievance go to the opposition. It is really important.

Amendment to Motion

Mr S.K. L’ESTRANGE: With that in mind, to assist the Leader of the House; the government Whip and member for Balcatta; and all the members here who know what accountability means, and to ensure that the chamber is able to address this matter properly, I move —

In part (3)(a)(ii) —

To delete the words “alternate between government and opposition each week” and substitute —
be allocated to the opposition each week

DR M.D. NAHAN (Riverton — Leader of the Opposition) [3.47 pm]: I want to make some comments on this. The member for Churchlands went through it in great detail. We are dealing with the rules of the house. As the member for Churchlands pointed out, generally those rules or standing orders are longstanding, and generally they are agreed to in a bipartisan manner prior to coming in and voting in this house, because they are the rules by which we operate not only in this government, but also in future governments. I recognise that this is a temporary change to standing orders to see how it works. But the intent clearly is that if it works, it will remain as part of our standing orders. These are the rules on which this Parliament and future Parliaments will operate. As we all know, governments and positions in Parliament change from Parliament to Parliament. You are in opposition in one Parliament; you can be in government in the next, and back to opposition in another Parliament. That is very important, and parties have recognised that these rules have to be bipartisan. They have to be bipartisan to work now and in the future. That is why we set up the Procedure and Privileges Committee to look at these issues, and, as the member for Churchlands went through in great detail, it is an eminent committee—the pre-eminent committee in this house.

The committee was instructed to look at various issues. It brought in expertise from outside, including the Clerk, the Deputy Clerk and the member for Armadale. It ensured that it was supported by all members of Parliament. It had a series of proposals and they were put to a vote. The committee report that was presented to this house recommended changing the standing orders only for those issues that received overwhelming majority support. We are discussing one of those issues now—that is, to shrink the time allowed for grievances, to expand the number of grievances taken and, as the report recommends, and as voted on, to give the additional grievances, around 20 a year, to the opposition.

Grievances are a very important part of this Parliament. They give members of Parliament a chance to come in and present an issue to a minister, and speak not only on behalf of people in Western Australia, but often speak about a crucial issue that a member is struggling to get through the normal processes on behalf of their constituencies. That is one of the most effective and important mechanisms of this Parliament. We deal with really important and crucial day-to-day issues confronting our constituents. Generally, ministers respond in a more or less objective and positive manner. They try to solve the problems. The Minister for Housing helped me address a really important public housing issue involving a constituent—he has now left after resolving the issues—who was basically being driven crazy by neighbours. I raised it in a grievance because I was not getting anywhere through the bureaucracy. When I raised it, the minister resolved it. I had another issue with someone who was accused of throwing cigarette butts out of a vehicle. The Minister for Environment, through his parliamentary secretary in this place, addressed it.

I admit that it is very important for members opposite to raise issues. Members opposite have more ready access to their colleagues who are ministers. They can have discussions with their ministers all the time. Also, as the member for Churchlands pointed out, if the grievance relates to government policy, because of the rules of the Labor Party, the backbenchers opposite struggle in Parliament to address it in a public manner because they are

prevented from taking a view that opposes government policy. They can do it behind closed doors. That is great. The issue is to resolve it. This is a really important, practical part of delivering on behalf of our constituencies. This is really important for the opposition.

We support what the Procedure and Privileges Committee recommended. We voted on these proposals as members. Why have a vote if it is just going to be ignored? That is what the government is trying to do. More importantly, as the member for Churchlands pointed out, we repeatedly raised with the Leader of the House the fact that we had trouble with the deviations from the committee report. Then he did a deal with us during the last sitting: if we finished a debate—truncated the debate—on an important issue in time for the government to get the legislation to the other house, it would adhere to the recommendations of the privileges committee and give the extra grievances to the opposition as recommended by the committee as a result of us all collectively deciding to do so through our vote. Today we found out that that deal is off, with no explanation. Again, the government is setting a precedence here by changing the standing orders and therefore the rules of this place. It is undermining that process. Once it sets a new precedent, future rule making is based on the precedent that is set. Basically, it has a process that we collectively and unanimously decide to alter the rules of this place. If the government deviates by using its numbers to ram through changes to the standing orders that the opposition parties disagree with, it is changing the rule-making processes of this house. There will be ramifications in the future. Future governments will look at that and say, “Forget the committee. Forget the views of this chamber. We will just use our numbers to dictate the standing orders.” When that happens, this place will fall apart and we will not be able to operate the way we are meant to—that is, in an objective and open process in which we hold the government to account or articulate our positions as ministers. Like life generally, we need rules. Those rules must be fair and open to all. They cannot be biased because one group is in a more powerful position than another. That is what the government is doing in this instance, and with no clear explanation.

We put forward an amendment to the motion. The amendment is clear. We go back to what the privileges committee—a pre-eminent committee of this chamber—set up to look at temporary alterations to the standing orders. Its recommendation was based on a survey of us all. The majority—I think the vote was 32 to 15—said that there should be changes to the length of grievances and an increase in the number of grievances, and they should all be given to the opposition. That is what we collectively decided through that vote and that is what the privileges committee recommended. That is what the government agreed to do last time we met. This amendment will ensure that we go back to what the committee recommended, what we collectively voted on and what the government agreed to last time. The government should not use its numbers to unilaterally determine the standing orders of this place. If it does, it sets a precedent that in the future will potentially be used against it. I am not threatening the government but once it starts going down that process of using its power and its numbers in this place to determine the rules, it is undermining governance not only in this chamber, but also in this state.

Several members interjected.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: We are talking about an amendment to change the standing orders of this place. We are talking about what flows from an inquiry instigated by this chamber for the pre-eminent committee in this house to look at temporary changes to the standing orders. Its recommendations were based on a survey undertaken by all members. The recommendations were based on those changes that had the overwhelming support of the majority of us, which means government members. Government members make up the overwhelming majority of members in this place. One of the recommendations related to grievances. The committee recommended that the number of grievances be expanded and they be given to us. Also, the Leader of the House agreed, through his Whip, to do this two weeks ago. If the government is going to unilaterally ram through and negate—that is, go against the privileges committee’s report, and that is what it is doing—these recommendations against the wishes of us all collectively and against the deal that the government Whip did two weeks ago, it is undermining the governance of this place unnecessarily.

Several members interjected.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Members are trying to change the subject.

The standing orders govern the operation of this place. Historically, they have been agreed to unanimously. That is what we thought we had today. When we walked into Parliament this week, we thought we had an agreement —

Mr D.A. Templeman interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members!

Dr M.D. NAHAN: — but the Leader of the House violated that. These amendments to standing orders are temporary, but they might become permanent in the future; it will depend how they operate. We do not support this change. The government is fundamentally setting a new precedent on the formation of and changes to standing orders in this place. Future governments will look at how this is done and we will remember that.

Debate adjourned, pursuant to standing orders.

MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT — PERFORMANCE*Motion*

MS M.J. DAVIES (Central Wheatbelt — Leader of the Nationals WA) [4.00 pm]: I move —

That this house condemns the Minister for Transport; Planning for —

- (1) her extraordinary and unilateral decision to call in a State Administrative Tribunal appeal relating to the Bay Village fly in, fly out camp in Karratha;
- (2) constant delays in responding to freedom of information requests and an utter lack of transparency;
- (3) putting the safety of Western Australians at risk by ignoring the expert advice of key government agencies;
- (4) her involvement in a plan to dump millions of tonnes of toxic soil in the Peel region;
- (5) overseeing a toxic culture of bullying at the Southern Ports Authority; and
- (6) putting Metronet ahead of regional transport priorities.

That is quite a list to accrue in the first two years as a minister, and one we felt warranted discussion in this house regarding some of the decisions and the way the decisions have been made by this minister in her portfolio areas. They are not insignificant portfolio areas; they touch all parts of the state. The decisions have ongoing implications for the communities impacted. When someone has that type of power within government, they need to be above reproach in the way they approach their portfolio. Unfortunately, from questions and through the freedom of information process and the decisions we have seen played out in the last two years, a number have caused concern for not only us, but also the stakeholders involved. It does not put too fine a point on it to say that this minister is almost a law unto herself. Those unilateral decisions we are speaking of go to the heart of processes and bodies like the WA Planning Commission to provide very appropriate and considered advice. For the minister to go outside those boundaries and, given the way her decisions have been defended in this place when they have been raised, calls into question some of the other decisions she has made.

I recall the debate we had about the Mt Helena decision and whether the minister has the right to question and challenge her department. Absolutely—we agree that as a good minister, that minister has the right to question the advice that comes from their department. They should do it; any good minister would do that. The point that was being made by members on this side of the house on that day was that we disagreed with the ultimate decision the minister made. We did not disagree with her challenging the department and taking into consideration information provided from a number of agencies. We were raising the fact that it was concerning that she had rejected advice from the WA Planning Commission and that it was a decision that was likely to have long-running ramifications for communities in light of the need for bushfire safety and long-term planning. My colleagues will go into that in more detail.

That highlights the fact that we are not calling into question the minister's right to question her department or make decisions contrary to advice that is provided, but we think she has got it wrong on these occasions. There are certainly questions about the way decisions were made. The issue I will focus on and that we have asked many questions on in this place and run a number of debates on is about the Woodside fly in, fly out camp. Members in this place will know that on many occasions we have expressed our concerns about the proliferation of fly in, fly out villages across the state under this government over the last two years. The government—not just this minister but the Premier and others—seemingly does not just say yes to the mining sector when it asks a question or puts forward a proposal, but goes the whole hog and completely acquiesces to requests put forward. There seems to be a lack of balance in decision-making. It is: “We will do whatever it costs and whatever it takes to get these projects over the line.” That is a nice line to run in the community but it means there is a serious imbalance between the outcomes and the benefits sought on behalf of the people of Western Australia for non-renewable resources and the fact that we as a community foot the bill, particularly those who operate or host these businesses in their community. We would have to be living with our head in the sand not to understand the concerns of the City of Karratha or other communities that have these large mining companies operating in their community; they have an impact. Although they generate jobs, they are doing that to meet the objective of creating an income for the company and delivering returns to their shareholders, so they are not doing it out of the goodness of their heart. They are very important companies and very important businesses. Government has a role to encourage organisations like Woodside, Rio Tinto and BHP, and members of the gold industry whom I met with this morning, to invest in this state. However, there needs to be a balanced approach to that. It cannot simply be, “Whatever the business says, we will make it happen for you.”

In the case of the Woodside decision around the fly in, fly out village that caused significant concern in the community of Karratha and surrounds, that community no longer wanted to be seen as a dormitory town. There has been an enormous amount of investment in that community to ensure it has the capacity to attract a residential workforce and it wanted the backing of the companies that operate from that region to say, “Yes, we understand what your vision is and what your aspiration is and will work with you to try to increase our residential workforce.”

It is very hard to do that at the same time as the company is asking for a 1 500-bed fly in, fly out work camp. That is not what we have ended up with, but it was not without some heartache along the way. We have been trying to get to the bottom of how those discussions were conducted and the minister's role in this matter. Unfortunately, that documentation was not forthcoming. We got to the point that we FOI-ed the City of Karratha because we could not get information from the government. The government was refusing to provide it and the minister's office was dragging its heels in providing the information. Members will have heard the question I asked today about the opposition being provided with a number of documents this morning at 7.50 ahead of the private member's business motion put on the notice paper yesterday in relation to this matter. We have been seeking that information for some time. We were aware that serious concerns were being raised by the City of Karratha about how this process would play out. We came to this house again and again with questions to the Premier about whether the government would be backing the City or Karratha or backing Woodside: "How are you approaching this?" "What is your attitude towards fly in, fly out?" "Give us some indication of where you stand on this." The Premier refused to answer it because he said a process was underway and he would not intervene in it. Just a little down the track, we find out that the minister has exercised a very significant power she has under her portfolio to call in a decision for the approval of that village in Karratha. That power has only ever been used nine times. I will be corrected on that, but my information is that it is nine times and two of those occasions have been by this minister. It has been used by the previous government; we are not denying that, but at the time, the now Treasurer raised serious concerns in his community about that power being wielded by the then Minister for Planning, Hon John Day. For the benefit of those in the house today, in November last year the Minister for Planning invoked what I said was a power rarely used by a minister to call in Woodside's appeal, which was sitting before the State Administrative Tribunal. Essentially, this was done a day after Woodside indicated to the minister's office that it wanted that to be pursued. That was the course of action it wanted the government to pursue, despite having reached an agreement with the City of Karratha on the terms of the lease and what it was prepared to do. Despite the fact that the City of Karratha and Woodside had both made evident—from the notes that we have been provided—that there was agreement between the two parties and that it would not look good for the minister to exercise that power, the minister did so anyway. The minister was given a couple of options in a briefing note. One option was to direct the State Administrative Tribunal to hear the case and make a determination and the other was to make a recommendation to the minister for her final recommendation—to sidestep SAT and go straight to the minister. Her preferred approach was for the minister to take the ultimate decision, knowing that the City of Karratha and Woodside had already reached an agreement and made an arrangement. It was not the arrangement that the city would have preferred, but they had reached a compromise.

In the freedom of information application material we got this morning at 7.50, there are multiple examples of toing and froing between the minister's office and the City of Karratha about the fact that they had reached an agreement and that they would prefer that course of action to be allowed to take place. They wanted to get to the next council meeting which was, I think, a week from then, on a Monday, and the city made it clear that it was not going to look good.

When we raised this with the Premier it was a shock and surprise to the City of Karratha that that was the action that the minister had taken. We asked the question of the Premier, and the Premier quite forcefully stood up in the house and made some very disparaging comments about the CEO of the City of Karratha at the time. When we go through the notes in response to the freedom of information application, we see that there is correspondence or text messages from the CEO of the City of Karratha saying that he was completely flabbergasted at the Premier's interpretation of what had happened and that he felt that at no time he had been abusive or in any way acted in the way that the Premier had described his behaviour, and that he wanted to take it up with the Premier. He was not given that opportunity for recourse, and we noted in the house at the time that this was a person who had no recourse in this chamber after the Premier of the state had made some fairly strong accusations about his behaviour. He concedes in the correspondence, as we have read, that he expressed his frustration and quite robustly put forward that there had been an agreement made and met and that he did not think it was necessary for the minister to exercise those powers.

The City of Karratha has managed many, many significant deals in the last 10 years, at least, to the point that one would almost say there are departmental decisions being made on this scale, because of the level of investment in that part of the world. It is a sophisticated outfit, and anyone who has dealt with it will tell you that. The feedback you get when you deal with it is that it has good resources and the ability to be professional with everyone at all times. So it was very disappointing that the Premier chose to make that contribution in the house. The CEO was never afforded the opportunity to actually meet with the Premier to discuss those comments and I think that is rather a reflection on the Premier and his ability to make sure that when he is talking about someone who is not in this house and not here to defend themselves, he is temperate in the way in which he expresses himself.

The words exactly from Mr Adams as CEO were —

"I did indicate that I felt that the call-in decision was unnecessary and ill-advised.

"While my language was very strong, none of that language was abuse and none of it was a personal attack on the staff member."

I can only go on what information has been provided to me and the commentary that has been provided by the City of Karratha; that was revealed in the FOI documents we got from the minister's office.

On 16 November at 2.44 pm, Mr Adams sent an email to someone in the Department of the Premier and Cabinet to say that the dispute was close to resolution and that Woodside had indicated that it would withdraw the SAT application. Woodside had actually said, "We will withdraw the application we have before the State Administrative Tribunal because we've actually reached an agreement." Two hours later, Mr Adams emailed someone at Woodside, alerting the person to a phone call he had received at 3.15 pm from Minister Saffioti's office. He said that the public servant told him that the Woodside officer had informed the government that the company was not comfortable with the proposed revised planning conditions and that, as a result, Minister Saffioti would call in the State Administrative Tribunal appeal.

If that email is a true reflection of what happened, it suggests that Minister Saffioti has used her extraordinary power within her portfolio directly in response to a Woodside complaint. As we have explained in this house many, many times, responding to the needs of significant businesses in Western Australia that are no doubt making an enormous contribution to our state's economy needs to be balanced with some judgement. There were clearly issues on the ground in that community in relation to this project. It was very sensitive. The community had made its views very well known, and not just the City of Karratha; the city was acting on behalf of the people who live in that community and representing their aspirations.

Mr Adams said —

"In good faith, we have worked hard to find a solution that works for all parties," ... "Going 'over our heads' at this point of time would be extremely poor form on Woodside's behalf.

"The City has been open and transparent in its discussions re: this revised proposal —

That had been put on the table —

This action by Woodside is not open or transparent."

It is very disappointing that the minister chose to engage in that behaviour instead of calling the City of Karratha to try to get a better outcome.

I think the city and the community just want to make sure they get a balanced outcome and that there is a long-term vision for their community. This is not a binary question; it does not mean that they do not support the Browse project and what is happening there. By extension, it does not mean that the National Party does not, either. The constant rhetoric we get from the other side of the house is that we do not like Woodside, we do not want the project to go ahead and that in fact we would rather see it fall in a heap. That could not be further from the truth. As members who represent regional Western Australia, we understand implicitly the importance of significant projects like this, not only for those communities, but also for the state's economy and for the national economy. It is absolutely untrue when that is put on the table as a response to concerns raised in this house by us in relation to this government's decision-making processes. We just want the workers in those businesses to be based in those communities, to help those communities grow.

The notes from that meeting on 15 November 2018 were very clear: Woodside wanted the Minister for Planning to intervene on its behalf, and the minister did so just one day later. That is the time line that can be put together, so an interpretation of that is that the minister has issued a call-in notice to appease Woodside, despite having advice from everyone that a deal had been reached and that there was movement in good faith towards the next council meeting, where the decision would be ratified.

It is really disappointing that it has come to this point. We had suspicions; hence the questions we have been asking in Parliament. We gained access to that information only this morning, as I said, at 7.50 in the morning. The documents were 47 days overdue and were subject to three extension requests and a reduction in scope. This minister is no orphan when it comes to this kind of behaviour in relation to freedom of information requests. It is a pattern across the entire government in providing information at the request of the opposition. We get accused of coming into this place without having done our research; I would argue that we are trying to make sure that when we do stand and ask questions, we target them and make sure that we have the information at hand. If ministers opposite were to answer the questions we ask in this house in a way that was meaningful, we probably would not need to FOI every document in the minister's office—or, in fact, the City of Karratha or any of the other places for which we go down that path. It is a tool that we are able to use as an opposition. Unfortunately, despite what this government claims, it is building a reputation for taking significantly longer than is allocated under the act. It is constantly asking for extensions and reducing the scope of those requests.

I have some data that I will touch on that relates to not only the minister's office, but also across government more broadly. I do not want to focus on this but it is unfortunate that the member for Pilbara has been seen to be on the side of what we can only assume is the government's position because it has sought to appease all of Woodside's requests and undermine the confidence of the City of Karratha. He has told the community that it needed to accept the 15-year lease. He has not been vocal about fly in, fly out practices in his community. In fact, on this matter

there was very little support for the City of Karratha and the community's position from that local member. It is disappointing from that perspective because this issue has been of significant interest. Every business, community member, school, sporting club and arts group relies on having a community that operates in their town with people on the ground. There is no end of evidence on the impact of fly in, fly out practices on occupational health and safety in the workplace. Minister Johnston is looking at developing a code of practice for the fly in, fly out industry. This Parliament, Parliaments in every other state and the federal Parliament have produced reams and reams of documents on the impacts of fly in, fly out work practices. I would have thought that there was really good reason for the minister to back the City of Karratha on this front and put a little pressure on Woodside to come up with a better solution.

I met with a gold company this morning that is bending over backwards in the communities in which it operates to try to change its shift times, or swings. During the industry's downturn, when everyone was returning to a two weeks on, one week off shift, this company resisted because it knew that the six weeks on, eight weeks off or the six weeks on, seven weeks off swing was better for the workers' families and the company got better productivity out of the community. It has changed its scope of where it sees the benefit for Western Australia, including Perth, because it is very easy to meet those key performance indicators when Perth is included in a company's global footprint, to including the community in which it is operating—that means really small Aboriginal communities in the goldfields and right up into the north west of the state, and communities like Laverton, Leonora and Leinster. It is trying to do its very best to ensure that it has a good balance of residential fly in, fly out workers and all the other practices that come to bear. It has read the writing on the wall about the community's attitude towards mining companies that are given the privilege of processing our non-renewable resources on behalf of the state of Western Australia. It understands that it needs to give something back. It is more than just pointing to the jobs. That is absolutely critical but it also serves its bottom line and its shareholders. It is about making sure that as a state government we get that tension and have an influence over the practices of these business to make sure that we are not simply saying, "Whatever you want, you can have. We'll turn a blind eye or say that it is an appropriate practice." I will be very interested in the minister's commentary about that because, as we have regularly said in this house, the balance is not there at the moment. This is a very specific example of a senior minister making a decision that clearly tips in the favour of the company as opposed to the community and its desires.

I want to touch briefly on the second point in the motion, which is the constant delays in response to freedom-of-information requests and an utter lack of transparency. In broad terms, these are the statistics that we have collated over the last two years on freedom of information applications made to all ministers and government agencies by our members of Parliament—this is only National Party members, not Liberal Party members. In response to these requests, in just 17 per cent of cases the decision was received within the 45-day period specified in the legislation. The average time taken was almost 75 days, which is two-thirds longer than the required 45 days. On average, requests for an extension to the deadline were made at least once in every case. In a number of cases, no request for an extension was received and the decision was just late—there was not even the courtesy of advice to our office or member who raised it. The application that was delayed the longest was made to Minister Ellery's office about education program cuts. We received five requests to extend the deadline and a decision was delivered 109 days past the 45-day deadline. It took almost three-and-a-half times longer than it should have done to get that information to the members who asked for it. This is not specific to the Minister for Transport; Planning to whom the motion refers today, but when we cut the data slightly differently, the minister's office appears in two of the five categories. Perhaps I will explain things and then members will be able to see that some significant requests have been made with a real lack of response.

I will run through our top-five list of FOI requests that took the longest time to receive a response, from the date lodged to the date received. This list goes only to September 2018, so it does not include the one that we got this morning at 7.50 am. As I have already outlined, the first request was about education program cuts and took 154 days to come back to us—remember, members, that the specified period in the legislation is 45 days. The second-longest response time to a request concerned bullying at the Southern Ports Authority, which is no longer under the purview of the Minister for Transport; Planning, and took 141 days. The third request to Minister MacTiernan, Minister for Regional Development, on the Albany wave energy project took 117 days to receive a response. The fourth request to Minister MacTiernan about the proposed reduction in funding to community resource centres took 114 days to receive a response. Lastly, the fifth request made to Minister Saffioti about the approval of the Ashburton North Strategic Industrial Area took 114 days to receive a response. Those were the FOI requests that took the longest in terms of response from the date lodged to date received. I will now run through the top-five list of FOI requests in terms of days overdue. The first one was again made to the Minister for Education and Training, Sue Ellery, and was 109 days. The second one was made to Minister Saffioti. It concerned bullying at the Southern Ports Authority and was 96 days overdue. The third one was made to Minister MacTiernan about the Albany wave energy project and was 72 days overdue. The fourth one was to Minister MacTiernan about the proposed reduction in funding to CRCs and was 69 days overdue. The fifth one was about the approval of the Ashburton North Strategic Industrial Area, which was 69 days overdue from the Minister for Transport's office.

Members should remember that when this government came into office, it said that it was going to have a rolled-gold level of accountability and transparency. That was how it was going to approach what it would do in government. We have just reached the two-year mark of this government's term of office. A government document tells us about all its "achievements" over the last two years—I am not sure that Hansard can pick that up, but that was said with a sarcastic or questionable tone. I can tell members that it has been very concerning to us in opposition. When we add this type of pattern in the first two years of office to the unwillingness of this government to answer questions in a sensible manner in this place or to even engage in sensible debate, as we have seen here today, it causes the broader community and us as the opposition, when we seek to do our job, serious concern. The issue for fly in, fly out workers and the City of Karratha, and the way the minister has handled this particular decision is extraordinary. The Treasurer, sitting opposite me now, indicated as much in very similar circumstances when Minister Day, on that side of the house when we were in government, made a similar decision. I find it very difficult to understand why, when such concern was shown in opposition, none is shown by those members in government. It can only go to the fact that because they have such significant numbers in this house, they bring such an arrogance to the way in which they approach business in this place and the way they present themselves to the community, such that they do not think this type of information or behaviour is of concern. To me, that is of serious concern. Members who will speak after me will talk about how other decisions have been made in this minister's portfolios. A very clear pattern is emerging. That is why we decided to bring this motion to the house. This pattern is of concern to us, as it relates to a minister who has significant responsibilities for portfolios that impact many people in Western Australia. That comes with huge responsibility, and we are not convinced that the way she is conducting herself or the decisions she is making are in the best interests of Western Australians.

MR D.T. REDMAN (Warren–Blackwood) [4.31 pm]: I want to add to the motion moved by the Leader of the Nationals WA and respond to some real cracks that are starting to emerge in this government, particularly with this minister and her decisions. I thought that the Leader of the Nationals WA articulated some very good examples, particularly about Woodside and the minister using her call-in powers. It is very unusual for that to happen. She was obviously closely knit to Woodside in that decision, ignoring the community and what we see as good community-development thinking. Opposition members are not the only ones making these observations; it is also the media and those outside. I refer to an article in *The West Australian* on Monday, 17 September 2018, by Gary Adshead, which reads —

On the issue of transparency and accountability in government, Premier Mark McGowan is trying to have his cake and eat it.

"We will strengthen governance, accountability and transparency across government," McGowan declared this year.

Further down, it points out —

Since coming to power just 18 months ago, the McGowan Government has used section 82 notices to block questions on almost 40 occasions.

Compare that with the 67 times in total—across more than eight years in office—that the Barnett government relied on section 82 in refusing to provide answers.

McGowan's "gold standard" of openness has become rather opaque.

Some massive accountability challenges are starting to emerge with this government. On a number of occasions, there have been some real question marks over the motivations that sit behind some of these decisions. Interestingly, the same article states —

Here's an example, involving Transport, Planning and Lands Minister Rita Saffioti that would not pass the pub test. As a high-profile minister in charge of crucial portfolios, time with Ms Saffioti is in demand. So, the Labor Party exploits that to raise funds from WA's business community by promoting \$3000-a-head "intimate dinners" with her. Call it cash for access.

The article then outlines all the challenges that Mr Adshead, in this case, had with getting access to freedom of information material, which the National Party is likewise working through, as the Leader of the Nationals quite rightly highlighted. Getting people around a table for \$3 000 a head is a little easier for a minister who is prepared to make some decisions that are a little out of the ordinary. Clearly, she is a minister who is in somewhat short supply.

Several members interjected.

Mr D.T. REDMAN: I am going to work through an argument —

Mr P. Papalia interjected.

Mr D.T. REDMAN: I am going to work through an argument and you are going to listen to my argument, because that is what private members' time is all about.

Mr P. Papalia interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Minister! Minister, sit back in your chair.

Mr P. Papalia: I can sit wherever I want in my chair.

The ACTING SPEAKER: We are not going to interject. We are going to listen to the argument.

Mr D.T. REDMAN: One of the points raised by the Leader of the Nationals—it is a debate I have raised here before, but I want to go over it again somewhat—was the minister’s decision to override a Western Australian Planning Commission recommendation about a planning decision at Mt Helena. Before I talk about that, I want to reflect on another decision that the minister made, which is outlined in a media release dated 1 March 2018. The heading is “Mangles Bay Marina proposal withdrawn”. I am very familiar with this project, because I was looking after it when I was the minister responsible for LandCorp. It was a LandCorp–Cedar Woods joint venture. My recollection is that as we were working through all the processes with the project, even the now Premier, as the local member for Rockingham, was not too concerned about it. We offered briefings and he did not raise any issues with us to say to shut it down. Then when the Labor Party got into government, the minister decided to accept the WAPC’s recommendation not to allow the project to go ahead. These are the arguments that the minister put forward in the media release —

When considering the proposed MRS amendment, the Minister for Planning accepted the Commission’s reasons for withdrawal including:

- The proposed scale of the development is large compared to the overall Point Peron reserve; and
- The Rockingham Lakes Regional Park, including Lake Richmond, is an important link in a series of reserves.

They were the main two points in the media release that supported the minister getting behind the WAPC and shutting down a fairly significant development in the Mangles Bay area down in Rockingham.

We can compare and contrast that to the minister’s decision to override a planning commission decision about an urban precinct development at Mt Helena. Metropolitan region scheme amendment 1277/57 to the Mt Helena urban precinct states —

The WAPC recommends that the Minister for Planning refuse the amendment.

It gives good reasons, not the least of which are the Department of Fire and Emergency Services’ recommendations highlighting a significant number of issues relating to fire risk in that area. The minister went against the WAPC’s recommendation for the scheme amendment that it was unsafe and not right, and included pretty significant concerns from the Department of Fire and Emergency Services. She said, “No, we’re going to go ahead with it”, yet with the Mangles Bay proposal, she got right behind the WAPC on the basis of the proposed scale of the development being inconsistent with the Point Peron reserve and the park providing an important link between a series of reserves and lakes. I find it amazing that the minister could make a decision like that and break ranks with the WAPC and the Department of Fire and Emergency Services’ advice. A couple of interesting lines are in the advice from the Department of Fire and Emergency Services on this urban precinct. It states that DFES was of the opinion —

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Warren–Blackwood, could you just give me guidance on the motion that is before us and which of the six very specific points you are referring to?

Mr D.T. REDMAN: The third point refers to “Putting the safety of Western Australians at risk by ignoring the expert advice of key government agencies.”

The ACTING SPEAKER: Thank you, member.

Mr D.T. REDMAN: On that very point, the Department of Fire and Emergency Services’ recommendations on the scheme amendment state —

DFES is of the opinion that the site represents an extreme bushfire risk that cannot be adequately reduced.

The DFES submission goes through a whole heap of other points, making reference to the various state planning policies that it is required to use as guidance and adhere to in making these recommendations. Despite the weight of evidence and the WAPC’s ultimate recommendation, the minister decided to go against that advice. We can compare and contrast that to the WAPC decision she supported about the Mangles Bay marina proposal.

Interestingly, this was pointed out by some media reports, such as an article by Paul Murray in *The West Australian* headed “Planning Minister Rita Saffioti is playing with fire.” He made reference to the Mt Helena urban precinct decision and described the final decision to go against the advice of the WAPC and the Department of Fire and Emergency Services as “baffling”. He goes on in that article to say —

And then there was this caveat at the end of her decision: “The Minister noted that this decision responds to the individual and particular circumstances of this site and is not necessarily a decision that may be applicable in other areas or in other circumstances.”

One party with an interest in that line is the Satterley Group which has its eyes on a much bigger 555ha development at North Stoneville, just five kilometres away, where it hopes to build 1400 homes among the trees. Public comment on Satterley's plans closed on January 10. The Mundaring shire had 60 days to put that development before the WAPC.

A negative precedent in Mount Helena could have made things quite messy.

If we were to draw the bow a bit, we have a decision that defies commonsense and puts the community at risk; nevertheless, the minister has made it. Just up the road is a Nigel Satterley development that would like a development decision made on Mt Helena, because it would probably help its cause if it goes before the WAPC at a later date. We know that before the last election—at least I have been told this; members opposite can deny it if they think I have this wrong—there was a dinner. Nigel Satterley became one of the great friends of the Labor Party before the last election.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Warren-Blackwood, you are talking about safety here, are you not?

Mr D.T. REDMAN: I am talking about the motion before us, which is about drawing links between the decision-making of the minister and serious concerns we have with the accountability of this government.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Safety, yes.

Mr D.T. REDMAN: Of course, that was a luncheon at which Nigel Satterley advocated voting for Labor and at which, if I remember rightly, the member for Butler, Hon John Quigley, stood up and thanked Mr Satterley for paying for lunch for everyone. I am drawing a pretty long bow here, but there are concerns about the decision-making in this matter and there are certainly some concerns about the safety of people who live in that community. Of course, we have seen the Woodside decision, which broke ranks with a very rarely used power and which conflicted with what had been happening in the Karratha community.

I will now go on to talk about another issue to do with the Forrestfield–Airport Link that has emerged for the minister recently—that is, a significant amount of contaminated soil that needs to be dealt with. I note some questions on notice have been asked about this matter. One question on notice from the member for Scarborough about this contamination issue refers to cost. In the response, the member for Scarborough was referred to a copy of a briefing note, tabled paper 2204. When we look at tabled paper 2204, we find that it is blank. It has black all over it. It has been redacted very heavily. One point that has been left open states that permanent disposal of that waste could cost between \$100 million and \$270 million, and that the cost of temporary stockpiling, including double handling, could be \$50 million. That is well in excess of \$300 million. The minister has a real challenge with this contaminated site. She will have to manage the disposal of what we are told could be up to seven million or eight million tonnes of contaminated soil, at a cost of more than \$300 million. That could put a pretty serious hole in the minister's budget, particularly the budget of her Metronet project.

If we fast forward to the challenge that has been put there, what do we find has been popping up recently? We find discussions have been happening at the Peel Development Commission level. It appears that the deputy chair of the Peel Development Commission, Greg Poland, resigned recently from his position. A WAtoday article, dated 27 February 2019, states —

Mr Poland claimed he had been asked by the ministers —

That includes Hon Alannah MacTiernan and Minister Saffioti —

to help dump the soil, which was looming as a contentious issue for the government.

There is a contaminated soil issue sitting there that could cost in excess of \$300 million, which is identified in budget papers and in responses from other questions on notice from other members of Parliament, and a member of the public has resigned from his position, claiming that he had bizarrely been asked by ministers to help dump the soil.

One or two articles that have been run in close proximity to each other have highlighted that there was some sort of meeting between Greg Poland and another businessmen in the Peel Development Commission region, in which he was given some intimate detail of some sort of deal that was intended to be done, under which, if this businessman took on the responsibility of this eight million tonnes of contaminated waste—if he found a location for it in the Peel area—those ministers would support it with a transaction giving him access to some building sand, which I am told could be worth in excess of \$600 million. Some sort of transaction has been negotiated. After questions were asked of the two ministers, within two hours that person resigned. That person resigned because it was very uncomfortable to be there. I think “untenable” was the word that was used. He resigned because it was untenable. Why was it untenable? The public record says that he claimed he was asked by the ministers to find somewhere to dump this product. A meeting went on. He probably overextended himself. I suspect there was a bit of overreach going on here on his part. When he finally resigned and there was commentary in the media, it was all from his lawyer. His lawyer was the one who came back and ran the public commentary.

I make the point that this minister has some real headaches. It is probably not surprising, given that she was prepared to use a very rarely used power to intervene on what was seen to be a settled decision between Woodside and the City of Karratha. If she was prepared to intervene in Mt Helena to have a planning commission recommendation overruled in a significant fire-risk area as identified by the Department of Fire and Emergency Services, then it is probably not unreasonable to extend a view that this minister might want to find a sneaky way to find a home for eight million tonnes of contaminated soil. What has played out is a number of discussions with some members of the community who have claimed that there has been a pretty close relationship between this particular member and a couple of ministers, in which he said, "I think I can land a deal here that will give you a good outcome, Mr Businessman, because these ministers will give you access to some land without running through due process." There is a little bit to play out on this. I will be making some freedom of information requests on this and I will be asking a series of questions, but on the surface, it smells, as does the decision to override the WAPC decision, putting future communities at risk. If the DFES advice is anything to go by, that decision is absolutely damning and bizarre to say the least. Then, of course, we have seen the other example in which special powers were exercised—the case of the City of Karratha.

[Member's time extended.]

Mr D.T. REDMAN: I am making the point strongly that now we are halfway through this government's term, we are starting to see some of the challenges in its decision-making. There are some real question marks, and it is not just us reading this play—members of the community and the media are reading the play. Accountability is out the window. Transparency is out the window. We struggle to get access to good information. When we do get access to good information, some of that stuff smells.

This minister needs to stand up and be accountable. In particular, there are a few key questions in relation to the Peel Development Commission: What conversations did the minister have with Greg Poland? How many times did the minister meet with Greg Poland and what was the nature of those discussions? Was reference made to the minister seeking outcomes about contaminated land? We know that discussions were happening between the business community and the Peel Development Commission, because the chair, Paddi Creevey, a very well respected lady, is quoted as saying that they were considering land-use options. From what I understand, it was certainly on the Peel Development Commission's agenda. Did either Minister Saffioti and/or Minister MacTiernan make reference to this in their discussions with the Peel Development Commission, what discussions happened internally and what strategies were put in place?

Bearing in mind that a whole heap of discussions and interactions happened behind the scenes, as they do between ministers and their agencies, we finished up with the deputy chair, no less, of the commission having a private meeting, which seemed to be reported in a significant amount of detail, and two hours after the ministers were made aware of that meeting, he resigned and his lawyers presented the argument back to the public. That smells. This minister has a bit to answer to on what happened there and her involvement with it. How does that happen? How did we finish up with the deputy chair, appointed by this government, by Minister MacTiernan, getting to that point? The negotiations and discussions were about finding a strategy to deal with what seems to be a pretty big headache for this minister, and which could bore a bloody great big hole in the Metronet project. It is not all public yet. Here is a chance for the minister to put some answers on the public record to give us a very, very clear understanding of what went on behind the scenes. If it does not come out now—if the minister dodges this and does not put on the table the nature of the relationships, the meetings that were in place and what forums were attended, including some of the \$3 000-a-table forums—government transparency is absolutely out the window, as was described by Gary Adshead in the article I quoted at the start of my presentation. The minister has a chance to put that information on the table, because if it does not come out now, it will come out down the track. It is a chance for the minister to put to bed, once and for all, why the deputy chair of one of our regional development commissions was put in an untenable situation in which he had to resign because of what was articulated in the media—and, by the way, not challenged. Why would they be having private discussions with private business people to do deals behind the scenes to access land that should otherwise go through a normal, open process?

To summarise, accountability and transparency are massively in question. It is not just the opposition saying that, but also the media. We have a minister with some pretty significant decisions on her plate. We saw the Mt Helena decision and the article referring to another Nigel Satterley development in the hills. We know that Nigel Satterley was involved with luncheons with the Labor Party prior to the last election. Promoting and supporting the Labor Party is probably not a natural fit for him; nevertheless, he was there. We have seen call-in powers used on Woodside; it is a very, very unfortunate position for that community. We have now seen part of the Peel Development Commission's decision from the deputy chair. The other part of that issue is the involvement of the Minister for Fisheries with the nationalisation of the lobster catch. There are a whole heap of question marks sitting over that involvement. A lot of things are starting to emerge, which will come out over time if they do not come out now. Here is a chance for the minister to get up and articulate to this house exactly where she stands in respect of her relationship with Greg Poland, because from the surface, that smells. The community needs to be made fully aware of what is happening.

MR P.J. RUNDLE (Roe) [4.54 pm]: I rise to support the motion of the Leader of the Nationals WA. I will mainly focus on the situation at the Southern Ports Authority. I believe the Minister for Transport mishandled the Southern Ports situation, and I will run through a track record of what happened. I would also like to make a few comments on Main Roads, which is becoming a larger concern in my electorate, and the Public Transport Authority's school bus services, which are within the transport portfolio.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member, the motion is really specific. You have the Southern Ports Authority—okay, it is point (6).

Mr P.J. RUNDLE: It is point (6), “putting Metronet ahead of regional transport priorities.” Thanks, Acting Speaker. First, I will focus on the Southern Ports Authority situation and my concern about the way that was handled. Over a period of time, as member for Roe, I had to ask a substantial number of questions to elicit any interest, to be honest. In the end, on 23 August 2018, the member for Warren–Blackwood and I ran a matter of public interest motion that stated —

That this house condemns the Minister for Transport for failing in her duties to provide a safe working environment for those employees of the Southern Ports Authority and failing to give those same employees confidence there will be sustained cultural change in the organisation.

I will outline the sequence of events. As members would know, it was very difficult for me, as a new member, when many members of the Esperance community and workers from the Southern Ports Authority who had been harassed and bullied were constantly coming into my office and contacting my electorate officers. I would like to run through a series of questions about those issues and the dates they were asked last year. Keeping in mind that the election was in March 2017, and the minister had not visited Esperance at any stage—until 18 months ago it ended up being. On 15 March 2018, I questioned the minister on her thoughts on the number of bullied and harassed employees and on Hon Laurie Graham's claims in his report on the Southern Ports Authority. The minister's reply was, “We take this seriously.” When I asked the minister a supplementary question about when she would visit Esperance. The answer was that she would continue to visit all parts of the state. I thought that was encouraging. She said that in March 2018; it has been a year, so maybe we will get a visit fairly shortly. On 12 June 2018, I asked minister about the authority's culture and bullying issues. She replied —

I am sure that everything will be done, from the board downwards ...

The minister said that there would be a smooth transition to the acting CEO. We all know how well that went. The transition to the acting CEO did not go well, and that issue was part of the matter of public interest motion that the member for Warren–Blackwood and I raised at that time. On 21 August 2013, I asked the minister whether she was satisfied with her appointment of the acting CEO and whether she was aware of any issues that might compromise that appointment. Her answer was that she was not aware. In another question, I asked the then Minister for Commerce; Industrial Relations whether he had read the WorkSafe report about issues at the Southern Ports Authority. As a background issue, he answered that he had no interest in the operation of ports, because they were not his responsibility. We have a pattern. The Minister for Transport does not seem to be that interested and does not want to visit Esperance; we have the Minister for Industrial Relations; and we have a culture of bullying and harassment in that port.

This should be bread and butter for the Labor Party. It should be right in there amongst it. It knows what it is all about. The Maritime Union of Australia was there. However, the Minister for Industrial Relations has said he has no interest in the port, because it is not his responsibility. That, to me, signals a disturbing trend. When those issues were not addressed, that sent out a red flag. Every employee, and probably every citizen in the Esperance community, was very concerned about that. The signal that sent to our community was not good. That was picked up by *The Esperance Express* and ABC Radio. Fortunately, after that series of questions on 23 August 2018, the Minister for Transport obviously realised that there was an issue at the port.

I want to run through a bit more of the date line. The Minister for Transport knew about the issues and did not want to address them. The member for Albany was screaming out for replacement of the acting chief executive officer because of the emotional bullying. Hon Laurie Graham, who had done the investigation into the Southern Ports Authority, expressed in his review serious reservations about the culture in the Esperance and Albany ports. The Minister for Industrial Relations said he has no interest in the port, because it is not his responsibility. Three or four days after the Nationals ran the matter of public interest on 21 August 2018, lo and behold, the Minister for Transport, to her credit, finally recognised that there was an issue and visited Esperance, and there has now been an improvement. That demonstrated that the Minister for Transport had either been too busy, or did not have an interest in our ports. Hon Alannah MacTiernan has now been appointed Minister for Ports, and she is interested in our ports. I refer to an article in *The West Australian* of 10 January by Dan Mercer, which states in part —

Ms MacTiernan yesterday said Mr Lewis —

The new boss of Southern Ports —

would be charged with healing any divisions that lingered after the “catastrophic breakdown” of relations between workers and management.

The new Minister for Ports recognised that there had been a catastrophic breakdown of relations between workers and management. That is very interesting, because when the WorkSafe order was issued, Southern Ports management put out a statement that it recognises that there is an issue among the workers, but it does not involve management or supervisory staff. That is one of the most bizarre things that has come out of that WorkSafe report. The Minister for Transport has now been sidelined in the ministerial reshuffle, and Hon Alannah MacTiernan has come straight in and exposed the lack of interest from the former minister to visit Esperance port. The Minister for Transport had a lot on her plate. Metronet was her focus. Ports were secondary.

Hon Alannah MacTiernan has suggested that the current set-up is not working and that the catastrophic breakdown between the workers and management is a concern. The minister has already looked at a couple of different scenarios, such as combining Esperance and Albany ports. In fact, she has flagged an overhaul of the whole organisation. I believe she is targeting a merger between Bunbury and Fremantle ports, and maybe combining Esperance and Albany ports. The minister is also looking at the outer harbour and the potential for a container port in Bunbury. The Minister for Ports has certainly come up with big ideas. Part of the overall picture is the Westport scenario. We know that was a problem late last year when the chair of Westport, Nicole Lockwood, a well respected businesswoman, tried to lodge her report to the minister and to the public. I refer to an article by Paul Murray in *The Weekend West* of 17 November 2018 titled “A port in the eye of a storm”. The article states, in part —

When the task force’s promised report still wasn’t released by the end of last week, it didn’t take too much digging to find that it was on Minister Saffioti’s desk.

A task force source said the report was with the minister for “editing” and probably would not be released for another two weeks.

Mr P. Papalia: Is this the report about Southern Ports?

Mr P.J. RUNDLE: This is all about Westport, which is part of the new port structure and part of Hon Alannah MacTiernan’s new portfolio.

Mr P. Papalia interjected.

Point of Order

Mr D.T. REDMAN: Mr Acting Speaker, the member is trying desperately to get his speech out, and it is only reasonable that he has the support of the Acting Speaker to achieve that.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr S.J. Price): Thank you, member. The minister is raising a valid question with regard to relevance. Can you explain to me, member, what you are talking about and why it is relevant to this specific motion?

Mr P.J. RUNDLE: I am building a picture of the new ports minister, and how it originated from the Southern Ports situation. I certainly think it is relevant, because it is another demonstration of the lack of interest from the minister formerly responsible for ports.

The ACTING SPEAKER: When you have a very specific motion that you are talking to, like this one —

Mr P.J. RUNDLE: I will certainly move on from that particular scenario, because I also want to focus on the latter part of our motion.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Thank you.

Debate Resumed

Mr P.J. RUNDLE: I believe the Minister for Transport has focused too much on Metronet. A string of issues in regional Western Australia have been put off to the side because of Metronet. Two of those issues were brought up in question time today. One is the Albany ring-road, and the other is the Karratha–Tom Price Road. Even though the minister would like to put the blame onto the federal government, it has taken nearly two years for the business case for the Albany ring-road to be lodged with Infrastructure Australia, and it managed to come into play only one or two days prior to the close-off point. That means that Infrastructure Australia has had no opportunity to assess the situation on the Albany ring-road, and unfortunately it looks as though that project will now miss out on federal funding. That is a real shame. Yes, the business case was lodged, but it has taken nearly two years. If that was such a focus for this government and for the member for Albany, the business case would have been lodged at least six months ago.

I now want to move, as part of this motion about this government’s lack of regional investment, to our concerns about the way in which Main Roads is handling its responsibilities. The biggest issue for me is the quality of road maintenance. Main Roads now seems to have a patch-up mentality. Main Roads’ answer to a maintenance issue is to put up some speed reduction signs, and that is it. There have been signs on a patch on Albany Highway just north of Bannister for over six months now. An area of probably the distance from me to you, Mr Acting Speaker, could be repaired, but Main Roads has left it and has put up signs that are slowing the whole traffic flow back to 60 kilometres an hour. Then, if members do not mind, we also have the police in that area picking up people for

speeding when all the road needs is a repair. It is a piece of road the distance from me to you, Mr Acting Speaker. This seems to be a new scenario. What also happens is that when my office rings Main Roads to say that we have an issue in Wagin, Williams or Narrogin, the answer they get is, “Ring your local MP.” I am the local member of Parliament. My office rings up and says that we have an issue and the answer is to ring their local MP! I do not know what is going on with that, but if that is its new technique for answering MPs or members of the public, that is a real concern.

Another concern is the length of time it takes to get a response to issues lodged. The Leader of the Nationals WA spoke about the length of time it takes to get responses to freedom of information requests. It is now taking nearly nine months to get a response to letters that we send. That is an issue.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member —

Mr P.J. RUNDLE: That is part of the regional road issue, Mr Acting Speaker.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr S.J. Price): Thank you for that clarification.

Mr P.J. RUNDLE: It is very concerning in that respect.

The other one I have real concerns about is the restricted access vehicle network. To me, there has been a lack of forward strategic planning for the road network for future RAV routes. That is starting to be a cause for concern. There was a classic example the other day when one of my constituents was looking to get a driveway put in for their large hay business. The person from Main Roads said that Main Roads does not approve of economic growth; that was one of the quotes from the Main Roads’ employee. Main Roads does not like that because it might actually have to deal with an issue. That is a real concern for me.

Mr P. Papalia: Have you written to the minister?

Mr P.J. RUNDLE: It was raised with me only on the weekend, minister, but I certainly will be, because that is a real concern.

There is also a concern about piloting.

[Member’s time extended.]

Mr P.J. RUNDLE: If someone wants to pilot a piece of their own agricultural machinery more than one kilometre up the road, they have to spend \$1 200 and do a two or three-day course to do so. These are some of the issues that are really starting to wear a bit thin on the agricultural sector. It is part of the Main Roads scenario. As far as I am concerned, it is all about there being too much focus on Metronet.

Part of the Main Roads scenario—part of our regional road network—is the school bus policy, which comes under the Public Transport Authority. We have some real issues with this 20-year-old policy. The PTA is dictating where children can go to school. I will be taking up this issue with the Minister for Transport. We have a 1999 policy. The PTA has confirmed that it is under-resourced in this area. Quite frankly, I agree. It is stretched. It does not have enough resources. Families were notified only one day before school started that their children could not be picked up at the front gate, but must be driven 20 or 30 kilometres by their parents. They had to rearrange their whole lives just one or two days before school started. This is a real issue. Parents are having to drive kids who previously had complimentary status. Instead of increasing the size of the bus, what they got was, “Sorry. You were a complimentary status. You could go on the bus last year, but it’s not going to happen this year. If you want to go to the school that is 30 kilometres away, just find your own way.” It does not matter whether parents are working or have other family requirements. There is one family with one child who attends high school 30 kilometres away and another child at primary school five kilometres away in a different direction and who need to be picked up at the same time. There is no adaptability within the policy to deal with it. That is a real issue. Women are not able to work, or men for that matter, because their day is structured around the school bus. As I said, parents were told a day before the beginning of the school year where they would have to drive, what they could do or that there was no room on the bus. There was an issue recently with the children from Pingelly who were getting a school bus to either Brookton or Narrogin following the closure of the Pingelly school. They had a bus to either destination and then, because the bus filled up, they were notified a day before school started that the scenario from last year was not going to happen this year. Instead of getting a larger bus to cater for those seven students, their parents now have to do all sorts of things to try to get their kids to school. As far as I am concerned, we have a real issue with the policy. I will be taking it up with the minister. The policy is from 1999.

Mr P. Papalia: You would want to hope that she is pretty forgiving and not mean and nasty!

Mr P.J. RUNDLE: I have no worries at all there, minister. There is a real issue that needs to be addressed.

The Southern Ports Authority issue in Esperance has been one of the most disappointing scenarios for me since becoming the local member. I will say that when the minister did turn her mind to it in August last year, we did actually see some results. I have had discussions with the chair of Southern Ports. I am looking forward to liaising with the new chief of Southern Ports on what he has in place to improve the culture there. As we identified in August 2018, there is and was a real issue at Southern Ports. I think this minister was not really that interested at

the time. We now have a new minister, Hon Alannah MacTiernan, who has identified that there was a catastrophic breakdown. I am hoping she will deal with that catastrophic breakdown and improve the culture at Southern Ports, because a culture of harassment and bullying is not acceptable. I will wind up my contribution with that. For me, this matter was of grave concern and was not handled very well at all.

MS R. SAFFIOTI (West Swan — Minister for Transport) [5.18 pm]: I rise to respond to that quite personal attack on me by members of the Nationals WA. They made a number of outrageous claims. Anyway, that is how they operate. I will go through and respond to many of the claims that were made.

The motion relates to a number of issues. I go to the Woodside Bay Village issue. The point was made that there was a dispute between the City of Karratha and Woodside and that the government had to play a role in that. That is correct. The claim that they had reached agreement and therefore the government was not needed is completely false—it is absolutely false. I will go through some of the discussions the City of Karratha had with my office. If the member wants to talk about bullying and intimidation, let us go through that. The reality is that we were waiting for an agreement between Woodside and the City of Karratha, and that did not eventuate. Of course we sought feedback, and one side said there was an agreement, and the other side said there was not, so we had to play a role. There is nothing extraordinary about that. Call-in powers have been used in the past. I want to know whether the National Party knows any of the owners who operate the other accommodation in Karratha. Does it have any relationship, or any donors who own some of the competing accommodation in Karratha? National Party members are silent on that. They can stand up and make absolutely outrageous claims, yet they will not come clean about their relationship with some of the competition, potentially, in the town.

The Leader of the National Party made some outrageous personal claims against me. She said that she could not get any information from the government, so she had to make a freedom of information application to the City of Karratha. I suspect she did not need to FOI the City of Karratha. I suspect those documents would have come out anyway. Anyway, she went through the processes and procedures—the farce. I will go through what the chief executive officer of the City of Karratha said to my staff member. This is the behaviour defended by the Leader of the National Party. When my staff member—I will not say the name—rang to explain the decision of the government, he was told that the CEO wanted to highlight to the minister that they would target the minister for the next three years, and that we were stuffing up a deal that had been agreed by Woodside, the local member and the city. They would take every opportunity, through the media and Parliament, to highlight the inappropriateness of this unnecessary course of action. This is the kind of language used. True to his word, he, through the National Party, is using Parliament to raise this issue. The National Party defends that type of behaviour, but I do not. I do not think that my staff member should have been exposed to that type of language. It is not up to the CEO of a council to use those words and threaten a minister of the Crown through that discussion, but that is what happened.

National Party members come in here and say that we did not do anything. We achieved more outcomes from our proposal than they ever did when they were in government. They come in here acting as if they actually achieved anything on workers' accommodation when they were in government. With the Wheatstone camp, everyone knows that the previous government signed off on a deal that was far worse than anything proposed here for Woodside. I mention again the National Party's lack of respect for the local member. He was elected by the community, but National Party members keep denigrating him. They talk about local. He is local.

Point of Order

Mr V.A. CATANIA: Point of order! It is good to see the member for Pilbara in the chamber for a change.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr S.J. Price): Member for North West Central, I call you to order for the first time for an abuse of process.

Debate Resumed

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: This is the first time we have had the five National Party members in the chamber. They were all absent for most of the discussion before. For the past hour and a half, they have not been in the chamber. The member for Pilbara, hardworking local small business man, is there fighting for local jobs and economic growth. That is what he has done, all along the way. To be honest, he has been one of the most persistent local members we have seen, on this issue in particular. The member for Pilbara has been saying that we want to make sure that we get local jobs for construction, and that this camp is integrated into the community. Those key issues reflect the views of the community, and that is what we have done. The City of Karratha and Woodside could not agree; it is as simple as that. We had two versions—one side said it had agreed; the other side said that it had not.

Mr V.A. Catania interjected.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Are you bullying me?

If both sides had said they had agreed, we would not have needed to be involved. One side said there was no agreement. It is as simple as that. We backed the community every step of the way, because we want to secure jobs and further development in the region. I know that is not a priority of the National Party, although I do not

quite know what is. Is it more services in the western suburbs? Is it extended CAT bus routes? That issue has been explained. The issue is that one side said it had an agreement, the other side said it did not. We created a compromise position that not only allowed the camp to go forward, but also secured local jobs and made sure that there was integration with the community. That was a far better deal than the National Party ever secured in eight and a half years. I do not know who the National Party is speaking for, but I am sure that the community of Karratha supports the fact that the state government is getting on with the job of securing local jobs and further economic development.

The next point was freedom of information applications. I think the member went through those statistics, and I will go through similar ones, but the fact of the matter is that if an application is submitted seeking all information over two years, we ask that the scope be reduced. I know many members opposite were not in opposition before, but the experience I had in opposition was that if I asked for a year of documents, that was too much. Six months was probably too much, and three months was where we pretty much always landed. There were costs as well. They said one of my FOI proposals would cost over \$2 000, and of course that made me reduce the scope. I know many members opposite have not experienced opposition, but that is what happens in the FOI process. I am not sure what else I can say on that. We comply with the law. We seek confirmation for extensions when we cannot deliver on time. That is what we do. Governments have done it before. The scope of a recent application from the Leader of the Opposition sought all documents on the construction of the Matagarup Bridge from 1 March 2017 to the present. The time and resources are out of this world, and are not defensible.

There was a personal attack by the member for Warren–Blackwood about the decision on the Mt Helena development. I will go through some of the letters written by the member for Warren–Blackwood, but I want to refer first to a former Minister for Planning, Hon John Day. He said that I had made a big call but he may well have made the same decision, taking into account all the information. He said he was certainly aware of it when he was minister. They are residents, and they are mainly small landowners around a particular Mt Helena proposed development. They were very much wanting decisions to be made about four or five years ago, and complaining about how long it was taking. Mr Day said that the Shire of Mundaring, in which Mt Helena is located, was very measured and sensible about the requirements it put in place, and made a recommendation to support the decision.

Again, I am not sure what the member is alleging or accusing me of or who he is representing, because it is definitely not the community. Some crude accusations about that decision are being thrown around by the National Party. I again say that it is the right decision, and I know that the Liberal Party supported that decision, because it was the right decision. I find it quite odd that members who represent heavily forested areas are saying that we should not have development there because of the bushfire danger. Does the National Party really want to shut down regional towns? Is that what it wants to do, because I think that is where it is heading? It wants to shut down towns surrounded by significant vegetation. That is the logical extension to its approach.

The member for Warren–Blackwood said that I should be a bit more bureaucratic in how I operate. He basically said that I should get caught up in red tape and bureaucracy. I will read some letters from the honourable member. He said that he had been approached by a group of constituents who appeared to be caught in bureaucratic red tape as a result of recent changes to WA planning guidelines for developments that are not in existing corridors, and he sought my advice and support for these families in providing some flexibility in processing their applications. So it is okay for him to approach me and ask me to set aside the bureaucracy and make these decisions. Another letter states that, at its meeting in May 2017, the statutory planning committee discussed the proposed structure. The member is disputing a decision and saying that he has key concerns about how a planning committee reached its decision and that I should override it.

Mr D.T. Redman: The Leader of the National Party highlighted clearly that the point is that it's not a blanket approach.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr S.J. Price): Member for Warren–Blackwood, you have had your chance. Can we hear the minister in silence, please.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I will comment on the interjection that it is not a blanket approach. I am meant to listen only to the approaches from members of Parliament, not from the community. The Mt Helena proposal was driven by the community and then adopted by the shire. It was a community-driven approach. I am not allowed to listen to the community, but I am allowed to listen to members of the National Party.

Mr D.T. Redman: We don't think you've shown leadership on this particular issue.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Warren–Blackwood!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I know there is a little bit of snobbery from the National Party towards some of us on this side of the chamber, and I will go through that in a moment.

Ms A. Sanderson interjected.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Yes.

The member wrote to me again and said that he knows that there are rules and guidelines, and I could go through all of them because there are quite a few. You guys are constantly telling me to set aside the rules and guidelines. The member is saying that if a member of Parliament raises something with a minister, they should act, but if it is driven by the community, they should not act. That is implicit in what he is saying: it should not be a blanket approach, but members of Parliament and members of the National Party should get what they want and I cannot judge each decision on the key facts; I have to say that because a member of Parliament has raised something with me, I have to act. Many members probably would not be aware that, frankly, I never saw any National Party ministers in my electorate in their eight and a half years. This element of privilege that they believe they have is incredible. As a local member, I would write to them and beg them for assistance, and I got nothing. I have engaged. I have set up meetings with the member for North West Central. When a legitimate concern comes to me, frankly, I want to help; I want to address the issues. Member for Moore, the Toodyay bridge is an example. It was a legitimate issue and the member came to me, but this is how they treat me now.

Mr W.J. Johnston: A personal attack.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: A personal attack.

Mr D.T. Redman: It's not a personal attack.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: No. Let me go through what the member has said.

Mr D.T. Redman interjected.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: No. The member never reflects on what he says to me. Today he mocked me about my experiences as a new mother.

Mr D.T. Redman: I didn't actually get to my feet, member.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: He never reflects on his interjections. The Leader of the National Party said to me that I have more front than Myer.

Mr D.T. Redman: You will not get a comment from me on that issue.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: When I was talking about my experiences as a new mother, the Leader of the National Party said that I had more front than Myer. She interjected and believed that somehow I was out of order, when she was mocking my experience as a new mother. Members opposite mocked me then and they are mocking me now. They never learn. I will stand up for new mothers going through serious issues in the early stages. I will stand up for them any day of the week.

The member for Warren–Blackwood basically made some very strong allegations about why I supported the Mt Helena proposal. He quoted a Paul Murray article and he stands by that. He thinks that is why I made that decision.

Mr D.T. Redman: I was making reference to that.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Yes. He made allegations.

Mr P. Papalia: Imputations.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: No, it was more than that. He says whatever he wants and when we call it out, he cannot handle it. He wrote letters to me asking me to set aside the guidelines and rules: "The statutory planning committee made a decision, but set that aside." I know that the Public Transport Authority orange school bus rules have been in place forever, but he ignored them. We never ignored them. The member for Roe said that it is a 1999 policy. Members had \$8 billion worth of royalties for regions for eight and a half years, so why did they not do something about the regional school bus policy? Now they are saying that our policy is too strict. It is an existing policy. I feel for families that are trying to find a balance, particularly when they live a distance from the school. We cannot fund the school of choice for every regional community. The previous government did not do it and we cannot do it. We try when there are unique circumstances, and I really feel for them when siblings are involved, because when they are existing students, it is very difficult. We try to manage it to get the outcomes for the family. I do not accept it when members come in here and condemn me on this issue and say that it is a 1999 policy, when they were in government for eight and a half years and had \$8 billion and did not fix it.

The member for Warren–Blackwood should have a look at what he said about me and how I act and what motivates me. He made some serious imputations, yet he sits there and says, "It's all okay; I didn't say that." He said that I supported the Mt Helena proposal because of Satterley. It is completely false. He read out a Paul Murray article. It was completely false. The Leader of the National Party said that the conduct of the City of Karratha was absolutely perfect, even though I read out what was said to one of my staff members. If she condones a CEO ringing someone at a ministerial office and threatening the minister, that is a very, very bad thing. That is not acceptable behaviour. The Premier called it out and I call it out, too. People should not abuse a staff member. On that issue, of course there were two accounts. We said that if they could reach agreement, we would not need to call it in, but they did not reach agreement, so we called it in. How did we get that information? We spoke to the City of Karratha and we spoke to Woodside; that is how we got the information. Members claim that there was agreement, but that is because they basically got one side of the story. We did not.

Everything that the member for Warren–Blackwood said about the perfluoroalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl substances issue was completely false. When he was a government minister and he was considering the business case and project definition plan for a tunnel, did anyone talk about where the soil was going to go? He came in—it was raised in the upper house too—as if, “Oh my goodness! They’re building a tunnel and now this government has a soil issue!” Did the member not think about it? When the member was sitting around cabinet talking about digging an eight-kilometre, twin-bore tunnel, did he think about it or was it noted that there was a lot of soil? What does it say in the business case? It is as though I have created a problem because the tunnel machine creates spoil.

Mr P.C. Tinley: Yes, who knew?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Who knew? Who knew when the member for Warren–Blackwood chose a tunnel—it was a cabinet decision, of which he was a member, and the member sitting next to him —

Dr A.D. Buti: Only sometimes; they were in and out.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Yes, it depended on the decision. When the member made a decision about the two tunnel-boring machines going eight kilometres, was the issue of the soil never discussed? Honestly, was it not? The member came into this place and said that the minister has created a problem with the soil, as if he had another plan. He had no plan. He made accusations about —

Mr D.T. Redman: The focus of my discussion was on comments that have been made in the media with respect to the Peel Development Commission and one Greg Poland, who has been quoted in the media as taking direction from you about finding avenues to get rid of significant amounts of contaminated soil. That is the issue we, and the public, are looking for a response on.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I will give the member my response. As I responded in WAtoday and as I responded to questions in the upper house, that is false. In a meeting, he put forward an idea. We checked it out and it was not going to work. It is as simple as that. The Peel Development Commission followed up. That was how it happened. I made it very clear in my response to WAtoday. The member came in and made different claims. He stood up and said I sought out Mr Poland to try to sort out the PFAS. That is completely false. The member has made that claim again and again. You come in, going to bat —

Mr D.T. Redman: I am not privy to the comments you have made to WAtoday media. I am asking questions here and there are unanswered questions in the media.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Well, read the paper and read *Hansard*. As I said, you come in here and make these outrageous personal claims all the time and you do it to people like me because—do you know what?—I think you have probably not mixed with people like me too much in your past. That is what I think.

Mr D.T. Redman: Minister, surely publicly reported commentary about what members of the public claim to be ministerial direction is reasonable for us to raise in this place?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Of course you can raise the issue, but I mean the claims you made when you came in. You asserted a number of things.

Mr D.T. Redman: I am citing public commentary on an issue that you need to be accountable for.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: You asserted a number of things and I am responding to them. I have heard a lot of reasons why you would not be backing the Bay Village concept—a lot of reasons. I have not used them in this house before, but maybe we need to go through why you would not be backing a competitor coming into the market. Maybe that is for another time. It is clear that you are very one-eyed about the Bay Village concept. I do not know why, but the member is very obsessed with that one, not so much Wheatstone Village. Maybe he did not have links with a competitor in town.

Mr D.T. Redman interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Warren–Blackwood.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Maybe he did not have links with a competitor in town.

Mr D.T. Redman interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr S.J. Price): Member for Warren–Blackwood, I call you to order for the second time. The minister has the floor. You have had your chance. You asked to make an interjection and she took it—no more.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Maybe he has some links to that city, I do not know. Maybe we will go through all that on another day. Maybe he should have disclosed that in this place.

On the PFAS decision, I responded to that today and made it clear. I saw the member for Bateman walking in. I do not really want to talk too much about this and I think it was discussed. There were some general concerns about it, but that is what happens—right? Now there is an issue of us having to try to dispose of the soil. It is as simple

as that. I have always made that very clear. I wish it was not the case. All the tests show that it is within the environmental guidelines so we are proceeding on that basis. It is not anything outrageous, it is just a part of doing the project. If the member wants to come in here and pretend it is something completely new that I have created—that I created a pile of soil containing some elements of PFAS—then I am going to dispute that because I did not do that. Members opposite left it there, or they left the concept and they approved a business case that was for two tunnels under an airport. Maybe PFAS would have been an issue. I know that the previous government was alerted to it but I do not want to go through all that again. We have to deal with it. We are dealing with that in the best possible way. I did not approach Mr Poland about it. We are just dealing with it as part of normal parts of government. As I said, testing has been undertaken and it is within the environmental guidelines that we use for other Department of Transport projects.

Mr D.T. Redman: Did you raise it with the Peel Development Commission?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: No.

I am glad that the member for Roe welcomes the new Minister for Ports; that is good. Members of the Nationals WA love Hon Alannah MacTiernan now, so that is good. I am glad. I think the commentary made by the member about me was a little bit harsh. I hate to say this, given that most of the bullying happened under his government's watch but it was a bit harsh, maybe.

Mr P. Papalia: A tiny bit.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Yes, a tiny bit harsh. Let me go through the reality. Most of the bullying claims were under the previous government's watch; they did nothing about it. We won the election and we instigated a review about the culture and environment. We engaged with WorkSafe Western Australia as well. We also created the changes that led to the appointment of a new CEO. I think there was a list of 18 recommendations from the review and we started to implement them all. That is what we did. I did not ignore it; I acted on it. The previous government ignored it. Again, I wish we did not have to deal with that issue but it was something that we inherited. We did everything possible. The member for Roe has become Hon Alannah MacTiernan's biggest fan, but I think yesterday his colleague was calling for her to be sacked. I do not know how that works! Was he calling for her to be sacked as a minister? Yesterday, the member for Warren–Blackwood said Hon Alannah MacTiernan should be sacked and today, it is as though the National Party is really welcoming her. Good on them and good luck to them on that one. As I said, we took it seriously. We inherited a significant culture issue. A review was undertaken and we began implementing its recommendations, which meant we saw a change of the CEOs. Again, it was a bit harsh about me visiting the regions. I think I explained before that I had some personal circumstances last year, particularly between March and June, but I will not go through it again because it is still a bit raw. I think I explained before why I was not doing many regional trips.

Regarding roads, I am sorry, member for Roe, but we cannot fix every mistake that the previous government left us. I am sorry that we cannot, but a significant backlog was left, which we are trying to address. I will go through the maintenance spending. The member talked about maintenance. He approached me about a particular issue and so did the Leader of the National Party. I took it seriously. Honestly, if it was the other way around and I was a new member and I approached a minister about a particular company not getting a look in for a Main Roads WA contracting issue, imagine what Hon Troy Buswell would have said to me. Probably something not nice, I suspect. I got Main Roads to work on it. I think the member is a bit wrong about Main Roads. I have been throughout regional Western Australia. Main Roads personnel are one of the most connected groups of individuals in regional areas that I have seen. They really are—I do not want to use the words “old school”, but it is like an old school department that is in touch with the local community and has really good regional representation. It is very different from what has happened to other agencies over time. I think they have been spared some of the things that have happened with other agencies that took on more privatisation and a contracting-out mentality although, of course, there is significant contracting out under Main Roads. However, there is a really good group of local people in whichever country town I go to. For example, representatives in Albany and the Kimberley are people who have been working in that area for many years and they know everything.

They know the community and they know the issues. Throughout the Pilbara, mining companies have been employing Main Roads to manage bridges over their rail lines. That has been a great success story. It is the reverse of contracting out. Some mining companies were burnt in the past when they tried to manage road and bridge projects in isolation of Main Roads and, as a result, there were issues with the pavement and costs. Now many mining companies are asking Main Roads to manage their projects. The Roy Hill bridge, which was opened recently, is an example of that. The feedback has been great. In my view Main Roads has been operating really well in the regions and the metro area. It has a really great interface with the community in the regions. We always want to do more, but this is government and this is Economics 101. If I had all the resources in the world, I would repave every road in WA, but we are trying to do our best to maintain roads. The South Coast Highway is one example. I was there with the member for Albany and the Premier about a month ago. Some of the pavement on that road is the oldest in the state, so we have a \$30 million program to improve that highway. I do not really understand the member for Roe's point. There has been significant investment.

I want to go through some numbers. In 2017–18, our first year of government, total road maintenance was \$438 million compared with \$267 million four years ago.

Mr V.A. Catania: Is there a breakdown of federal funding in that?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: That is maintenance. We are injecting more money into maintenance and also injecting more into local government road agreements—more than the former government ever did.

It is an issue. I am proud that when we were in opposition we made a number of commitments on roads. We are now delivering in those across the suburbs and the regions—in Kalgoorlie, the South Coast Highway and the Tom Price–Karratha Road. I will go through them. The Bunbury Outer Ring Road is an interesting example. The former government did nothing about it for eight and a half years. Now we are trying to find the right route. It seems that some members of the Liberal and National Parties do not want it. Member for Collie–Preston, is that correct?

Mr M.P. Murray: Of course.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: We are consulting with the community, but there are issues in both the northern and southern areas. The Bunbury Outer Ring Road is a big road project and we have faced challenges delivering it, but all we have got from the Nationals and the Liberal Party is criticism, which is odd, because I thought they wanted it. They do not appear to want it. They have thrown some interesting challenges at us, but we have strong members like the members for Collie–Preston, Murray–Wellington and Bunbury. They have engaged with their communities to make sure that the route and the style of the project will last for generations to come.

The member for Roe said that the Albany ring-road should be done. Let me give members an example. When we won government, no work or planning had been done on that road. I am sorry, but it does take a while to prepare business cases, as we found out even with the Metronet project. We have gone through the business case process and business analysis, and I really hope that the federal government can fund it, especially because it appears as though federal government regional members have not been able to deliver on some of their promises. Rick Wilson in particular has been attacking the state government all the time. We are the government that has prepared the business cases, put \$35 million on the table and raised it with the federal government whenever we could, but all he does is attack us.

Mr P. Papalia: But it's okay! Andrew Hastie got \$10 million without a business case for a train station that no-one needs.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Just to clarify, that member for Warnbro.

Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup interjected.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: No, he got 14 per cent funding for a railway station. That is what he got. It was a nothing commitment.

Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup: For a railway station that no-one needs?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: No. It is a nothing commitment, but he knows he cannot deliver it and he is trying to hoodwink the people in that area. The member for Dawesville might want to take that one back. It was a nothing commitment, drawn on the back of an envelope, for \$10 million. He has not got any funding for any of the road projects on Thomas Road that he has been campaigning on. He has banners out there. I do not know! The member for Pearce got some commitment for local government roads. Why did the member for Canning not get commitments for local government roads?

Mr P. Papalia: Have they written him off?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Maybe, they have, but the federal government has given a commitment to fund 14 per cent of a train station. What a mockery! What are they trying to do? Are they trying to hoodwink the people of Mandurah? Whereas we are committing to a multilevel car park in Mandurah—federal Labor has committed to half of that, too. We are going to take the pressure off Mandurah train station straightaway as opposed to the federal government's mischievous commitment. It is trying to hoodwink the people in that area. But I digress.

Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup: I thought you were in support of Lakelands.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Lakelands and Karnup, yes.

Mr P. Papalia interjected.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Yes. I am going through the business case process, which the federal government asked me to do, to compare the two. We are doing that. But, really, \$10 million from the federal government is not enough. It is not much at all. Someone said that it would pay for only the car park at the Lakelands train station, and not the train station. I think the people of that area probably see through this very shallow commitment from Andrew Hastie. That is what I think. I think they realise it takes more than \$10 million to build a train station nowadays. As I said, I digress.

The Albany ring-road—we are out there, poor Main Roads, doing all the business cases, doing all the work, going to Canberra. I raise the matter with Canberra all the time. Then Rick Wilson says that the state government is not doing enough. That is what the member for Roe said. I have a hint: why not lobby the federal government on this. I do not know! Call me aspirational, but why doesn't the opposition lobby the federal government on this? What do you reckon! What do you think?

Mr P. Papalia: Who is the federal government?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: They came here last week and there was a range of commitments—we are still trying to work out what they were. Were they government commitments or election commitments? I do not know. I cannot remember. Does anyone know? Were they government commitments or election commitments? The member for Dawesville does not know. That is where we are. No-one knows the status of these federal government commitments, but I welcome them. If they are in the budget, I will really welcome them. Are they election commitments? I am not too sure, because I do not think they are going to win! Let us hope that they are in the budget. I hope that those commitments worth \$99 million—why not just make it \$100 million?—are in the budget. It would be good if they were locked away. I hope they did not come here using government resources and media releases to advertise what could be a Liberal Party election commitment. I hope that is not the case.

Last week, the federal government came over but did not mention the Albany ring-road, or the Tom Price–Karratha Road. There was nothing. Who is that federal minister—Melissa Price? She is the federal minister. She is in the cabinet. You would think that she might advocate for a regional road project! You would think that would be the case. Member for Roe, I am going to tell you this: lobby the federal government. I know he has connections. He has connections everywhere. I see it in the parliamentary dining room all the time. You are a well-connected man.

Mr P.J. Rundle: Get the member for Albany to lobby.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: He is doing that. But the member for Roe raised it.

Mr V.A. Catania: What about federal Labor? Have they made a commitment? Have you written to them?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I am working always—working always! But I know that the member for Roe is a very well connected man. He knows a bit too much about a lot of things. That is my concern about the member for Roe. He is well connected. The member should use those connections —

Mr P. Papalia: He's connected to the AFL.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: He is connected to everybody; the member for Roe is a wily fox. He is on the South Fremantle board. Every time I go into the dining room, he is courting another group; he is amazing. I have been watching the member for Roe's work. When he had my kids' principal in for dinner, that scared the hell out of me! He has left, so it has all worked out—only kidding. The member for Roe is a well-connected man. We put \$35 million on the table. We have done the work; we want the money. Please, member for Roe, use your very good connections, go to Canberra and help us get that money before the federal budget. I would really like that. If the Liberal and National Parties work with us, not attack us for doing the work and putting in the money, and instead attack the federal government for not putting in money, my gut feeling is that would work really well.

The Karratha–Tom Price road, member for North West Central—is it still “Central”?

Mr V.A. Catania: Yes.

Several members interjected.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Pardon. Do not make me go there. I was reflecting on the member for North West Central's comment that if he was in government, the road would be built already. Does the member really believe that? I do not think he does.

We have been working with mining companies; so far, it has not been so successful. Who knew it is hard to get money out of mining companies? We are working with mining companies and the federal government. We are trying to get those funds, but, of course, we have \$50 million in the budget. We discovered asbestos along the road, which we are cleaning up.

Mr K. Michel interjected.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: It is lucky that we were there to clean it up. Works will be underway very soon. I am very keen to visit the site with the member for Pilbara to launch that project. That project has lasted for so many years. The project was around in our last term and then nothing happened. It is back again because Labor is the only team that has put this project on the agenda in the past 20 or 30 years.

Mr I.C. Blayney: Well, build it; don't just put it on your agenda.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Member for Geraldton, do not interject. Come on, the member for Geraldton has a lot happening in his area.

Mr I.C. Blayney: Can I ask you a question?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: It depends.

Several members interjected.

Mr I.C. Blayney: The \$35 million for the Albany Ring Road; is that sitting waiting for the federal government to add money to it?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Yes.

Mr I.C. Blayney: It's a bit like that train station and the 14 per cent, isn't it?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: No. I will give an example. The federal government has funded 50 to 80 per cent of Metronet, but it has only funded 18 per cent of the Lakelands station project. The federal government obviously likes Metronet much more than it likes the Lakelands station. Another point is that historically regional roads are 80 per cent funded by the federal government. I thank the member for that interjection, because I handled it well!

Let us go through all the projects we are doing because we not building Roe 8. We are not building Roe 8—I just had to refer to that again. The National Party is obsessed with Roe 8. I will go through the projects. There is funding of \$5 million for passing lanes on Indian Ocean Drive, which has been completed. There is funding of \$2.5 million for widening and sealing shoulders on Northam–Cranbrook Road south of Katanning; \$2 million for widening and sealing shoulders on South Western Highway south of Waroona; \$2.1 million and \$1.5 million for widening and sealing shoulders on Boyanup and Capel Roads west of Boyanup; \$1.5 million for widening and sealing shoulders on Great Northern Highway north of Cue; \$1.5 million for widening and sealing shoulders on Goldfields Highway south of Kambalda and \$4.6 million for south of Leonora; \$2.5 million for passing lanes on Coolgardie–Esperance Highway; \$3.9 million for reconstruction and widening York–Merredin Road east of York; and \$2 million for widening and sealing shoulders on North West Coastal Highway south of Fortescue roadhouse and \$2.15 million for passing lanes west of Roebourne.

Those are just the regional road safety initiative projects funded through the reallocation of Perth Freight Link funding. Maintenance expenditure is at record levels. The Western Australian Local Government Association state roads agreement funding is at record levels and is increasing each year. We are doing a lot given the tight budgetary considerations. We are doing major regional road projects, including, as I said, the Bunbury Outer Ring Road.

Mr K.J.J. Michel: The Coongan Gorge.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I opened the Margaret River Perimeter Road a couple of weeks ago.

Mr W.J. Johnston: Whose electorate is that?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: It is the member for Warren–Blackwood's electorate. It is a touchy subject.

Mr D.T. Redman: I got feedback that you put the ruler over it to try to stop it happening.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: That is wrong. I saved it. The member is wrong again. I know the member has set views about me —

Mr D.T. Redman: So you are putting on the record that you did not pursue the project to try to see whether you could claw it back as a saving.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Me?

Mr D.T. Redman: Yes.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Yes, absolutely. I know the member comes into the chamber with set views about me. But in a lot of instances I am fighting for regional WA. Maybe it is because I grew up on an orchard! Shall we go through that again?

As I said, there is Karratha–Tom Price road; an upgrade between Albany and Jerramungup on South Coast Highway; Gibb River Road; Great Northern Highway from Muchea to Wubin; the Bow River Bridge, which I opened—it was a fantastic experience—and Great Northern Highway from Wyndham to Maggie's Jump Up.

Again, I want to highlight some of the exceptional work Main Roads has been doing in the regions and particularly the companies involved in the Margaret River Perimeter Road and some of the Kimberley projects that are really trying to facilitate —

Mr P. Papalia: That is an impressive number.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: That is just half.

Those companies' engagement with local businesses and the local Aboriginal workforce has been exceptional. One of the most pleasing results of the government's focus on local participation is some really good results on the ground. It means that young Aboriginal people living in the area are being employed locally. Some of the local knowledge they bring to the projects—for example, their role in some of the Kimberley projects around Wyndham in particular—about the environment and what is very important to the local community is essential. If we were

to contract out for that advice from other parts of the state, we would probably get different advice. They know the area so well and what is important to them rather than what could be seen as important to them, and that has worked really well. In Wyndham, two young men involved in the prison camp left the prison camp and obtained full-time employment. Again, that is incredible. We are also using day prisoners to help build these projects. We are getting really, really good outcomes. Like I said, 30 to 40 per cent of the workforce are locals, and that is something we are very keen to continue to encourage across the state. It is something that started in the past couple of years—probably before, but it has had renewed emphasis with the local participation strategies. It is something we are very keen to do.

There is the Coongan Gorge realignment, mentioned by the member for Pilbara; the NorthLink project, which is a metro project that pops into the regions; and the regional road safety program. We are keen to promote the run-off-the-road crash road improvement. This program has been adopted by both sides of politics because of the cost benefits. For a limited cost, we get a huge benefit in relation to single driver accidents; that is, drivers running off the road because the shoulder is not wide enough or there is no audible line edging. We are keen to put this program to the commonwealth for funding because a small investment in this area can lead to great outcomes. The results are for everyone to see. Where we have gone in and widened the shoulders and put on audible edges, the number of crashes has reduced significantly. These are the priority issues that we would like to address throughout regional Western Australia. In the south west, the wheatbelt and the great southern, there are a lot of older roads with very narrow shoulders. In the overall scheme of things, a small investment in that area will produce some really great outcomes. We are putting that to the commonwealth, because we think that is a good investment of commonwealth funding to improve regional road safety.

I also want to touch on regional airfares. The Economics and Industry Standing Committee conducted an inquiry into regional airfares. I believe, maybe because I am the transport minister, that transport in regional Western Australia—whether that be roads or access to competitive airfares—is essential to facilitate economic growth, create amenity, and assist with lifestyle. That includes the rail system. The challenges that have been created for this government because of the closure of the tier 3 lines —

Mr W.J. Johnston: How come they were closed?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: It was because the National Party sold the regional rail network. For example, we funded the *AvonLink*. If what National Party members think of me were true, I would not have saved the *AvonLink*. I actually really, really support regional communities and access to excellent transport services.

The inquiry into regional airfares recommended that the government develop an aviation strategy. We are developing that now, and Department of Transport teams will be in regional Western Australia over the next two weeks consulting with the community and stakeholder groups about what we can do about regional airfares across the state. Again, the Nationals, with \$8 billion in the royalties for regions fund, could probably have done significant work on this issue in the eight and half years in which they were in government. They did not do much in this area, but are now calling for us to do everything immediately. Some good work has been done by the Minister for Tourism —

Mr P. Papalia: On what?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Airfares.

Mr P. Papalia: Outstanding!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I did not say outstanding. I just said good work. It was outstanding! Now the minister is listening! It was outstanding work by the Minister for Tourism.

Mr P. Papalia: On what?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Regional airfares!

Mr P. Papalia: Yes!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: He is very proud of the work so far, with Broome, Monkey Mia and Carnarvon.

Several members interjected.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Okay. We will give the former government Albany and Esperance, and we will take the rest. However, there is much more to do. I have had the opportunity recently to meet some senior people in some airlines.

Mr P. Papalia: So have I!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Not at the same time—they were different meetings, but hopefully we all agreed on the same thing. I think we both would have put up the importance of regional airfares to regional communities. Is that what you said, Minister for Tourism?

Mr P. Papalia: Yes. I was speaking up for regional communities, as always.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: We believe transport is a major catalyst, not only for economic growth, but also for amenity. We talk about people wanting to move into regional towns. I believe the ability for people to come back to Perth if they have sick relatives, for example, has an impact on their decision. If people can be guaranteed affordable airfares, that will play into their decision-making, because we are all parts of extended networks and we want the ability to go back to those networks should we need them or should they need us at any point in time. The Minister for Tourism would be happy to know that the Department of Transport is in the regions at the moment seeking feedback and developing a state aviation strategy.

Mr P. Papalia: Good on you, minister! Brilliant!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Yes, brilliant! We will then move on and do all we can on all the routes across the network. We wish more of that work had been done by the former government —

Mr P. Papalia: Making up for lost time.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: We are continuing to do what we can, to make up for lost time.

I no longer have these particular portfolios, but in lands, we have done a lot. We have given a lot of approvals for regional age care, member for Collie–Preston; Minister for Seniors and Ageing, to help facilitate good outcomes and the ability for people to age in place.

Over the past week I have launched some regional bike strategies. That is also a key element of tourism. I think the Minister for Tourism is very excited about how are working, through the transport and tourism portfolios, to grow more cycling experiences, whether that be road racing or mountain biking. Mountain bike trails provide a big tourism opportunity in the member for Collie–Preston’s area around both Collie and Margaret River.

Ms L. Mettam: And Dwellingup.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Yes. I met a regional tourism operator who explained to me just how popular bike trails are with families who come to the area and can take a package, hire the bikes and ride the trails. That is an exciting opportunity, particularly for international tourism across the south west and great southern.

Mr M.P. Murray: It is right across the region. It is very well very spread out.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: It is also cape to cape. It stretches through both.

Mr M.P. Murray: You asked, and we delivered.

Ms L. Mettam interjected.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Do not worry, member for Vasse. You did not really compliment me on my announcement down there. That was a bit of a bad one. That was a bit negative. You could have just given me that one, could you not? It was a bit negative. Anyway, even though the local member does not appreciate it, we are still doing the work to implement mountain bike strategies and a coordinated and consistent cycling strategy across regional Western Australia.

All in all, it was upsetting to have such a personal attack by Nationals WA members on my integrity and everything about me through this motion. They will probably say tomorrow, “Set aside this guideline. Don’t worry about these rules; don’t worry about what the WA Planning Commission has said; don’t worry about the Public Transport Authority regional school bus policy, which has been there since 1999, and do a deal for me.” That is how they operate. I am upset that they did not see fit to really understand what happened with my staff member and the City of Karratha. I do not think that is fair. However, as we have always seen, National Party members believe they are above the law and the rules of this place and can say whatever they like to us. They say awful things to us. However, when we respond, somehow we are out of order. That is how the National Party has played this constantly. National Party members have come into this place and made some personal attacks. Through this motion, they have claimed a lot of things about my behaviour that are completely wrong and false. I have demonstrated in my 59 minutes that we are doing a lot of work in the regional transport space. That work was not done by the former government.

We want to get better airfares. We want to do more on roads. We want to do what we can to support regional communities, which assist in the economic development of this state by creating diversity in our population. We will continue to encourage the regions, from the tourism angle and also from the broader economic development angle.

Mr P. Papalia: We sent Hemsworth and Damon up to the member for North West Central’s electorate!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: We sent two Hollywood superstars to the member for North West Central’s electorate. I mean, honestly!

Mr P. Papalia: Do not think that was an accident! We said, “Go to Vince’s seat!”

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Yes. Thank you very much.

MR W.J. JOHNSTON (Cannington — Minister for Mines and Petroleum) [6.18 pm]: I want to make a few remarks about this motion. This is not the main issue, but I first want to point out to the member for Roe that he has misrepresented what I said in this chamber when he asked me questions about the claimed bullying at Southern Ports. I will not directly quote what the member for Roe said because I did not write it down, but, *inter alia*, he said that I was not interested in the issue. That is not the answer I gave him when he asked about this matter in question time some years ago. I said to him that I am not able to intervene in the operations of WorkSafe. I then said that if he wanted to ask about the specifics of the port, he needed to ask the Minister for Transport, because that was the ministerial arrangement at the time and the Minister for Transport was the relevant minister. The member for Roe was asking me about the activities of WorkSafe. The point I made to him in question time and I make to him again now is that I do not actually control WorkSafe. By law, there is an independent commissioner, and he is not subject to direction about the way he executes his functions. He is, of course, subject to direction regarding policy matters, which is appropriate, but in respect to the way in which he does an investigation, for example, he does not answer to me on those issues. The point I made to the member in question time and I make again now is that he cannot ask the Minister for Industrial Relations about a decision of an independent commissioner. That is a stupid question, because it does not understand the functioning of government. That is the point I made to the member for Roe in the past. Apparently, because of his comments today, he still does not get that.

I will make that point again: the investigation by WorkSafe into the issues with the Southern Ports Authority was independent of me as minister, and it should be. The point I made in question time on this matter was that if the member for Roe wants the minister to be the one who makes these decisions, I will make the decision to investigate a particular contractor in the construction sector who I think is an appalling employer. If that is what the member wants me to do, that will be the first thing I do. I understand that person has been a generous donor to the Nationals WA, but I would not make the decision for that reason; I think he is an appalling employer. If that is what the member wants me to do, that is what I will do, but I do not think that is actually what he wants me to do. The point I make to the member for Roe is that he should not come in here and say silly things, because if he does, I will stand up and point out how dumb they are. I ask the member to please actually think about what he says when the leader and deputy leader of his party ask him to make comments in this chamber. He should not come in here and say random things, because it is embarrassing to him.

I will make another point on this. When there was a problem with First Quantum Minerals in the member for Roe's electorate, the Premier and I personally involved ourselves in making sure that the people in his electorate were looked after. When there was a problem for the workers at the Cleveland–Cliffs project in Yilgarn in the member's electorate, the Premier took the lead and I assisted him to make sure that as many people as possible kept their jobs, particularly in Esperance. The company that took over Cliffs had had an experience of exporting out of Kwinana, so it was quite likely that if it had gone ahead, it may well have made the decision to export from Kwinana, which would have led to the loss of jobs in the member's electorate. We made the decision to make sure that those people were looked after in Esperance. As the Premier pointed out, it cost less to give that company assistance than if we had given no assistance at all and that project had closed. Both the Premier and I have been criticised by members of the National and Liberal Parties for saving hundreds of jobs in the member for Roe's electorate. I do not get what it is about the Nationals that they do not thank this government for the hard work it has done to help that electorate and to make sure that the people who live there get looked after. It is bizarre that that is their attitude, but it is.

I want to go on to an issue that relates specifically to one of the points in the motion about the resolution. Point 1 of the motion referring to the Minister for Transport; Planning states —

her extraordinary and unilateral decision to call in a State Administrative Tribunal appeal relating to the Bay Village fly in, fly out camp in Karratha;

Let us put this in context. The Browse gas was discovered in 1971. That is how long it has been known that one of the world's largest gas finds is off the coast of Western Australia. Think about that, members. It is 48 years since that find. That gas has been known about for nearly half a century. The idea that somehow that gas will simply come out of the ground by itself and be turned into LNG and exported is silly. Let us not forget what happened. When the former Labor government was in power, a process was designed to provide an opportunity for that gas to come onshore. That was being done because the former Labor government was very keen to make sure that the Indigenous people in the Kimberley could get a benefit out of that gas. When the Labor government was defeated in 2008 and the Liberal government came in, the Premier, Colin Barnett, took over the management of that process and junked the process. He specifically chose the James Price Point site as being the place for the development of that gas. That was a controversial decision, because the process we had followed would have allowed Aboriginal people to have the final say on the location of an LNG plant, if it were to go ahead in the Kimberley. I remember when we were debating this issue in this chamber that Hon Colin Barnett, on behalf of the then government, said it was a bad decision and wrong of the Labor government to give that final decision on the location of the plant to Aboriginal people. I remember that, because I actually spoke in that matter of public interest debate and pointed out that all we were doing was to give them the same right that we give to farmers.

Let us not forget what happened. That project went on. The joint venture partners at that time were different from the JV partners now. Two of those partners—Chevron and Shell—wanted the gas to come to the North West Shelf to backfill the existing LNG facilities on the Burrup. BHP was a JV partner at the time and did not have a view—it did not mind if it went to James Price Point or the Burrup. Woodside at that time, under different leadership, supported it going to James Price Point. The point was that that was a controversial issue and the Premier was involving himself directly in it. Remember that the retention lease was tied; they were given a continuation of their retention lease, but it was tied to James Price Point. They had to proceed to see whether they wanted to invest in James Price Point. In December 2011, they did not say that they would not proceed; they said that they could not make a decision until 2013, which, of course, was conveniently after the election. That way, they did not have to admit that they could not get it to work at James Price Point.

Members should remember that at the same time, the Prelude facility close by was being done as a floater. We do not want a floating LNG facility, because then we cannot get domestic gas. Remember, friends in the chamber, that domestic gas is the core of Western Australia's energy system. The jobs of the workers at Pinjarra, Wagerup and Kwinana depend on the access to gas. We have a domestic gas reservation policy. I make that point: it is a domestic gas reservation policy. If we do not have LNG exports, there is nothing to reserve, so we have to make sure that it comes to shore. In 2011, the JV partners decided to delay a decision, conveniently for the then Premier, until after the 2013 election, so that they did not have to admit that the project was not proceeding. The point, again, is that the decision was again delayed on one of the world's largest gas fields, which had been discovered in 1971. In January 2012, Inpex, which has the nearby Ichthys field, made its decision. I have the media release in which Inpex announced its decision. It is dated 13 January 2012 and headed "Inpex and Total make final investment decision on Ichthys LNG project, Australia". I will quote, in part, Mr Kuroda, the chairman of Inpex, who said —

“The Ichthys FID announced today by INPEX and Total signals the start of construction of one of the world's largest LNG facilities based on an estimated 40 years of gas and condensate reserves from the Browse Basin offshore Western Australia,” ...

I want to make a point about that, because in 2011, when Woodside and other joint venture partners in the Browse project announced the decision to delay their decision, the then Premier, Hon Colin Barnett, said that that was good because it meant that Inpex could also join with the Browse project to come to James Price Point. In 2012, Inpex announced that it was going to Darwin. This project has been hanging around for a long time.

Point of Order

Mr R.S. LOVE: I cannot see anything in the motion that deals with Browse gas, Inpex or any of these matters. We are having a very nice history lesson on the development of gas fields offshore in Western Australia, but it is not actually mentioned in the motion. I do not quite see why we are discussing it. Previous rulings on this matter have been to bring speakers back to the points outlined in the motion. I ask that you do that with this minister, Madam Acting Speaker.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms S.E. Winton): Thank you. Minister, I am enjoying your debate very much; please bring it back to the motion.

Debate Resumed

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: This is about the Bay Village. We must understand what the Bay Village is about. I am sorry that people do not understand that Woodside says that it needs the Bay Village for the project to bring Browse gas to the North West Shelf. This is the point that I am making. The idea that, somehow, the Bay Village is a decision on its own and not related to the broader context of why Woodside wants to build Bay Village, shows why the National Party, and apparently the Liberal Party, are incapable of governing Western Australia. I just make this point.

In December 2011, the former Premier said that it was good to delay the project.

Point of Order

Mr R.S. LOVE: I would like a ruling from the Chair as to whether this fits into the context of this debate.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Thank you, member; sit down. I am not giving a ruling; I have asked the member to continue his debate.

Debate Resumed

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: I am addressing the first point, which states —

Extraordinary and unilateral decision to call in a State Administrative Tribunal appeal relating to the Bay Village fly in, fly out camp in Karratha.

The Bay Village fly in, fly out camp is required in Karratha because of the decision by the joint venture partners not to do what the Liberal and National Parties wanted them to do, but instead to backfill the North West Shelf.

There is no way to understand why this is such a key decision for the people of this state and the people of Karratha until we understand what will happen if the backfilling of the North West Shelf does not occur. This is absolutely critical to the people of this state, and I am extraordinarily surprised that people on the other side do not understand how critical this decision is, and why the government of Western Australia has to do what is necessary to get this investment decision made. This is a \$26 billion project, and it secures Karratha's future for the next 40 or 50 years. Without this decision, Karratha will lose hundreds of employees. Hundreds of workers will leave Karratha, and the city will be undermined. I do not understand why the National Party, and apparently the Liberal Party, do not want to make holistic decisions. This is a difficult process. If it were easy, the former government would have achieved it, and the gas would now be onshore being processed at James Price Point. The problem is that it is complicated and difficult.

So then 2013 came around, and the Browse joint venture had been realigned and it made a decision not to proceed. That then gives us the opportunity to backfill the North West Shelf. However the North West Shelf can only be backfilled if the gas is brought from Browse to Karratha. If that is not done, the Karratha gas plant will become idle. The former government, with the support of the Labor Party, passed a bill through this chamber to change the terms of the state agreement for the North West Shelf joint venture to allow gas other than North West Shelf gas to go to that plant. It also allows the current joint venture partners, with the approval of the government—they will have to ask—to idle the plant on the North West Shelf. That was not done by the Labor Party. We voted in favour of the bill, because it was a sensible outcome, but let us understand what happened. The former government set this up, and agreed with the North West Shelf joint venture to allow third party gas to come into that plant. That is critical, because work has been done on the gas field to increase its production, but that shortens the length of time the gas is available, because there is only a limited amount of gas, and it will eventually run out. All gas fields eventually run out. In the mid-2020s, that plant will start to idle. Let us understand: there are hundreds of full-time jobs in Karratha for permanent process and maintenance workers—not fly in, fly out workers—on the North West Shelf joint venture facilities. It has five export trains and two domestic trains, and it requires hundreds of workers, who live permanently in Karratha.

If the joint venture is not able to bring the gas from the Browse field to the North West Shelf, there will be two disastrous outcomes. The first is that there will be no capacity for domestically reserved gas to support workers across Western Australia who rely on gas for energy for the companies they work for, and process operations that happen around the state. That is one bad outcome, because if there are no exports, we cannot reserve domestic gas, because the two things go together. Unlike on the east coast, where they messed everything up, here in Western Australia, Alan Carpenter's decision for a gas reservation policy, which was supported by the former government, is very critical to us. If we do not have exports, we do not have domestic gas.

[Member's time extended.]

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: That is why it is so critical. A lot of construction work will be required for this. As people know, there is discussion about building a second train for the Pluto facility, building a connection between the Pluto facility and the North West Shelf joint venture facility, which are next to each other, so that rather than running as two separate facilities they can run as a single facility. There is a need to build domestic facilities for Pluto, and then it is necessary to build the offshore subsea infrastructure to bring the gas and condensate up to a floating production, storage and offloading facility, and then a gas pipeline to Karratha to bring the feed gas to the North West Shelf joint venture facility. Without those construction works, Karratha will absolutely die. Hundreds of workers who are currently living in Karratha in high-paid jobs, and sending their children to school in Karratha, will lose their jobs. Rio Tinto also has hundreds of workers living in Karratha. Remember, Rio and Woodside own more houses and have more permanent staff in Karratha than anybody else. The city cannot survive without those two companies. Rio uses the gas from the North West Shelf joint venture to operate its facilities. Without that gas, Rio's business is undermined as well. It is absolutely essential for permanent workers in Karratha, who will have permanent jobs for the next 50 years in Karratha—not FIFO workers, but day workers who live and send their children to school in Karratha. They can only keep their jobs if Woodside can build the facilities it needs to bring to bring the Browse offshore gas to Karratha. Those facilities will have to have the support of the Bay Village. That is why this is critical. I do not understand why the City of Karratha is so opposed to investment in its future. Without Browse gas coming to Karratha, the City of Karratha cannot live. It is that simple. Anybody who wants to see a strong future for Karratha has to support that gas being brought down from Browse to Karratha and, to do that, Woodside says that it needs an accommodation camp. Obviously, the construction workforce is a temporary workforce; it is not a permanent workforce. There will be a period, just as there was on Barrow Island and at Wheatstone and Pluto and on the North West Shelf joint venture, when there will be a temporary workforce while construction is underway. It is just a fact; it is not an argument or a debate.

I understand that the City of Karratha is not saying that it does not want fly in, fly out workers; it is saying that it does not want them at that particular camp. I was interested in the comments of the Minister for Planning. It is interesting that National Party members have not told us why they support other fly in, fly out facilities in Karratha, but not this one. This is the one that the companies that are going to invest billions of dollars in to secure

Western Australia's energy future say they need to get the job done. As the Minister for Planning outlined, had the City of Karratha and the joint venture partners come to an agreement, she would never have had to call in the decision. The reason that the decision was called in was that there was no agreement between the two sides. The facts are that there cannot be an agreement with one party; there has to be an agreement with two parties. Let us understand that the minister's calling in this decision was the right decision for the state of Western Australia. It is like when former Ministers for Lands allocated land to FIFO camps in a range of cities across the north west. That was done under the previous government. This is exactly the same. As I say, without Browse gas coming to the North West Shelf facility, Karratha has no future.

I am pleased that the member for Pilbara is interested in the City of Karratha's future and that he is not just pulling political stunts and supporting long-term decisions that make people feel good but do not do anything for the future of this town or the state. This is a necessary decision. I must say that I would have preferred it if the City of Karratha and Woodside had come to an agreement, because then the government of Western Australia would not have had to be involved. That would have been the simplest way, but it did not happen.

I am looking forward to the National Party explaining why it supports fly in, fly out to other facilities in Karratha but not to this one, because that is an important issue. Sometimes the National Party presents this issue as being about whether people support or oppose fly in, fly out. That is not the case here. This is not about whether there will be a fly in, fly out workforce; it is about whose village the fly in, fly out workers will stay in. That is an important question that we have not had a clear explanation on.

The member who moved this motion is allowed to make personal attacks on the Minister for Planning. I think it is sad that she does that, but she is allowed to. The idea that somehow this is a minor matter and is just some issue on the side—an individual planning decision—shows why they are in opposition. They have demonstrated to the people of this state that they are not capable of running the place. The single largest victory of any party in the history of Western Australia was at the 2017 election, yet members of the Liberal and National Parties have never come in here and explained why they lost. They have never told us what they did wrong that led to so many people voting against them at the election, and why their hero Brendon Grylls was defeated by a small business man. What a fabulous success story—a migrant who came to Western Australia from India and made a life for himself as an air-conditioning subcontractor and built a successful business in Karratha. He was not a fly in, fly out guy from the western suburbs of Perth, like the former member for Pilbara. I remember the former member for Pilbara interjecting on me during a debate about where Horizon executives lived. He said that they had to live in Perth in the same way that he did. That is what he said in the chamber—go and read *Hansard*. At least we now have a member who lives in the electorate. The member for Pilbara has made his life in the electorate and reflects the values of the people of the Pilbara. It is a great story. When I meet somebody in the Pilbara, I often hear stories about how they moved from somewhere else in the world. Of course, there is also the great story of the Indigenous people up there. Apparently, it was all right for the former government to invest all that money in Karratha, but not Roebourne. Compare the amount of investment in Karratha with the amount of investment in Roebourne. That is an interesting issue. The member for Pilbara is an extraordinary success story in Western Australia. He was proudly able to come here. The National Party laughs at his accent and those sorts of things. It is an absolute disgrace the way they treat him. He is a success story that Western Australians love and they voted for him. They voted against Brendon Grylls and they voted in favour of the current member for Pilbara, and the National Party has not told us why that happened. What was wrong with the National Party that it was voted out in that electorate? Who picked in their election day sweeps that the Labor Party would pick up the Pilbara?

Mr D.J. Kelly: I did.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: There you go! But who in the National Party predicted that loss? Which members of the National Party told everybody that they were going to lose the seat of Pilbara? Given that none of them thought it was going to happen, they still have not told us why it happened. Why did they lose that seat? Why did the Liberal and National Parties get crushed in the worst defeat of any government in the history of Western Australia? I will tell members one of the reasons and it is demonstrated by this motion. They do not get the interests of Western Australians. They do not understand that they have to make real decisions for the future of the state and make tough calls that will ensure that Western Australia survives in the long term.

As I say, without Browse gas coming to Karratha, Karratha's future is undermined. It needs the hundreds of residential jobs created by the North West Shelf joint venture to survive, and it needs the gas to support the work of Rio, which also has hundreds of workers living in Karratha. Without those two companies, Karratha's future is dim—as dim as the National Party's decision-making processes.

This is essential. This motion should not condemn the minister for calling in this decision; it should congratulate her for putting the interests of the state of Western Australia first, not narrow sectional interests or somebody's commercial interests or any of those other issues. She put the interests of Western Australians first and she put the interests of the community in Karratha at the top of her list. We know from the people who want to potentially invest that money that they needed this decision to be made. Without this decision, their investment would have

been more complicated. Let us make sure that people understand. The gas was found in 1971. It does not just pop out of the ground by accident; it has to be managed to get it to work. That is why the minister should be congratulated on making this decision, and congratulated by the City of Karratha because she is helping to secure the future of Karratha.

Division

Question put and a division taken, the Acting Speaker (Ms S.E. Winton) casting her vote with the noes, with the following result —

Ayes (12)

| | | | |
|-----------------|--------------------|-----------------|--------------------------------|
| Mr I.C. Blayney | Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup | Mr R.S. Love | Mr D.T. Redman |
| Ms M.J. Davies | Mr A. Krsticevic | Mr W.R. Marmion | Mr P.J. Rundle |
| Mrs A.K. Hayden | Mr S.K. L'Estrange | Mr J.E. McGrath | Ms L. Mettam (<i>Teller</i>) |

Noes (28)

| | | | |
|-------------------|------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Dr A.D. Buti | Mr W.J. Johnston | Mrs L.M. O'Malley | Ms J.J. Shaw |
| Mr J.N. Carey | Mr D.J. Kelly | Mr P. Papalia | Mrs J.M.C. Stojkovski |
| Mrs R.M.J. Clarke | Mr F.M. Logan | Mr S.J. Price | Mr C.J. Tallentire |
| Mr M.J. Folkard | Ms S.F. McGurk | Mrs M.H. Roberts | Mr P.C. Tinley |
| Ms J.M. Freeman | Mr K.J.J. Michel | Ms C.M. Rowe | Mr R.R. Whitby |
| Ms E.L. Hamilton | Mr Y. Mubarakai | Ms R. Saffioti | Ms S.E. Winton |
| Mr M. Hughes | Mr M.P. Murray | Ms A. Sanderson | Mr D.R. Michael (<i>Teller</i>) |

Pairs

| | |
|-------------------|---------------|
| Dr D.J. Honey | Mr M. McGowan |
| Dr M.D. Nahan | Mr R.H. Cook |
| Mr K.M. O'Donnell | Ms J. Farrer |
| Mr V.A. Catania | Mr B.S. Wyatt |

Question thus negatived.

McGOWAN GOVERNMENT — PERFORMANCE — REGIONS

Motion

MS M.J. DAVIES (Central Wheatbelt — Leader of the Nationals WA) [6.54 pm]: I move —

That this house condemns the McGowan government for its disdain and neglect of regional Western Australia during its first two years in power through its metro-centric attitude and mean-spirited decision-making processes.

It is only a short period until the house rises, so I will lay out a brief overview and this motion will sit on the notice paper until such time as we can revisit it. I am sure that we will be able to add to the list that we have accrued over the previous two years of some of the decisions that this government has made that have been detrimental to the people of regional Western Australia. Despite the contributions from the two ministers who spoke in the previous debate, I can tell members on the ground that when we are in our communities, there are serious concerns about the way this government conducts itself regarding the issues that are important to regional Western Australians. It is one thing to say it in this place and to make it sound as though a plethora of things is happening, but when the government gives with one hand and takes away with another, the community is rightfully concerned about a whole raft of things. We are talking about essential services like the Laverton Hospital, aged-care facilities, community resource centres, Moora Residential College and the Schools of the Air. It has not been a good start to this government's term and, two years in, everything that we predicted is coming to pass. That is very disappointing because we live in the communities and we are a part of them. We want to see them thrive. I am sure that is the aspiration of everyone in this place, but the decisions that have been driven by this government were made because it has made some serious commitments here in the Perth metropolitan area around Metronet. The project is unfunded at this point. We do not know what the taxpayer will be up for to deliver that project. At the same time, as I said, serious projects such as Laverton Hospital are going unfunded. We spoke about that earlier in the week, as part of the government's investment in health.

The National Party remains concerned about a number of things regarding this government's record. It would be of no surprise to anyone in this place that the number one issue that we are very concerned about is the complete and utter decimation of the royalties for regions fund under this government. It was a policy that was embraced and needed, and well understood in its simplicity, by the communities of regional Western Australia. It gave them some hope that, when government members were making decisions, they were making decisions with regional people in mind—not just the cabinet members, but also the Parliament and all those who work in our public service.

There was a need for regional Western Australia to be at the top of the list when we were making decisions. That is what royalties for regions was designed to do. It was designed to leverage dollars from not only the federal government and local governments, but also the private sector to make sure we could deliver projects right across the state. There was a strong tenet to that policy, which was the closer a person was to the decision in this decentralised decision-making model, the better the decision would be. We had significant trust in local governments to deliver significant projects for the state and on behalf of their communities. If members travel around the state, they will learn of not only the things that they can touch and feel in these communities, but also the social infrastructure that was facilitated as a result of this program. Unfortunately, this government has effectively cut \$1 billion of the royalties for regions program that would usually come from normal government expenditure. There is nearly \$80 million in subsidies for the orange school bus system. No-one is arguing that the orange school buses are not essential pieces of infrastructure. They deliver many children safely to their schools every day. But that is a Department of Transport responsibility; it was never envisaged that something like that should come from royalties for regions. There is \$134.7 million for regional TAFE subsidies. Again, it is absolutely critical that regional people have access to higher education in the regions, but that is a Department of Education responsibility and was never envisaged to come from royalties for regions, unless we are talking about trying to leverage new courses or deliver a new model, such as in the Geraldton Universities Centre or perhaps what we have been trying to do in Muresk to test the models that suit our state. We know some models of funding delivery that come from the federal government in particular are very difficult to make work in regional Western Australia. Child care, aged care and higher education are three examples I can think of that would probably benefit if we had access to royalties for regions in the way that it was designed—to try to deliver a better outcome. The childcare model, to the credit of the former Minister for Communities, has been continued under this government, but it is one of the few models that did not get the funding ripped out of it as this Labor government swept into power. There is \$795 million for water subsidies, which goes straight to the Water Corporation. Everybody would understand that the Water Corporation provides an essential service. There is no questioning that, but that is absolutely a responsibility that should be funded from consolidated revenue, not royalties for regions. It is the day-to-day business of government to provide essential services for the communities of Western Australia. That is topped out with \$31 million for education assistants. Again, it is a great initiative, which I fully support. My mother was a teacher and I have many friends and family members in the education system. The value of education assistants cannot be overstated but they are a Department of Education responsibility, yet royalties for regions is picking up the tab for the salaries of those who work in regional schools. That is not what royalties for regions was designed for.

Debate adjourned, pursuant to standing orders.

BILLS

Returned

1. Waste Avoidance and Resource Recovery Amendment (Container Deposit) Bill 2018.
2. Waste Avoidance and Resource Recovery Amendment (Container Deposit) Bill (No. 2) 2018.

Bills returned from the Council without amendment.

House adjourned at 7.01 pm

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Questions and answers are as supplied to Hansard.

STATE RECORDS COMMISSION — 2017–18 ANNUAL REPORT

4326. Mr A. Krsticevic to the Attorney General:

I refer to the recently tabled State Records Commission 2017–18 Annual Report and the listing of Ms Lisa Ward as Acting Information Commissioner, appointed 3 April 2018, and ask:

- (a) why was Ms Ward not appointed as permanent Information Commissioner;
- (b) was the decision to appoint Ms Ward to the role in an acting capacity designed to save money:
 - (i) if yes, how much money was saved;
- (c) why has Ms Ward's replacement, Catherine Fletcher, also been appointed to the position in an acting capacity; and
- (d) when is Mrs Fletcher's term of appointment as Acting Information Commissioner due to expire?

Mr J.R. Quigley replied:

- (a) Ms Ward was appointed A/Information Commissioner on 31 March 2018.
This was prior to her appointment as a Magistrate of the Magistrates Court of Western Australia on 16 July 2018.
- (b) No.
 - (i) Not applicable.
- (c)–(d) Ms Catherine Fletcher was appointed as A/Information Commissioner until 15 July 2019 or until a substantive Information Commissioner is appointed, whichever occurs first.
A process to appoint a substantive Information Commissioner has been commenced.

MINISTER FOR ENVIRONMENT — PORTFOLIOS — VIDEOGRAPHY SERVICES

4419. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the parliamentary secretary to the Minister for Environment; Disability Services; Electoral Affairs:

Have any of your departments, agencies, boards, public owned corporations or Ministerial offices (since 17 March 2017) spent money on videography services:

- (a) If so:
 - (i) What videographer has been engaged;
 - (ii) What was the purpose of each engagement of service;
 - (iii) What was the production title of each engagement of service; and
 - (iv) How much money has been spent?

Mr R.R. Whitby replied:

For the Western Australian Electoral Commission:

No.

- (a) (i)–(iv) Not applicable.

17 March 2017 to 30 June 2017

Department of Environment Regulation

No.

- (a) (i)–(iv) Not applicable.

Office of the Environmental Protection Authority

No.

- (a) (i)–(iv) Not applicable.

For the former Department of Parks and Wildlife

No.

- (a) (i)–(iv) Not applicable.

For the Conservation and Parks Commission

No.

(a) (i)–(iv) Not applicable.

For the Swan River Trust

No.

(a) (i)–(iv) Not applicable.

For the Botanic Gardens and Parks Authority

(a)

| (i) What videographer has been engaged | (ii) What was the purpose of each engagement of service | (iii) What was the production title of each engagement of service |
|--|--|---|
| Jason Thomas Cinematography | Promotional video shown at 2017 conference in Canberra and on conference website to encourage registrations. | Australasian Botanical Guides' Conference in Kings Park, 2019. |
| Jason Thomas Cinematography | Promotional video for visitors and tourists appearing on Kings Park website and social media. | Welcome to Kings Park. |
| Jason Thomas Cinematography | Three short drone videos for Kings Park social media use. | Mount Eliza, Lotterywest Federation Walkway and Pioneer Women's Memorial. |
| Jason Thomas Cinematography | Video appears when an online purchase is made on the Aspects website to explain how Aspects' profits support Kings Park. | Thank you for shopping at Aspects of Kings Park Gallery Shop. |

(a) (iv) \$2,349 (excl GST)

For the Zoological Parks Authority

(a)

| (i) What videographer has been engaged | (ii) What was the purpose of each engagement of service | (iii) What was the production title of each engagement of service |
|--|---|---|
| Lush TV | Promotion of activities, services and functions of Perth Zoo. | Functions and Weddings Promotion Video. |
| Gatecrasher Agency | Promotion of activities, services and functions of Perth Zoo. | Promotional Videos. |

(a) (iv) \$4,150 (excl GST)

1 July 2017 to 30 June 2018

For the Department of Biodiversity, Conservation and Attractions

(a)

| (i) What videographer has been engaged | (ii) What was the purpose of each engagement of service | (iii) What was the production title of each engagement of service |
|--|--|---|
| Jason Thomas Cinematography | Educational resource used by Kings Park Education and the Kings Park Festival. | Adorable Florables wildflower characters. |
| Jason Thomas Cinematography | Video for event sponsor and promotional use. | Djilba Festival for schools. |

| | | |
|--------------------|---|--|
| Ali Kelana | Training tool for new Kings Park Volunteer Guides. | How to lead a guided walk. |
| Gatecrasher Agency | Promotion of activities, services and functions of Perth Zoo. | Saving Wildlife Together x 3 15sec TVC. |
| Gatecrasher Agency | Promotion of activities, services and functions of Perth Zoo. | Teddy Bears Picnic Promotion Video. |
| Gatecrasher Agency | Promotion of activities, services and functions of Perth Zoo. | Zoorassic Park Teaser Cinema Commercial. |
| Gatecrasher Agency | Promotion of activities, services and functions of Perth Zoo. | Zoorassic Park Promotional Video. |
| Gatecrasher Agency | Promotion of activities, services and functions of Perth Zoo. | Zoorassic Park Vox Pop Video. |

(a) (iv) \$19,583.67 (excl GST).

For the Conservation and Parks Commission

No.

(a) (i)–(iv) Not applicable.

For the Swan River Trust

No.

(a) (i)–(iv) Not applicable.

ATTORNEY GENERAL — PORTFOLIOS — VIDEOGRAPHY SERVICES

4424. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Attorney General; Minister for Commerce:

Have any of your departments, agencies, boards, public owned corporations or Ministerial offices (since 17 March 2017) spent money on videography services:

(a) If so:

- (i) What videographer has been engaged;
- (ii) What was the purpose of each engagement of service;
- (iii) What was the production title of each engagement of service; and
- (iv) How much money has been spent?

Mr J.R. Quigley replied:

Department of Mines, Industry Regulation and Safety:

Please refer to Legislative Assembly Question on Notice 4428.

The Corruption and Crime Commission:

(a) Yes.

- (i) Mills Wilson
- (ii) Promote International Anti-Corruption Day 2018
- (iii) “What is Corruption?”
- (iv) \$6,990.76 (incl. GST)

LegalAid Western Australia:

(a) Yes.

- (i) Envision Productions

- (ii) To video legal and other professional training (to place on our online learning management system) and to create short community legal education videos to place on LegalAid WA' website.
- (iii) The name of the legal training topic or the community legal education topic.
- (iv) \$10,875.82 (excluding GST).

Office of the Commissioner for Children and Young People:

- (a) Yes.
 - (i) Lonely Mountain Video
 - (ii) Filming of four video resources for schools and general community on supporting LGBTI young people, published as online resource; Live stream for regional attendees and recording as website resource of Vulnerability Speaker Series seminar; Filming and production of a video resource on children's rights for use in presentations and as an online resource; Filming and production of video resource introducing the We Are 10 project for WA school students; Filming and production of video resource for WA children on how to make a complaint within an organisation published online; Filming and production of video resource from Geraldton and Perth advisory committees as online resource; Video slideshows of We Are 10 entries for use in WA libraries and as online resource; Filming of Thinker in Residence seminar on mental health for use as an online resource; Filming of speakers at two Vulnerability Speaker Series seminars – Understanding vulnerability in children and young people and The role of services in assisting vulnerable children and young people – as online resources; Filming of interviews with young people talking about vulnerability for use in Vulnerability Speaker Series seminars and as an online resource; Short excerpts of interviews with young people talking about vulnerability for use online to promote Vulnerability Speaker Series; Live stream for regional attendees and recording as website resource of School and Learning consultation findings; Production of video from live stream footage for use as website resource on harmful sexual behaviours.
 - (iii) *What do LGBTI young people want people to know? How to be a good ally to LGBTI children and young people, How schools can support LGBTI children and young people, Messages of hope for LGBTI children and young people; Improving the wellbeing of Aboriginal children – Professor Helen Milroy, Improving the wellbeing of Aboriginal children – Mick Gooda, Improving the wellbeing of Aboriginal children – Young people from Aboriginal leadership cross-cultural solutions program, Krista Dunstan and Rhys Paddick – Vulnerability Speaker Series; Statement of Commitment to WA children and young people; We Are 10 – welcome message to students from the Commissioner; Top tips on how to make a complaint; The Commissioner's 2017 Geraldton Advisory Committee, The Commissioner's 2017 North Metropolitan Advisory Committee; Life through the eyes of WA 10 year-olds, We Are 10 – This is what Kimberley children had to say, We Are 10 – This is what Goldfields children had to say, We Are 10 – This is what Mid West children had to say, We Are 10 – This is what Pilbara children had to say, We Are 10 – This is what South West children had to say, We Are 10 – This is what Wheatbelt children had to say, We Are 10 – This is what North Metro children had to say, We Are 10 – This is what South Metro children had to say; Using technology to support young people's mental health; Understanding vulnerability in children and young people – Winthrop Professor Stephen Zubrick Understanding vulnerability in children and young people – Winthrop Professor Donna Cross, Understanding vulnerability in children and young people – Professor Alan Duncan, The role of services in assisting vulnerable children and young people – Policy Officer Alexa Wilkins, The role of services in assisting vulnerable children and young people – Judge Andrew Becroft, The role of services in assisting vulnerable children and young people – Professor Leah Bromfield; Effective interventions and supports for vulnerable children and young people, Young people and vulnerability: Ryan's story, Young people and vulnerability: Tamika's story, Young people and vulnerability: Shontae's story; no production titles; Student's views on school and learning; Children and young people with harmful sexual behaviours.*
 - (iv) \$6480; \$1,266.15; \$4090; \$1660; \$3163.64; \$3900; \$940; \$830; \$3516; \$3685; \$450; \$600; \$200. (all figures excluding GST)

The Department of Justice; The Equal Opportunity Commission; The Legal Practice Board (including the Legal Professional Complaints Committee); Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions; Office of the Information Commissioner/Freedom of Information; Solicitor General's Office; State Solicitors Office.

- (a) No.

MINISTER FOR ENVIRONMENT — PORTFOLIOS — VIDEOGRAPHY SERVICES

4436. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the parliamentary secretary representing the Minister for Environment; Disability Services; Electoral Affairs:

Have any of your departments, agencies, boards, public owned corporations or Ministerial offices (since 17 March 2017) spent money on video editing services:

- (a) If so:
- (i) What company has been engaged to undertake the editing;
 - (ii) What was the purpose of each engagement of service;
 - (iii) What was the production title of each item being edited; and
 - (iv) How much money has been spent?

Mr R.R. Whitby replied:

For the Western Australian Electoral Commission:

- (a) No.

17 March 2017 to 30 June 2017

Department of Environment Regulation

- (a) No.

Office of the Environmental Protection Authority

- (a) No.

For the former Department of Parks and Wildlife

- (a) No.

For the Conservation and Parks Commission

- (a) No.

For the Swan River Trust

- (a) No.

For the Botanic Gardens and Parks Authority

- (a)

| (i) What company has been engaged to undertake the editing | (ii) What was the purpose of each engagement of service | (iii) What was the production title of each item being edited |
|--|--|---|
| Jason Thomas Cinematography | Promotional video shown at 2017 conference in Canberra and on conference website to encourage registrations. | Australasian Botanical Guides' Conference in Kings Park, 2019. |
| Jason Thomas Cinematography | Promotional video for visitors and tourists appearing on Kings Park website and social media. | Welcome to Kings Park. |
| Jason Thomas Cinematography | Three short drone videos for Kings Park social media use. | Mount Eliza, Lotterywest Federation Walkway and Pioneer Women's Memorial. |
| Jason Thomas Cinematography | Video appears when an online purchase is made on the Aspects website to explain how Aspects' profits support Kings Park. | Thank you for shopping at Aspects of Kings Park Gallery Shop. |

- (a) (iv) \$1,080 (excl GST).

For the Zoological Parks Authority

- (a) Yes.

| (i) What company has been engaged to undertake the editing | (ii) What was the purpose of each engagement of service | (iii) What was the production title of each item being edited |
|--|---|---|
| Gatecrasher Agency. | Promotion of activities, services and functions of Perth Zoo. | Promotional Videos |

- (a) (iv) \$2,250 (excl GST).

1 July 2017 to 30 June 2018

For the Department of Biodiversity, Conservation and Attractions

(a)

| (i) What company has been engaged to undertake the editing | (ii) What was the purpose of each engagement of service | (iii) What was the production title of each item being edited |
|--|--|---|
| Jason Thomas Cinematography | Educational resource used by Kings Park Education and the Kings Park Festival. | Adorable Florables wildflower characters. |
| Jason Thomas Cinematography | Video for event sponsor and promotional use. | Djilba Festival for schools. |
| Alex Asbury editing | Edit promotional video for the future zoo used across news media, social media and websites. | Perth Zoo: Future Zoo. |
| Gatecrasher Agency | Promotion of activities, services and functions of Perth Zoo. | Saving Wildlife Together x 3 15sec TVC. |
| Gatecrasher Agency | Promotion of activities, services and functions of Perth Zoo. | Teddy Bears Picnic Promotion Video. |
| Gatecrasher Agency | Promotion of activities, services and functions of Perth Zoo. | Zoorassic Park Teaser Cinema Commercial. |
| Gatecrasher Agency | Promotion of activities, services and functions of Perth Zoo. | Zoorassic Park Promotional Video. |
| Gatecrasher Agency | Promotion of activities, services and functions of Perth Zoo. | Zoorassic Park Vox Pop Video. |

(a) (iv) \$7,945 (excl GST).

For the Conservation and Parks Commission

(a) No.

For the Swan River Trust

(a) No.

ATTORNEY GENERAL — PORTFOLIOS — VIDEOGRAPHY SERVICES

4441. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Attorney General; Minister for Commerce:

Have any of your departments, agencies, boards, public owned corporations or Ministerial offices (since 17 March 2017) spent money on video editing services:

(a) If so:

- (i) What company has been engaged to undertake the editing;
- (ii) What was the purpose of each engagement of service;
- (iii) What was the production title of each item being edited; and
- (iv) How much money has been spent?

Mr J.R. Quigley replied:

Department of Mines, Industry Regulation and Safety:

Please refer to Legislative Assembly Question on Notice 4445.

Office of the Commissioner for Children and Young People:

(a) The Commissioner for Children and Young People's expenditure on video production, which includes some editing, has been provided in response to QON 4424.

The Department of Justice; The Equal Opportunity Commission; The Legal Practice Board (including the Legal Professional Complaints Committee); Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions; Office of the Information Commissioner/Freedom of Information; Solicitor General's Office; State Solicitors Office The Corruption and Crime Commission; LegalAid Western Australia:

(a) No.

MINISTER FOR ENVIRONMENT — PORTFOLIOS — PHOTOGRAPHY SERVICES

4453. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the parliamentary secretary representing the Minister for Environment; Disability Services; Electoral Affairs:

Have any of your departments, agencies, boards or publicly owned corporations (since 17 March 2017) spent money on professional photographer services:

- (a) If so, for all non-event based photography:
- (i) What company has been engaged to undertake the photography;
 - (ii) What was the purpose of each engagement of service; and
 - (iii) How much money has been spent; and
- (b) If so, for all event-based photography:
- (i) What company has been engaged to undertake the photography;
 - (ii) What was the event photographed and where;
 - (iii) Was the photographer paid money to undertake travel, and if so, how much; and
 - (iv) How much money has been spent in total?

Mr R.R. Whitby replied:

For the Western Australian Electoral Commission

No.

(a)–(b) (iv) Not applicable.

17 March 2017 to 30 June 2017

Department of Environment Regulation

- (a) Yes
- (i) Landgate
 - (ii) Aerial photography required under Contaminated Sites Act 2003 (the CS Act) and Contaminated Sites Regulations 2006 to identify, record, manage and clean up contamination in Western Australia.
 - (iii) \$75.03
 - (iv) \$75.03
- (b) Not applicable.

For the former Department of Parks and Wildlife

No.

(a)–(b) (iv) Not applicable.

For the Conservation and Parks Commission

No.

(a)–(b) (iv) Not applicable.

For the Swan River Trust

No.

(a)–(b) (iv) Not applicable.

For the Zoological Parks Authority

No.

(a)–(b) (iv) Not applicable.

For the Botanic Gardens and Parks Authority

Whilst it is unclear what the member is referring to by “event based” and “non-event based”, the total cost can be supplied as per (b)(iv) of the question.

| | |
|---|---|
| (a)–(b)(i) What company has been engaged to undertake the photo editing | (a)–(b)(ii) What was the purpose of each engagement |
| Jason Thomas Cinematography | Tree planting at Saw Avenue. |
| Jason Thomas Cinematography | Sponsorship prospectus and promotional purposes. |

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Jody D'Arcy Photographer | Aspects Corporate Gift Guide. |
| Landgate | Bold Park for spatial information and vegetation mapping. |

(b) (iv) \$4,086.47 (excl GST)

1 July 2017 to 12 February 2019

For the Conservation and Parks Commission

No.

(a)–(b) (iv) Not applicable.

For the Swan River Trust

No.

(a)–(b) (iv) Not applicable.

For the Department of Biodiversity, Conservation and Attractions

Whilst it is unclear what the member is referring to by “event based” and “non-event based”, the total cost can be supplied as per (b)(iv) of the question.

| (a)–(b)(i) What company has been engaged to undertake the photo editing | (a)–(b)(ii) What was the purpose of each engagement |
|---|--|
| Jody D'Arcy Photographer | Aspects of Kings Park marketing activity (advertising, website, social media) for 2017/18. |
| Jason Thomas Cinematography | Stage 2 of Rio Tinto Naturescape Kings Park. |
| Jody D'Arcy Photographer | Kings Park Education programs. |

(b) (iv) \$4,370 (excl GST)

ATTORNEY GENERAL — PORTFOLIOS — PHOTOGRAPHY SERVICES

4458. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Attorney General; Minister for Commerce:

Have any of your departments, agencies, boards or publicly owned corporations (since 17 March 2017) spent money on professional photographer services:

(a) If so, for all non-event based photography:

(i) What company has been engaged to undertake the photography;

(ii) What was the purpose of each engagement of service; and

(iii) How much money has been spent; and

(b) If so, for all event-based photography:

(i) What company has been engaged to undertake the photography;

(ii) What was the event photographed and where;

(iii) Was the photographer paid money to undertake travel, and if so, how much; and

(iv) How much money has been spent in total?

Mr J.R. Quigley replied:

The Corruption and Crime Commission:

Whilst it is unclear what the member is referring to by “event based” and “non-event based”, the total cost can be supplied as per (b) (iv) of the question.

(b) Yes.

(i) Photography by Sarre; D-Max; Photography Project

(ii) Photography for Annual Reports and website – Northbridge office premises.

(iii) No.

(iv) \$9,159 (incl. GST)

The Department of Justice:

(a) Nil.

- (b) Yes.
 - (i) Joondalup Photo Design
 - (ii) Coverage of official opening of the Wandoo Rehabilitation Prison in Murdoch, 6 August 2018.
 - (iii) No.
 - (iv) \$450.00

The Department of Mines, Industry Regulation and Safety:

Please refer to Legislative Assembly Question on Notice 4462.

The Equal Opportunity Commission:

- (a) Yes.
 - (i) David Broadway Photography; B Visual Media.
 - (ii) Stock photography of WA children and young people in leisure settings taken in Joondalup for long term use in production of CCYP communications – including publications, presentations, banners and online activities; Stock photography of WA children and young people in leisure settings taken in Kununurra for long term use in production of CCYP communications – including publications, presentations, banners and online activities.
 - (iii) \$582.50; \$1200.
- (b) Yes.
 - (i) David Broadway Photographic; Natasha Gillespie; David Broadway Photography.
 - (ii) Photography at launch of We Are 10 exhibition at the WA State Library, Perth Cultural Centre, for use in CCYP communications – including annual report, presentations and online activities; Photographing attendees and event proceedings during an Aboriginal Forum held at The Rise, Maylands, for use in CCYP communication materials; Photographing two Vulnerability Speaker Series events held at The Duxton, Perth, – including photographs of key attendees and event proceedings for use in CCYP communications – including publications, presentations and online activities.
 - (iii) Any travel time was included in total price.
 - (iv) \$407.50; \$250; \$670.

The Equal Opportunity Commission; The Legal Practice Board (including the Legal Professional Complaints Committee); LegalAid Western Australia; The Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions; Office of the Information Commissioner/Freedom of Information; The State Solicitors Office; Solicitor General's Office:

- (a)–(b) Not applicable.

MINISTER FOR ENVIRONMENT — PORTFOLIOS — PHOTOGRAPHY SERVICES

4470. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the parliamentary secretary representing the Minister for Environment; Disability Services; Electoral Affairs:

Have any of your departments, agencies, boards, publicly owned corporations or Ministerial Office (since 17 March 2017) spent money on professional photo editing services:

- (a) If so:
 - (i) What company has been engaged to undertake the photo editing;
 - (ii) What was the purpose of each engagement;
 - (iii) How much money has been spent; and
 - (iv) Have the edited images been made publicly available:
 - (A) If not, why not?

Mr R.R. Whitby replied:

For the Western Australian Electoral Commission

No.

- (a) (i)–(iv) Not applicable.
 - (A) Not required

17 March 2017 to 30 June 2017

Office of the Environmental Protection Authority

No.

(a) (i)–(iv) Not applicable.

(A) Not required.

Department of Environment Regulation

No.

(a) (i)–(iv) Not applicable.

(A) Not required.

For the former Department of Parks and Wildlife

No.

(a) (i)–(iv) Not applicable.

(A) Not required.

For the Conservation and Parks Commission

No.

(a) (i)–(iv) Not applicable.

(A) Not required.

For the Swan River Trust

No.

(a) (i)–(iv) Not applicable.

(A) Not required.

For the Botanic Gardens and Parks Authority

(a)

| (i) What company has been engaged to undertake the photo editing | (ii) What was the purpose of each engagement |
|--|--|
| Jason Thomas Cinematography | Tree planting at Saw Avenue. |
| Jason Thomas Cinematography | Sponsorship prospectus and promotional purposes. |
| Jody D'Arcy Photographer | Aspects Corporate Gift Guide. |

(iii) \$610 (excl GST).

(iv) Yes.

For the Zoological Parks Authority

No.

(a) (i)–(iv) Not applicable.

(A) Not required.

1 July 2017 to 30 June 2018

For the Department of Biodiversity, Conservation and Attractions

(a)

| (i) What company has been engaged to undertake the photo editing | (ii) What was the purpose of each engagement |
|--|--|
| Jody D'Arcy Photographer | Aspects of Kings Park marketing activity (advertising, website, social media) for 2017/18. |
| Jason Thomas Cinematography | Stage 2 of Rio Tinto Naturescape Kings Park. |
| Jody D'Arcy Photographer | Promotional photography of Kings Park Education programs. |

(iii) \$2,272 (excl GST).

(iv) Yes.

For the Conservation and Parks Commission

No.

- (a) (i)–(iv) Not applicable.
(A) Not required.

For the Swan River Trust

No.

- (a) (i)–(iv) Not applicable.
(A) Not required.

ATTORNEY GENERAL — PORTFOLIOS — PHOTOGRAPHY SERVICES

4475. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Attorney General; Minister for Commerce:

Have any of your departments, agencies, boards, publicly owned corporations or Ministerial Office (since 17 March 2017) spent money on professional photo editing services:

- (a) If so:
(i) What company has been engaged to undertake the photo editing;
(ii) What was the purpose of each engagement;
(iii) How much money has been spent; and
(iv) Have the edited images been made publicly available:
(A) If not, why not?

Mr J.R. Quigley replied:

Office of the Commissioner for Children and Young People:

- (a) Expenditure on photography, which may include some editing by the photographer, has been provided in response to QON 4458.

The Department of Mines, Industry Regulation and Safety:

Please refer to Legislative Assembly Question on Notice 4479.

The Department of Justice; The Equal Opportunity Commission; The Legal Practice Board (including the Legal Professional Complaints Committee); Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions; Office of the Information Commissioner/Freedom of Information; Solicitor General's Office; State Solicitors Office The Corruption and Crime Commission; LegalAid Western Australia:

- (a) No.

ATTORNEY GENERAL — PORTFOLIOS —
UNLAWFUL, UNAUTHORISED OR WRONGFUL ACCESS TO PREMISES

4485. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Attorney General:

I refer to buildings or offices occupied by the Minister's departments, agencies, boards or publicly owned corporations and ask in the past twelve months:

- (a) Has there been any incident of unlawful, unauthorised or wrongful physical access to these premises and if so:
(i) How many such incidents have there been and on what dates;
(ii) What premises were accessed;
(iii) How was access gained in each incident;
(iv) Was there any attempted or successful access to any cabinet related information:
(A) If so, what was the nature of this access (i.e. accessing computer, network systems, filing system etc.); and
(B) If so, what was the nature of the information that was accessed;
(v) Was there any attempted or successful access to any private information (such as customer details):
(A) If so, what was the nature of this access (i.e. accessing computer, network systems, filing system etc.); and
(B) If so, what was the nature of the information that was accessed; and
(vi) What measures have been taken to mitigate future unlawful, unauthorised or wrongful access?

Mr J.R. Quigley replied:

- (a) No, not applicable.

WATER CORPORATION — INNOVATION HUB

4488. Dr M.D. Nahan to the Minister for Water:

I refer to the Water Corporation's New Innovation Hub and I ask:

- (a) How much funding has the Water Corporation allocated to the New Innovation Hub for the following years:
- (i) 2018–19;
 - (ii) 2019–20;
 - (iii) 2020–21; and
 - (iv) 2021–22;
- (b) What was the total cost of the refurbishment of the existing facilities to create the New Innovation Hub;
- (c) Is the Water Corporation in partnership with the private sector to develop the membrane aerated biofilm reactor; and
- (d) If yes to (c), which private sector firm?

Mr D.J. Kelly replied:

- (a) (i) \$374,220
(ii)–(iv) Future budgets are yet to be finalised and will be subject to annual review.
- (b) Investment to 31 January 2019 was \$2.826 million.
- (c) No.
- (d) N/A.

REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT — 2018–19 *ECONOMIC AND FISCAL OUTLOOK***4494. Mr D.T. Redman to the minister representing the Minister for Regional Development; Agriculture and Food; Minister Assisting the Minister for State Development, Jobs and Trade:**

I refer to the 2018–19 Economic and Fiscal Outlook and ask:

- (a) Have any progress reports been prepared for the Kimberley Schools Project which was allocated \$5.9m and \$9.5m in the 2017–18 and 2018–19 financial years respectively;
- (b) If so, will the minister make these reports available;
- (c) What remediation and or replacement work has been undertaken to infrastructure in the first 10 communities identified in the Essential and Municipal Services Upgrade Program (allocated \$25m in the 2018–19 financial year);
- (d) How many houses have been constructed as part of the North West Aboriginal Housing Initiative (allocated \$20m in the 2018–19 financial year); and
- (e) What work has been completed in each of the communities identified in the Pilbara Aboriginal Town-Based Reserves project (allocated \$2m in the 2018–19 financial year)?

Mr M. McGowan replied:

- (a)–(b) The Minister's office has arranged a briefing for the Member in April to report on progress.
- (c)–(d) Please refer to the answer provided to question on notice 4496.
- (e) Transition Plan for Tjalka Boorda has been completed, approved and is being implemented. Transition Plans for Parnpajinya and Irrungadji have been drafted and are under review. Cheeditha Business Plan has been completed. Transition Plans for Bindi Bindi and Goodabinya are in development.

TREASURY AND FINANCE — 2018–19 *ECONOMIC AND FISCAL OUTLOOK***4495. Mr D.T. Redman to the Treasurer; Minister for Finance; Energy; Aboriginal Affairs:**

I refer to the 2018–19 Economic and Fiscal Outlook and ask:

- (a) Have any progress reports been prepared for the Kimberley Schools Project which was allocated \$5.9m and \$9.5m in the 2017–18 and 2018–19 financial years respectively;
- (b) If so, will the minister make these reports available;

- (c) What remediation and or replacement work has been undertaken to infrastructure in the first 10 communities identified in the Essential and Municipal Services Upgrade Program (allocated \$25m in the 2018–19 financial year);
- (d) How many houses have been constructed as part of the North West Aboriginal Housing Initiative (allocated \$20m in the 2018–19 financial year); and
- (e) What work has been completed in each of the communities identified in the Pilbara Aboriginal Town-Based Reserves project (allocated \$2m in the 2018–19 financial year)?

Mr B.S. Wyatt replied:

- (a)–(b) I am advised the Minister for Regional Development has arranged a briefing for the Member in April to report on progress.
- (c)–(d) Please refer to Legislative Assembly Question on Notice 4496.
- (e) Please refer to Legislative Assembly Question on Notice 4494.

HOUSING — 2018–19 ECONOMIC AND FISCAL OUTLOOK

4496. Mr D.T. Redman to the Minister for Housing; Veterans Issues; Youth:

I refer to the 2018–19 Economic and Fiscal Outlook and ask:

- (a) Have any progress reports been prepared for the Kimberley Schools Project which was allocated \$5.9m and \$9.5m in the 2017–18 and 2018–19 financial years respectively;
- (b) If so, will the minister make these reports available;
- (c) What remediation and or replacement work has been undertaken to infrastructure in the first 10 communities identified in the Essential and Municipal Services Upgrade Program (allocated \$25m in the 2018–19 financial year);
- (d) How many houses have been constructed as part of the North West Aboriginal Housing Initiative (allocated \$20m in the 2018–19 financial year); and
- (e) What work has been completed in each of the communities identified in the Pilbara Aboriginal Town-Based Reserves project (allocated \$2m in the 2018–19 financial year)?

Mr P.C. Tinley replied:

- (a)–(b) I am advised the Minister for Regional Development has arranged a briefing for the Member in April to report on progress.
- (c) A comprehensive land audit of ten priority communities identified in the Essential and Municipal Services Upgrade Program was completed in May 2018. This audit included preliminary site investigations for contamination, hazardous building materials assessment, and municipal services and infrastructure audits for ten remote Aboriginal communities in the Kimberley and Pilbara. In addition, water and wastewater concept plans have been developed over the past 12 months for Bayulu, Bidadanga, Mowanjum and Warmun.

The Department of Communities has contracted the Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage to oversee land decontamination and remediation works in eight communities (Ardyaloon, Bayulu, Bidadanga, Djarindjin, Lombadina, Mowanjum, Warmun and Yandeyarra). Remediation activity is expected to commence in April 2019.

The arrangement for water and wastewater upgrades to proceed in Mowanjum, Bidadanga and Bayulu is being formalised through a funding agreement between the Water Corporation and Department of Communities, with works again expected to commence in April 2019.

- (d) To date in the East Kimberley, eight transitional housing dwellings have been constructed, with work underway on another seven dwellings.

The North-West Aboriginal Housing Fund has scheduled the initial East Kimberley program over four years to enable young Aboriginal employees to complete their apprenticeships through Fund projects. There are 22 Aboriginal apprentices working with Aboriginal businesses on the construction of these houses.

An expansion of the transitional housing model is also underway in the Pilbara through the Fund. However, this project will see the repurposing and refurbishment of 40 existing houses owned by the Department of Communities, rather than new construction.

- (e) Please refer to Legislative Assembly Question on Notice 4494.

WATER CORPORATION — HILLARYS

4501. Mr P.A. Katsambanis to the Minister for Water; Fisheries; Forestry; Innovation and ICT; Science:

I refer the Minister to water consumption in the electorate of Hillarys and ask:

- (a) For each month of 2017 how many overdue notices were issued by Water Corporation to households in the electorate of Hillarys;
- (b) For each month of 2018 how many overdue notices were issued by Water Corporation to households in the electorate of Hillarys;
- (c) For each month of 2017 how many households in the electorate of Hillarys accessed Water Corporation's financial hardship program; and
- (d) For each month of 2018 how many households in the electorate of Hillarys accessed Water Corporation's financial hardship program?

Mr D.J. Kelly replied:

- (a)–(d) [See tabled paper no 2279.]

MINISTER FOR ENVIRONMENT — EVENTS — RAC ARENA

4505. Mr W.R. Marmion to the parliamentary secretary representing the Minister for Environment; Disability Services; Electoral Affairs:

How many events has the Minister attended at the RAC Arena since March 2017:

- (a) Which events did the Minister attend as an invited guest and who hosted the Minister; and
- (b) Which events did the Minister attend privately and pay for the tickets themselves?

Mr R.R. Whitby replied:

- (a) One event. This was the 2018 Hopman Cup finals in a box hosted by Minister Papalia, Minister for Tourism.
- (b) As per standing order 75, the Minister is not able to answer the question as it does not relate to actions or decisions pertaining to matters under the Minister's administrative responsibility as a sworn Minister of the Crown.

MINISTER FOR EMERGENCY SERVICES — EVENTS — RAC ARENA

4508. Mr W.R. Marmion to the Minister for Emergency Services; Corrective Services:

How many events has the Minister attended at the RAC Arena since March 2017:

- (a) Which events did the Minister attend as an invited guest and who hosted the Minister; and
- (b) Which events did the Minister attend privately and pay for the tickets themselves?

Mr F.M. Logan replied:

None.

As per standing order 75, the Minister is not able to answer the question as it does not relate to actions or decisions pertaining to matters under the Minister's administrative responsibility as a sworn Minister of the Crown.

ATTORNEY GENERAL — EVENTS — RAC ARENA

4510. Mr W.R. Marmion to the Attorney General; Minister for Commerce:

How many events has the Minister attended at the RAC Arena since March 2017:

- (a) Which events did the Minister attend as an invited guest and who hosted the Minister; and
- (b) Which events did the Minister attend privately and pay for the tickets themselves?

Mr J.R. Quigley replied:

- (a) No.
- (b) As per standing order 75, the Minister is not able to answer the question as it does not relate to actions or decisions pertaining to matters under the Minister's administrative responsibility as a sworn Minister of the Crown.

MINISTER FOR WATER — EVENTS — RAC ARENA

4518. Mr W.R. Marmion to the Minister for Water; Fisheries; Forestry; Innovation and ICT; Science:

How many events has the Minister attended at the RAC Arena since March 2017:

- (a) Which events did the Minister attend as an invited guest and who hosted the Minister; and
- (b) Which events did the Minister attend privately and pay for the tickets themselves?

Mr D.J. Kelly replied:

- (a) 1 event. “Insights into Investing into High Growth Ventures” hosted by Perth Angels.
- (b) As per standing order 75, the Minister is not able to answer the question as it does not relate to actions or decisions pertaining to matters under the Minister’s administrative responsibility as a sworn Minister of the Crown.

EMERGENCY SERVICES — FIRE ALARM CALL-OUTS

4519. Mr P.A. Katsambanis to the Minister for Emergency Services; Corrective Services:

I refer the Minister to fire alarm call outs and ask:

- (a) For each month of 2017 how many false fire alarm calls outs occurred in the electorate of Hillarys;
- (b) For each month of 2018 how many false fire alarm calls outs occurred in the electorate of Hillarys;
- (c) In 2017 how many false fire alarm call out infringement notices did the Department of Fire and Emergency Services issue in the electorate of Hillarys; and
- (d) In 2018 how many false fire alarm call out infringement notices did the Department of Fire and Emergency Services issue in the electorate of Hillarys?

Mr F.M. Logan replied:

- (a) Number of false fire alarm call outs in the electorate of Hillarys for 2017 by month:

| | 2017 |
|--------------|-------------|
| January | 7 |
| February | 7 |
| March | 10 |
| April | 2 |
| May | 10 |
| June | 3 |
| July | 10 |
| August | 4 |
| September | 9 |
| October | 10 |
| November | 7 |
| December | 13 |
| Total | 92 |

- (b) Number of false fire alarm call outs in the electorate of Hillarys for 2018 by month:

| | 2018 |
|--------------|-------------|
| January | 11 |
| February | 13 |
| March | 6 |
| April | 3 |
| May | 3 |
| June | 2 |
| July | 10 |
| August | 2 |
| September | 3 |
| October | 3 |
| November | 1 |
| December | 2 |
| Total | 59 |

- (c)–(d) The false fire alarm fee is a fee for services under section 36ZL(2) of the *Fire and Emergency Services Act 1998* and is not an infringement. The false fire alarm fee applies only to those premises which have more than three false fire alarms in a 12-month period. The number of false fire alarms for each premises is reset on 1 July each year. Number of false fire alarm invoices issued in the electorate of Hillarys for 2017: 44. Number of false fire alarm invoices issued in the electorate of Hillarys for 2018: 28.

PREMIER — MEETINGS — HUAWEI

4549. Dr M.D. Nahan to the Premier; Minister for Public Sector Management; State Development, Jobs and Trade; Federal–State Relations:

- (1) Has the Minister met with Huawei?
 (2) If yes to (1), on what date, what issue was discussed and who was present at the meeting?

Mr M. McGowan replied:

- (1) Since being elected to Government the Premier has not met with Huawei.
 (2) N/A.

MINISTER FOR ENVIRONMENT — MEETINGS — HUAWEI

4552. Dr M.D. Nahan to the parliamentary secretary representing the Minister for Environment; Disability Services; Electoral Affairs:

- (1) Has the Minister met with Huawei?
 (2) If yes to (1), on what date, what issue was discussed and who was present at the meeting?

Mr R.R. Whitby replied:

- (1) No.
 (2) Not applicable.

MINISTER FOR EMERGENCY SERVICES — MEETINGS — HUAWEI

4555. Dr M.D. Nahan to the Minister for Emergency Services; Corrective Services:

- (1) Has the Minister met with Huawei?
 (2) If yes to (1), on what date, what issue was discussed and who was present at the meeting?

Mr F.M. Logan replied:

- (1) No.
 (2) Not applicable.

ATTORNEY GENERAL — MEETINGS — HUAWEI

4557. Dr M.D. Nahan to the Attorney General; Minister for Commerce:

- (1) Has the Minister met with Huawei?
 (2) If yes to (1), on what date, what issue was discussed and who was present at the meeting?

Mr J.R. Quigley replied:

- (1) No.
 (2) Not applicable.

MINISTER FOR MINES AND PETROLEUM — MEETINGS — HUAWEI

4561. Dr M.D. Nahan to the Minister for Mines and Petroleum; Energy; Industrial Relations:

- (1) Has the Minister met with Huawei?
 (2) If yes to (1), on what date, what issue was discussed and who was present at the meeting?

Mr W.J. Johnston replied:

- (1) Yes
 (2)

| Meeting date | Issue discussed | Attendees |
|------------------|--|---|
| 22 February 2018 | Not applicable. Represented Premier at Huawei Chinese New Year Celebrations. | Hon Bill Johnston MLA Mr Ron Sao, Principal Policy Adviser |

| | | |
|------------------|--|---|
| 16 November 2017 | Outcomes from the Huawei Australia Energy Summit. | Hon Bill Johnston MLA Mr Neil Roberts, Chief of Staff Mr John Lord, Chairman Huawei Australia Mr Theo Shao, WA State Manager of Enterprise Solution – Huawei Australia Enterprise Business Group |
| 12 November 2017 | Technologies briefing at Huawei Group's Research and Development Centre as part of overseas travel to China and South Korea, 8–14 November 2017. | [See tabled paper no 2277.] |

MINISTER FOR WATER — MEETINGS — HUAWEI

4565. Dr M.D. Nahan to the Minister for Water; Fisheries; Forestry; Innovation and ICT; Science:

- (1) Has the Minister met with Huawei?
- (2) If yes to (1), on what date, what issue was discussed and who was present at the meeting?

Mr D.J. Kelly replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Not applicable.

MINISTER FOR ENVIRONMENT — PORTFOLIOS — HUAWEI

4569. Dr M.D. Nahan to the parliamentary secretary representing the Minister for Environment; Disability Services; Electoral Affairs:

For each agency, department and corporation within the Minister's portfolios, I ask:

- (a) What projects are Huawei currently involved in;
- (b) What are the nature/description of those projects;
- (c) What is the role of Huawei (e.g. lead proponent, sub-contractor, technical advisor to Government) in the contract;
- (d) What is the specific services provided by Huawei for each contract;
- (e) What is the total value of each contract; and
- (f) When was each contract commenced and when are they expected to be completed?

Mr R.R. Whitby replied:

Huawei products and components are used by a range of companies in Australia including Optus, Vodafone and TPG. For example, Optus and Vodafone use Huawei equipment and technology as per of their 4G and 3G networks. In relation to projects where Huawei has been specifically contracted by the Government:

For the Western Australian Electoral Commission

- (a) Nil.
- (b)–(f) Not applicable.

For the Department of Biodiversity, Conservation and Attraction

- (a) Nil.
- (b)–(f) Not applicable.

MINISTER FOR EMERGENCY SERVICES — PORTFOLIOS — HUAWEI

4572. Dr M.D. Nahan to the Minister for Emergency Services; Corrective Services:

For each agency, department and corporation within the Minister's portfolios, I ask:

- (a) What projects are Huawei currently involved in;
- (b) What are the nature/description of those projects;
- (c) What is the role of Huawei (e.g. lead proponent, sub-contractor, technical advisor to Government) in the contract;
- (d) What is the specific services provided by Huawei for each contract;

- (e) What is the total value of each contract; and
- (f) When was each contract commenced and when are they expected to be completed?

Mr F.M. Logan replied:

Huawei products and components are used by a range of companies in Australia including Optus, Vodafone and TPG. For example, Optus and Vodafone use Huawei equipment and technology as per of their 4G and 3G networks. In relation to projects where Huawei has been specifically contracted by the Government:

The Department of Justice advises:

- (a) Nil.
- (b)–(f) Not applicable.

The Department of Fire and Emergency Services advises:

- (a) Nil.
- (b)–(f) Not applicable.

The Inspector of Custodial Services advises:

- (a) Nil.
- (b)–(f) Not applicable.

Supervised Release Review Board advises:

- (a) Nil.
- (b)–(f) Not applicable.

ATTORNEY GENERAL — PORTFOLIOS — HUAWEI

4574. Dr M.D. Nahan to the Attorney General; Minister for Commerce:

For each agency, department and corporation within the Minister's portfolios, I ask:

- (a) What projects are Huawei currently involved in;
- (b) What are the nature/description of those projects;
- (c) What is the role of Huawei (e.g. lead proponent, sub-contractor, technical advisor to Government) in the contract;
- (d) What is the specific services provided by Huawei for each contract;
- (e) What is the total value of each contract; and
- (f) When was each contract commenced and when are they expected to be completed?

Mr J.R. Quigley replied:

- (a)–(f) None, not applicable.

MINISTER FOR ENVIRONMENT — MINISTER'S OFFICE — ALCOHOL EXPENDITURE

4586. Dr M.D. Nahan to the parliamentary secretary representing the Minister for Environment; Disability Services; Electoral Affairs:

- (1) Has any alcohol been placed on any Government-issued credit card within the Ministerial office since the March 2017 election?
- (2) If yes, to (1):
 - (a) What was the amount;
 - (b) What was the date of the expenditure;
 - (c) What was the event or purpose of that expenditure; and
 - (d) Which credit card was the alcohol charged to?

Mr R.R. Whitby replied:

- (1) Yes. The transaction was made in error and the purchase was immediately refunded by the vendor at the point of purchase.
- (2) If yes, to (1):
 - (a) \$43.99
 - (b) 25 May 2018
 - (c) In error
 - (d) Principal Policy Advisor

MINISTER FOR EMERGENCY SERVICES — MINISTER'S OFFICE — ALCOHOL EXPENDITURE

4589. Dr M.D. Nahan to the Minister for Emergency Services; Corrective Services:

- (1) Has any alcohol been placed on any Government-issued credit card within the Ministerial office since the March 2017 election?
- (2) If yes, to (1):
 - (a) What was the amount;
 - (b) What was the date of the expenditure;
 - (c) What was the event or purpose of that expenditure; and
 - (d) Which credit card was the alcohol charged to?

Mr F.M. Logan replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2)
 - (a) Please refer to Question on Notice 1074.
 - (b) Wednesday 3 May 2017.
 - (c) Please refer to Question on Notice 1074.
 - (d) The card issued to the Minister's Appointments Secretary.

ATTORNEY GENERAL — MINISTER'S OFFICE — ALCOHOL EXPENDITURE

4591. Dr M.D. Nahan to the Attorney General; Minister for Commerce:

- (1) Has any alcohol been placed on any Government-issued credit card within the Ministerial office since the March 2017 election?
- (2) If yes, to (1):
 - (a) What was the amount;
 - (b) What was the date of the expenditure;
 - (c) What was the event or purpose of that expenditure; and
 - (d) Which credit card was the alcohol charged to?

Mr J.R. Quigley replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Not applicable.

MINISTER FOR WATER — MINISTER'S OFFICE — ALCOHOL EXPENDITURE

4599. Dr M.D. Nahan to the Minister for Water; Fisheries; Forestry; Innovation and ICT; Science:

- (1) Has any alcohol been placed on any Government-issued credit card within the Ministerial office since the March 2017 election?
- (2) If yes, to (1):
 - (a) What was the amount;
 - (b) What was the date of the expenditure;
 - (c) What was the event or purpose of that expenditure; and
 - (d) Which credit card was the alcohol charged to?

Mr D.J. Kelly replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) (a)–(d) Not applicable.

MINISTER FOR ENVIRONMENT — PORTFOLIOS — LEASES

4603. Dr M.D. Nahan to the parliamentary secretary representing the Minister for Environment; Disability Services; Electoral Affairs:

- (1) For all departments, agencies and corporations within the Minister's portfolios are there any leases that are subject to AASB 16?
- (2) If yes to (1):
 - (a) what is each lease; and
 - (b) what is the value of each lease?

Mr R.R. Whitby replied:

Please refer to Legislative Assembly Question on Notice 4600.

MINISTER FOR EMERGENCY SERVICES — PORTFOLIOS — LEASES

4606. Dr M.D. Nahan to the Minister for Emergency Services; Corrective Services:

- (1) For all departments, agencies and corporations within the Minister's portfolios are there any leases that are subject to AASB 16?
- (2) If yes to (1):
 - (a) what is each lease; and
 - (b) what is the value of each lease?

Mr F.M. Logan replied:

- (1)–(2) Please refer to Legislative Assembly Question on Notice 4600.

ATTORNEY GENERAL — PORTFOLIOS — LEASES

4608. Dr M.D. Nahan to the Attorney General; Minister for Commerce:

- (1) For all departments, agencies and corporations within the Minister's portfolios are there any leases that are subject to AASB 16?
- (2) If yes to (1):
 - (a) what is each lease; and
 - (b) what is the value of each lease?

Mr J.R. Quigley replied:

- (1)–(2) Please refer to Legislative Assembly Question on Notice 4600.

MINISTER FOR WATER — PORTFOLIOS — LEASES

4616. Dr M.D. Nahan to the Minister for Water; Fisheries; Forestry; Innovation and ICT; Science:

- (1) For all departments, agencies and corporations within the Minister's portfolios are there any leases that are subject to AASB 16?
- (2) If yes to (1):
 - (a) what is each lease; and
 - (b) what is the value of each lease?

Mr D.J. Kelly replied:

- (1)–(2) Please refer to Legislative Assembly Question on Notice 4600.

BHP — IRON ORE ROYALTY PAYMENTS

4618. Mr D.T. Redman to the Minister for Mines and Petroleum; Energy; Industrial Relations:

I refer to the reported underpayment of Royalties by BHP and ask:

- (a) When did BHP start claiming the disputed 'sales commission' deduction according to government audits;
- (b) When did Government first raise the disputed 'sales commission' deduction with BHP;
- (c) When did BHP stop claiming the disputed deduction;
- (d) Why is the Government only pursuing back payments to 2004;
- (e) Gareth Parker wrote on 27th January 2019 "there was a specific, though so far undisclosed reason, those public servants went over the books again." What was the reason;
- (f) If the audit as claimed by the Treasurer was 'routine'; why did the legitimacy of the deduction not get picked up earlier;
- (g) What was the length of time between the audit finishing and the discrepancy being raised with BHP;
- (h) Will you table correspondence between BHP and Government on this issue;
- (i) What meetings have you and/or Treasury had with BHP on this issue; what were the dates and who was present at the meetings;
- (j) Does the State Agreement with BHP define legitimate deductions;
- (k) What document/agreement gives the State direction in defining legitimate deductions for mining companies paying royalties to the state;
- (l) Does the Treasurer expect the Commonwealth to claw back any windfall payments to the state through the Commonwealth Grants Commission:
 - (i) If so, what proportion of the disputed underpayment will the State retain;

- (m) Has BHP admitted a royalty underpayment to the State:
 - (i) If no, why are they reported as apparently keen to settle; and
 - (ii) If yes, how long have they known they owe the State royalties; and
- (n) Has the audit identified any other mining company that has potentially underpaid royalties to the State?

Mr W.J. Johnston replied:

- (a) The deductions now in dispute relate to arrangements that commenced in 2002.
- (b) April 2017.
- (c) BHP commenced paying the correct royalty in March 2018.
- (d) Changed marketing and distribution arrangements entered into by BHP in 2002 affected the basis for claiming deductions in respect of “sales commission”.
- (e) All royalty arrangements and payments are periodically audited by DMIRS.
- (f) The issue was the result of an ordinary audit of the royalty return.
- (g) The audit was completed in May 2017. See answer (b) for when the matter was raised with BHP.
- (h) No. Royalty returns and payments are lodged with DMIRS on a confidential basis as they contain commercially sensitive, company specific information. Royalty assessment matters that arise are therefore dealt with in confidence between the State and the Company.
- (i) Royalty assessment matters that arise are dealt with in confidence between the State and the Company.
- (j) The deductions that may be claimed are set out in each State Agreement Act and are therefore on the public record.
- (k) The relevant State Agreement Acts.
- (l) This is a question for the Treasurer.
 - (i) Not applicable.
- (m) No.
 - (i) Not applicable.
 - (ii) Not applicable.
- (n) All royalty arrangements and payments are periodically audited by DMIRS. Through regular royalty audits, audit queries are occasionally raised with royalty payers and dealt with by the Department. Royalty assessment matters that arise are dealt with in confidence between the State and the relevant company.

CORRECTIVE SERVICES — FOI REQUESTS

4625. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Minister for Corrective Services:

I refer to the six Freedom of Information (FOI) applications I lodged on 1 January 2018, which were acknowledged and paid for and ask:

- (a) Why have only two FOIs been returned;
- (b) What is the usual time taken to process and return FOIs;
- (c) What is the status of all remaining FOIs which I have lodged; and
- (d) How many applications remain outstanding beyond the 45 day timeline required to process FOI requests:
 - (i) In relation to (d) what is the longest an application is currently outstanding?

Mr F.M. Logan replied:

There were no FOI applications lodged or received in the office of Minister Logan on 1 January 2018.

- (a) Not applicable.
- (b) The time taken to process FOI applications is dependent on the complexity of the specific application. The permitted period is 45 days after the access application is received or such other period as is agreed between the agency and the applicant or allowed by the Information Commissioner.
- (c) Not applicable.
- (d) None.
 - (i) Not applicable.

MINISTER FOR ENVIRONMENT — PORTFOLIOS — FOI REQUESTS

4629. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the parliamentary secretary representing the Minister for Environment; Disability Services; Electoral Affairs:

For all Freedom of Information (FOI) applications presently received and being processed by the Minister's office, departments, agencies, government trading enterprises or boards within the Minister's portfolio responsibilities, I ask:

- (a) What is the average time taken to process and return a FOI application;
- (b) As at 1 February 2019 how many FOI applications remain outstanding beyond there 45 day timeline:
 - (i) In relation to (b), what is the longest time an application has been outstanding and why;
- (c) How many FOI applications were received in the calendar years of:
 - (i) 2016;
 - (ii) 2017; and
 - (iii) 2018; and
- (d) How many FOI applications were successfully processed and returned within 45 days during the calendar years of:
 - (i) 2016;
 - (ii) 2017; and
 - (iii) 2018?

Mr R.R. Whitby replied:

Please refer to Legislative Assembly Question on Notice 4626.

MINISTER FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT — PORTFOLIOS — FOI REQUESTS

4633. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Minister for Local Government; Heritage; Culture and the Arts:

For all Freedom of Information (FOI) applications presently received and being processed by the Minister's office, departments, agencies, government trading enterprises or boards within the Minister's portfolio responsibilities, I ask:

- (a) What is the average time taken to process and return a FOI application;
- (b) As at 1 February 2019 how many FOI applications remain outstanding beyond there 45 day timeline:
 - (i) In relation to (b), what is the longest time an application has been outstanding and why;
- (c) How many FOI applications were received in the calendar years of:
 - (i) 2016;
 - (ii) 2017; and
 - (iii) 2018; and
- (d) How many FOI applications were successfully processed and returned within 45 days during the calendar years of:
 - (i) 2016;
 - (ii) 2017; and
 - (iii) 2018?

Mr D.A. Templeman replied:

(a)–(d) Please refer to Legislative Assembly question on notice 4626.

ATTORNEY GENERAL — PORTFOLIOS — FOI REQUESTS

4634. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Attorney General; Minister for Commerce:

For all Freedom of Information (FOI) applications presently received and being processed by the Minister's office, departments, agencies, government trading enterprises or boards within the Minister's portfolio responsibilities, I ask:

- (a) What is the average time taken to process and return a FOI application;
- (b) As at 1 February 2019 how many FOI applications remain outstanding beyond there 45 day timeline:
 - (i) In relation to (b), what is the longest time an application has been outstanding and why;

- (c) How many FOI applications were received in the calendar years of:
- (i) 2016;
 - (ii) 2017; and
 - (iii) 2018; and
- (d) How many FOI applications were successfully processed and returned within 45 days during the calendar years of:
- (i) 2016;
 - (ii) 2017; and
 - (iii) 2018?

Mr J.R. Quigley replied:

Please refer to Legislative Assembly Question on Notice 4626.

MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT — PORTFOLIOS — FOI REQUESTS

4639. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Minister for Transport; Planning:

For all Freedom of Information (FOI) applications presently received and being processed by the Minister's office, departments, agencies, government trading enterprises or boards within the Minister's portfolio responsibilities, I ask:

- (a) What is the average time taken to process and return a FOI application;
- (b) As at 1 February 2019 how many FOI applications remain outstanding beyond there 45 day timeline:
- (i) In relation to (b), what is the longest time an application has been outstanding and why;
- (c) How many FOI applications were received in the calendar years of:
- (i) 2016;
 - (ii) 2017; and
 - (iii) 2018; and
- (d) How many FOI applications were successfully processed and returned within 45 days during the calendar years of:
- (i) 2016;
 - (ii) 2017; and
 - (iii) 2018?

Ms R. Saffioti replied:

Refer to Legislative Assembly Question on Notice 4626.

MINISTER FOR ENVIRONMENT — PORTFOLIOS — FOI REQUESTS

4646. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the parliamentary secretary representing the Minister for Environment; Disability Services; Electoral Affairs:

How many full time equivalent staff were dedicated to the receipt and processing of Freedom of Information (FOI) applications within the Minister's departments, agencies, government trading enterprises or boards as at:

- (a) 1 January 2016;
- (b) 1 January 2017;
- (c) 1 January 2018; and
- (d) 1 January 2019?

Mr R.R. Whitby replied:

Western Australian Electoral Commission

(a)–(d) 1

Office of the Environmental Protection Authority

- (a) 0.6
- (b) 0.6

Department of Environment Regulation

- (a) 2.5
- (b) 3.5

Department of Parks and Wildlife

- (a) 0.8
- (b) 0.8

Department of Biodiversity, Conservation and Attractions

- (c) 0.8
- (d) 0.8

Botanic Gardens and Parks Authority

- (a) 0
- (b) < 0.1
- (c) < 0.1
- (d) < 0.1

Zoological Gardens Authority

- (a) < 0.1
- (b) < 0.1
- (c) < 0.1
- (d) < 0.1

MINISTER FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT — PORTFOLIOS — FOI REQUESTS

4650. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Minister for Local Government; Heritage; Culture and the Arts:

How many full time equivalent staff were dedicated to the receipt and processing of Freedom of Information (FOI) applications within the Minister's departments, agencies, government trading enterprises or boards as at:

- (a) 1 January 2016;
- (b) 1 January 2017;
- (c) 1 January 2018; and
- (d) 1 January 2019?

Mr D.A. Templeman replied:Former Department of Local Government and Communities (17 March 2017 – 30 June 2017)

- (a)–(b) One.
- (c)–(d) Not applicable.

Former Department of Culture and the Arts (17 March 2017 – 30 June 2017) including statutory bodies

- (a)–(b) Nil.
- (c)–(d) Not applicable.

Department of Local Government, Sport and Cultural Industries including statutory bodies

- (a)–(b) Not applicable.
- (c)–(d) One.

Metropolitan Cemeteries Board

- (a)–(d) Nil.

National Trust of Western Australia

- (a)–(d) One.

Former Office of State Heritage and Heritage Council of Western Australia (17 March – 30 June 2017)

- (a)–(b) Not applicable.
- (c)–(d) One.

Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage (1 July 2017 – 12 February 2019)

- (a) Please refer to Legislative Assembly question on notice 4656.

MINISTER FOR SENIORS AND AGEING — PORTFOLIOS — FOI REQUESTS

4652. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Minister for Seniors and Ageing; Volunteering; Sport and Recreation:

How many full time equivalent staff were dedicated to the receipt and processing of Freedom of Information (FOI) applications within the Minister's departments, agencies, government trading enterprises or boards as at:

- (a) 1 January 2016;
- (b) 1 January 2017;
- (c) 1 January 2018; and
- (d) 1 January 2019?

Mr M.P. Murray replied:WAIS

(a)–(d) None.

VenuesWest

(a)–(d) None.

Combat Sports Commission

(a)–(d) None.

Department of Sport and Recreation (prior to 1 July 2017)

- (a) One.
- (b) One.
- (c)–(d) Not applicable.

Sport and Recreation (WA) (post 1 July 2017)

- (a)–(b) Not applicable.
- (c)–(d) Please refer to Legislative Assembly Question on Notice No. 4650.

Department of Communities

Please refer to Legislative Assembly Question on Notice No. 4658.

ENVIRONMENT — YALGORUP NATIONAL PARK

4661. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the parliamentary secretary representing the Minister for Environment:

I refer to the Yalgorup National Park and ask:

- (a) What was the total park maintenance and conservation budget for:
 - (i) 2016;
 - (ii) 2017;
 - (iii) 2018; and
 - (iv) Forecast 2019;
- (b) How many FTE (if any) were dedicated to the conservation and maintenance of Yalgorup during:
 - (i) 2016;
 - (ii) 2017;
 - (iii) 2018; and
 - (iv) Forecast 2019;
- (c) What are the outstanding maintenance priorities for Yalgorup as at 1 January 2019 and for how long has each priority remained overdue; and
- (d) Has there been any incidents of environmental vandalism at Yalgorup since 1 January 2017 and if so, what incidents and what was the extent of the damage?

Mr R.R. Whitby replied:

- (a) (i) \$260,000
- (ii) \$248,000
- (iii) \$277,000
- (iv) \$392,000

- (b) (i)–(iv) 1.5

Note: Figures based on financial year such that the answer for (i) 2016 refers to 2015–16 figures.

- (c) A large portion of the infrastructure in the national park was replaced after the 2016 Waroona/Yarloop fires and is in good condition. Some trails within the park will require resurfacing in the coming years. The existing boardwalk at the Mt John Thrombolite site has had minor maintenance in recent years to maintain its integrity, however it will require re-decking within the next five years.
- (d) Gates and fences have been cut or damaged in the park resulting in damage to the lakes from vehicles and trail bikes. This illegal access has led to rubbish being dumped and firewood being illegally collected.

MINISTER FOR ENVIRONMENT — PORTFOLIOS — COMMUNICATIONS STAFF

4665. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the parliamentary secretary representing the Minister for Environment; Disability Services; Electoral Affairs:

For all departments, agencies, government trading enterprises or boards within the Minister's portfolio responsibilities I ask as at 1 January 2019:

- (a) What is the total number of employees engaged in media, communications, marketing or speechwriting, including:
- (i) Public;
 - (ii) Corporate; and
 - (iii) Media relations;
- (b) What is the salary of each of these employees; and
- (c) What is the job title for each of these employees?

Mr R.R. Whitby replied:

Please refer to Legislative Assembly Question on Notice 4662.

MINISTER FOR EMERGENCY SERVICES — PORTFOLIOS — COMMUNICATIONS STAFF

4668. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Minister for Emergency Services; Corrective Services:

For all departments, agencies, government trading enterprises or boards within the Minister's portfolio responsibilities I ask as at 1 January 2019:

- (a) What is the total number of employees engaged in media, communications, marketing or speechwriting, including:
- (i) Public;
 - (ii) Corporate; and
 - (iii) Media relations;
- (b) What is the salary of each of these employees; and
- (c) What is the job title for each of these employees?

Mr F.M. Logan replied:

(a)–(c) Please refer to Legislative Assembly Question on Notice 4662.

ATTORNEY GENERAL — PORTFOLIOS — COMMUNICATIONS STAFF

4670. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Attorney General; Minister for Commerce:

For all departments, agencies, government trading enterprises or boards within the Minister's portfolio responsibilities I ask as at 1 January 2019:

- (a) What is the total number of employees engaged in media, communications, marketing or speechwriting, including:
- (i) Public;
 - (ii) Corporate; and
 - (iii) Media relations;
- (b) What is the salary of each of these employees; and
- (c) What is the job title for each of these employees?

Mr J.R. Quigley replied:

(a)–(c) Please refer to Legislative Assembly Question on Notice 4662.

MINISTER FOR WATER — PORTFOLIOS — COMMUNICATIONS STAFF

4678. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Minister for Water; Fisheries; Forestry; Innovation and ICT; Science:

For all departments, agencies, government trading enterprises or boards within the Minister's portfolio responsibilities I ask as at 1 January 2019:

- (a) What is the total number of employees engaged in media, communications, marketing or speechwriting, including:
- (i) Public;
 - (ii) Corporate; and
 - (iii) Media relations;
- (b) What is the salary of each of these employees; and
- (c) What is the job title for each of these employees?

Mr D.J. Kelly replied:

(a)–(c) Please refer to Legislative Assembly Question on Notice 4662.

CORRECTIVE SERVICES — SPECIAL OPERATIONS GROUP

4679. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Minister for Corrective Services:

How many times have the Special Operations Group (SOG) been operationally deployed to respond to an incident during:

- (a) 2016:
- (i) What was the prison and broad description of each incident;
 - (ii) How many times, if any, was live ammunition fired; and
 - (iii) How many times, if any, were rubber baton rounds fired;
- (b) 2017:
- (i) What was the prison and broad description of each incident;
 - (ii) How many times, if any, was live ammunition fired; and
 - (iii) How many times, if any, were rubber baton rounds fired; and
- (c) 2018:
- (i) What was the prison and broad description of each incident;
 - (ii) How many times, if any, was live ammunition fired; and
 - (iii) How many times, if any, were rubber baton rounds fired?

Mr F.M. Logan replied:

- (a) (i) In 2016, the Special Operations Group deployed to 24 emergencies at Prisons across the State, where the incident exceeded the capability at the local level.
- (ii)–(iii) Details requested in relation to prison security are sensitive and may pose a risk to the safety of the prison network. The member is reminded of this and that it would be inappropriate to disclose further information.
- (b) (i) In 2017, the Special Operations Group deployed to 5 emergencies at Prisons across the State, where the incident exceeded the capability at the local level.
- (ii)–(iii) Details requested in relation to prison security are sensitive and may pose a risk to the safety of the prison network. The member is reminded of this and that it would be inappropriate to disclose further information.
- (c) (i) In 2018, the Special Operations Group deployed to 6 emergencies at Prisons across the State, where the incident exceeded the capability at the local level.
- (ii)–(iii) Details requested in relation to prison security are sensitive and may pose a risk to the safety of the prison network. The member is reminded of this and that it would be inappropriate to disclose further information.

COMMERCE — FUELWATCH

4682. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Minister for Commerce:

What was the operational cost and what was the total number of FTE staff dedicated to 'Fuel Watch' during the following years:

- (a) 2016;
- (b) 2017; and
- (c) 2018?

Mr J.R. Quigley replied:

- (a) \$451,196 and 2 FTE;
- (b) \$457,993 and 2 FTE;
- (c) \$410,649 and 2 FTE.

MINISTER FOR ENVIRONMENT — PORTFOLIOS — PROPERTY OWNED

4686. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the parliamentary secretary representing the Minister for Environment; Disability Services; Electoral Affairs:

- (1) As at 1 January 2019 for all departments, agencies, government trading enterprises or boards within the Minister's portfolio responsibilities I ask whether or not there is any land or building owned fully or partially within the following suburbs and if so, what is the address and purpose of each property:
 - (a) Mandurah – 6210;
 - (b) Halls Head – 6210;
 - (c) Erskine – 6210;
 - (d) Falcon – 6210;
 - (e) Wannanup – 6210;
 - (f) Dawesville – 6211;
 - (g) Bouvard – 6211; and
 - (h) Herron – 6211?
- (2) In relation to (1) are any buildings unoccupied or land vacant and if so, what ones?

Mr R.R. Whitby replied:

Please refer to Legislative Assembly Question on Notice 4683.

MINISTER FOR REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT — PORTFOLIOS — PROPERTY OWNED

4688. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the minister representing the Minister for Regional Development; Agriculture and Food; Ports; Minister Assisting the Minister for State Development, Jobs and Trade:

- (1) As at 1 January 2019 for all departments, agencies, government trading enterprises or boards within the Minister's portfolio responsibilities I ask whether or not there is any land or building owned fully or partially within the following suburbs and if so, what is the address and purpose of each property:
 - (a) Mandurah – 6210;
 - (b) Halls Head – 6210;
 - (c) Erskine – 6210;
 - (d) Falcon – 6210;
 - (e) Wannanup – 6210;
 - (f) Dawesville – 6211;
 - (g) Bouvard – 6211; and
 - (h) Herron – 6211?
- (2) In relation to (1) are any buildings unoccupied or land vacant and if so, what ones?

Mr M. McGowan replied:

Refer to answer to PQ4683.

MINISTER FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT — PORTFOLIOS — PROPERTY OWNED

4690. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Minister for Local Government; Heritage; Culture and the Arts:

- (1) As at 1 January 2019 for all departments, agencies, government trading enterprises or boards within the Minister's portfolio responsibilities I ask whether or not there is any land or building owned fully or partially within the following suburbs and if so, what is the address and purpose of each property:
- (a) Mandurah – 6210;
 - (b) Halls Head – 6210;
 - (c) Erskine – 6210;
 - (d) Falcon – 6210;
 - (e) Wannanup – 6210;
 - (f) Dawesville – 6211;
 - (g) Bouvard – 6211; and
 - (h) Herron – 6211?
- (2) In relation to (1) are any buildings unoccupied or land vacant and if so, what ones?

Mr D.A. Templeman replied:

- (1)–(2) Please refer to Legislative Assembly question on notice 4683

ATTORNEY GENERAL — PORTFOLIOS — PROPERTY OWNED

4691. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Attorney General; Minister for Commerce:

- (1) As at 1 January 2019 for all departments, agencies, government trading enterprises or boards within the Minister's portfolio responsibilities I ask whether or not there is any land or building owned fully or partially within the following suburbs and if so, what is the address and purpose of each property:
- (a) Mandurah – 6210;
 - (b) Halls Head – 6210;
 - (c) Erskine – 6210;
 - (d) Falcon – 6210;
 - (e) Wannanup – 6210;
 - (f) Dawesville – 6211;
 - (g) Bouvard – 6211; and
 - (h) Herron – 6211?
- (2) In relation to (1) are any buildings unoccupied or land vacant and if so, what ones?

Mr J.R. Quigley replied:

Please refer to Legislative Assembly Question on Notice 4683.

ATTORNEY GENERAL — PORTFOLIOS — CISCO DEVICES — CYBERSECURITY

4703. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Attorney General; Minister for Commerce:

Within the Department of Justice, has Cisco Smart Install been replaced as per the Attorney's answer to Question on Notice No. 3109:

- (a) If so, on what date was it replaced; and
- (b) If not, why not?

Mr J.R. Quigley replied:

- (a) No.
- (b) The risk of the Smart Install vulnerability was fully mitigated on 1 August 2018 in accordance with Cisco advice by implementing the recommended Cisco workaround to disable Cisco Smart Install and the configuration of all switches to prevent the vulnerability being exploited in the future. Replacement of all switches will be carried out in conjunction with the Department's transition to GovNext. This transition is due to be completed in early 2020.

WATER — FLUORIDATION — MEMBER FOR WANNEROO

4708. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Minister for Water; Fisheries; Forestry; Innovation and ICT; Science:

Since 11 March 2017 has any of the Minister's water related departments, agencies, government trading enterprises or boards received correspondence from the Member for Wanneroo in relation to water fluoridation and if so:

- (a) On what date(s) was the correspondence received; and
- (b) Will the Minister table that correspondence:
 - (i) If not why not?

Mr D.J. Kelly replied:Aqwest

No.

- (a)–(b) (i) Not applicable.

Busselton Water

No.

- (a)–(b) (i) Not applicable.

Department of Water

No.

- (a)–(b) (i) Not applicable.

Department of Water and Environmental Regulation

No.

- (a)–(b) (i) Not applicable.

Water Corporation

No.

- (a)–(b) (i) Not applicable.

MINISTER FOR ENVIRONMENT — PORTFOLIOS — WELCOME TO COUNTRY CEREMONIES

4714. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the parliamentary secretary representing the Minister for Environment; Disability Services; Electoral Affairs:

For all departments, agencies, government trading enterprises or boards within the Minister's portfolio responsibilities within 2018 have there been any Welcome to Country or Acknowledgement of Country ceremonies paid for by the agency, and if yes:

- (a) What was the event, meeting, conference or seminar;
- (b) Where was the event, meeting, conference or seminar held; and
- (c) What organisation or individual conducted the ceremony or acknowledgement and how much were they paid?

Mr R.R. Whitby replied:

Please refer to Legislative Assembly Question on Notice 1200.

MINISTER FOR EMERGENCY SERVICES — PORTFOLIOS —
WELCOME TO COUNTRY CEREMONIES**4717. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Minister for Emergency Services; Corrective Services:**

For all departments, agencies, government trading enterprises or boards within the Minister's portfolio responsibilities within 2018 have there been any Welcome to Country or Acknowledgement of Country ceremonies paid for by the agency, and if yes:

- (a) What was the event, meeting, conference or seminar;
- (b) Where was the event, meeting, conference or seminar held; and
- (c) What organisation or individual conducted the ceremony or acknowledgement and how much were they paid?

Mr F.M. Logan replied:

- (a)–(c) Please refer to Legislative Assembly Question on Notice 1200.

ATTORNEY GENERAL — PORTFOLIOS — WELCOME TO COUNTRY CEREMONIES

4719. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Attorney General; Minister for Commerce:

For all departments, agencies, government trading enterprises or boards within the Minister's portfolio responsibilities within 2018 have there been any Welcome to Country or Acknowledgement of Country ceremonies paid for by the agency, and if yes:

- (a) What was the event, meeting, conference or seminar;
- (b) Where was the event, meeting, conference or seminar held; and
- (c) What organisation or individual conducted the ceremony or acknowledgement and how much were they paid?

Mr J.R. Quigley replied:

- (a)–(c) Please refer to Legislative Assembly Question on Notice 1200.

MINISTER FOR WATER — PORTFOLIOS — WELCOME TO COUNTRY CEREMONIES

4727. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Minister for Water; Fisheries; Forestry; Innovation and ICT; Science:

For all departments, agencies, government trading enterprises or boards within the Minister's portfolio responsibilities within 2018 have there been any Welcome to Country or Acknowledgement of Country ceremonies paid for by the agency, and if yes:

- (a) What was the event, meeting, conference or seminar;
- (b) Where was the event, meeting, conference or seminar held; and
- (c) What organisation or individual conducted the ceremony or acknowledgement and how much were they paid?

Mr D.J. Kelly replied:

- (a)–(c) Please refer to Legislative Assembly Question on Notice 1200.

FAMILY AND DOMESTIC VIOLENCE — REFUGES — PEEL REGION

4729. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Minister for Prevention of Family and Domestic Violence:

I refer to the Government's announcement in May 2017 in relation to a second family violence refuge in the Peel Region and ask:

- (a) Has land been identified for the new refuge:
 - (i) If not why not; and
 - (ii) If so, what postcode is the refuge located;
- (b) What stage of construction is the refuge at;
- (c) What is the anticipated practical completion date for the refuge;
- (d) What is the anticipated opening and operation date for the refuge; and
- (e) How many persons will the refuge shelter at capacity (including a breakdown for adults and children)?

Ms S.F. McGurk replied:

- (a) Yes.
 - (i) Not applicable.
 - (ii) To protect the safety of the women who will access the refuge, it is not appropriate to specify the location.
- (b) Construction is in the schematic design stage.
- (c) The Department of Communities is working towards a practical completion date in the first quarter of 2021.
- (d) The Department is working towards the refuge service being open and operational in line with the practical completion date. The operational date is also contingent on the tender process for the service provider.
- (e) The number of women and children accommodated will depend on the individual need, client mix and family sizes at any one time.

SENIORS HOUSING — MANJIMUP

4740. Dr M.D. Nahan to the Minister for Housing:

I refer to the media release dated 11 December 2018 titled "Builder selected for Manjimup seniors housing project" and I ask:

- (a) What is the State Government's contribution to this project and what is the value of the contribution;

- (b) What is the expected financial return to the State, both in dollar terms and return on investment;
- (c) How many homes did the State build under its Affordable Housing Action Plan 2017–18 to 2019–20 for the 2017–18 financial year; and
- (d) What is the role of the South West Development Commission and does the role include financial support?

Mr P.C. Tinley replied:

- (a) The site identified for the Manjimup Senior’s Housing Project is a 2.5-hectare former school site purchased by the Housing Authority in 2010. It will deliver approximately 55 units and will be developed in five stages.

The cost to deliver Stage 1 will be approximately \$4.6 million which includes \$2 million of Royalties for Regions funding and \$2.6 million funded by the Department of Communities. Of the \$4.6 million, \$2.5 million has been allocated for site remediation and construction of 26 serviced lots and \$2.1 million for construction of nine dwellings.

- (b) The estimated proceeds from the sale of the nine dwellings is \$2.5 million, with the estimated value of the remaining 17 lots totalling \$1.2 million.

The value of the remaining land will be improved by the increased level of infrastructure provided to the site during the Stage 1 civil works.

- (c) In 2017–18, 460 homes were built under the Affordable Housing Action Plan:

79 homes for social housing;

71 homes for National Partnership Agreement on Remote Indigenous Housing; and

310 Homes for Affordable Housing Sale.

- (d) The South West Development Commission, in collaboration with the Shire of Manjimup and Department of Communities, developed a business case for a Royalties for Regions grant application to develop the proposed Manjimup Seniors Housing Project.

At the time of the submission the South West Development Commission’s role was to facilitate various grants schemes under the Royalties for Regions program. The South West Development Commission has not provided any funding to this project.

FISHERIES — SHARK MONITORING NETWORK

4742. Dr M.D. Nahan to the Minister for Fisheries:

I refer to the media release dated 8 December 2018 titled “South-West beaches get new shark receivers in time for summer” and I ask:

- (a) What is the cost of the installation of the three satellite-linked receivers; and
- (b) What is the additional operational cost of the three satellite-linked receivers on an annual basis?

Mr D.J. Kelly replied:

- (a) \$154 986.43
- (b) \$13 192.02 per year

HOUSING — TENANCY AGREEMENT TERMINATIONS

4743. Mr J.E. McGrath to the Minister for Housing:

- (1) Can the Minister provide information/data on how many Tenancy Agreements under the *Residential Tenancies Act 1987* were terminated by the Department of Housing as a result of legal action in response to a “dangerous behaviour” incident from 2011 to 2018 in:

- (a) Como;
- (b) Karawara;
- (c) Kensington;
- (d) Manning;
- (e) Salter Point; and
- (f) South Perth?

- (2) Can the Minister provide a list of examples of “dangerous behaviour” incidents that led to the termination of Tenancy Agreements in the above cases from 2011 to 2018?

- (3) Can the Minister provide information/data on how many Tenancy Agreements under the *Residential Tenancies Act 1987* were terminated by the Department of Housing as a result of legal action in response to a series of “serious disruptive behaviour” incidents or strikes within 12 months from 2011 to 2018 in:
- (a) Como;
 - (b) Karawara;
 - (c) Kensington;
 - (d) Manning;
 - (e) Salter Point; and
 - (f) South Perth?
- (4) Can the Minister provide a list of examples of “serious disruptive behaviour” incidents that led to the termination of Tenancy Agreements in the above cases from 2011 to 2018?
- (5) Can the Minister provide information/data on how many Tenancy Agreements under the *Residential Tenancies Act 1987* were terminated by the Department of Housing as a result of legal action in response to a total of three “disruptive behaviour” incidents or strikes within 12 months from 2011 to 2018 in:
- (a) Como;
 - (b) Karawara;
 - (c) Kensington;
 - (d) Manning;
 - (e) Salter Point; and
 - (f) South Perth?
- (6) Can the Minister provide a list of examples of “disruptive behaviour” incidents that led to the termination of Tenancy Agreements in the above cases from 2011 to 2018?
- (7) Can the Minister provide information/data on how many Tenancy Agreements under the *Residential Tenancies Act 1987* were terminated by Housing as a result of legal action in response to an “illegal use of premises” from 2011 to 2018 in:
- (a) Como;
 - (b) Karawara;
 - (c) Kensington;
 - (d) Manning;
 - (e) Salter Point; and
 - (f) South Perth?

Mr P.C. Tinley replied:

- (1)(a)–(f), (3)(a)–(f), (5)(a)–(f), (7)(a)–(f) The Department of Communities does not capture data for reporting purposes on termination of tenancies by individual suburb or strike severity level. The suburbs identified fall within the Department of Communities’ South East Metropolitan Region.

The total number of tenancies vacated following termination of the tenancy agreements by Court Order for disruptive behaviour or illegal use of premises in the South East Metropolitan Region are as follows:

2013–14 – 17

2014–15 – 8

2015–16 – 18

2016–17 – 19

2017–18 – 7

Data for 2011–12 and 2012–13 is not reported by Region and only state-wide figures are available.

- (2) Proven incidents of dangerous behaviour have included:
- Verbal abuse and threats towards a neighbour which escalated to include a physical assault resulting in Police charges.

- (4) Proven incidents of serious behaviour have included:
- Arguing and physical fighting at the property which involved weapons.
 - Verbal abuse and threats made towards a neighbour.
 - Screaming and threats to kill neighbours.
- (6) Proven incidents of disruptive behaviour have included:
- Loud music, yelling and screaming into the early hours of the morning.
 - Excessively loud music resulting in Police attendance.
 - Shouting and fighting at the property.
 - Dirt bikes being revved late at night.
 - Excessive noise coming from the property.

KEYSTART — CLIENTS

4754. Dr M.D. Nahan to the Minister for Housing:

I refer to Keystart and I ask:

- (a) Will the Treasurer provide the percentage of Keystart clients who are in excess of their monthly repayments by one month or more for each month of the 2017 and 2018 calendar years;
- (b) Will the Treasurer provide the percentage of Keystart clients with defaulted accounts for each month of the 2017 and 2018 calendar years; and
- (c) Will the Treasurer provide the percentage of Keystart clients with accounts in arrears for each month of the 2017 and 2018 calendar years?

Mr P.C. Tinley replied:

(a)–(c) [See tabled paper no 2278.]

WATER — SOUTHERN SEAWATER DESALINATION PLANT

4757. Dr M.D. Nahan to the Minister for Water:

I refer to page 36 of the 2018–19 Mid Year Review and the reference to increased output from the Southern Seawater Desalination Plant and I ask, what is the expected annual cost to increase the capacity of the plant from the forecast 87 gigalitres per year to 109 gigalitres per year for the following years:

- (a) 2019–20;
- (b) 2020–21; and
- (c) 2021–22?

Mr D.J. Kelly replied:

There are no plans to increase the output of the Southern Seawater Desalination Plan from the current forecast.

SHARKS — HAZARD MITIGATION

4760. Dr M.D. Nahan to the Minister for Fisheries:

I refer to page 189 of Budget Paper 2 of the 2018–19 Budget and the \$400,000 allocated to shark mitigation initiatives and I ask:

- (a) Will the Minister provide a breakdown of the initiatives to be funded;
- (b) Does the Government spend other money on shark mitigation and if so, will the Minister provide detail of that funding, broken down by activity or initiative, for the current financial year and each year of the forward estimates;
- (c) Does the Government provide funding for shark research, either to the Department of Fisheries? If yes, what is the total amount of funding to the Department of Fisheries for the current financial year and each year of the forward estimates;
- (d) Does the Government provide funding for shark research to external organisations? if yes, what is the total amount of funding to the Department of Fisheries for the current financial year and each year of the forward estimates; and
- (e) How many staff within the Department of Fisheries work exclusively on shark research or mitigation activities?

Mr D.J. Kelly replied:

- (a) The \$400,000 is allocated to shark hazard mitigation initiatives which includes a partnership with Surfing WA, and additional funding for the McGowan Government's world-first shark deterrent rebate scheme.
- (b) [See tabled paper no 2280.]

- (c) Yes an amount of \$232,000 is allocated in 2018–19. Funding for out-years will be determined through the Department's internal budget setting process.
- (d) No.
- (e) 8.

ROTTNEST ISLAND AUTHORITY — FOI REQUESTS

4761. Dr M.D. Nahan to the Minister for Tourism:

I refer to the letter from Vince Ianni, Director Business Services, Rottnest Island Authority to the Leader of the Opposition dated 31 January 2019 regarding the Rottnest Island Authority's decision to defer providing documents sought under the *Freedom of Information Act 1992*, and ask:

- (a) Who made the decision to defer providing the documents requested under the Freedom of Information Act;
- (b) Was the CEO consulted on this decision to defer providing the documents requested under the Freedom of Information Act;
- (c) Was legal advice sought before the decision was made to defer providing the documents requested under the Freedom of Information Act;
- (d) Was the Board consulted on the decision to defer providing documents requested under the Freedom of Information Act;
- (e) If yes to (d), what members of the Board were consulted and did they agree with the decision to defer providing the documents;
- (f) Was the Minister, or any of the Minister's staff, consulted or advised on the decision to defer providing the documents requested under the Freedom of Information Act; and
- (g) Was the Premier, or any members of the Premier's staff, consulted or advised on the decision to defer providing the documents requested under the Freedom of Information Act?

Mr P. Papalia replied:

- (a) Vince Ianni, Director Business Services, Rottnest Island Authority.
- (b) No.
- (c) No.
- (d) No.
- (e) Not Applicable.
- (f) Yes, Minister's staff.
- (g) No.

ENVIRONMENT — CANAL ROCKS BOAT RAMP — RISK ASSESSMENT

4762. Ms L. Mettam to the parliamentary secretary representing the Minister for Environment:

I refer to Legislative Council Question Without Notice 390 answered on 16 May 2018 and I ask:

- (a) When was the independent risk assessment into the Canal Rocks boat ramp received by the Department of Biodiversity, Conservation and Attractions (DBCA);
- (b) When was the independent risk assessment into the Canal Rocks boat ramp received by the Minister for the Environment;
- (c) Will the Minister table the independent risk assessment into the Canal Rocks boat ramp? If not, why not;
- (d) Which firm or consultant undertook the independent risk assessment into the Canal Rocks boat ramp;
- (e) What was the cost of the independent risk assessment into the Canal Rocks boat ramp;
- (f) Which stakeholders were consulted by the consultants undertaking the independent risk assessment into the Canal Rocks boat ramp;
- (g) Which stakeholders were consulted by the Minister or his office on the future management of the Canal Rocks boat ramp; and
- (h) When will the Minister announce his decision on the future management of the Canal Rocks boat ramp?

Mr R.R. Whitby replied:

- (a) 25 January 2019.
- (b) Early February 2019.
- (c) The report will be publicly released and a copy will be provided to the Member at that time.

- (d) The independent risk assessment was undertaken by Marico Marine Ltd.
- (e) The cost of the independent risk assessment was \$66,370 (excluding GST).
- (f) In addition to consultation with the Member, the following stakeholders were consulted by the consultants:
 - (a) City of Busselton;
 - (b) Recfishwest;
 - (c) Naturaliste Volunteer Marine Rescue group;
 - (d) Department of Transport;
 - (e) Department of Fire and Emergency Services;
 - (f) Canal Rocks Action Group;
 - (g) Southern Seafood Products;
 - (h) Seafari Marine (commercial tour operator);
 - (i) Selim Fisheries (commercial fisher);
 - (j) Riskcover;
 - (k) Department of Biodiversity, Conservation and Attractions;
 - (l) Hon Adele Farina MLC; and
 - (m) Members of the public with a known interest in the Canal Rocks boat ramp.
- (g) Hon Adele Farina MLC, Don Punch MLA, Libby Mettam MLA, Mayor Grant Henley (City of Busselton), Mr Geoff Brierley and Mr Paul Bresland (Naturaliste Volunteer Marine Rescue), Mr Peter Kalbfell (Jet Adventures – commercial tour operator), Mr Glenn Wakelam (Yallingup resident), and Mr David Hunt (Yallingup resident).
- (h) The report recommendations are being considered and a decision on the future management of the Canal Rocks Boat Ramp will be forthcoming.

SHARKS — COMMUNITY RESEARCH

4782. Ms L. Mettam to the Minister for Fisheries:

I refer to DPIRD2019004 'Community Research and Survey Services – Shark Campaign' advertised on the TenderWA website and ask:

- (a) What is the purpose of the community research being undertaken by Metrix Consulting as part of this tender;
- (b) To date, what quantitative research has been undertaken as part of this tender;
- (c) To date, what quantitative research is planned for 2019 as part of this tender;
- (d) To date, what qualitative research has been undertaken as part of this tender;
- (e) To date, what qualitative research is planned for 2019 as part of this tender; and
- (f) What are the key findings of this community research to date?

Mr D.J. Kelly replied:

- (a) The research is to understand the current understanding of the community towards beach use, sharks and shark mitigation.
- (b) A baseline survey in October 2018 (reported in November 2018) and a secondary survey in December 2018, with findings reported in January 2019.
- (c) Nil.
- (d) A baseline survey in October 2018 and a secondary survey in December 2018.
- (e) Nil.
- (f) Key findings are:

The Sea Sense campaign increased the likelihood for people to take greater personal responsibility for their own safety against sharks.

The Sea Sense campaign had strong levels of awareness amongst at-risk segments, including heavy beach users and surfers.

Beach use for swimming and water based activities has significantly increased since 2016.

Less than one in five feel there is a high risk of encountering a shark on the WA coast or beaches.

