



Parliamentary Debates

(HANSARD)

FORTIETH PARLIAMENT
FIRST SESSION
2017

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, 18 October 2017

Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, 18 October 2017

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

PAPER TABLED

A papers was tabled and ordered to lie upon the table of the house.

COMMISSIONER OF POLICE — WA POLICE — SUPPORT

Notice of Motion

Mr P.A. Katsambanis gave notice that at the next sitting of the house he would move —

That this house expresses its unequivocal support for Western Australian Commissioner of Police, Mr Chris Dawson, and all Western Australian police officers protecting the Western Australian community.

HERITAGE PERTH — HISTORIC HEART

Statement by Minister for Heritage

MR D.A. TEMPLEMAN (Mandurah — Minister for Heritage) [12.02 pm]: As part of Perth Heritage weekend, I was pleased to attend the launch of the Historic Heart project for East Perth. I believe that this innovative project has the potential to revitalise the east end of the Perth CBD, build a strong identity for the area and create a safe and vibrant destination for the local community and visitors. Historic Heart speaks to the history of the urban environment, intertwined with the community. The launch of the Historic Heart project on Sunday was held on the site of the fledgling Swan River Colony's first hospital, surrounded by some of Perth's oldest buildings—Perth Mint, our first fire station, the law courts, Government House and St Mary's Cathedral. The McGowan government is proud to support Historic Heart's objective to improve the urban environment and will provide a \$250 000 contribution to support signage, lighting, closed-circuit television and a range of landscaping initiatives, including bike racks, alfresco areas and planter boxes. I understand that expertise from the Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage and the Department of Transport has helped shape the plan to link the CBD through this precinct and onto the new Perth Stadium via the Swan River pedestrian bridge, along with the planned Waterbank riverfront redevelopment along the Causeway. Western Australia is an ancient land and the story of Perth is far deeper than that represented by its urban fabric. Aboriginal people have a long association with the East Perth area and there are many important Aboriginal heritage sites within this area that overlay with colonial settlement heritage—for example, Government House.

Historic Heart marks the beginning of the resuscitation of Perth's east end. Although Historic Heart is not a major infrastructure project, it is a commendable initiative aimed at improving the amenity and urban environment. I would like to acknowledge Mr Adrian Fini, whom we must credit with the conception of the Historic Heart of Perth initiative, and also the member for Perth, John Carey, who is a passionate advocate for the renewal and activation of spaces within the city. Improving the amenity of the area will encourage visitors to wander around the precinct, absorbing some of the heritage ambiance. The official launch of Historic Heart at this year's Perth Heritage Days was not simply a happy coincidence—rather, it is hoped that this initiative will ultimately have a part to play in strengthening the beating heart of Perth.

I would like to finish by acknowledging Mr Richard Offen's stewardship of Heritage Perth for more than a decade. Richard will shortly be bowing out of this role, so, Richard, please accept my very best wishes for the future.

BUSHFIRE SEASON — NORTHERN WET SEASON — PREPAREDNESS

Statement by Minister for Emergency Services

MR F.M. LOGAN (Cockburn — Minister for Emergency Services) [12.05 pm]: I would like to take this opportunity to inform the house about the state's preparedness for this year's bushfire season and the northern wet season. As always, it will be an extremely busy time for our emergency services personnel and volunteers. Last year, despite it being a relatively quiet bushfire season, career and volunteer firefighters attended more than 3 200 bushfires. Bushfire is a real and present threat and we all have a role to play in preparing our families, homes and businesses for bushfires and cyclones. Being ready can be the difference between life and death.

On Sunday, 1 October, the new Department of Fire and Emergency Services Commissioner, Darren Klemm, and I launched the "Are You Bushfire Ready?" campaign at Argyle-Irishtown in the south west. The people of Argyle-Irishtown are a fantastic example of taking a proactive approach to be ready for when a bushfire breaks out. Their actions made the difference when bushfire threatened homes and lives on Australia Day this year. Argyle-Irishtown was recognised as one of the state's leading bushfire-ready communities and presented with a certificate of appreciation by Commissioner Klemm. The "Are You Bushfire Ready?" campaign is run by the Department of Fire and Emergency Services and supported by the Department of the Premier and Cabinet. It

reinforces the message that bushfire is a shared responsibility and everyone has to take steps now to reduce their bushfire risk. People must also make a plan about what they would do in the event of an emergency. Included in this year's targeted awareness campaign is a suite of new tools that will guide individuals and families through planning and preparing their bushfire survival plan.

"Fire chat" is the five-minute conversation everyone who lives near bush, even in the suburbs, needs to have with their family and neighbours. Only 16 per cent of Western Australians have actually had a conversation with their families about how they would survive a bushfire. People need to consider when to leave, where to go and which way to go. At each new level of bushfire planning, it asks: are you sure you are prepared to stay? That is something people have to seriously consider. It could be far worse than they think. Community members who elect to stay are taken through another series of steps that explain what it means to "be ready" to stay and defend. Property preparation and emergency kit checklists are also available for download or in hard copy. There will also be community street meets led by DFES community preparedness teams in high-risk areas. Bushfire ready teams, made up of our state's invaluable volunteers, will also be visiting homes across the regions to help them prepare for the season. In the north west of the state, communities need to prepare for cyclones and flooding with the coming wet season. The coast between Broome and Exmouth is the most cyclone-prone region in Australia. I ask members of this house to raise awareness about these important issues and encourage their communities to prepare for bushfires, cyclones and floods.

ABALONE FISHERS — WEST COAST ZONE — SAFETY

Statement by Minister for Fisheries

MR D.J. KELLY (Bassendean — Minister for Fisheries) [12.08 pm]: On Sunday, 15 October I announced a number of management changes that will improve the safety of recreational fishers fishing for abalone in the west coast zone. This includes the Perth metropolitan coast. These changes were a result of a review into the operation of the fishery following the deaths of four people since 2012. My approval for the changes followed consultation with Recfishwest and Surf Life Saving Western Australia. The west coast zone season will now run over summer to reduce the risk of abalone fishers encountering rough weather conditions. The season will now occur on four specified Saturday mornings instead of Sundays, with the first scheduled for 9 December. This ensures that Surf Life Saving resources can be available during the fishing times. Importantly, if severe weather conditions are forecast, the Department of Primary Industries and Regional Development will be able to close the fishery and reschedule the fishing session to a later date.

To ensure the fishery's sustainability, the recreational catch will be closely monitored so that this season's catch is between 18 and 22 tonnes. The number of fishing days may be reduced or extended to keep the catch within this range. Almost 18 000 licences are issued annually in this iconic, highly valued fishery on Perth's doorstep. It is another example of the collaboration between the key fisheries stakeholders working together to improve the safety of our state's fisheries. I look forward to continuing to ensure that all Western Australian fisheries not only remain the best in the world for sustainability, but are also safe for all to participate in.

IRON ORE (CHANNAR JOINT VENTURE) (HAMERSLEY RANGE) AGREEMENTS AMENDMENT BILL 2017

Introduction and First Reading

Bill introduced, on motion by **Mr M. McGowan (Minister for State Development, Jobs and Trade)**, and read a first time.

Explanatory memorandum presented by the minister.

Second Reading

MR M. MCGOWAN (Rockingham — Minister for State Development, Jobs and Trade) [12.10 pm]: I move —

That the bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of the Iron Ore (Channar Joint Venture) (Hamersley Range) Agreements Amendment Bill is to ratify two variation agreements. The bill is necessary to give effect to amendments to the Iron Ore (Channar Joint Venture) Agreement Act 1987 and the Iron Ore (Hamersley Range) Agreement Act 1963, which I will refer to as the Channar state agreement and the Hamersley state agreement respectively.

The Channar state agreement will expire on 22 February 2018. The key purpose of the variation agreements is to extend the term of the Channar state agreement by 10 years to 2028, with the possibility of a further extension for a period not exceeding five years. Its extension will allow mining to continue at the Channar mine and for rehabilitation and decommissioning activities to be undertaken once mining has been completed.

Before I put these two variation agreements into context, it is important to highlight that the Channar mine is of historical and symbolic significance as it was, in the 1980s, the first large-scale overseas mining project in which China had taken a direct equity interest. The Channar Mining Joint Venture, in developing the mine, was the first large-scale mining initiative between Australia and China. I will now provide some background on the parties to the Channar and Hamersley state agreements, their operations and the requirement to vary the two state agreements.

The parties to the Channar state agreement are the state, Channar Mining Pty Limited, Sinosteel Channar Pty Ltd and Hamersley Iron Pty Ltd. For simplicity, I shall refer to the parties, other than the state, to the Channar state agreement as Channar Mining, Sinosteel Channar and Hamersley Iron. Channar Mining and Sinosteel Channar are collectively referred to as the joint venturers. Channar Mining has a 60 per cent share of the joint venture and Sinosteel Channar has the remaining 40 per cent. Channar Mining and Hamersley Iron are part of the Rio Tinto group. Sinosteel Channar is part of Sinosteel Corporation, which is a major Chinese state-owned enterprise. The parties to the Hamersley state agreement are the state and Hamersley Iron.

The Channar mine is located approximately 20 kilometres from Paraburdoo and is situated on a mining lease granted under the Mining Act 1978 and held pursuant to the Channar state agreement. The project was approved in 1988 under the Channar state agreement, with an initial production limit of 200 million tonnes by 2012. This target of 200 million tonnes has been met and the joint venturers expect to reach a production target of up to 270 million tonnes of iron ore by February 2018.

Hamersley Iron provides services and facilities under the Hamersley state agreement to support mining at Channar. The Channar mining operation involves conventional open pit mining, crushing and screening of iron ore. The ore is then transported from the Channar mining areas by conveyor to Hamersley Iron's Paraburdoo processing plant. The conveyor is located on a special lease granted under the Land Administration Act 1997 and held pursuant to the Channar state agreement. Following further processing at the Paraburdoo plant, the ore is then loaded onto trains and railed to either Dampier port or Cape Lambert port for export. The Channar mine produces about eight million to 10 million tonnes of high quality iron ore per annum and employs around 142 workers.

I turn now to the provisions of the bill and the two variation agreements. The provisions of the bill essentially set out to amend the Channar and Hamersley state agreements by ratifying and attaching two variation agreements. The bill ratifies the Channar variation agreement and attaches a copy as schedule 2 to the Channar state agreement. Similarly, the bill ratifies the Hamersley variation agreement and attaches a copy as the sixteenth schedule to the Hamersley Range state agreement.

The key provisions of the Channar variation agreement are as follows. Clauses 1(3) and 1(4) essentially require the state to introduce into Parliament a bill to ratify a variation agreement by 31 October 2017 and to have it ratified by 31 December 2017; otherwise, the Channar state agreement will expire in February 2018. Similar provisions also exist in the Hamersley variation agreement. Clause 2(4)(a) deletes clause 23(1) and substitutes it with the requirement that the joint venturers pay to the state iron ore royalty in accordance with the Hamersley state agreement. The Channar state agreement royalty provisions have been amended to reinforce the current arrangements whereby the joint venturers pay to the state iron ore royalty in accordance with the Hamersley state agreement.

Clause 2(5) inserts new clause 23A after clause 23, which allows the joint venturers to blend iron ore from the mining lease held pursuant to the Channar state agreement with iron ore mined under the Hamersley state agreement. Clause 2(6) amends clause 31 relating to the payment of rates by excluding from the unimproved value rating exemption any part of the land that is a specified improvement, with specified improvements being accommodation, recreation or administration facilities and associated buildings or maintenance workshops within 100 metres of such facilities.

Clause 2(8) deletes clause 50 and substitutes it with a new clause that extends the expiry date of the Channar state agreement. New clause 50(1) extends the term of the Channar state agreement by 10 years to 22 February 2028. New clause 50(2) provides that the joint venturers may give notice to the state agreement minister no later than 22 February 2027 of their desire to extend the Channar state agreement for a further period not exceeding five years. Under new clause 50(3) the state agreement minister is able to extend the Channar state agreement for the joint venturers to complete any productive mining activities or to decommission and rehabilitate the mine site in accordance with new clause 50(2) for a further five years.

Clause 2(9) inserts new clause 50A after clause 50. New clause 50A(1) deems, upon endorsement of the relevant registers, the extension of the term of the mining lease and special lease I163654 held pursuant to the Channar state agreement so that they expire on 22 February 2028, or such later date agreed to by the state agreement minister pursuant to new clause 50(3) of the Channar state agreement. This essentially means that the term of the mining lease and the special lease currently held under the Channar state agreement shall be deemed to be extended to coincide with the same term of the Channar state agreement. Clause 2(10) amends clause 51, requiring the parties to the Channar state agreement to submit to the jurisdiction of the courts of Western Australia.

The key provisions of the Hamersley variation agreement are as follows. Clause 2(1) inserts a new definition "Channar Joint Venture Completion Date", which means the date, if it occurs, on which an associated company such as Hamersley Iron becomes, prior to the cessation or determination of the Channar state agreement, the sole entity of the joint venturers for the purposes of the Channar state agreement. Clause 2(2) inserts new subclause (8) after clause 8E(7), which obligates the company to include in the company's local participation plan activities in connection with the Channar state agreement. Clause 2(3)(a) amends clause 10(2)(i) by inserting provisions to the effect that the company is required, when it is reasonably and economically practicable, to use local labour, materials, plant and equipment and supplies from Western Australia when it is not prejudicial to the interests of

the company in respect to activities in connection with the Channar state agreement. Clause 2(3)(b) inserts a new subparagraph (ia) after clause 10(4)(a)(i), which allows the blending of iron ore with iron ore mined under the Channar state agreement.

Clause 2(4)(b) inserts new subclause (1A)(a) after clause 10H(1), which provides for the inclusion of land subject to the mining lease held pursuant to the Channar state agreement within mineral lease 4SA, which is held pursuant to the Hamersley state agreement. This inclusion of land can occur on and from the Channar joint venture completion date and prior to the cessation or determination of the Channar state agreement. Application for such inclusion is to be made to the Minister for Mines and Petroleum and with the written consent of the joint venturers under the Channar state agreement. This new subclause will allow the transfer of land from the Channar mining lease to mineral lease 4SA, while operations continue under the Channar state agreement on the remaining land subject to the Channar mining lease. Clause 10H(1A)(b) allows the Hamersley state agreement party to apply for a similar lease, licence, easement or other title to that which is held pursuant to the Channar state agreement. The application is to be made with the written consent of the joint venturers under the Channar state agreement. Clause 10H(1B) requires Hamersley Iron to complete any outstanding decommissioning, remediation, rehabilitation and other closure activities and works relating to land included in mineral lease 4SA, or in respect to any lease, licence, easement or title granted under clause 10H(1A)(b).

The ratification of this bill provides certainty for the ongoing operations of the Channar mine, enabling the continued mining and export of iron ore. This will support the continued employment of 142 jobs at Channar and continuation of the payment of royalties to the state. The extended term of the Channar state agreement will also provide time for the rehabilitation of those areas that have been disturbed once mining has been completed. I commend the bill to the house.

Debate adjourned, on motion by **Mr A. Krsticevic**.

CORRUPTION, CRIME AND MISCONDUCT AMENDMENT BILL 2017

Introduction and First Reading

Bill introduced, on motion by **Mr J.R. Quigley (Attorney General)**, and read a first time.

Explanatory memorandum presented by the Attorney General.

Second Reading

MR J.R. QUIGLEY (Butler — Attorney General) [12.23 pm]: I move —

That the bill be now read a second time.

This bill proposes an amendment to the Corruption, Crime and Misconduct Act 2003 to restore the power and jurisdiction of other authorities, particularly the Corruption and Crime Commission, over misconduct by members of Parliament that could constitute a breach of the Criminal Code. The proposed amendment was previously put before Parliament in the Corruption, Crime and Misconduct and Criminal Property Confiscation Amendment Bill 2017, which was debated in the September sittings of the Legislative Assembly. In the course of the debate on that bill, it became clear that the proposed amendment, which now forms the current bill, was required to be considered in greater detail than the more substantive sections of the bill dealing with powers in relation to unexplained wealth. For that reason, on Wednesday 7 September 2017 I moved to split the bill in order that the most pressing amendments could be passed without referral to a committee, on the understanding that the amendment now before the house would subsequently be introduced in a separate bill.

The Corruption, Crime and Misconduct Amendment Bill 2017 introduces the amendment to Parliament as proposed in September. The rationale for the amendment remains the same as at its introduction in the prior bill. Section 3(2) of the CCM act was originally inserted into the Corruption and Crime Commission Act 2003, as it was then known, by the Corruption and Crime Commission Amendment and Repeal Act 2003. The subsection, in its original form, read —

- (2) Nothing in this Act affects, or is intended to affect, the operation of the *Parliamentary Privileges Act 1891* or the *Parliamentary Papers Act 1891* and a power, right or function conferred under this Act is not to be exercised if, or to the extent, that the exercise would relate to a matter determinable exclusively by a House of Parliament, unless that House so resolves.

An amendment to section 3(2) of the CCM act by the Corruption and Crime Commission Amendment (Misconduct) Act 2014 removed the word “exclusively” from that subsection. That amendment had the effect of ousting the jurisdiction and powers of the CCC in relation to all conduct that is covered by section 8 of the Parliamentary Privileges Act 1891. In its current form, the section has the result that the CCC’s jurisdiction would not extend to any conduct or matter that gives rise to an offence under section 8 of the Parliamentary Privileges Act 1891.

The effect of the proposed amendment rests on the significance of the word “exclusively”. Prior to the removal of the word “exclusively”, section 3(2) did not prevent the CCC from exercising powers on a range of misconduct by members of Parliament. This was because a range of conduct constituted both breaches of the

Parliamentary Privileges Act 1891 and criminal offences. For example, certain misconduct by members of Parliament under section 8 of the Parliamentary Privileges Act 1891 could also amount to offences under the Criminal Code. This is particularly so with respect to sections 55 to 61 of the Criminal Code, which involve interference with the proper operation of Parliament, including corruption offences, such as members of Parliament receiving bribes. There are also offences for corruption and abuse of office, contained in chapter XIII of the Criminal Code. Given the definition of “public officer” in the Criminal Code, it is clear that many of those offences would relate to offences of corruption committed by members of Parliament in that capacity. Many of these Criminal Code offences comprise elements that are substantially identical to some of the offences set out in section 8 of the Parliamentary Privileges Act 1891, or breaches of parliamentary privilege generally. Bribery of a member of Parliament is probably the clearest example of conduct that would comprise both an offence against section 61 of the Criminal Code and an offence punishable by Parliament under section 8 of the Parliamentary Privileges Act 1891.

In creating the Criminal Code offences referred to, Parliament has ceded its previously exclusive authority to deal with conduct of the character referred to in section 8 of the Parliamentary Privileges Act 1891. Offences under these provisions of the Criminal Code may properly be investigated by the police and prosecuted in the courts. Insofar as conduct by a member of Parliament or another person constitutes an offence against both the Criminal Code and section 8 of the Parliamentary Privileges Act 1891, the courts and the relevant houses of Parliament may have been said to have had concurrent jurisdiction. Given the concurrent jurisdiction of the courts and Parliament in relation to that “conduct”, it cannot be said that punishment for the conduct that gives rise to an offence against section 8 of the Parliamentary Privileges Act 1891 was, following the introduction of the relevant Criminal Code offences, determinable exclusively by Parliament. That conduct may well amount to an offence against the Criminal Code and, indeed, “misconduct” for the purposes of the Corruption, Crime and Misconduct Act 2003.

The removal of the word “exclusively” from the Corruption and Crime Commission Amendment (Misconduct) Act 2014, had the potential effect that even though suspected conduct may well amount to an offence against the Criminal Code and, indeed, “misconduct” for the purposes of the CCM act, if that conduct would also amount to a breach of parliamentary privilege, it could not be the subject of a Corruption and Crime Commission investigation. This is because the matter would be determinable by a house of Parliament. Reinsertion of the word “exclusively” would remove that potential effect so that the CCC would be able to investigate conduct over which there was concurrent jurisdiction of the courts and Parliament. The amendment would leave the powers and privileges of Parliament unaffected. Indeed, the broader purpose of section 3(2) of the CCM act is to ensure that the privileges of Parliament are not affected by the CCM act. For example, the Parliament and its privileges committees would retain their full authority in relation to the investigation and determination of breaches of the privileges of Parliament, including all the offences under section 8 of the Parliamentary Privileges Act 1891. The amendment does not affect those powers at all.

Similarly, parliamentary privilege would still have a role to play in the investigation and prosecution of these Criminal Code offences, whether by the CCC as part of a misconduct investigation, or an investigation by the police as part of a criminal investigation. For example, parliamentary privilege may preclude the obtaining and adducing of various types of evidence. In this regard, a distinction needs to be drawn between the powers of Parliament under the Parliamentary Privileges Act 1891, which exclusivity the Criminal Code provisions affect, and the immunities enjoyed by the house, their members and committees under section 1. The immunities of a house of Parliament and of a member of a house are not affected by the existence of these Criminal Code offences. For example, article 9 of the Bill of Rights 1689, which provides that “the freedom of speech and debates or proceedings in Parliament ought not to be impeached or questioned in any court or place out of Parliament”, may, in a particular case, have an impact on the extent of an investigation by the CCC or a prosecution in a court for an offence against the Criminal Code. It is settled that article 9 of the Bill of Rights is made applicable in Western Australia by section 1 of the Parliamentary Privileges Act 1891. The authority for that is *Halden v Marks* (1995) 17 WAR 447 at 461. Those issues are separate from the one dealt with by the amendment, which is whether the CCC, as with the police, can investigate certain conduct at all.

I commend the bill to the house.

Debate adjourned, on motion by **Mr A. Krsticevic**.

COURT JURISDICTION LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL 2017

Introduction and First Reading

Bill introduced, on motion by **Mr J.R. Quigley (Attorney General)**, and read a first time.

Explanatory memorandum presented by the Attorney General.

Second Reading

MR J.R. QUIGLEY (Butler — Attorney General) [12.38 pm]: I move —

That the bill be now read a second time.

The Court Jurisdiction Legislation Amendment Bill 2017, together with recently announced increases to the resources of the District Court, aims to improve the timeliness, efficiency and effectiveness of the criminal justice

system for all Western Australians. It does this by adjusting the jurisdictional boundaries between the Supreme Court, the District Court and the Magistrates Court in their criminal jurisdiction, to ensure that offences can be dealt with in a timely manner and in the most appropriate jurisdiction. The amendments proposed follow a review of the jurisdictional boundaries of the courts conducted by the Solicitor-General. In conducting the review, consultation occurred with the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court and the Chief Judge of the District Court, on behalf of their respective courts and the Director of Public Prosecutions. Data was also provided by the Department of Justice on the performance of the superior courts.

The first part of the bill deals with the jurisdictional boundary between the Supreme Court and the District Court. The original jurisdiction of both courts relates to indictable offences. Traditionally, the division between the two courts has related to offences that carry a term of life imprisonment, and other offences. Although the Supreme Court has jurisdiction over all indictable offences, the District Court, generally, does not have jurisdiction over offences for which a sentence of life imprisonment may be imposed. This is the consequence of section 42(2) of the District Court of Western Australia Act 1969.

As the maximum penalty for certain offences—for example, arson—has been increased to life imprisonment, this has meant that offences previously tried in the District Court have become part of the exclusive jurisdiction of the Supreme Court. The nexus between life imprisonment and the exclusive jurisdiction of the Supreme Court was, however, removed with the passage of the Misuse of Drugs Amendment (Methylamphetamine Offences) Act 2017, which enabled offences involving the trafficking of methylamphetamine, for which a life sentence is now provided, to be tried in the District Court. This bill enables other life sentence offences to be tried in the District Court, including perjury in relation to life imprisonment offences, arson, criminal damage by fire, armed robbery and assault with intent to rob. It does this by confining the Supreme Court's exclusive jurisdiction to those offences that are essentially homicide offences. These offences are section 279, murder; section 280, manslaughter; section 283, attempt to unlawfully kill; section 288, procuring, assisting suicide; and section 290, preventing birth of a live child. In addition, the bill provides that regulations may be made enabling other offences to be within the Supreme Court's exclusive jurisdiction. This is necessary to deal with commonwealth offences, jurisdiction for which is conferred on the state courts by reference to subject matter. There are a number of commonwealth offences punishable by life imprisonment, involving homicide, for example, that should remain with the Supreme Court. Other commonwealth offences, particularly those dealing with the trafficking of drugs, are better dealt with in the District Court.

There are a number of reasons why it is preferable for the District Court's jurisdiction to be increased in this way. The District Court is, predominantly, a criminal trial court, with a far greater proportion of its judicial resources being devoted to criminal matters than is the case in the Supreme Court. The overall number of lodgements in the District Court is much higher than in the Supreme Court and the average length of each trial is shorter—a matter that is largely a function of the complexity of homicide trials. This has meant that there are efficiencies that may be employed in the District Court, including the significant over-listing of trials, which currently is at between 40 per cent and 50 per cent. The same cannot be done in the Supreme Court. The District Court's jurisdiction also means there is a substantial accumulation of expertise in criminal matters, particularly drug offences, which raise similar issues in both state and commonwealth offences. The proposed division is also consistent with the approach in other states where the Supreme Court is, essentially, a homicide court. To meet the additional jurisdiction, and also to take account of these efficiencies, the government, in the recent budget, made provision for an additional two judges to be appointed to the District Court. These judges, who are due to commence in the new year, are intended to address the court's already increased workload and the additional jurisdiction proposed by this bill. At the same time, this bill makes reforms to a number of offences that can be tried in either the District Court or the Magistrates Court as "either-way" offences. The first set of changes relates to property offences that are each-way offences and for which a summary conviction penalty is provided. In relation to a number of such offences, there is a monetary value of the property, above which the charge is not to be dealt with summarily. These offences include section 401, burglary; section 409, fraud; section 426(2), stealing and related offences; and section 527, fraudulent dealing with a judgement debtor.

For each of these offences, the monetary limit, above which the charge is not to be dealt with summarily, is \$10 000. This amount was set in 1996 by the Criminal Law Amendment Act 1996 and has, therefore, not been increased for over 20 years. It is well overdue for reform and updating. By increasing that amount to \$50 000 there will be more flexibility to allow the Magistrates Court to determine a matter, where it would otherwise have to transfer the matter to the District Court. The final changes relate to unlawful threats, contrary to section 338B of the Criminal Code. Currently, when an unlawful threat is a threat to kill, the offence may be tried only in the District Court, whereas all other unlawful threats may be finalised in the Magistrates Court. The Director of Public Prosecutions has advised that although a charge of threat to kill sometimes accompanies sexual offence charges, most frequently it is charged with associated domestic violence charges. Often, the associated charges can be dealt with only in the Magistrates Court, such as common assault or breach of a violence restraining order, or they are either-way offences that could be dealt with in either the District Court or the Magistrates Court. Frequently, the count of threat to kill is the only charge that must be dealt with in the District Court.

As a result, the Director of Public Prosecutions advises that many matters that could otherwise be finally determined in the Magistrates Court are committed to the District Court together with the threat to kill charge. In addition, because charges under this section are difficult to prove and can be discontinued as a result of insufficiency of evidence or because they are an inappropriate complication in an already difficult matter, the final result is that matters are unnecessarily committed to the District Court, with consequential delay in finalisation. The DPP advises that these issues cause impediment to the early resolution of domestic violence cases. It also means that often there may be a multiplication of proceedings for a single incident, which is undesirable, particularly for victims of domestic violence. For this reason, it is proposed that, in an appropriate case, a charge of threat to kill can be determined in the Magistrates Court by imprisonment for three years and a fine of \$36 000. It should be stressed that none of these changes require that the case be finalised in the Magistrates Court. The Criminal Code already requires that when, in a particular case, an appropriate penalty could be given only in the District Court, the case must be committed to the District Court. These changes simply provide more flexibility to enable the matters to be determined in the most appropriate forum.

The Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, the Chief Judge of the District Court and the Chief Magistrate have all agreed that these changes are sensible and appropriate. Although efficiencies are expected, precisely how the changes impact on the workload of the courts will require analysis once the changes are in place. The government has committed to each of the courts that it will keep these resourcing issues under review so as to continue to improve the delivery of criminal justice in this state.

I commend the bill to the house.

Debate adjourned, on motion by **Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup**.

WESTERN AUSTRALIAN JOBS BILL 2017

Second Reading

Resumed from 17 October.

MR T.J. HEALY (Southern River) [12.53 pm]: I rise to support the Western Australian Jobs Bill 2017. I note that I am not the lead speaker. I want to make some comments on the bill in relation to Southern River and my community. It is fantastic that we finally have a government in Western Australia that is prepared to put WA jobs first and to stand up and ensure that local apprentices and local companies get work on important infrastructure projects.

This legislation is part of WA Labor's plan for jobs that was endorsed at the March state election. It was endorsed to the degree that there are more members in this chamber from the Labor Party than ever before. That was an incredible endorsement of WA Labor's plan for jobs. What does this bill do? It sends an expectation—a signal—to industry and to government to have a local sourcing strategy. It ensures that when government invests in infrastructure and when industry, at a variety of levels, makes investments to industry, they look at ensuring that local companies can get the work, that local apprentices can be trained and that we can procure goods from our local community. That keeps the money and jobs here, so that you and I will get the work.

This bill establishes an agency to support and advise small to medium-sized enterprises. I will refer to them as SMEs later in this speech. I think we are looking at an online interface as well as the ability of other resources to ensure that small to medium-sized enterprises—I believe that well over 90 per cent Western Australian businesses are SMEs—get help to link to tenders. The agency will help to inform SMEs when jobs, government contracts and other opportunities for procurement are coming up. This will benefit the SMEs in my electorate. It will support the small contractors and the small businesses in Canning Vale, Southern River, Huntingdale and Gosnells. I endorse what I said before: it is fantastic that there is a Western Australian government that is prepared to invest in this.

Participation plans will allow government to entrench local content and identify strategic projects. I will pass some comment on the previous government, because a number of projects could have been incredible opportunities to identify strategic projects and jobs that should have gone to Western Australian companies—jobs that local Western Australians should have had. Of course, these strategic projects, which the relevant minister has the ability to identify as a result of this bill, will mean that more local content requirements will be made. Local procurement, local training and local employment are aspects that were missing from the Barnett government years.

Mr A. Krsticevic interjected.

Mr T.J. HEALY: Southern River residents missed out on local projects, member for Carine. They missed out; it was horrible. I will refer to the Swan River bridge later on.

Mr A. Krsticevic: We were looking for workers. They said they were too busy.

Mr T.J. HEALY: The former government said, "We looked for the workers. We looked for them, but we couldn't find them." They were not in camouflage; they were not hiding from you! The bridge that was sent overseas is one example. There were many similar projects, and the Langouant inquiry will look at a number of them. The Swan River bridge to the stadium —

Mr A. Krsticevic: Believe it or not, the company that is building the bridge now said it couldn't do it. They were too busy.

Mr T.J. HEALY: I refer to comments made in the debate yesterday. People said, "We never knew it was going to be built overseas." Building the Swan River bridge was an opportunity to spend an estimated \$50 million here. Eventually, the contract went to a company or a contractor that outsourced it and it was outsourced again. How could the government not know that local people would not be employed in that project? My question is a bit of a trap: was it simple-mindedness or was it negligence? At which point does one say, "Here's \$50 million"? As a teacher, that is not pocket change to me. When we invest in such a large piece of infrastructure, there is an opportunity. The government awarded that contract. I again draw back to this bill. If this bill had been in place and any one of the ministers, advisers or members—a lot of men, of course—in the Liberal government had even looked at a local government bill, I think we would have seen some better outcomes. This bridge probably would have been built in Western Australia in the first place and it might even have been for the original \$50 million price tag. We are now spending more like \$70 million, because it was, of course, sent to Malaysia. As the member for Carine said, the Malaysian company could not do it. I come back to the question—again, please do not answer, because it is a trap—was it negligence or was it simple-mindedness? We have some incredible advisers and incredible departmental staff. We do not act alone in government. We have an incredible public service. How did the bridge get through the system but no-one knew it would be built in Malaysia? Did no-one do their research?

Mr W.R. Marmion interjected.

Mr T.J. HEALY: By passing this bill, member for Nedlands, a focus on local content will be put into law as part of the strategic development of these projects.

Mr A. Krsticevic interjected.

Mr T.J. HEALY: I will mention Metronet as an important project. The planning and construction of different elements of the Metronet program include the Canning Vale train line in Southern River, which heads out to Ellenbrook and up to Yanchep; the development of the railcars; the school and road projects; and the new buses. Before the election, the McGowan government said—I come back to the fact that it is great to do the things we said we would do—that it would introduce a bill to protect Western Australian jobs, and it is doing that.

Mr A. Krsticevic interjected.

Mr T.J. HEALY: This bill ensures that each of the project's stages will include a higher percentage of local content.

Mr A. Krsticevic: Are you guaranteeing Western Australian jobs in this bill, so a job won't go to any other state or any other country?

Mr T.J. HEALY: Is the member talking about railcars as a good example?

Mr W.R. Marmion: Yes; that'll do.

Mr T.J. HEALY: If we start off with railcars—I acknowledge the former Minister for Transport—the previous government's two per cent local content for the railcars, which was disgraceful —

Mr W.R. Marmion interjected.

Mr T.J. HEALY: We are starting from a low base. We have not said it will be 100 per cent.

Mr A. Krsticevic interjected.

Mr T.J. HEALY: We have said that we are going to increase —

Point of Order

Mr D.J. KELLY: I am having a little bit of trouble hearing the member for Southern River. There seems to be some malcontents on the other side. I am very keen to hear what the member for Southern River has to say.

Mr T.J. HEALY: Mr Acting Speaker, I am very happy to keep the interjections. They are part of my education process.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr S.J. Price): Thank you, member. There is no point of order but I know Hansard is struggling to hear the member as he contributes to this debate. Member for Carine and member for Nedlands, can you just give the member a bit of air time so everyone can hear what he is saying, please.

Debate Resumed

Mr T.J. HEALY: We are saying that we aim for at least 50 per cent local content but because we came in with such a low base, if we do anything, we are doing better than the previous government. Our election commitment was to establish, in the northern suburbs, a rail training unit. More and more of the percentage of these railcars can be made in Western Australia so members' constituents and my constituents will get the apprenticeships and training. The money will stay here in our economy—then, of course, it gets taxed, then it comes back again. Trust me; members opposite will be able to take credit. They will say, "You know what; we in the Liberal Party said we were so anti-jobs" but —

Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup interjected.

Mr T.J. HEALY: I am sorry, member for Dawesville. Liberal Party members said they were anti-Western Australian jobs. I apologise; I thank the member for Dawesville. It will not happen tomorrow but this bill will pass, and each of these aspects will come into play. When members opposite come to speak to their constituents, this bill will allow them to say, “Wasn’t it fantastic that the Labor government passed these local content laws?”

Mr A. Krsticevic interjected.

Mr T.J. HEALY: Secretly and quietly, the member for Carine can take credit for it and that is just fantastic. Yesterday in question time a matter was raised and I believe it was about the former member for Morley, who said he had recommended that the railcars be made in Mumbai. It was then clarified that it was the Punjab. I was very excited because my grandmother was born in Mumbai. I thought it was fantastic. The former member for Morley is not here, but why —

Mr W.R. Marmion interjected.

Mr T.J. HEALY: Was the member for Nedlands the Minister for Transport at the time? Why did we pass up that opportunity? Why would a member of this Parliament—I am sure the Punjabi trains are fantastic—not seek to have them made here?

Mr W.R. Marmion: I don’t know, but —

Mr T.J. HEALY: “I don’t know”; that is the concern we have.

Mr W.R. Marmion: A member of Parliament can say whatever they like.

Mr T.J. HEALY: Okay; certainly —

Several members interjected.

Mr T.J. HEALY: I seek to clarify —

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members!

Mr T.J. HEALY: I will move on; I apologise.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Through the Chair thanks, member.

Mr T.J. HEALY: Which Minister for Transport sent the former member for Morley off to do this research?

Mr W.R. Marmion: No-one.

Mr A. Krsticevic: No-one.

Mr T.J. HEALY: No-one?

Mr S.K. L’Estrange: Backbenchers are allowed to travel on their own.

Mr T.J. HEALY: So there was no government endorsement? Okay.

Mr D.J. Kelly: The member for Morley should not have been allowed to travel on his own.

Mr T.J. HEALY: It sounds like it!

Several members interjected.

Mr T.J. HEALY: Okay; he did not travel alone.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Minister!

Mr T.J. HEALY: I will move on, Mr Acting Speaker, to opportunities at Elizabeth Quay.

At Elizabeth Quay, there were some opportunities for local procurement. Did I support Elizabeth Quay? It is a very pretty, beautiful place but was it essential? I do not know. It was certainly built with the tears, hopes and dreams of my students in Southern River. The rushed, dodgy water park—those aspects. If there had been a local procurement policy, it would be fantastic to see what that could have changed but, of course, the projects that I call the golden statues of the former member for Cottesloe all around Perth and Western Australia, like Elizabeth Quay and Roe 8, were done only because he wanted to get them done. He was not too fussed about ensuring there were Western Australian jobs.

The Perth Children’s Hospital was a great project. Imagine if there had been a local jobs bill at that time. If there had been a local procurement policy and we had said, “Let’s build it here in Western Australia and let’s use local apprentices” we may not have had —

Mr W.R. Marmion: It was built here; it’s in my electorate!

Mr T.J. HEALY: Then why did we import all these asbestos things from overseas? I think it would have been a fantastic idea to build and manufacture them here. Would having local content not have been a better option?

I will come back to opportunities with the “Premier’s Palace”. Were local jobs and local procurement used there? I do not know.

Mr W.R. Marmion: It was built in WA!

Mr T.J. HEALY: If it was, that is fantastic, but with this bill, when we make decisions to build infrastructure—of course, they will also be evidence-based decisions; they will not be ego-based—it will be in law that we will employ local apprentices. We will ensure that those things happen.

Mr A. Krsticevic interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Carine.

Mr A. Krsticevic interjected.

Mr T.J. HEALY: I guess you may be referring to the Priority Start program.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Southern River, through the Chair, please.

Mr T.J. HEALY: I think the member for Carine is talking about the Priority Start program, which means that for local projects, X dollars have to be allocated to apprentices. The Priority Start program was plagued; it was a horrible arrangement by the previous government. We will honour the program’s original intent. The former government—as I like to say, the Barnett–L’Estrange government—allowed companies to count existing apprenticeships as part of their calculations. I am looking forward to the challenge. The previous government did a horrible job with Priority Start. We will ensure that as part of the procurement and the participation plan, there will be opportunities for local apprentices. Students, young people and even people re-entering the workforce in all our electorates deserve the chance to work on Western Australian government projects. They deserve the chance to work on industry-led projects. This bill will allow us to deliver on our election commitments. We encourage other industries and other aspects of government to follow suit. This bill is going to make a difference in my community and others, and I commend the bill to the house.

MR S.K. L’ESTRANGE (Churchlands) [1.09 pm]: It is wonderful to have the opportunity to follow the member for Southern River, a new member of Parliament in this place, who is clearly enthusiastic and pro-jobs. Why would he not be? We are all pro-jobs because we would not be very good members of Parliament if we were in this place and did not support local jobs for the people in our electorates. It would be a very brave member of Parliament who would try to advocate sending jobs interstate or even overseas. It would be a very brave member of Parliament to think that was a good idea. Of course, we on this side of the chamber strongly support jobs growth for Western Australians. We advocate very strongly that if a bill is to come into this place, it should be robust and able to deliver on its intent. Clearly, Premier McGowan and the Labor backbenchers who have so far made speeches are telling the people of Western Australia that the solution to the one-third extra people on the dole queue over the last three years up to right now exists in the Western Australian Jobs Bill 2017. Unfortunately, members, if we take a little extra time to dig into the detail of this bill we will find that it does not achieve what the Premier and backbench are saying it will. I will take a few moments of members’ time today to step through the reasons this bill fails to do so.

The first is that it is simply not a believable framework to grow local jobs because, for example, part of the bill requires the minister to develop and implement a Western Australian industry participation strategy. That is a key component of this bill. But when the opposition was briefed on this bill the other day, we asked where the Western Australian industry participation strategy that underpins everything this bill purports to do is. The adviser said it has not yet been written. We asked when it would be written and the adviser said they did not know. We asked for a ballpark figure of when the Western Australian industry participation strategy would be written. The adviser said maybe by March 2018. That was the answer we got. The Western Australian industry participation strategy—a key aspect of this bill that will deliver local jobs—has not been written. That is the first and key point, member for Southern River. That strategy is a key, key point.

The second example, as stated in the bill, is that the Minister for State Development, Jobs and Trade is to determine that the Western Australian industry participation strategy supply is a strategic project if it meets the criteria prescribed in regulations. That is the second aspect. The Western Australian industry participation strategy and the regulations must be there for this to work. Neither are there. We are debating a hollow bill. It is a bit like an empty box. The government presented this shiny box. The people of Western Australia are being presented with a box with really good glossy advertising around the outside—“Here is the box that will deliver jobs”—but when we open the box and look inside, it is empty. I think we are the only members in this chamber who seem to either have opened the box to have a look or are prepared to stand in this place and say, “Do you know what? We are dealing with an empty box.” We need to make sure the box has the stuff in it that the government is saying will deliver these jobs to the people of Western Australia. Members, it does not have it. Fundamentally, it does not do what it

purports to, and that is a very, very great shame. I will tell members why: because leading up to the election now Premier McGowan and the then Labor opposition said their number one priority for the people of Western Australia was jobs growth and they went to the election with a jobs plan for WA. Clearly, part of that jobs plan was to present a bill that would solve the problem that they identified in that during the Liberal-National government some government contracts went offshore. They said they would fix that with a jobs plan and a bill to deliver on that, and that was their number one priority.

The real shame here is that the plan is not ready. It is October and it is not ready. The Western Australian industry participation strategy has not been written or completed and the regulations do not exist. Here we are in October 2017—remember that prior to the election this was the number one priority—hearing that maybe the Western Australian industry participation strategy will be ready in March 2018. That means this government, which went to the election with jobs for the people of Western Australia as its number one priority will wait a full year before the Parliament of Western Australia will be able to critically analyse that plan because the plan is not yet there. This bill, which states that it needs to have a plan, does not have a plan.

Mr D.J. Kelly: Eight years without a plan.

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: Member, the Labor Party went to the election —

Mr D.J. Kelly: Yes, I know, mate.

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: — saying its number one priority was a jobs plan.

Mr D.J. Kelly: They threw the Liberal Party out because it had eight years without a jobs plan.

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: Yes, but the people of Western Australia know that. The member is not telling us anything we do not know.

Mr D.J. Kelly: Well, apparently you don't.

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: No. I am saying the Labor Party presented to the people of Western Australia —

Mr D.J. Kelly: You're cranky that we haven't done everything in the first six months!

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: — that it would come to the election with a jobs plan, it told the people of Western Australia its number one priority would be to bring a bill into this place that would help fix jobs for local Western Australians —

Mr D.J. Kelly: And we are! We are!

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: The government is not! The a bill does not contain —

Mr D.J. Kelly: It is a bill!

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: No, the member is not listening! The bill does not contain a Western Australian industry participation strategy, which the bill says it has to have to work. It does not have it!

Mr D.J. Kelly: And my point was that you didn't have a strategy for Western Australian jobs for eight years.

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: Let me get this right: the minister's defence for having nothing is because we did not do what the Labor Party said it would do at the election. That is the minister's defence.

Mr D.J. Kelly: No, you're not listening. You're not listening.

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: That is what the minister is saying.

Mr D.J. Kelly: You're not listening.

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: That is what the minister is saying.

Mr D.J. Kelly: You're not listening.

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: The accountability for the Labor Party's commitments to the people of Western Australia lies with the Labor Party because they are its commitments. It is accountable for its commitments, not us! The people of Western Australia need to be made aware of that. It is about time they started putting a bit of pressure on the government so that it delivers on what it said it would.

Mr D.J. Kelly: Sorry; who's going to put pressure on us?

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: The people of Western Australia.

Mr D.J. Kelly: So you're cranky at them now, are you?

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: No, I am not cranky at them.

Mr D.J. Kelly: Okay.

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: I am saying it is about time they became aware that they are being sold an empty box, because that is what the government has presented them with in this bill.

Mr D.J. Kelly: I thought you said it was about time they put pressure on us.

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: I will try to progress my speech.

Does this come as a surprise to us? Of course it does not. We have a pattern of behaviour of the Labor government that is all about spin—promising one thing, then either backflipping or not delivering. One or the other. I will go through an example for members.

Ms S.F. McGurk: Fully funded, fully costed. Fully funded, fully costed.

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: The minister can go back to the election commitments of the former Liberal–National government two elections ago, but this government is accountable right now. The Labor Party said no new taxes and no increases in taxes, full stop. This Premier said it, the Labor Party backed it up and straightaway after the election and, having lied to the people of Western Australia, they backflipped on that commitment. That is the first one.

The second one was that the government said it would increase real wages and job security. An example of that commitment was that prior to the election the Labor Party went to the Western Australian police force and said it would commit to a 1.5 per cent wages rise this year. It committed to that, but when it came into power it said that was off the table and there would be a \$1 000 a year flat rate increase—no 1.5 per cent increase—and told the police force to take it or leave it; that is now going through the courts.

Mr W.R. Marmion: They're not happy.

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: They are not happy. That was another backflip and another example of the government deceiving a sector of the Western Australian community.

The third one is that the government said it would have a competitive taxation regime that would encourage investment in employment. A competitive taxation regime is not increasing a gold tax by 50 per cent or increasing payroll tax, thereby making Western Australia the highest taxed business sector of the entire country. That is not competitive. If the government thinks that is being competitive, maybe we misunderstood it. We thought “competitive” meant being the best or lowest; maybe the government thinks “competitive” is just make it the worst in the country and we win. That is what is happening with that commitment made going into the last election.

The fourth one is a limit on annual increases to state government tariffs, fees and charges. The Labor Party said there would be a limit. Well, it came straight in to power and whacked about 10 per cent on the non-discretionary tariff level for electricity. I think overall increases in rates and charges to the people of Western Australia went up over 11 per cent. They thought they were getting this wonderful new government that would reduce the costs and burden on households and support businesses and grow jobs; so far, all we have seen is the government going back on everything it committed to going into that election, and actually deceive a number of sectors of the Western Australian community, and the people more broadly, with its policies. Of course, the final thing, and the most serious of them all, is that the Labor Party went to the election with this spin saying that it had a debt reduction strategy and that it had set up a debt reduction account. When quizzed by the media on what this debt reduction strategy would be, the Labor Party said that it would grab 50 per cent of the iron ore royalty and put that into the debt reduction account when iron ore reaches \$85 a tonne and the GST reaches 65 cents in the dollar per capita. That was never going to happen in this financial year. I will be very surprised if it ever happens at all. The Leader of the National Party is crossing her fingers. We are all crossing our fingers for that to happen, but that is the Labor Party's debt reduction account. That was it. That was not going to happen. Out there in the community, we call that a pipedream. That is what the Labor Party took to the election and sold as spin. People thought, “These guys have got a plan. The Liberal–National government does not have a plan, but they've got a plan”, even though the plan was never going to work. Then—this is the *pièce de résistance*—the Labor Party won the election and presented its first budget, and that debt reduction strategy account now does not exist and has been replaced with a new one. This one is almost unbelievable. It is a line in budget paper No 1 that simply states that the government will set up a debt repayment account and the money put into the account will pay off the \$11.3 billion of extra debt that the government is putting into the budget with unanticipated or windfall revenue. That is a quote from the Treasurer's budget paper No 1—“unanticipated or windfall revenue”. Guess what? The community calls that winning lotto. The government has gone from a pipedream to winning lotto as its debt reduction strategy. When the Labor government comes into this place with a jobs bill, professing to give more jobs to Western Australians and that it will solve the unemployment problems in Western Australia, its track record of spin and rubbish is pretty extensive and we have not even been a year into this Labor government yet. The government has a pretty extensive spin history and this is just another example. This is number six on the government's “spinometer”—or whatever we want to call it—of spin. It is a real shame, because although it does not come as a surprise to us on this side of the chamber, as we look quite closely at what the government does, sometimes people in the community are just too busy living their lives to drill down and look closely at what the government is presenting as answers to the problems that face them and their communities every day. I think it is a real shame the government is doing this.

Mr D.J. Kelly: If they were only as smart as you!

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: They are very, very bright out there, but whether they have the time to dig into the government's legislation and identify the flaws in it is another question. I will read from the Premier's second reading speech given on 6 September. I quote —

This bill that I lay before the house today fulfils a key commitment of the McGowan Labor government under the plan for jobs—that is, to ensure that money spent by the Western Australian government on goods and services is used, wherever possible, to support local industry and create local jobs.

He said that this bill “fulfils”.

Mr W.R. Marmion: All done.

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: It is not done. It does not fulfil that commitment at all.

Mr D.J. Kelly: You are getting a bit desperate.

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: In fact, the use of the phrase “wherever possible” is in itself sneaky and the minister knows it. It is sneaky, it is cunning, it is devious and it is no different from the five former sneaky things that we have already talked about today. On the face of it, Western Australians looking for work will listen to the Premier and his backbench and they will read the phrase “support local industry and create local jobs” to mean that in the seat of Kingsley, they can get a job in their local area, or if not in Kingsley, certainly close by in metropolitan Perth. That is where these jobs will be; that is where this will happen. Likewise, they will think that in Joondalup, Murray–Wellington, Kalamunda and Burns Beach.

Mr W.R. Marmion: In Bicton.

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: They will think that in all those seats. They will think that that is what that means. They will think of jobs for people who live in Western Australia with their families and their children attending local schools and universities. They will think that this is about jobs for them in the local area. The key word here is “local”, because that is what the Premier and members opposite are selling to the people of Western Australia. But will this bill do what the Premier and the people opposite are saying it will do?

Dr M.D. Nahan: It cannot.

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: The Leader of the Opposition is right: it cannot. Let us go to clause 3 of the bill. This is opening up the box; let us look what is inside. I recommend that members all have a good look at clause 3 and the definition of “local industry”. It states —

local industry means suppliers of goods produced, or services provided, in Western Australia, another State, a Territory or New Zealand;

Ms S.F. McGurk: Not Malaysia.

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: That is how this Premier and this Labor government have defined “local industry”. When the people in the community hear the government say that it has a local jobs policy, they think it means local, but the government has defined “local” as New Zealand. That is not local; that is overseas. When the government harps on about the Malaysia bridge situation, it actually falls into the same trap. The government is saying that it went to the election with the promise that this stuff would not be built overseas, but the government's bill states that things can be built in New Zealand.

[Member's time extended.]

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: That is the first thing. In his second reading speech, the Premier also made the following point, and I quote —

The bill requires the strategy to be consistent with section 92 of the commonwealth Constitution. The implementation of the strategy will also need to be cognisant of the state's obligations under treaties and other international agreements to which the commonwealth or the state is a party.

That is another interesting thing when we open up the box of this bill and have a look inside. Let us see what that tells us.

Mr D.J. Kelly: We have to abide by the Constitution; even you would understand that. It is a bit of a given.

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: What do members think that means? Let us have a read of section 92 of the Constitution. It states —

92. Trade within the Commonwealth to be free

On the imposition of uniform duties of customs, trade, commerce, and intercourse among the States, whether by means of internal carriage or ocean navigation, shall be absolutely free.

That is the first bit. One of the treaties the Premier referred to is the Australia and New Zealand Government Procurement Agreement, so let us have a look at that, because that is inside the box of this bill. Let us read that bit about the objective of this agreement. I quote —

The objective of the ANZ Government Procurement Agreement is to create and maintain a single ANZ government procurement market in order to maximise opportunities for competitive ANZ suppliers and reduce costs of doing business for both government and industry.

This will be achieved by:

- ensuring the opportunity exists for ANZ suppliers to compete on an equal and transparent basis for government contracts in the Commonwealth of Australia Government, Australian States and Territories, and New Zealand Government;
- ensuring the absence of inter-state and trans-Tasman application of preference schemes and other forms of discrimination in government procurement, based on the place of origin of goods and services;

There we go. The Premier's second reading speech is sneaky, because on the one hand he is selling the cover—local jobs bill for the people of Western Australia. Read his second reading speech and dig into the bill, and there is no such thing; it is actually a fiction. It is a play on the emotions of the people of Western Australia and it is a play on the emotions of the thousands of Western Australians looking for work right now. It is shameless spin, and it is shameless spin at a time when over the last three years the dole queue has increased by one-third. That is disgraceful.

Mr D.J. Kelly: That is something you can be proud of.

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: The Labor Party won the election, minister, by coming in on a number one priority, which was a jobs bill, and this is what it has dished up. The minister and his Premier have dished up nothing more than spin to not only this Parliament, which is shameful, but also the people of Western Australia, and they know it. So far, all this jobs bill means to us on this side of the chamber—it should mean this to the people opposite and to the people in the broader community—is that we need to read the fine print, because when we read the fine print, we come across the definition of “local industry” stating that it is not local; it can be New Zealand. We come across the requirements under the Australian Constitution, which means that what the government is publicly proposing to do cannot happen. It means that the government needs to look at the Australia and New Zealand Government Procurement Agreement because we are not allowed to breach it. It goes on to mean that we need the WA industry participation strategy, a core component of the Western Australian Jobs Bill that has not been written yet. It means also that we need the regulations to be written because the regulations will underpin, with the Western Australian participation strategy, what industries can or cannot do regarding procurement. None of that exists in this bill because it has not been written. This bill is nothing more than heavy on political spin and very light on substance, facts and reality.

Part 2 of this bill is also reliant on the development of a Western Australian industry participation strategy. I will look at some of those components, and it is interesting that in part 2, clause 5 of the bill states in part —

- (1) The Minister must develop and implement a written strategy about the participation by local industry in activities for or in connection with a supply that meets the criteria prescribed for the purposes of this subsection.
- (2) The strategy is to be called the Western Australian Industry Participation Strategy.

No businesses have seen this yet; it has not been written. According to the summary of the briefing on the bill, each prospective supplier is required to submit a participation plan in the course of the procurement process for supplies that meet criteria prescribed in regulations, known as a WAIP supply. The participation plan is to outline the supplier's commitments to local industry participation. Even the suppliers cannot write their plans yet because they have to base their plans on the government's plan, which has not been written. That is in the bill. Further key requirements are that agencies must assess and consider the participation plan in the procurement process, in accordance with the WAIPS.

Mr W.R. Marmion: It must be the worst piece of legislation that has ever been brought in here.

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: It must be, mainly because of the spin it proposes. How will these prospective suppliers' participation plans work?

Mr W.R. Marmion: We don't know.

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: We do not know. Why do we not know? We do not know because they cannot be written. We do not know the workability of this bill because the content of this bill is missing—it does not exist. It cannot be critiqued; it cannot be tested. Finally, in the Premier's second reading speech, he said —

I, as the responsible minister, will report annually to Parliament on the implementation of the legislation and the strategy.

That will be an interesting report. He cannot do it this year, because if this bill goes through this place, how can he report on it when the contents of the bill—a key component of the bill—are missing?

Mr D.J. Kelly interjected.

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: I will take that interjection. Notwithstanding the spin of this bill, let us say the industry participation strategy is written by March 2018, let us give them until March 2019. What will be the key performance indicators that the Minister for State Development, Jobs and Trade will report on? Will he report on the number one KPI he took to the election, which was that he would create 50 000 new jobs for Western Australians? That is what the people think this bill can do. I hope that the number one KPI the minister decides to report on annually is how he is progressing the 50 000 new jobs and link it to this bill. If he does not come up with 50 000 new jobs linked to this bill and basing 50 000 new jobs only on an upswing in the economy, which has nothing to do with his industry participation strategy, this bill will prove itself to be nothing more than what I have outlined today, and that is absolute spin. It is a shame for everyone in this place to have to waste their time debating a bill that is shallow and that has no substance.

Ms S.F. McGurk: You had eight years. Gorgon went ahead and you guys required no local content at all. Everyone knows that.

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: All the member for Fremantle has to do to be true to herself and to her government is deliver on what this bill purports to deliver and I will be happy to stand up in this place and congratulate her.

Ms S.F. McGurk: Great. I look forward to it.

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: I can tell her right now that the bill the government presented to this Parliament to be debated here and now is absolutely shameless, and she knows it.

Ms S.F. McGurk: I met engineers who had to go overseas to get work on Gorgon under your government.

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: The member can sit there and continue to throw interjections as though she is in opposition. She is not in opposition anymore; she is in government and when in government, members have a responsibility to the people of Western Australia and to prove to the people of Western Australia that this bill can work. They cannot sit in this place today and tell anyone it can work, because it is absent of the fundamental elements the bill needs to work—they have not been written. The bill also contains definitions that tell everyone that it cannot do what the government says it can do. That is why, minister, this bill is nothing more than token spin and the government is simply waiting for the economy to recover so that it can try to connect its spin to an economic recovery and tell the people of Western Australia, “See, we fixed it.” We know what the government is up to. It is a disgrace and it has to stop.

MRS L.M. O'MALLEY (Bicton) [1.36 pm]: I rise to add my contribution to the debate on the Western Australian Jobs Bill 2017. This bill is, in essence, about one thing—more jobs for WA. This bill is about enabling local job growth by way of supporting increased participation of the small and medium business sector in the delivery, development, supply and maintenance of goods and services within and for the government sector. This bill is about opportunity and optimism. It is about increasing participation.

I have to say that listening to the negative comments from members opposite about our job-growing initiative is disappointing, but that is something I am becoming used to. Many of the negative comments from members opposite centre on the issue of free trade agreements. This bill acknowledges the challenges around FTAs imposed by the commonwealth on preferencing Western Australian businesses. This bill will not alter those FTAs, and nor should it. That is a matter for the commonwealth but this bill manages those challenges effectively within regulations and strategic targeting and by identifying exemptions through its focus on small and medium businesses. But it seems that members opposite would have us wait and go slow in facilitating opportunities for small and medium businesses. The people of WA witnessed eight years of the go-slow approach of the previous Liberal–National government and they rejected it in favour of a government committed to getting on with things. The people of this state elected the McGowan Labor government because we are committed to taking action on jobs for WA. The passing of this bill will enable this government to get on with that commitment. This bill will have a direct and beneficial impact in WA's small and medium business sector, a sector that plays a vital role in the economy of this state.

Small and medium businesses are defined in the bill to be consistent with procurement policies of other Australian jurisdictions, which is a business with under 200 full-time equivalent employees. A staggering 97 per cent of Western Australian businesses fall into the SME category. This bill will open up incredible opportunities for WA businesses and the people they employ. It will enable Western Australian SMEs to grow. It will grow WA jobs. There are approximately 1 948 small businesses in the electorate of Bicton and in some parts of my electorate, as many as 40 per cent of my constituents own a small business. There is no doubt that the Western Australian Jobs Bill 2017 will have a positive impact on the business owners of Bicton, with the flow-on effect of an enlarged workforce to cater for this growth not to be underestimated.

Coming from a world of small business ownership, I am particularly excited about the emphasis on participation. This bill provides something that is critical to successful participation: opportunity and support through the establishment of the industry participation advisory service. This service will provide an incredibly important function in supporting small to medium-sized enterprises with the process of tender for government contracts. This legislation will be supported by regulations and the Western Australian industry participation strategy—the WAIPS. Several checks and balances are also contained within the bill to ensure value, accountability and transparency in the process. Head powers, obligations and requirements of agencies are included in the legislation. This bill sets up WA's SMEs to succeed, and that is something we should all be excited about. I am proud to represent the business owners of Bicton in this place and I am proud to have built a small business with my husband over 15 years throughout both challenge and success. I get what it is to step away from the security of a regular pay cheque and to take a chance and pursue the dream of small business ownership. WA's small businesses employ around 512 000 people, and the passing of this bill will see that already impressive number grow.

The comments made yesterday by the member for Vasse about this government not supporting small business are simply untrue; this bill is proof of that. Her comments are also highly insulting to those small business owners who voted alongside the vast majority of the voters of this state to bring the McGowan government to office. It is likewise an insult to the many small business owners of Bicton who voted for me to become their member of Parliament—a Labor local member in a Labor state government. It is not easy to be a small business owner; I know that firsthand. The SMEs of Bicton and right across this state need two things to thrive: the opportunity to participate and the support system to maximise the potential for success. This bill contains both and I am very pleased to support it. I commend this bill to the house.

MR P.J. RUNDLE (Roe) [1.42 pm]: I rise to make a brief contribution on the Western Australian Jobs Bill 2017. As our leader said yesterday, the Nationals will be supporting the jobs bill, but we have a substantial number of concerns, some of which I will bring to the attention of members. The first one, as the member for Churchlands mentioned, is about the WA industry participation plan, which plans to increase local content on government contracts. The problem is that it has not yet been written and it is very hard for us to ascertain how this will play out as time goes on. That is a real weakness of this jobs bill. The bill requires government agencies to develop a plan on how local industry can compete for government contracts, which will apparently be tabled in Parliament. I certainly look forward to that in the future under this bill. Under this legislation, businesses supplying to government agencies must have a participation plan that will encourage local businesses to compete. Ministers will be able to determine which projects are strategic projects, and that criteria will be covered by the regulations. However, there are still many questions to be answered on that. I remember the member for Kalgoorlie last night talking about this local criteria. Under the Australia and New Zealand Government Procurement Agreement, “local industry” means suppliers of the goods produced or services provided in Western Australia and other states and territories or New Zealand. The most disappointing part about this would probably have to be the many examples and opportunities whereby we can really focus on Western Australia. I would like to bring one of those examples to your attention, Madam Acting Speaker.

I have been speaking to the Minister for Emergency Services about a local issue partly in my electorate and partly in the electorate of the member for Collie–Preston. A business called WA Fire Appliances in Narrogin has supplied our government and the Department of Fire and Emergency Services with firefighting vehicles for many years. It is a fantastic company that employs 12 local people and provides apprenticeships. It has been working with DFES for many years now and built a fantastic local business. It has now been informed, “Sorry; your tender is not up to scratch despite the fact that you have been working for the state for many years. We are looking towards a company in Newcastle.” This contravenes the whole scenario about local jobs. I would be surprised if the member for Collie–Preston, who also has a company in this electorate with 18 employees —

Mr D.T. Punch: This bill will fix that.

Mr P.J. RUNDLE: I would be very concerned about a particular company in our friend the member for Bunbury's region that looks to be losing somewhere in the order of 18 jobs because this local contract will be going to Newcastle in New South Wales. I look forward to the Minister for Emergency Services, the member for Southern River, whom we heard from a few minutes ago, and the Fire and Emergency Services Commissioner intervening, because this comes back to the basics about local employment.

I will make a couple of other points. Under the previous government's Building Local Industry policy, all government-funded projects or contracts over \$20 million or with capital equipment of over \$1 million required an industry participation plan. Apart from the fact that the industry participation plan has not been written, the main difference is that the thresholds, which we have not seen or do not know about, are much smaller and the policy will be legislated, with mandated reporting requirements. Despite playing out a mantra of providing more jobs for Western Australia, the state government does not seem to really understand the opportunity that it is throwing away by cutting important job-creating projects in the regions. I draw the attention of members to one particular project that affects my electorate of Roe. The great southern housing alliance project is, or was, a fantastic project, with nine local governments getting together and providing up to \$4 million of cash and in kind.

The plan was for the federal government to supply a matching \$10 million and the state government, as committed to by the previous cabinet, to also supply about \$11 million. I asked the Premier a few weeks ago whether he was comfortable with sacrificing \$10 million of federal money for this project. The response I got was something in the order of “Are the Nationals happy about Elizabeth Quay?”

That has absolutely no relevance. I am concerned because the federal member for O'Connor, Rick Wilson, has gone in to bat for this project and has managed to source \$10 million of federal funding, but now the state government has bailed and left this whole project in jeopardy. That is a real disappointment. Apparently, there is a \$22 million competitive fund out there in the forward estimates and various aged care and independent living projects now need to put their hat in the ring for that money, when we had this project within arm's reach. We had local jobs and this whole program was set out, but there we go. Now it is totally in jeopardy. Those projects may or may not be able to access that \$22 million in the forward estimates. Who knows whether that will get pushed out further? I do not know. I think this is a great opportunity —

Mr D.J. Kelly: Do you take any responsibility for the state of the finances that you left us with when you complain about these projects?

Mr P.J. RUNDLE: I would love to concentrate on what I am focusing on here, and this is very relevant to the Western Australian Jobs Bill. It is such a contradiction that the government's public sector agency review will cut 3 000 jobs as part of slashing the number of departments from 41 to 25. Straightaway that contravenes the electoral promise with 40 per cent of departments amalgamated or abolished under the plan, which is aimed at creating a more efficient public sector. I understand the concept, but it is contravening the policy for local jobs because 3 000 jobs have gone out the door. Another thing I think has been underestimated is how difficult it is to get these departments working. It will be another three, four or five years down the road before we streamline departments and have them working under this scheme. As the Treasurer said, of course, when we reform government to the extent that it will be reformed, there will be some job losses. He said that the Labor Party made that clear before the election. All I heard about was the 50 000 jobs that were going to be created. I do not know where that is coming from. Another example is the Perth Freight Link project; 3 000 jobs have been lost as a result of the government cancelling the Perth Freight Link project.

Then we look at the payroll tax. Our leader spoke about payroll tax yesterday. It is probably one of the most insidious taxes that we can have. This will probably contribute to another 2 000 or 3 000 jobs being lost. Quickly adding up, somewhere in the order of 8 000 jobs will be lost whereas the Labor Party's pre-election advertising was all about creating 50 000 jobs. I go back to the gold royalty rate increase. The government's lack of understanding of the gold sector is threatening job creation and exploration in the gold sector. The Treasurer told government that he was unaware that thousands of jobs in the gold sector would be lost if the gold royalty was hiked up by Labor. The Premier said that not a single job would be lost if the gold royalty hike got the nod. There seems to be so many contraventions. When we look at the figures that were produced, we see that 3 500 jobs across four of the most marginal goldmines in Western Australia will be lost, just for starters.

I draw members' attention to a couple of the more regional scenarios that are playing out. The community resource centres are very close to my heart, after having been on the Western Australian Regional Development Trust. The member for Bunbury would be well aware of that trust. We did a review into the community resource centres several years ago and made 26 recommendations, but we could certainly see the value of the resource centres in regional communities. Now we have a \$10 million cut over two years to the community resource centres, which I am really worried about. The community resource centres provide significant opportunities for young people in the regions such as traineeship opportunities. Some young people start a job at the CRC and stay there for maybe a year or two and then they move on to the local government. Really, that is a start in life for them. I would certainly like to draw members' attention to that.

Another thing that I would like to point out is that in tandem with this bill the state government needs to change its mindset. I spoke to the Minister for Small Business about this. I know the government is aware of this, but we need to not only improve local jobs, but also police the bullying and the tactics employed by many head contractors and middle contractors, I call them, in government projects. Members are aware of the situation at Perth Children's Hospital. I point them to some examples within my electorate. A couple of the larger hospitals are being redeveloped in the Katanning and Narrogin areas. They are \$35 million projects and when those projects were announced as part of the royalties for regions program, the local communities thought that was fantastic because it was great for the community. They were really looking forward to it but it is turning into a disaster for local contractors because head and middle contractors are now turning into an art form how not to pay locals for genuine work. One scenario is an invoice is received that has a spelling mistake or something that is not quite right, so it is sent back and it might be paid in the next few months. Another scenario is that an invoice is sent and three or four per cent is taken off if the contractor wants it paid within 14 days. This is not good enough when a local contractor has done the work in good faith; we need to have some protection for those contractors. As I said, I have been, and will be, talking to Minister for Small Business.

I know that the government is keen to look into this. As I said, not paying a percentage for work that has been done has been turned into an art form. To be honest, I do not think that it is good enough. Building Management and Works is controlling these projects and it is really important that we look at not only this local jobs bill, which as I said, we support as a National Party, but all the things that go in tandem with it.

I previously referred to some other projects, but I think the Liberal–National government invested in many job-creating projects. Seizing the Opportunity Agriculture had \$350 million worth of projects. The member for Warren–Blackwood, as the previous Minister for Regional Development, would be well aware of that. That project created many local jobs and many opportunities for people in the regions and in the nine development commissions throughout the state. Another example is the \$14 million Water for Food program, of which the Minister for Water is well aware. That was another great job-creating opportunity.

I welcome the Western Australian Jobs Bill, as I said. I would like ministers to lead by example. The Minister for Sport and Recreation has some great opportunities with suppliers for Perth Stadium. As the member for South Perth said last night, I am encouraged by certain elements of local jobs and local companies.

Debate interrupted, pursuant to standing orders.

[Continued on page 4885.]

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

MINISTER FOR POLICE — PRINCIPAL POLICY ADVISER

529. Mr P.A. KATSAMBANIS to the Premier:

Can the Premier confirm whether anyone from his office or from the Department of the Premier and Cabinet has met or discussed with the Minister for Police, or any of her staff, the conflicts of interest arising from the minister's principal policy adviser's candidacy in the City of Bayswater local government elections; and, if so, what were the outcomes of these discussions?

Mr M. McGOWAN replied:

As I understand it, there was a newspaper article about this issue a week or so ago that a staff member of the Minister for Police who is running for election in the local government elections in Bayswater put up a Facebook post, or something of that nature, about a local law and order issue. As I understand it, she was counselled and she took the Facebook post down. As far as I am aware, that is the extent of the matter.

MINISTER FOR POLICE — PRINCIPAL POLICY ADVISER

530. Mr P.A. KATSAMBANIS to the Premier:

I have a supplementary question. What measures or protocols has the Premier put in place either within the Minister for Police's office or across government to prevent similar potential conflicts of interest with ministerial staff who aspire to be members of local government?

Mr M. McGOWAN replied:

I think the staff member of the Minister for Police was counselled on the matter and took a Facebook post down —

Mrs M.H. Roberts interjected.

The SPEAKER: Minister for Police!

Mr M. McGOWAN: — in relation to some issue concerning local CCTV or something of that nature. I cannot remember the exact details, but to me it does not seem like the biggest of issues. Hundreds of people are running —
Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members!

Mr M. McGOWAN: An upper house answer to a question that disclosed all the action that has been taken and the like in relation to this matter was provided to the member for Hillarys on 17 August.

Mr P.A. Katsambanis: That is when I asked the question; the answer was yesterday, only after I had to ask for it again.

Mr M. McGOWAN: Okay. The member was provided with the answer yesterday.

The SPEAKER: Members, do not speak across the chamber, please.

Mr M. McGOWAN: All I say is that in the context of the current local government elections—we know that all sorts of shenanigans go on in local government elections and lots of people say lots of things about other people across the state—this is the sort of thing that happens. But, to me, that officer has been counselled; it is a relatively minor issue.

WESTERN AUSTRALIAN JOBS BILL 2017

531. Ms E. HAMILTON to the Minister for State Development, Jobs and Trade:

I refer to the record unemployment that occurred under the previous Liberal–National government that saw a doubling in the jobless rate in Joondalup.

- (1) How will the McGowan government's Western Australian Jobs Bill maximise employment opportunities for Western Australian workers and businesses?
- (2) How will the bill provide greater levels of local content on government projects?

Mr M. McGOWAN replied:

I thank the member for Joondalup for the question and her support of her local electorate.

- (1)–(2) Indeed, as we speak in this place we are ploughing through the Western Australian Jobs Bill. I thank the opposition for its support of the legislation, although in supporting it, the opposition seems to be very critical of it.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members!

Mr M. McGOWAN: Some of the commentary is interesting, but perhaps if the opposition keeps criticising, I will get to that. We are very keen to ensure higher levels of local content in government work in Western Australia. I think that is what the people of Western Australia want and that is what our bill will provide. Under the existing arrangements, there was inadequate accountability and very little reporting of local content for government contracts. For the first time ever, legislation will apply to all government agencies, including government trading enterprises, and all suppliers. For the first time, participation plans will be written into contracts and those participation plans will have to show the level of local content and contractual requirements that will allow for legal action if they are not complied with. There has never been a requirement for suppliers to show how much local content will be provided in a government contract. Members should remember that in any given year—for instance, in 2015, the Western Australian government spent as much as \$24 billion on goods, services and works—the government spends a very significant amount. Ensuring higher levels of local content ensures more local work, as is done in other states. That is what we are about—making sure there are more local jobs.

I went to a Chamber of Commerce and Industry of Western Australia breakfast this morning at which a local fabricator stood up and said that he was thrilled with the legislation that we are putting in place. He was very excited. We support local manufacturers and fabricators. We know we produce world-best standards and provide world-best quality in Western Australia. We understand that Western Australian businesses and workers can provide that. I was absolutely thrilled to meet him. His name was Ian.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Scarborough!

Mr M. McGOWAN: He was very excited by our legislation because he knew, as does the Western Australian business community, that under the former arrangements there was not enough local content; under Labor there will be increased levels of local content.

Point of Order

Mr D.T. REDMAN: Mr Speaker, the Premier seemed to be citing from an official document. I wonder whether you could ask him to table it, please.

The SPEAKER: Premier, is that an official document?

Mr M. McGowan: No; and I wasn't quoting from it.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Premier, I just wanted to know whether it is an official document.

Mr M. McGowan: No.

The SPEAKER: It is not an official document.

MINISTER FOR POLICE — JOHN GANGELL

532. Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP to the Minister for Police:

Can the minister please advise the house of the role of Mr John Gangell in her ministerial office and whether in his role he has sought information from WA Police in relation to his elected position as the Mayor of the Town of Bassendean?

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS replied:

Mr Gangell is a policy officer. What was the second part of the member's question?

Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup: Whether in his role he has requested any information from WA Police.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Whether he has requested any information—he is a —

Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup: I'll read it again: whether he sought any information from WA Police in relation to his elected position as Mayor of the Town of Bassendean?

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Mr Speaker, I am happy to answer that.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members!

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Guess what? He is the police policy officer; he no doubt requests information from WA Police.

Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Dawesville!

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: I am unaware of him asking any questions of WA Police about his role as mayor.

MINISTER FOR POLICE — JOHN GANGELL

533. Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP to the Minister for Police:

I have a supplementary question. Will the minister guarantee to the house that Mr Gangell is and will be prevented from using confidential information he gets from the police portfolio in his role —

Several members interjected.

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: I will repeat my supplementary question. Will the minister guarantee —

Mr W.J. Johnston interjected.

The SPEAKER: Minister for Mines and Petroleum, I call you to order for the first time.

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: Will the minister guarantee to the house that Mr John Gangell is and will be prevented from using confidential information relating to the police portfolio in his elected position as Mayor of the Town of Bassendean?

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS replied:

I have a couple of points to make here. It seems that the Liberal Party, after having been decimated at the state election, is now trying to re-energise itself somehow in local government politics. It is really focused on it. I make the point that Mr Gangell is not up for election. He has been Mayor of Bassendean for some years. He has been on the Bassendean council, I guess, for about 10 years. He is a well-respected and —

Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup: He accesses information relating to WA Police.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: The member for Dawesville will get his answer.

The SPEAKER: Member for Dawesville!

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: He is a well-respected person in local government. He has been re-elected as mayor several times over with the support of people from different political persuasions.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members, your minister is on her feet. Members over here, just listen to the answer, please.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: The member for Dawesville would be aware, given that he was a public servant working in the Premier's office and actively engaged on Liberal Party campaigns such as the Hasluck campaign and other campaigns over the years, that there is a code of practice that all employees —

Several members interjected.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Am I able to answer the question, Mr Speaker, without all this interruption?

The SPEAKER: Yes. Go on.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: There is a code of practice that all employees —

Mr A. Krsticevic interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Carine!

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Am I able to get a sentence out without an interjection? Mr Speaker, are you going to continue to allow them to interject?

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Hillarys, I call you to order for the first time. Members, just let the minister answer the question. We will get on to the next one.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Thanks.

There is a code of practice that all employees of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet are obliged to abide by. Mr Gangel will abide by it.

Dr M.D. Nahan: Has he?

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Has he? Of course he has abided by it! He is required to.

The SPEAKER: Minister, the question is over.

RAILCARS — 2017–18 STATE BUDGET

534. Ms C.M. ROWE to the Minister for Transport:

I refer to the \$322 million committed in the McGowan government's first budget for new railcars.

- (1) How will this government ensure that there are opportunities for local workers and local businesses in the procurement and manufacturing of these railcars?
- (2) Can the minister outline how this will contrast with the previous Liberal–National government's failure to utilise local content on past manufacturing of railcars?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI replied:

I thank the member for this question.

- (1)–(2) We know that the Liberal Party is anti–WA jobs. It resisted calls to bring that bridge back to WA to be built. It resisted getting more funds for WA.

Dr M.D. Nahan: You did not get any more funds. You just redirected them.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: It resisted the redirection of the \$1.2 billion in funds. It wanted the federal government to rip it out, as I recall. There is one constant theme. It is anti–us getting more WA jobs. That is the only constant theme that it has. We have allocated, over the forward estimates, \$322 million and a total allocation of over \$500 million for greater local content in our rail manufacturing. Under the Liberal government, it was two per cent in WA. The Leader of the Opposition was promoting that Queensland was going totally offshore. We know the problems that the Queensland government has now encountered with the new rolling stock. We do not want that mistake. We will be ordering over 100 new railcars.

Mr D.C. Nalder: C series?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The member for Bateman has interjected. He said that \$1.2 billion was allocated for 300 new railcars. Do members remember that? That was \$1.2 billion, of which \$5 million was allocated in the budget. Six months later, the now Leader of the Opposition took that whole prospect away and the \$1.2 billion evaporated. No new railcars were ordered for the expansion of the network. I do not know whom members opposite were talking to.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members! Member for Bateman!

Dr M.D. Nahan: Fabricate!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Fabricate? Yes, we are. Local fabrication—finally!

Mr D.T. Redman: Mr Speaker —

The SPEAKER: No, she is still going.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I was just processing the fabrication line. I could not believe the Leader of the Opposition, who did not fabricate anything when he was over here, is now saying that we need to fabricate more; we agree.

Dr M.D. Nahan: What about the stadium?

The SPEAKER: Leader of the Opposition!

Dr M.D. Nahan: What about the stadium?

The SPEAKER: Leader of the Opposition!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: We want to fabricate more and more.

Dr M.D. Nahan: One hundred per cent steel fabrication of the stadium!

The SPEAKER: Leader of the Opposition, you said it three times and I warned you twice. I call you to order for the first time.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Members opposite are proud that they built the stadium here. It is not as though they could have built it over there and transported it on a ship. They had to build it here.

We have had a lot of positive talks with industry. Again, I do not know whom members opposite were talking to, but there are manufacturers keen to participate. Next week there will be another industry meeting, putting together the key manufacturers and local suppliers to see what opportunities there are for local suppliers to engage in the railcar procurement strategy. We have a plan. It is a plan about promoting WA jobs. All the opposition wants to do is knock, knock, knock and wreck, wreck, wreck!

MINISTER FOR HOUSING — FINANCIAL RETURN

535. Mr D.T. REDMAN to the Premier:

I refer to the financial return submitted by the Minister for Housing.

- (1) Is the Premier aware that the minister attached an addendum to his financial return identifying a failure to declare ownership of four properties for the period 25 March to 30 June 2010 and failing to declare income from these properties, failing to declare ownership of two properties from 1 July 2012 to 30 June 2013, failing to declare rental income from three properties in the period 25 March 2010 to 30 June 2010, and failing to declare income from one property in the return period from 1 July 2012 to 30 June 2013?
- (2) Was the Premier aware of these significant declaration failures prior to appointing the Minister for Housing as one of his ministers?

Mr M. McGOWAN replied:

- (1)–(2) Honestly, what is the member for Warren–Blackwood doing? Each day he comes in here and he muckrakes. What is he doing? Why does he not go and do some policy work?

He is referring to the minister correcting a declaration four years ago when he was not a minister—when he was an opposition backbencher. He corrected a declaration. That is what we should do. If an error is made, the declaration is corrected. We can go through —

Mr D.T. Redman: Were you aware of it?

Mr M. McGOWAN: No, of course I was not.

If the member for Warren–Blackwood wants to, we can go through all the declarations and find where someone made a correction. What turns on it? He was not a minister at the time. He had no executive decision-making capacity. The member has trawled through the records back to 2010 to see that the minister corrected a record. That is the member for Warren–Blackwood’s big attack! This mob’s big attack is some obscure Facebook post by some staffer I have barely even heard of. Honestly! Why does the opposition not do some policy work and come out with some decent ideas for the state?

MINISTER FOR HOUSING — FINANCIAL RETURN

536. Mr D.T. REDMAN to the Premier:

I have a supplementary question. Did the minister declare these previously undeclared interests in his ministerial declaration on becoming a minister in March this year; and, if so, will the Premier table a copy of that ministerial declaration?

Mr M. McGOWAN replied:

I have no idea what the member for Warren–Blackwood is referring to—that someone needs to declare something they did not declare seven years ago and declare the fact that they did not declare it on some declaration they put in at the start of this year? Apparently, that is the argument that the member is putting.

Mr D.T. Redman: Did he declare it to you in his ministerial declaration?

The SPEAKER: Member for Warren–Blackwood, you have asked the question.

Mr M. McGOWAN: Honestly, if the member for Warren–Blackwood wants, we will get the staff to go through all his declarations and find where he put in place an addendum—if that is what he wants us to do? That appears to be the approach he wants to adopt. Why does the National Party not go and do a little bit of work rather than just muckrake?

BROOME REGIONAL PRISON — UPGRADE

537. Ms J. FARRER to the Minister for Corrective Services:

I refer to the \$2.7 million upgrade to Broome Regional Prison.

- (1) Why is an upgrade needed?
- (2) What will it involve?
- (3) How will the work benefit local contractors and local workers?

Mr F.M. LOGAN replied:

I thank the member for Kimberley for the question. It is of course a critical one for her and her constituents in the Kimberley.

- (1)–(3) Once again, we have a situation in prisons in which the Labor government is left to clean up the mess left by the previous Liberal–National government. If members look at Broome Regional Prison, as I did earlier this year, they will see the appalling state that Broome Regional Prison was left in by the previous government. Why was it left in that condition? It is because the previous government did not know whether it wanted it open or closed. In 2015, the previous Liberal government indicated it was going to close Broome Regional Prison. It was only after a year or so it realised it is the third-busiest remand prison in Western Australia; it would be impossible to close. Therefore, the previous government then indicated that it might keep it open. There was this continuous hiatus for the people of Broome, the people who worked in the prison of Broome and of course the prisoners in Broome wondering whether that prison was going to stay open or was not going to stay open. As result of that, the maintenance and any change in that prison dropped off completely. It was a pigsty when I got there; it was absolutely disgraceful. The previous government should hang its head in shame that it put prisoners in there. As a result of the claim by my department during the budget process, \$2.7 million has been allocated to Broome Regional Prison. That will allow us to put in a new, more secure prisoner reception area and new cells for female prisoners; extend cyclone perimeter fences and new razor wire for the security of the external part of the prison; and expand outer-cell amenity for the maximum-security unit, which was absolutely disgraceful, leaving people in the maximum security unit with an amenity area that was not much bigger than a dog cage. Accommodation upgrades include new bunks, mattresses, electrical fittings, ablutions, radio upgrades and mobile duress alarms, and a new secure visitors area will be installed as part of this upgrade.

In terms of the work that it will generate for the Broome and Kimberley community, up to 70 per cent of all the work over this \$2.7 million allocation will be made available and hopefully picked up by local contractors—unlike the contracts that failed to materialise under the opposition’s government. Does the member for Nedlands remember when he was the Minister for Housing and I came into this house time after time begging him through MPIs, grievances and questions on notice to actually give work to local contractors in the Kimberley? His promise was, “Oh, yes. I’ll have a look at that and I will get it fixed.” It never happened. At least under WA Labor, we will get local jobs in the Kimberley and we will have contracts for local businesses in the Kimberley at last.

COMMISSIONER OF POLICE — SELECTION PROCESS

538. Mrs L.M. HARVEY to the Minister for Police:

- (1) Do you agree with the highly respected former Commissioner of Police, Dr Karl O’Callaghan, that the credibility of Public Sector Commission’s values and independence evaporated as a result of political interference in the Commissioner of Police selection process?
- (2) Do you also agree with Dr O’Callaghan that the questioning of the selection process by the member for Burns Beach amounts to political interference?

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS replied:

You will note, Mr Speaker, that the question started with the words, “Do you agree.” The member is clearly seeking an opinion, which you will be aware is against the standing orders.

COMMISSIONER OF POLICE — SELECTION PROCESS

539. Mrs L.M. HARVEY to the Minister for Police:

I have a supplementary question. I cannot believe the minister’s response. The minister is given an opportunity to correct the record. Who should the community agree with —

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members! Please, I want to hear the supplementary.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Here is the minister’s opportunity to place some confidence in her leadership in the Minister for Police portfolio by putting on the record who the public should trust—should they trust the minister or the highly respected former Commissioner of Police?

The SPEAKER: That is not a supplementary question.

HEALTH — INFORMATION PORTAL

540. Mrs J.M.C. STOJKOVSKI to the Minister for Health:

I refer to this government's commitment to putting patients first and ensuring they are fully informed about how their hospitals are operating.

- (1) What is this government doing to improve transparency in our health system and ensure vital information is available to the public?
- (2) Why is it so important?

Mr R.H. COOK replied:

(1)–(2) As they say, I broke some bones in my hands, but on the other hand, I am in good health!

Several members interjected.

Mr R.H. COOK: That is all; thank you!

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Minister, that was very close to a point of order, but I will let you off.

Mr R.H. COOK: I would like to thank the member for the question. It is important that we put patients first and part of putting patients first is about creating a transparent, responsive, world-leading health system. One of the frustrations I had as the shadow Minister for Health—I am sure that the current shadow minister might reflect on this—is that under the previous mob, we were constantly trying to seek information about how well the system was working. Unfortunately, the information was difficult to find and difficult to navigate. There was an absolute lack of transparency about the way the health system was working on behalf of the patients of Western Australia. We are going to make some changes so that we can put patients first, make sure our health system is transparent and ensure that the system is operating in the interests of the people it is there to serve. I am very pleased to say that we will move to a single portal or dashboard of information for the information we put out there. We want to make sure that patients, at a glance, can understand how long they will be waiting in an emergency department, how long it will take to see an outpatient specialist, or how long they will have to wait for their surgery. This is all information to which they are entitled. I cannot explain the number of times that we were left waiting, under the previous government, for basic information to be uploaded onto the Department of Health's website.

Mr W.R. Marmion interjected.

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

Mr R.H. COOK: Often when that information was loaded up, around elective surgery and so forth, it was in detailed PDF documents that were difficult to navigate. As I said, we will move to a single portal, a dashboard, of the health department's performance to make sure all this information is available, not just for members of Parliament who know where to find it, but to average punters who want to know how well their health system is working on their behalf.

As part of the first stage of this process, by early next year, we are aiming to see improved transparency access and navigation through the availability of existing publicly available performance reports via a dedicated "our performance" webpage; presentation of the elective surgery waitlist report in an easily navigable and accessible webpage, not through lengthy PDF documents; and a state implementation, replacing these documents with a web-based portal that allows patients to see current information—information that they can use to boost their health literacy and use the system better. As we know, we have been spending some time fixing up the mess left to us by the previous mob. We are going to hold ourselves to a higher standard—a standard that will see our health system turned into a transparent, world-leading, adaptive and responsive health system that will act and put patients first.

MINISTER FOR REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT — WAVE ENERGY PROJECT —
CONFLICT OF INTEREST

541. Ms M.J. DAVIES to the Premier:

Some notice had been provided to the Premier. I refer to the Albany wave energy project.

- (1) Was the Premier aware that one of his most senior candidates had an interest in Carnegie Clean Energy on 24 January 2017 when he identified Carnegie Clean Energy as the likely proponent of this project?
- (2) When cabinet approved the total funding amount for the Albany wave energy project —
 - (a) did the Minister for Regional Development advise the Premier of any potential conflict of interest;
 - (b) did the Premier make a determination on whether the minister had a potential conflict; and
 - (c) did the minister withdraw from the cabinet room while the relevant item was under discussion?

- (3) Given that the final decision on the allocation of funds to Carnegie Clean Energy did not go to cabinet —
- (a) who made the final decision;
 - (b) what was the Minister for Regional Development's involvement in the process; and
 - (c) did the minister at any point raise with the Premier her potential conflict of interest?

Mr M. McGOWAN replied:

I thank the member for the notice that was given. Before answering this question, I would like to remind the house that at no point did Minister MacTiernan have a stake in or own shares in Carnegie while making any decision in relation to it. I would also like to remind the house that she donated the shares to charity prior to being sworn in both to the ministry and to Parliament to avoid even the perception of a conflict of interest.

- (1) Under the standing orders, I am under no obligation to answer matters occurring before the government was sworn in. However, it is worth noting that WA Labor's release mentioned Carnegie as "a likely" not "the likely" proponent. It is also worth noting that at no point was —

Dr M.D. Nahan: She's the only one who had the potential to do that, and you know it.

The SPEAKER: And I am the only one who has the potential to call you to order, Leader of the Opposition, so I call you to order for the second time.

Mr M. McGOWAN: It is also worth noting that at no point was the then candidate a decision-maker on opposition policy as matters were handled by me as shadow Minister for Regional Development and the member for Cannington as shadow Minister for Energy.

- (2) Not applicable. As the minister donated her shares to charity prior to being a cabinet minister or elected to Parliament, no such conflict of interest existed.
- (3) (a) The final decision was made following a competitive tender process that was evaluated by an independent evaluation panel. The evaluation panel consisted of five voting members from the Department of Primary Industries and Regional Development—DPIRD—the Public Utilities Office and the Great Southern Development Commission, and was overseen in a review and advisory capacity by Department of Finance Government Procurement. The evaluation panel made a final recommendation for selection, which was approved by the deputy director general of DPIRD. The director general DPIRD executed a financial assistance agreement with Carnegie for the state's contribution of \$15.75 million.
- (b) Following the recommendation of the evaluation panel and deputy director general approval, DPIRD secured the minister's approval to negotiate on the contract terms and execute the final agreement.
- (c) As the shares were donated prior to her being either a minister or a member of Parliament, there was no potential conflict of interest to raise.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ELECTIONS

542. Mr J.N. CAREY to the Minister for Local Government:

I refer to the local government elections currently underway.

- (1) How many candidates have nominated?
- (2) What is the level of female representation?
- (3) Can the minister advise the house of any concerns relating to how some campaigns have been run?

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN replied:

- (1)–(3) I thank the member for Perth for the question and acknowledge the great reforming processes that he put in place when he was the Mayor of Vincent and his leadership.

It is important to note that we are coming to the end of the local government elections. On 21 October, throughout Western Australia, we will see the conclusion of an election process that has been for me, as the minister, very interesting. I will make some brief comments about some of the things that have concerned me with regard to these 2017 elections.

There are 1 388 candidates who have nominated for this election. This is a record number of people who have put themselves forward. I congratulate them and I acknowledge them for putting themselves forward for their communities, and I wish them well. The number of women, though, is 481. It remains low. It is an area that, again, I know has been a challenge for local government for a number of years, but we need to change this. We need to have greater representation of women and we need to have greater representation of diversity, so that we have councils that reflect the diversity of their communities. We also need more younger people. I unashamedly say that: we need more younger people.

There have been number of examples—in fact, some members have highlighted examples from their local constituencies and local government areas that they represent in their electorates of some concerning things that have occurred in campaigns over the last month or so. Again, the example of the young woman in Mosman Park. A 21-year-old young woman who wants to put herself forward—as she should—and who heeded the call, if you like, for greater diversity and for young people. She put herself forward and then got slammed through social media by some very, very dubious—in many respects anonymous—groups that attacked her because she was simply putting forward that she believes there should be more young people in local government. There have been a number of examples. I think in a number of electorates candidates have been attacking each other, some sitting members of council up for re-election have been having slanging matches—that is inappropriate—and very, very disturbing social media attacks. It is unacceptable.

Unfortunately, I have a great concern that this sort of behaviour actually has the potential to intimidate people from putting themselves forward. Indeed, if we want greater diversity, it may impede people in our communities who we know have great skills, great potential and great opportunity. They may in fact be deterred from putting themselves forward. I am concerned.

Member for Perth, one of the things I am going to do after this weekend, after the elections are concluded, is call a roundtable meeting with the department, the Western Australian Local Government Association and local government professionals—and request that the Electoral Commissioner be at that meeting—because I think we need to talk about this campaign we have seen in the last month or so, which concludes on Saturday. I want to talk about what we need to do collectively to try to address some of this serious stuff that has been occurring, because it will only deter good people from putting themselves forward and it will have an impact on what we know already are very, very low turnout and participation rates. We want more people participating in the voting process in local government elections, and we want more people from diverse backgrounds contributing to their communities by putting their hands up. If they are going to be deterred by this sort of behaviour, it needs to be dealt with.

ROAD SAFETY COMMISSIONER — KIM PAPALIA

543. Mrs L.M. HARVEY to the Minister for Road Safety:

Why did the minister mislead the house when she clearly supported the forced removal of Mr Kim Papalia from the position of Road Safety Commissioner well before 27 June?

Ms M.M. Quirk interjected.

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

Ms M.M. Quirk interjected.

The SPEAKER: I call you to order for the second time, member for Girrawheen.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS replied:

These are matters that I have answered in this house before. Obviously, there is some attempt by the opposition to throw a bit of mud in my direction today. I think that is most unfortunate. I certainly did not set out to get rid of Mr Kim Papalia; he is someone who has my respect. I do question when we send correspondence to the opposition whether they sought his permission to make public that correspondence in this house, because I do not think they did.

Dr M.D. Nahan: Answer the question.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: The member can answer that if he likes, but I do not think the opposition did Mr Papalia any service by revealing in this house the correspondence that he made with the Leader of the Opposition. Mr Kim Papalia made his decision not to continue in the role of his own accord without any pushing from me.

ROAD SAFETY COMMISSIONER — KIM PAPALIA

544. Mrs L.M. HARVEY to the Minister for Road Safety:

I have a supplementary question. Given that the minister has misled the house with her answer, will she now resign as Minister for Police?

The SPEAKER: That is not a supplementary question.

Withdrawal of Remark

Dr A.D. BUTI: The member for Scarborough made an accusation that the minister misled this house and I ask her to withdraw that.

The SPEAKER: Could you withdraw that, please, member for Scarborough.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I withdraw.

Mr F.M. Logan interjected.

The SPEAKER: You should keep quiet, Minister for Emergency Services. I call you to order.

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS SYSTEM — REVIEW

545. Mr S.A. MILLMAN to the Minister for Commerce and Industrial Relations:

I refer to this government's review into the state's industrial relations system. Can the minister outline to the house why a review is needed and can he correct the misrepresentations that have been made by the member for Hillarys?

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON replied:

I am very happy to answer the question from the member for Mount Lawley, who had a distinguished career in law before coming to Parliament and is now an excellent representative of the people of Mt Lawley. We recently announced our review into the industrial relations system in Western Australia. That was an election commitment that we made. We promised to do this at the time of the election. One of the terms of reference is we have requested the reviewer to review the definition of "employee" in the Industrial Relations Act and in the Minimum Conditions of Employment Act with the objective of ensuring comprehensive coverage for all employees. I make the point that this is very important, because the International Labour Organization Protocol of 2014 to the Forced Labour Convention, 1930 requires that relevant labour laws apply to all workers in all sectors of the economy. However, in Western Australia there are workers who are excluded from our industrial relations system, that being employees engaged by homeowners in their own house. Unfortunately, Western Australia prevents the commonwealth from ratifying that ILO convention.

Mr P.A. Katsambanis: Rubbish.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: It is amazing that the member for Hillarys says "rubbish". That is the conclusion of the review done by the former Department of Commerce on behalf of Hon Michael Mischin when he was Minister for Commerce.

Mr P.A. Katsambanis interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Hillarys!

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: That was the conclusion of the review by the Department of Commerce under the former government. The member for Hillarys knows this because I have sent him a copy of the correspondence and a briefing note. I have sent him a copy of a letter from Hon Michaelia Cash, a copy of the letter I sent back and a copy of the briefing note from the agency that outlines the issues.

Ms M.M. Quirk interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Girrawheen!

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: Not only that, I also note that the Chamber of Commerce and Industry of Western Australia has welcomed the government's review of industrial relations laws. There has been no review of the act since 2002. It is appropriate and right that this takes place. The conspiracy theories on the other side know no bounds. The few people who read the member for Hillarys' opinion piece would have seen it dripping with conspiracy theories. Another term of reference that I want to draw to the attention of the chamber is the third one, which states —

Consider the inclusion of an equal remuneration provision in the Industrial Relations Act 1979 with the objective of facilitating the conduct of equal remuneration cases and other initiatives in the Western Australian Industrial Relations Commission.

Having been here on Thursday when the member for Carine asked about the salary entitlements of my wife, as if somehow that was an issue of concern to me or my behaviour —

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members!

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: The idea that my wife's salary, which is determined in accordance with the provisions that every member of Parliament's salary, is —

Mrs L.M. Harvey: Don't deny that's how you are double dipping.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: The member for Scarborough says "double dipping". Apparently, if someone's wife has a paid job, it is double dipping, according to the member for Scarborough.

Mrs L.M. Harvey interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member!

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: I would expect that the double dipping referred to was my wife getting paid a salary. I would expect the Liberal Party —

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order, members!

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: I have had four members of the opposition apologise to me so far. I expect all the others to apologise as well.

Mrs L.M. Harvey interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Scarborough! I call you to order for the first time.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: I also expect the Liberal Party to support an equal remuneration provision being included in the IR act so that we can finally get to the bottom of the problems of gender inequality in this state.

COMMISSIONER OF POLICE — SELECTION PROCESS

546. **Mr P.A. KATSAMBANIS to the Minister for Police:**

The highly respected former police commissioner has said today that the process of appointing a new police commissioner eroded public confidence due to the perception of political interference.

Ms M.M. Quirk interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Girrawheen.

Mr P.A. KATSAMBANIS: Given the well-known actions of the member for Burns Beach in relation to this appointment, how can the minister assure the Western Australian public that there was no such political interference?

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS replied:

It is good that the member for Hillarys marina has at last asked me a question on the issue. He has done a better job of actually asking —

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: At least, unlike his colleague the member for Scarborough, he knows how to ask a question, so well done on that.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members!

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: How can I assure the public?

Mr I.C. Blayney interjected.

The SPEAKER: I heard you the first two times, member for Geraldton.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: I can easily assure the public because I know we went through that process with the utmost probity. I have made statements in the house, which are correct, that there is no requirement for any government to utilise the Public Sector Commissioner process and so forth in appointing a Commissioner of Police. I engaged with the Public Sector Commission and I also engaged with the Corruption and Crime Commissioner. As I have put on record, I spoke to Mr McKechnie from the CCC within a couple of weeks of us taking office and talked through that process.

Mrs L.M. Harvey interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Scarborough.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: It is interesting that we have an interjection from the member for Scarborough. Did the former minister utilise that process when she reappointed Mr O'Callaghan or when she appointed any of the Deputy Commissioners of Police—did she? No, she did not. It is interesting, is it not? I have met a higher standard than the Liberal Party has ever met when it comes to the appointment of the Commissioner of Police.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members, please, it is the last question. Let us get it over and done with.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Nobody was excluded from the process. Everybody had the opportunity to make their case before the panel, and at the end of that process we have one of the most highly respected people in policing in Australia as our Commissioner of Police. He has a distinguished record of policing. He has over 10 years' experience as Deputy Commissioner of Police and a 30-year career with the WA police force.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: On top of that, for the last three and a half years he headed the Australian Criminal Intelligence Commission. That is a very important role that requires someone of the utmost probity and skill. He served with distinction in that role and he will serve with distinction in the role of Commissioner of Police. The only people really undermining him are members opposite.

COMMISSIONER OF POLICE — SELECTION PROCESS

547. Mr P.A. KATSAMBANIS to the Minister for Police:

I have a supplementary question. Given that the highly respected former Commissioner of Police has no personal gain or personal benefit from making these statements, why should we take and the public of Western Australia take the minister's word ahead of his word?

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS replied:

The point members opposite fail to get here is that we have had a proper process. I involved the Public Sector Commissioner in it and I involved the Corruption and Crime Commission in it. People can have 100 per cent confidence in their Commissioner of Police. Members opposite can prattle about something they read on Twitter or heard somewhere else but they are the facts. We went through a proper process. Someone of the highest standards has been appointed to that position. I have met standards that the member for Hillarys' government and earlier Liberal governments never even contemplated. When members opposite were in office, they appointed commissioner after commissioner without going through the public sector process and without utilising section 90 of the CCC. That section can be utilised by ministers when they appoint deputy commissioners or assistant commissioners or, indeed, any senior police, something they chose not to do. I might note that the former government, without any process, re-appointed Dr Karl O'Callaghan on a couple of occasions without going through any process.

**PAY-ROLL TAX AMENDMENT (DEBT AND DEFICIT REMEDIATION) BILL 2017 —
PAY-ROLL TAX ASSESSMENT AMENDMENT (DEBT AND DEFICIT REMEDIATION) BILL 2017 —
EXPLANATORY MEMORANDA — CORRECTION**

Statement by Speaker

THE SPEAKER (Mr P.B. Watson): I have received advice that the explanatory memoranda for the Pay-roll Tax Amendment (Debt and Deficit Remediation) Bill 2017 and the Pay-roll Tax Assessment Amendment (Debt and Deficit Remediation) Bill 2017 tabled on 12 October 2017 were in draft form. Although the drafts included example calculations with figures rounded to four decimal places, the revised EMs, whilst not materially different, provide the same example calculations with figures truncated at four decimal places, in accordance with the legislation. I have authorised the explanatory memoranda for the bills to be replaced with the final version of the documents and for the website to be updated accordingly. Members who have previously obtained a copy of those documents are advised to obtain the updated versions from the Assembly office.

COMMISSIONER OF POLICE — SELECTION PROCESS — MINISTER FOR POLICE

Standing Orders Suspension — Motion

MRS L.M. HARVEY (Scarborough — Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [2.51 pm] — without notice: I move —

That so much of standing orders be suspended as is necessary to enable the following motion to be moved forthwith —

- (1) That this house refers the Minister for Police to the Procedure and Privileges Standing Committee for report back to the house by 30 November 2017 for misleading the house regarding the employment of former Road Safety Commissioner Kim Papalia.
- (2) Calls on the Premier to suspend the Minister for Police from cabinet pending the outcome of an investigation by the Procedure and Privileges Committee.

The opposition is moving this motion at this time, and I note —

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order, members! This is an important motion; please everyone listen.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Thank you, Mr Speaker. We think it is of the utmost importance. It is important that we suspend standing orders to debate this motion. I note that the manager of opposition business is now discussing this matter with the Leader of the House.

The opposition has moved this suspension of standing orders today because of the chaos and dysfunction we see under the stewardship of the Minister for Police; Road Safety. Everyone saw the front page of the newspaper today. None of us on this side of the house disagrees with the appointment of Mr Chris Dawson as Commissioner of Police. However, we disagree with the political interference in the process and the destabilising effect that has had on the police force in Western Australia and on community confidence with respect to the appointment of the Commissioner of Police. The commissioner's appointment should be beyond reproach. There should never be any question whatsoever as to the validity of such an appointment.

In addition, the opposition has learnt that the Minister for Police has deliberately misled this house regarding the appointment of former Road Safety Commissioner Mr Kim Papalia. The opposition has obtained documents under the freedom of information process from the Minister for Police, a document, I might add, that reflects incredibly

badly on the Premier's office because we have had to appeal to the Freedom of Information Commissioner to have the Premier release documents subject to the FOI act.

Several members interjected.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Listen to the rabble over there. This is important. This is about gold-standard transparency that members opposite promised.

The SPEAKER: Members on this side, the debate on the motion is to be held in silence. Member for Scarborough, talk to the motion, please.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Thank you, Mr Speaker. We know that the Minister for Road Safety knew as early as 8 June and supported the removal of the Road Safety Commissioner well in advance of 27 June. The minister came into this place and said on 26 and 27 June that she had no knowledge of the Road Safety Commissioner moving on and that he was doing that of his own volition. We know from information we have received from the Public Sector Commissioner that on 8 June, the minister was well aware of the Road Safety Commissioner being moved on with her support.

The minister has misled the house. She has failed since 27 June to go back over her own records and at the first available opportunity come to this place and correct the record and apologise to the house for misleading the house and the community of Western Australia in such an abhorrent way about the removal of such a high-profile person from that position. She has refused to do that. There is chaos and dysfunction in the police portfolio. Look at the police officers. For the first time in years, they are taking industrial action as a result of a broken 1.5 per cent pay rise promise by the minister. It was okay before the election but after the election, no, all bets are off. Members opposite will say anything to get elected, but promises are not worth anything if one is a police officer in this state.

Then we have the minister's failure to secure vital funding for the purchase of stab-proof vests for police officers—absolute failure—and there is a range of other issues.

I have just been informed that the government has agreed to a suspension of standing orders with a time-limited debate, so I will sit down and make further comment on this suspension and the substantive motion after the manager of opposition business has stood.

Mr D.A. Templeman: I'm not the manager of opposition business.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Leader of the House, sorry.

Standing Orders Suspension — Amendment to Motion

MR D.A. TEMPLEMAN (Mandurah — Leader of the House) [2.57 pm]: I move to add to the motion, after "forthwith" —

subject to the debate being limited to 20 minutes for government members and 20 minutes for non-government members

In moving that amendment, I need to remind the opposition that the normal convention is to give some notice of a suspension. That was the case when we sat on that side.

An opposition member interjected.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: The member was never in here so he would not know. The former Leader of the House in the previous government was always given notice—at least 10 minutes, if not more—that there was an intention to suspend standing orders. I hope that that will be the agreed practice between the government and the opposition in the future, so I formally add that to the motion.

Amendment put and passed.

Standing Orders Suspension — Motion, as Amended

The SPEAKER: Members, as this is a motion without notice to suspend standing orders, it will need the support of an absolute majority for it to proceed. If I hear a dissentient voice, I will be required to divide the Assembly.

Question put and passed with an absolute majority.

Motion

MR P.A. KATSAMBANIS (Hillarys) [2.58 pm]: I formally move the motion.

This motion is not something that the opposition has moved lightly. However, we have sat back and watched complete and utter dysfunction and chaos in the Minister for Police's office and in her handling of a critical portfolio such as police in Western Australia at a very important time. We have seen confidence in this minister erode. Unfortunately, when public confidence in the minister erodes, it reflects on the very police force that we,

as a community, need to support, and whose support we need back in return to keep us safe. We have seen the dysfunction unfold, but we now have evidence that on top of the dysfunction, this minister has directly misled the house in an attempt to deny the Parliament and the public of Western Australia proper scrutiny around the dismissal of Kim Papalia from the position of Road Safety Commissioner. On 27 June 2017 in this place, the minister said —

I say earnestly that I had anticipated that Mr Papalia would continue in that role, and continue to be Road Safety Commissioner, and that we would continue to have a Road Safety Commission.

She further said —

No pressure has been put on Mr Papalia. My belief was that we were working well together and that he would continue in the role.

On 27 June, the minister wanted us to believe that she walked into the office that morning and found out—around 26 or 27 June—from Mr Papalia that he no longer wanted to be Road Safety Commissioner. That is what the minister told this house. However, the opposition looked into this, as members in opposition do. We thought, “Let’s check to see if we can take this minister at her word.” It has been difficult with this minister. There has been so much dysfunction and chaos in her portfolio, sometimes we do not know where to start. We had a look and it transpired that on 8 June 2017, the Public Sector Commissioner, Mr Wauchope, wrote to the Minister for Police; Road Safety in a letter headed “Transfer of CEO and Interim Acting Arrangements”. The Public Sector Commissioner wrote to the minister —

... it is my intention to transfer Mr Kim Papalia, Commissioner of Road Safety, Road Safety Commission to the performance of other functions in the Senior Executive Service for the remainder of his term of appointment, which expires on 27 October 2020.

Then Mr Wauchope further said to the minister in this correspondence —

Based on our previous discussions, I understand that you support this arrangement.

On 8 June, Mr Wauchope confirms in his letter that he and the Minister for Police; Road Safety had had discussions about the position of Mr Papalia.

Mr T.J. Healy: Pap-ah-lia.

Mr P.A. KATSAMBANIS: Pap-ah-lia, okay—to-mah-to, to-may-to. When we talk about mispronunciation and names, I am the expert in this place. I have heard many pronunciations of my name, but do not deflect from the real substance of the issue here. Prior to 28 June, this minister not only knew there was a transfer in place, but also supported the arrangements to remove the Road Safety Commissioner from his position and send him to Coventry to do other duties; it is quite clear. On 27 June, the minister said in here, “What a surprise to me. I was working well with the commissioner. I thought we could continue, carry on, and work really, really well”, when in the background, the minister had been having meetings with the Public Sector Commissioner to work out how to remove the Road Safety Commissioner and where to place him, and not only that, there had been correspondence and discussions. It goes to show that this minister treats the Parliament of Western Australia with utter contempt. If this is not an issue for the Standing Committee on Procedure and Privileges, I do not know what is. It is here in black and white; there is no argument. If this minister had performed her duties fantastically well in the rest of her portfolio, we would have said, “It was a slip. It was an excuse.” But look at the dysfunction in her portfolio and the way in which the appointment of the Commissioner of Police was handled. The opposition has full and utter confidence in the new police commissioner and in our police force, which is doing a great job in difficult times with no support from this minister. However, we have no confidence in this minister because we know now that in the appointment process of the police commissioner not only was the police minister of the McGowan Labor government involved in the process, but also the de facto police minister of the McGowan Labor government, the police minister in waiting, the member for Burns Beach, was interfering. We know that the selection process went from having a short list to having a long list after a chat between the member for Burns Beach and the police minister.

Mrs M.H. Roberts interjected.

Mr P.A. KATSAMBANIS: That is exactly what happened. The Western Australian police force has been denied the pay increase that this government promised before the election. When asked to give our police proper support in providing them with stab-proof vests, the minister baulked and had to be dragged kicking and scheming to a process that still has not delivered those vests. Given the record of this minister, we do not know if those vests will ever be delivered. This minister has issues with ministerial advisers having to be counselled, as the Premier said, on mixing their work under term-of-government appointments in government and campaigning for public office. I welcome people running for public office, but when there is a clear conflict between their duty and their running for public office, it has to be managed. Counselling after the event is just not good enough. There are many other issues to discuss. I am going to run out of time in this time-limited debate, but it is quite clear that this minister has misled this house. This is an issue for the Procedure and Privileges Committee, and whilst it is being investigated this Premier has to stand up, show some leadership and appoint a police minister who will do the right thing by the portfolio.

MRS L.M. HARVEY (Scarborough — Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [3.07 pm]: I rise to reiterate some of the points made by the member for Hillarys. Through the freedom of information process, we have a letter written by the Public Sector Commissioner dated 8 June to Hon Michelle Roberts, Minister for Police; Road Safety. This letter clearly states —

... it is my intention to transfer Mr Kim Papalia, Commissioner of Road Safety, Road Safety Commission to the performance of other functions in the Senior Executive Service for the remainder of his term of appointment, which expires on 27 October 2020.

Based on our previous discussions, I understand that you support this arrangement.

The minister was on 6PR on 26 June and said —

“I had expected Kim Papalia would continue in his role as Road Safety Commissioner, but much to my surprise, he advised the Public Sector Commissioner he didn’t wish to continue in the role under the new structure.”

Once again in this house on 27 June, the minister misled the house and stated —

No pressure has been put on Mr Papalia. My belief was that we were working well together and that he would continue in the role.

That is the role of Road Safety Commissioner. The letter dated 8 June to the minister clearly shows that she knew well before 26 and 27 June that Mr Papalia was being moved on, and, in fact, she supported him being moved out of that role.

That is very clearly misleading the house. The performance of this minister has caused dysfunction and chaos. Whenever this minister is criticised, her immediate response is to go on the attack. She attacked Mr Papalia and tried to besmirch his reputation. She implied that he was acting outside his remit as Road Safety Commissioner by not providing information that was cabinet-in-confidence to the Langoullant inquiry. She attacked him and said that he should have provided the information and that he should not have acted in the way he did. She knew that he was being moved on, because she supported that, but she told this house she was surprised he was being moved on and criticised him for his actions around protecting the long-held convention in this place of releasing cabinet-in-confidence documents.

I refer to the commissioner appointment process. We have talked about this matter many times in this Parliament and the former Commissioner of Police, Dr Karl O’Callaghan, who is very highly respected and regarded in the community, has offered his views on this. I quote from what he said on ABC News. His view was that the process had been corrupted and that there was inappropriate political interference in the appointment of the Commissioner of Police. As a result, it was unfortunate for a man as highly regarded as Mr Chris Dawson to be constantly operating under the premise that there was a dubious appointment process. Chris Dawson, quite frankly, deserves better than that. He deserves better than having to operate in the environment created by the Minister for Police in response to a phone call from the member for Burns Beach saying, “My mate didn’t get an interview. Can you get him an interview?” Then we found out —

Mrs M.H. Roberts: When was the phone call? What phone call?

The SPEAKER: Order! Minister for Police, I call you to order.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: The member for Burns Beach is on the record saying that is exactly what happened. He bragged about it to the media. For goodness sake! He has bragged about it to the media and he takes full responsibility for the appointment process being interfered with. We know that process was interfered with because it went from a short list of applicants being interviewed to everyone being interviewed all of a sudden, including the member for Burns Beach’s mate, who is highly credentialed, apparently, but did not get the job. What did the government do? This comes down to the Premier’s leadership, too. Dr Karl O’Callaghan is highly regarded. He had 13 years of distinguished service as Commissioner of Police. He served the community in some way, shape or form in WA Police for more than 40 years. What did the Premier do? He attacked the former commissioner. He said to tell him that he has relevance deprivation disorder. For goodness sake! The commissioner is quite rightly pointing out completely inappropriate interference in what should have been an independent process. Instead of the Premier saying that the commissioner probably has a point but we have a good candidate notwithstanding that, he came out and attacked Karl O’Callaghan. He accused him of having relevance deprivation disorder and undermining Mr Dawson.

Mr O’Callaghan has been very clear in his radio interviews this morning that this is nothing to do with Mr Dawson. It has to do with an inappropriate political interference in the selection process, which puts Mr Dawson on the backfoot from the first day of his appointment. He deserves better. If this government had any regard for standards and transparency, it would not have occurred. The Minister for Police should have told the member for Burns Beach that that was an inappropriate conversation and an inappropriate request and that it was being handled independently through the Public Sector Commissioner. The minister should have told the member that he needed

to tell his friend, “Sorry, try next time when the commissioner’s job is up for appointment again.” That would have been the appropriate response, not to change the process and the committee that was put together to vet applicants. That is not the right process. Ministers are supposed to be strong and stand up to people interfering in a process and say, “No, there is a standard here and I am not going to drop below that standard because I want to find some mates for my faction.” That is not how ministers should behave, and that is what we have seen with this process.

Then we look at police. For the first time in many, many years—we certainly did not see it over the eight and a half years of the Barnett Liberal government—we see police taking to the streets and striking. We did not see police take industrial action and now we are seeing that because the government has failed to deliver the 1.5 per cent pay rise that it promised. It said, “Too bad, police.” The minister has failed to secure funding for stab-proof vests that police officers say they require. We have a debacle over the purchase of new police uniforms. How can we have confidence that this decision was made by Commissioner Chris Dawson and not the result of interference of the Minister for Police in police operations? We cannot have confidence in that. We do not know whether this was Mr Dawson’s decision because we know this minister likes to interfere in decisions and the independence of these kinds of processes.

Then we look at the road safety issue on Indian Ocean Drive. Instead of decisive action and the Minister of Police speaking to the Minister for Transport to get the Main Roads engineers to look at that road and take some action to improve the safety of it, what did we get? The Minister for Police decided to set up a committee and get drivers to take photos and tell the government what they think we should do. Motorists might have some information, but engineers design roads and make the appropriate changes to improve the safety of those roads. Where would they try to source those funds? They would source it from the road trauma trust fund, except we know that that account has now been raided for non-road safety projects, such as overhead costs for the Department of Transport employees—the lighting bill, the increased electricity bills, the rental bills and for cups of tea and coffee for the people working in the Department of Transport. Overhead employment costs for the Department of Transport are now being raided from the road trauma trust account, thereby relinquishing the ability of a road safety initiative being put in place on Indian Ocean Drive where, tragically, we have seen the loss of life like never before over the past six or so months.

Ms M.M. Quirk interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Girrawheen!

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: It has been a terrible tragedy and that needs fixing. It does not need a committee. It needs a solution, and that is what ministers are put in place to provide. A solution would be provided by engineers, not by people driving along in their cars taking photographs on their mobile phones. That will not solve the problem.

Then in question time the minister completely failed to articulate how she is managing conflicts of interest in her office. When elected members of local government are acting as policy advisers in her office, there will be conflicts of interest. The minister failed to articulate how she will manage those, whether she is managing those or whether any of those conflicts have been declared. Good grief! What is she thinking? What can we expect in the future if this minister is not brought before the Procedure and Privileges Committee and made to explain her case and apologise to this house for misleading it and once again treating this Parliament with contempt, which is what we have seen from this government from day one? It treats Parliament, the community and its processes with contempt.

Now I come to the Premier. The reason the motion calls on the Premier to take some leadership and have the Minister for Police stand down is that we have had to take the extraordinary step of requesting a review by the Information Commissioner because the Premier’s office is failing to release documents that we have requested under FOI. We know they exist. The Premier’s office is failing to release documents subject to the FOI act, which is in direct contravention of his promise of gold-standard transparency. The Premier said that he would set a new level of gold-standard transparency. The Premier has set a low bar. His poor decision-making —

Mr M. McGowan: Are you retiring?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I am not retiring. I am living the dream. I am here to hold the Premier to account because the Premier and the Minister for Police are the gifts that keep on giving.

MRS M.H. ROBERTS (Midland — Minister for Police) [3.19 pm]: One problem I have noted in this place over many years is that a lot of people—people like the member for Scarborough—judge others by their own standards, and the member for Scarborough’s standards are very, very, very low. Members may recall that she misled Parliament over the detective shortages back in 2016. She was found by a committee to have misled the house. She basically came into this house and said that the WA Police Union had not raised the matter of detective shortages with her. The only problem was that Mr Brandon Shortland said that she had in front of the whole union committee and that they actually had a tape-recording of their raising that issue with her. They are the member for Scarborough’s standards.

Mrs L.M. Harvey interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Scarborough, you were heard in silence; can we have the same now.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: The member for Scarborough came in here with a grab bag of issues, and again has misled the Parliament. She does it over and over again. Today she introduced a new element into the Commissioner of Police's appointment, and is now alleging that I received a phone call from the member for Burns Beach.

Mrs L.M. Harvey interjected.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Can you tell me where he said that? Can you tell me that? Have you got a reference for him saying that?

Mrs L.M. Harvey interjected.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Have you got a reference?

Mrs L.M. Harvey interjected.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: No, you do not, because you made it up. There was no phone call. You will not be able to find a reference of him saying that he did that because he simply did not do it. It is an absolute nonsense.

Today, the opposition has also added the issue of stab-proof vests. Let us have a little go on that one. I have said in this house and on the public record—the current and former commissioners of police have said this—that money is not the problem; it is not the issue. The issue is getting something practical, wearable and agreed to. Deputy Commissioner Brown has special responsibility for dealing with the police union on this matter. I understand they are working together well on this matter and that money is not and never has been at issue. What is at issue is what is appropriate, wearable, serviceable, and provides for the occupational health and safety of our police officers, and that matter is properly in the domain of the Commissioner of Police. Today, the member for Scarborough had a go at the uniform issues. I understand that Mr Dawson has made a presentation about the uniform matter as part of the estimates hearing in the Legislative Council. I also understand that he answered questions from the media at a press conference. I understand that most of the elements of the uniform that were pictured in *The West Australian* will come into service. What the Commissioner of Police has taken issue with is the black polo shirt, and whether it is appropriate as a predominant uniform for WA Police. Again, the opposition has made a false allegation at me. The member for Scarborough said that maybe I interfered in this matter; maybe it is my idea and not the commissioner's idea. That is another false allegation from the member for Scarborough. Commissioner Dawson raised the issue with me and said that he was going to review the matter. It was his initiative and his decision. That has been just another kind of weird own goal, misleading fallacy from the member for Scarborough.

Opposition members have also managed to drag Indian Ocean Drive into it. It is pretty sad that they are trying to make political capital out of that. A significant number of deaths have occurred on that road so far this year, and the fact is that that is the state the former minister left the road in. What did the member for Scarborough do to improve safety on Indian Ocean Drive when she was Minister for Police; Road Safety? I will tell her what I have done. I have put in place a high-level working party of directors general to look objectively and scientifically at what will be the best things to do. In addition, I have had discussions with the Minister for Transport, who is working with her agency. They have brought forward the expenditure of \$7 million for four overtaking lanes. I have raised the issue of policing on that road with senior police. I have been on patrol on Indian Ocean Drive. I have personally driven that road a number of times. I went on patrol a couple of months ago with some traffic enforcement group officers and spoke with them about what they routinely see there. I received an assurance from the Western Australian police force that it has significantly upped the patrolling of that road. Maybe the former government should have asked some questions about police presence on that road. Police presence on country roads has been a significant issue for years. Under the watch of the former government, road deaths went up, and Western Australia now is one of the worst states in Australia for road fatalities and serious injuries.

The former government should not be proud of that record, and nor should it be proud of its record in the level of crime in our community. It rolled out a so-called new model of policing that saw consistent double-digit increases in crime. That is not a record the member for Scarborough or the former government can be proud of. It is nothing short of complete nonsense for them to come in here and talk about chaos and dysfunction. In my view, the Road Safety Commission and the Western Australian police force are operating extremely well. Both the new acting commissioner for the Road Safety Commission and the Commissioner of Police are doing excellent jobs in their respective commissions.

The opposition has decided to enter the domain of local government elections and cast aspersions on members of my staff. I am not sure what the opposition is getting at when it comes to Mayor Gangell from Bassendean. Maybe it thinks that people in local government should not be able to work in state or federal government in case there is a conflict. If the opposition's issue is whether those conflicts are being managed appropriately or declared, it is my understanding that Mr Gangell made the appropriate declarations about being Mayor of Bassendean, and I understand that Ms Clarke informed her manager and the Department of the Premier and Cabinet that she intended to be a candidate at the City of Bayswater elections. I think that the real issue seems to be that another Bayswater councillor happens to be the research officer of the member for Hillarys. Some people have suggested to me that the member for Hillarys' research officer, Mr Fleeton, aspires to be a candidate for the position of the Mayor of Bayswater.

Several members interjected.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: It may be that the member for Hillarys marina's electorate officer —

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Hillarys.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: — has a real interest in who gets elected in that ward of the City of Bayswater. The opposition is clouding the issue.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Hillarys, do you want to go home early?

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Members of this house might be interested to know that the CEO of Bayswater has actually lodged a complaint about Mr Fleeton for using the council letterhead for electoral material—and that that complaint has been lodged with the Local Government Standards Panel. Apparently Mr Fleeton could be in breach of the city's code of conduct for elected members. Mr Fleeton, who works for the member for Hillarys marina, is well known in Liberal Party circles.

Withdrawal of Remark

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: The minister is incorrectly referring to the name of a member of this place.

The SPEAKER: Minister, could you refrain from using that phrase, and withdraw it.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: I withdraw.

Debate Resumed

Mr P.A. Katsambanis interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Hillarys, I have given you a lot of licence. I call you to order for the second time.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: I am sure the member enjoys his view over Hillarys Boat Harbour as, no doubt, does Mr Fleeton, the Bayswater councillor. I am told he was a very active Young Liberal at Murdoch University and previously a member of the Australian Liberal Students' Federation. A Liberal political operator is in the member for Hillarys' office and is also a councillor in the City of Bayswater.

Mr P.A. Katsambanis: It is not in my electorate. It is nowhere near my electorate.

The SPEAKER: Member for Hillarys, I call you to order for the third time. Members from both sides, just listen to the minister.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Some kind of politics is playing out in the City of Bayswater and, no doubt, in a lot of councils throughout Western Australia. We have provided answers about how conflicts of interest are being managed. I have advised the house that Ms Clarke informed her manager and the department of her intention to run for office. At that time, discussions occurred regarding strategies to ensure the mitigation of any potential, perceived or actual conflicts of interest. In answer to parliamentary questions, I have also pointed out that Ms Clarke has not sought any information specific to the City of Bayswater. It seems that members opposite are trying to make some capital out of the fact that Ms Clarke is interested in CCTV grants. The grants that are available are crime prevention grants that have been around since I introduced them in 2004. They are hardly top-secret information.

I will move on to the matter of Mr Papalia. Some unfortunate imputations have been made in my direction about me allegedly wanting to get rid of him or having had a hand in it. The fact of the matter is that I had no agenda to get rid of Mr Papalia. Various comments have been read out today. I stand by all those comments—those I made on 6PR and those I made in this house. Mr Papalia enjoyed my support and, from my perspective, we were working well together. Mr Papalia raised no concerns with me. I want to make it very clear on the record that I did not seek meetings with Mr Wauchope to undermine Mr Papalia in any way, nor did I ever request that Mr Wauchope move on Mr Papalia and so forth. Mr Wauchope met with me and advised me that Mr Papalia did not want to continue. When Mr Wauchope advised me of that, I was surprised. I added, though, that I did not have any issue with it because Mr Wauchope explained that Mr Papalia did not want to continue in the role or go back to WA Police. If anyone here is unaware, Mr Papalia was formerly a WA Police officer. For reasons that are best known to himself and that I am not aware of him making public, he did not want to go back to that agency. That was his call. He did not want to go back to WA Police. He raised that, but did not raise it with me. He raised it, appropriately, with the Public Sector Commissioner, who had a discussion with him. The Public Sector Commissioner advised me that that was Mr Papalia's choice and what he wanted to do. I said words to the effect of, "If that's what he wants to do, that's his call. We'll find someone else to take on that role who is happy to be the Road Safety Commissioner." I cannot unequivocally tell members all the exact reasons Mr Papalia took the actions he did. They are best known, presumably, to himself. He did not explain those reasons to me. He may have had more detailed discussions with the Public Sector Commissioner, but my recollection of the advice that the Public Sector Commissioner gave to

me was that he did not want to go back to WA Police. He enjoyed being a CEO. I think he would have liked to have continued on as a CEO. Obviously, our government had made the decision to go from 40 CEOs down to 22 CEOs, which was something that we needed to do to streamline our public service and to try to claw back some of the enormous debt that the former government had put us into.

I listened to the bits and pieces that were read out by the member for Hillarys and the member for Scarborough. They have basically put one and one together and come up with about 300. The fact remains that as a result of those changes in departments—40 going down to 22—Mr Papalia had the appropriate discussions with the Public Sector Commissioner about his future. I made it clear to the Public Sector Commissioner that I was more than happy for Mr Papalia to continue as the Road Safety Commissioner, but that position would be located within WA Police. That was the direction that we were going in. I suppose I can only say it so many times, but he made the call. My recollection is that Mr Wauchope advised me of that verbally and in writing. Initially, I was very surprised because my perception from the outside was that Mr Papalia really enjoyed the position of Road Safety Commissioner. We had had some good conversations and good meetings, so it surprised me. On one level, it also surprised me that Mr Papalia chose not to have a conversation directly with me about his concerns. He made a response to the reorganisation on 6PR. That is why I publicly said on 6PR that if Mr Papalia wanted to, he could continue in that role. I also clarified that our government intended to continue to have a Road Safety Commissioner. That was his call. I was informed of his call by the Public Sector Commissioner and I said words to the effect of, “If that’s what he wants to do, that’s fine by me. We’ll find someone else to do that role.” There was never any suggestion that I sought for the Public Sector Commissioner to initiate some course of action against Mr Papalia. That is simply not correct. He was going about his job and initiating the changes that were required as a result of the reduction of CEOs across government.

This has been a grab bag of issues. To me, the opposition looks desperate and grubby. It is not focused on the real agendas, the provision of government services or creating jobs in our community. It is clearly not focused on reducing the massive debt burden it left the state with. Its rejection of the gold tax is evidence of that. Instead, it comes in here day after day with a series of very nasty, very grubby tactics. If members opposite think that will get them anywhere in opposition, it will not. It will just make them more irrelevant than the member for Scarborough already knows she is.

Division

Question put and a division taken with the following result —

Ayes (16)

Mr C.J. Barnett	Mrs L.M. Harvey	Mr W.R. Marmion	Mr K. O’Donnell
Mr I.C. Blayney	Mr P. Katsambanis	Mr J.E. McGrath	Mr D.T. Redman
Mr V.A. Catania	Mr A. Krsticevic	Dr M.D. Nahan	Mr P.J. Rundle
Ms M.J. Davies	Mr S.K. L’Estrange	Mr D.C. Nalder	Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup (<i>Teller</i>)

Noes (36)

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

Pair

Ms L. Mettam

Mr B.S. Wyatt

Question thus negatived.

WESTERN AUSTRALIAN JOBS BILL 2017

Second Reading

Resumed from an earlier stage of the sitting.

MR P.J. RUNDLE (Roe) [3.44 pm]: I have 30 seconds to close from my previous contribution. As I was saying to the Minister for Sport and Recreation, the Treasurer and the Minister for Emergency Services, I welcome the Western Australian Jobs Bill 2017, but the new government needs to lead by example. With the company supplying the lights for the stadium and the suppliers to our Department of Fire and Emergency Services, we need to focus on not just supplying jobs, but making sure that we have local content in our industries that are also WA suppliers. As our esteemed leader, the member for Central Wheatbelt, said yesterday, we welcome the jobs bill and we will support it, but it must be run in tandem with those local companies.

MR D.T. PUNCH (Bunbury) [3.45 pm]: I was getting so excited about this bill that I rose early! I rise to speak in support of the Western Australian Jobs Bill 2017. It is an incredibly important bill for so many reasons, not the least of which is that the government is sending a clear message to the WA business community about the importance of participation in the government's around \$25 billion spend per annum. It sets out a clear structure within procurement processes about how business can participate. I understand the anxiety that has been expressed by many members opposite—that this legislation would sit within the broader market context defined by section 92 of the Constitution and the Australian New Zealand Government Procurement Agreement—but there are two options with this. We can wring our hands and say, “It is an open market; let the market decide” and not do anything, or we can be proactive and look for opportunities to work within that framework and maximise the potential for small and medium enterprise, particularly when this government's program of works will involve procurement right across regional WA and the metropolitan area.

Our aim is to recognise that we cannot preclude suppliers from outside WA, but we can require all suppliers to understand the Western Australian industry participation strategy and directly assist local businesses to get smarter information and direct lines of sight about contracting information. We can make sure lead contractors in particular understand the capability, capacity and quality of fabrication of all suppliers in our local market. These industry participation requirements will require suppliers to complete an industry participation plan as part of the procurement process. I have talked with businesses about these sorts of concepts. They tell me that they are a very good lead-in in the audit process for preparing and providing a tender, stopping and taking stock of what is around, what they can use and how they can form good strategic alliances and taking that forward in a complete procurement opportunity. It will require agencies receiving offers to assess and consider the participation plan and look at it in detail without compromising value-for-money considerations. But it does provide the opportunity to consider value for money in the context of the government's agenda for job creation and local content, supply and participation. The commitments in those agreements will be required to be included in final contracts should the proponent be the successful tenderer. It provides a clear structure that is mandated and backed by legislation that provides a minister who is responsible and a reporting framework. It lifts the whole issue out of the realm of policy, out of the realm of “Well, maybe we could” and out of the realm of chance and puts it into a clear positive structure for the future.

I have worked on both sides of the procurement agenda, in both the consideration of offers and supporting industry to take advantage of offers. I know it takes extensive work to introduce local capability and local capacity to lead contractors.

We learnt about that way back in the early part of 2000 with term network contracts for Main Roads Western Australia. The process involves building opportunities for networking to create understanding and business relationships and detailed industry briefings—I am very pleased to hear about the Metronet briefings coming up and the opportunity for regional participation in those briefings to see what the opportunities might be for regional business and industry—and then working with procurement agencies to ensure that contract components and offers are pitched in a way that maximises opportunity for a broad offering to the business community and the opportunity for competitive tenders to come back. These sorts of processes enable potential suppliers to evaluate their own ability to deliver and opportunities to collaborate.

I am very pleased to see that on 24 and 25 November this year Procure South West will hold an exhibition in Bunbury showcasing local industry capability. This is about business and industry taking the lead in looking at the procurement opportunities and how they can build relationships and alliances, and work collaboratively to take a proposal forward. Procure South West will be held over two days and all sorts of opportunities will arise from that. The sponsors are an impressive list of local business leadership. South32 Worsley is the major sponsor. The South West Development Commission is there to take advantage of its new opportunity to drive the ability of local contractors, as is Regional Development Australia South West. The South West Chamber of Commerce and Industry has maximised the opportunity of all the chambers of commerce in the south west to take advantage of and collaborate on the business opportunities. I acknowledge the outstanding work undertaken by Mr Rolf Stene, AM, a founder of the South West Chamber of Commerce and Industry who has been a leading advocate of ensuring that regional businesses particularly get advantages from the opportunities to be had out of broader contracts and procurement. The Bunbury Wellington Economic Alliance is an association of six local governments, business and industry coming together to support the development of industry across the region and working in a way that builds collaboration, networks and the sharing of information, and pursues opportunities at both government and industry levels. The Chamber of Minerals and Energy of Western Australia's South West Regional Council represents major mineral processors in the mining sector across the region. Finally, the Warren Blackwood Economic Alliance at Manjimup brings into play the business community and the four local governments that make up the Warren Blackwood Economic Alliance.

In the south west, business is grabbing hold of opportunities and asking the questions: How can we better collaborate to take advantage of opportunities that we have seen going across to eastern states or to overseas providers? How can we showcase what we have to offer and work collaboratively without compromising value for money and competition and making sure that there is maximum opportunity to show what we can do best?

Procure South West will include trade shows showcasing industry–business capability. Key industry speakers will talk about opportunities and the way to manage quotation and tender processes from both a government and an industry and business point of view. It will include information-sharing forums that will be opportunities to network, pool ideas and look at opportunities to collaborate and build off each other’s capacity, thereby going after some of the larger contracts that an individual contractor previously would not have had the opportunity to access. There will be careers and networking forums looking at opportunities for training and building careers in the south west across business and industry networks. There will be specific collaboration and speed-dating sessions, and opportunities for people to take advantage of more detailed analyses of what each other has to offer.

Procure South West is a business, industry and government forum. It is exactly what this jobs bill is about—bringing people together. Its objectives include showcasing the capability of local industry and its ability to understand the needs of major industry and government. Its second objective is to encourage government and major industry to invest in local goods and services to create jobs. The focus is on building the capacity of local business to meet current and emerging needs of major industry. It is not just about selling wares; it is about strategic analysis of what is coming up.

Mr W.R. Marmion: And you’re doing it without the bill.

Mr D.T. PUNCH: No, it will be done in the context of the bill. This bill—our policy—has set the framework. It is supported by some very good members in the members for Murray–Wellington and Collie–Preston. It has good support across the board.

Procure South West will provide opportunities for major industry to inform and collaborate with the support of south west businesses. It will encourage idea sharing and problem-solving and, importantly, create, nurture and grow south west business relationships within and across industries. It will encourage idea sharing, problem-solving and promote innovation in thinking. I am sure they are things that all members on both sides of this chamber would support. It will provide a platform for career information and opportunity. Procure South West is business taking responsibility for its contribution to both business-to-business and business-to-government relationships. It recognises that business relationships give rise to opportunities for collaboration, innovation and capturing prosperity, and is a perfect match between the goals of this bill and the aspirations of business. I acknowledge all those local business leaders for their vision. This bill provides a structure in the form of participation plans requiring agencies to take notice of those participation plans in the procurement process, and ensures that the accountability process for delivering on commitments given matches perfectly with efforts of the business community to look at how it can work together to take advantage of these opportunities.

This bill is also part of the government’s broader agenda on industry participation. At a broader level, our jobs plan will focus on design and specification of supply requests to ensure that WA industry has the maximum potential to compete and that the terms of trade are relevant to business and industry. We heard the member for Roe talking at length about some of the practices he has seen in the contracting world recently that have been absolutely counterproductive to supporting business in his electorate. In cases when only intrastate offers are received, there can be an even greater opportunity to increase regional consideration, as constitutional and free trade agreement conditions will not apply in those circumstances. These can include criteria that more accurately requires identification of the location where businesses operate. In my own electorate, on many occasions, people have felt quite disenfranchised by large-scale businesses opening a small shopfront in the area and capturing agreements on the basis of local contracting and local provisions, and then finding that the work is contracted overseas. That has particularly been the case in the engineering sector.

This bill is part of a broad suite of actions. Importantly, that includes ministerial responsibility for jobs, greater transparency and reporting on outcomes, and genuine commitments to maximise the potential for procurement across the whole of the WA business sector. Together with this government’s program of public works and commitments such as the WA innovation grants there is a great opportunity for local business to participate, innovate and grow.

I am proudly Bunbury. I intend to work as hard as I can to support jobs and business.

Mr D.A. Templeman: The second-largest regional centre.

Mr D.T. PUNCH: But the most productive.

From my discussions locally, I know business will welcome this bill. It has been watching closely what this government has been doing across the board. When the Minister for Regional Development; Agriculture and Food addressed the business lunch in Bunbury, the questions we received were all about how we can maximise opportunities out of the policies of this government. We are not a policy-free zone; we have a clear suite of policies that we are taking forward and the business community in my electorate is welcoming it. This bill makes clear that major contractors especially will need to identify how they embrace and understand local supply, local content and local jobs. It is a terrific bill, and when I spoke in the debate on the motion yesterday, I mentioned the local fabricator Hotweld, which is a great example of a small Western Australian microbusiness.

Debate adjourned, pursuant to standing orders.

McGOWAN GOVERNMENT — MINISTERS*Motion*

MR D.T. REDMAN (Warren–Blackwood) [4.01 pm]: I move —

That this house condemns the Premier for appointing ministers that have demonstrated a lack of public accountability and transparency.

I rise today to speak to the motion. This motion is very appropriate, given the debate we have just had on a suspension of standing orders moved by the Liberal Party regarding issues with the current Minister for Police and our view that she gave misleading information about the facts of the matter and that she should be accountable for that. It is appropriate and timely that we take stock of where we are at, given that we are heading towards the end of the year of a new government. In my view, and certainly that of the National Party, this government has had some fairly serious shortcomings in public accountability and transparency in a number of areas. It is no stretch of the imagination that that is a platform the Premier and the Labor Party took to the election. The government attempted to wear as a badge of honour that it would have the highest standards of transparency and accountability, and we would therefore assume that its actions would follow that. I want to work through issues that have emerged with a number of ministers at various points in time to paint a picture that, in fact, it is not all rosy with public accountability. I make the point that it is now time to take stock, if nothing more, to send a very strong signal that we, the opposition, are watching to ensure that the government is accountable to the standards that it espouses to reach.

The first minister I want to talk a little bit about is Minister Logan, who is Minister for Corrective Services. That is a portfolio I had for a while, so I am very familiar with the issues that the minister has been working through. I want to talk about the culture that sits behind the way that many Labor Party members and current ministers behave and treat people. I want to talk about an occasion prior to the election. I understand that Mr Logan was not minister at the time, but it paints a picture. The now minister made statements at a forum in Jandakot addressing the Perth Indian community on 3 March. He referred to the Roe 8 issue and made his views very clear about the contractors, sending a very strong signal to the public at a public forum. He said that if any of those contractors chose to seek compensation from the government, the government would remember them. A person does not get to be a member of Parliament or, indeed, a minister representing the Labor Party if they have not been through that battle-hardened world of the union movement. Not too many Labor members reach what might be seen as the Holy Grail of that pathway, which is becoming a member of Parliament and, ultimately, a minister, without having some battle scars. Through these sorts of events we know the culture behind the ministers who sit in this house. I want to go into the comments made by Mr Logan. I quote from an article that appeared in the ABC online news on Thursday, 9 March 2017. It states —

A senior WA Labor MP has come under fire for a warning he gave to Roe 8 contractors who might attempt to seek compensation if Labor wins the election and stops the project.

Shadow Cabinet minister Fran Logan was at a public forum for members of Perth's Indian community in Jandakot on March 3.

He was reported as saying the following —

“If they then turnaround and say now we want to be compensated for the loss of the long-term contract —

He is referring to the Labor Party's plan to cancel the Roe 8 project —

I am sure that Mark (McGowan) will say see you in court,” Mr Logan said.

“That's a long process. There's lots of other projects coming up and we will remember your name —

I highlight that again—“we will remember your name” —

if you put your tender in. If that's the game you want to play. If you want to take us to the court, no worries.

“We'll see you in court for over the next four or five years and when you put your tenders in we will look very carefully at your tenders.”

If that is not a threat, I will go he. That was commentary on 3 March this year, just a whisker before the election, from a member of Parliament who is currently Minister for Corrective Services. It was threatening behaviour towards contractors who may well be seeking compensation, and rightly so, on a decision that the current government made. Yes, I admit that it made that call before it went to the election; nevertheless, a compensatory path was only to be expected, and there was threatening behaviour. That is the culture that sits behind this. I will refer to another example in my speech today that also comes back to some of this culture. I guess it lays some of the foundations of that behaviour. I would call that bullying behaviour. I will refer to some other examples of similar types of bullying behaviour that is starting come out, now that the Labor Party is in government, in feedback we are getting. It relates to people who hold authority in our community and decisions that get made by government about who might seek benefit from that.

I now want to refer to the Minister for Regional Development; Agriculture and Food, Hon Alannah MacTiernan. A number of questions about issues related to her were asked by the Leader of the National Party. I want to go through where we have come from to get to the point that we find ourselves at today. The minister has a long history in renewable energy. She has a long history of espousing those opportunities. Indeed, when she was a minister in the previous Labor government, she made decisions about a range of projects. I want to quote from a media release from Tuesday, 5 August 2008, just before that infamous election in that year. The article shows a picture taken of a very young looking minister and is headed “Wave power a step closer in Albany”. It is a media statement from the minister and some commentary. I quote —

Planning and Infrastructure Minister Alannah MacTiernan today announced that Perth-based Carnegie Corporation had been issued a five-year exclusive licence to identify suitable areas for a wave energy facility off Albany’s coastline.

The minister is on the public record supporting that wave energy project. Indeed, in this case she made a clear call to support an exclusive licence for this Perth-based company to pursue some renewable energy options in the Albany area. The target of a couple of campaigns from the Labor Party, which can be seen in its policy positions going into the 2013 and 2017 elections, is to make Albany a town that uses 100 per cent renewable energy. There is the wind farm in Albany and it has some issues with shortage of capacity, so I can understand a political argument around that.

Since the former minister in 2008 made statements around her support for those projects and, I guess, her support for a project in Albany, she has been on a board. She was a director of Energy Made Clean Company, so she was a board member. The chief executive officer of EMC said that as a former long-serving Minister for Planning and Infrastructure, Alannah brings a wealth of experience and a reputation for getting difficult jobs done. “We are extremely pleased she has agreed to take on this role”, said Mr Davidson, the company CEO.

There is a history there; she has been involved with that. She made a decision on 4 July 2013 to resign from that position, when Carnegie Wave Energy acquired a 35 per cent stake in EMC to establish an alliance agreement and begin working together on a wave-integrated microgrid in Mauritius. Other projects took the fore. The point is that the minister was a director. There was a point in the time that she received a shareholding as payment for her role and has kept that shareholding.

Dr A.D. Buti: She hasn’t got that shareholding any more.

Mr D.T. REDMAN: I am talking about a shareholding at a point in time.

Dr A.D. Buti: She wasn’t a minister then.

Mr D.T. REDMAN: I am talking about a former minister who played a role as a director of a company and who took payment of a shareholding when she was a director and held that shareholding.

Dr A.D. Buti: She wasn’t a minister then.

Mr D.T. REDMAN: I was not suggesting she was a minister when she had the shareholding.

Dr A.D. Buti: What relevance is it then?

Mr D.T. REDMAN: I am not saying she was. I am making the point, member for Armadale—if the member listens to me—that there is clearly a strong link between the minister and Carnegie given her history as a minister in a previous government, being a director of a company that is now part owned by Carnegie at a point and having a shareholding as a payment from that company.

Mr W.J. Johnston: Was Hon Alannah MacTiernan ever a director of Carnegie?

Mr D.T. REDMAN: I am not aware that she was a director of Carnegie, but Carnegie acquired EMC, of which the former minister was a director and at that time had a shareholding in it and clearly had a shareholding of a part owner of the organisation called Carnegie.

Mr W.J. Johnston: As I understand your allegation, she awarded the contract to Carnegie —

Mr D.T. REDMAN: I am making an argument that there is a link between the minister and a history that has her closely linked to these organisations.

Mr W.J. Johnston: I am just trying to establish: was she ever a director of the company that won the tender?

Mr D.T. REDMAN: I am not aware that that was the case.

A strong history is developing. The current government went to the election on a platform, including announcements in Albany about developing wave power down there and supporting a project that in the Labor Party’s view would push for a 100 per cent renewable energy focus for the community of Albany. At this point in time, she was not a minister; it was prior to the election. It is interesting that the Labor Party went to the election and won the election. Once the election was won, shares in Carnegie jumped 23 per cent. Just after the election, on 13 March, Carnegie shares jumped 23 per cent based on Carnegie being likely to receive a wave energy project in Albany. That was

interesting because, clearly, Carnegie was seen to be the frontrunner. I can fully understand how it would be seen to be a frontrunner—because of the associations Carnegie had with the former minister and the minister’s views about wave energy in Albany and, indeed, her links to Carnegie and support of licences for Carnegie going back prior to 2008. The shares jump just after the election; three or four days later, the minister divests herself of the shares. The shares went up, but she wonders, “How can I sort this from a public perception perspective? Let’s give the money away.” She did—a fantastic gesture. Indeed, the Premier said twice in response to questions that she gave her money to a charity. That means that if any one of us has shareholdings or a financial interest in something, we give them to a charity; that is okay. The Premier pushed that point twice. I do not accept that.

Mr W.J. Johnston: The minister never gave away shares.

Mr D.T. REDMAN: The fact is if we have a shareholding, we are demonstrating an interest and a relationship with the companies. The Premier said today in his response to a question from the Leader of the National Party —

However, it is worth noting that WA Labor’s release mentioned Carnegie as “a likely” not “the likely” proponent.

That fixes it. This sorts it right out. It is in our policy position as a likely proponent. That is arm’s length. It must be arm’s length, surely to God. Funnily enough, everything rolls out. There is not even a cabinet decision. From what we can understand, the decision is based on the subcommittee of cabinet that considers the budget, the Economic and Expenditure Reform Committee, approving that and getting the resources to it. Then the minister is given the lead because the Minister for Energy is pretty busy, to run a process and announce it. It did not even go through cabinet; cabinet did not get a chance to have some scrutiny at arm’s length in this process. If this issue is not a perceived conflict of interest, I will eat my hat.

Mr S.A. Millman: We look forward to that.

Mr D.T. REDMAN: This issue is a perceived conflict of interest. I will tell members a bit of advice I got at one stage. As former ministers, we have to watch this stuff awfully closely. I am a regular user of Jacob’s Ladder. I have an apartment close by and I use Jacob’s Ladder to maintain a little bit of fitness. When I was the Minister for Lands, I got a letter from the City of Perth asking for approval to get the land easement that Jacob’s Ladder sits on changed to a mall. The City of Perth wanted it changed to a mall with my authorisation so it could put a time frame on when it could open and close it—apply a curfew running from seven o’clock in the morning to seven o’clock at night. On the basis of me being a user of Jacob’s Ladder—bear in mind that ministers drive on the roads that they approve—I sought advice. The advice that came to me was, “Terry, you’ve got a perceived conflict of interest here.” I use all sorts of stuff that government makes decisions on sitting around the cabinet table, so I stepped back and passed on that decision to another minister. If ministers are to hold the highest order of accountability and transparency, they need to be cognisant of those steps. I do not believe that has happened here. I believe that there is too much of an association. Too much smoke is coming out of this to suggest there is not a fire there. The Premier should have sought to get at greater distance from this minister and that project, which at points in time, albeit not as a minister, she has had shareholdings in and links to. She had been a director of companies that are now associated with this organisation and she has a history of promoting this project, and I do not think there is enough arm’s length space here. That is the first point. I think there has been a failing here of what I call a perceived conflict of interest, albeit some of the mechanics and time frames are awfully close and the language used is awfully cute; nevertheless, it is there.

One more issue that I think heightens the matter is the nature of the project itself. We are familiar with it because it was a project that the Great Southern Development Commission had been working on. We the National Party, I am pretty sure supported by the Liberal Party, took it to the election to enable us to say there is a significant renewable energy project to occur down here. One of the issues we were grappling with was the gas pipeline versus renewable energy, versus the longer-term energy capacity needs of Albany. It is a very difficult issue because once we commit to making big investments, it takes future decisions out of the play, so it was not easy. We committed to that project prior to the election. We committed to a wave-integrated renewable energy project with a number of pieces to it. In summary, it was a \$22.4 million commitment out of royalties for regions. It was on that historical line that runs to Walpole—Walpole, Denmark, Albany—that has a lot of capacity and reliability issues, and here technology was potentially presenting a solution to it. What was put up in discussions with Western Power and its needs, and in discussions with a range of companies that could produce and support these new capacity and generation solutions, was a solar array with batteries in Walpole that could take a certain amount of peak load for a period. It would have a solar battery solution at Walpole and a solar battery solution at Denmark integrated with Denmark Community Windfarm, coming back to Albany and setting up a common-use infrastructure to hook in a wave project in Albany.

It would have been a fully integrated microgrid and a fantastic initiative. In summary, out of \$22.4 million, \$10.6 million went towards Western Power to have a substation for the connectivity for future investment by the private sector, \$11.1 million went through Denmark Community Windfarm to support the ownership of the solar array, and \$700 000 went towards the University of Western Australia to assist with wave integration site investigation works. The university received some support for some of the technology that was available. It was

a fantastic project. That total of \$22.4 million was going to produce 10 megawatts of peak capacity out of the solar photovoltaic cells, two megawatts out of the battery situations at Denmark and Walpole, and ultimately a 20 megawatts contribution from the wave farm. Albany has a total need of around 45 megawatts—a fairly significant amount of capacity for \$22.4 million. What project did the Labor Party put up? Firstly, it has forgotten about Denmark and Walpole, but put those projects aside for a second. The Labor Party has put \$3.75 million towards a wave energy research centre. Investing in research will not do anything for capacity. Following the procurement process, Carnegie Clean Energy is now putting \$15.75 million towards a trial technology project that will produce one megawatt. That is a total of \$19.5 million. It cost \$22.4 million for the work that we did with Carnegie and the Clean Energy Group, with Western Power producing in excess of 10 megawatts through solar power and two battery solutions producing two megawatts each, and then it hooks into 20 megawatts from the wave farm. In future, the Labor project will pick up 20 megawatts from the wave farm. If we compare those two projects, even a very superficial analysis says that something is not quite right because of the investment made and the return in energy capacity. Although the project is innovative and different and uses wave technology that is not necessarily locked down hard as something that will make way for solar, wind and all the other options on the table, the numbers come up short for what we are getting out of it. The value for money does not appear to be there.

This issue has been put on the table now because a former minister from a former Labor government is pursuing wave energy in Albany—the renewable energy Holy Grail for Albany—as a project and wants to launch it, having had strong links with the project through her directorships and shareholdings and payments at points in time. She came in as a minister, and the project still runs through, and that company has landed with the outcome of what might seem to be a substandard or suboptimal solution for the capacity that it actually delivers. To me, there are some arms-length issues here that emerge. I would have thought that the Premier, at the very least, would have sought to take a step to distance himself or to distance the minister—for her own benefit, arguably. I do not deny her passion or her capacity, but there are enough unanswered questions here to say that there should have been another step in that process. In my view, there has not been, and the Premier should have taken steps to deal with what is a significantly perceived conflict of interest, where a company, now with a major shareholding, of which the minister was a previous director—therefore, relationships can be built from that—and at one point she held shares in it. There is enough smoke to be wondering whether there is a fire. If it was not for the fact that they have come up significantly short on a value-for-money proposal, one might look at it slightly lighter.

Mr M.P. Murray: Who checked your figures?

Mr D.T. REDMAN: We worked with Western Power and Carnegie because they are the same companies that the government works with. In fact, we were as surprised as hell when the announcement was made of what was going to be invested in one part of the project. We wondered what was going on. It did not add up. For a slightly greater amount of money, we could have secured the reliability and capacity of a line going out to Walpole—over 100 kilometres—secured a microgrid, and picked up a significant private investment by the way of the energy component.

Mr M.P. Murray: All that for \$24 million? I doubt it.

Mr D.T. REDMAN: I am making a claim and I stand by it.

I want to go to another level of discussion now about a couple of questions that I have asked in this place. I need to be careful—and rightly so. I have asked two questions: one of the Minister for Local Government last week and one of the Premier yesterday about some issues that we are aware of up in Port Hedland and in the Warralong community. I say this with caution because I do not, for a second, like the idea of naming people from outside the house. The Premier was right today: once you name people, they do not have a chance to respond. This privilege is there for a very good reason so that members are able to raise issues without fear of litigation, but it needs to be used sparingly and carefully. If only one of these issues came to the fore, that is probably where you would leave it. But a couple of issues have come up on the basis of two questions. I want to put that together very carefully and highlight where some issues sit with the government. The main point I make here—I will run to the argument to get to that point—is that the response from the Minister for Local Government last week and the Premier yesterday does not take on board, in my view, a preparedness to have a look at those issues and make their own judgements on whether what is being raised is fair or not. If the Minister for Local Government says, “Yes, I will have a look at that”—in fact, I gave him the bit of paper and I am pleased he took it, but I do not know if any actions have arisen from that. The Premier went into defensive mode yesterday, and on the basis of those questions said, “This is as the Minister for Local Government said. This is just a duck hunt, which fits into the local government space. We should expect that that sort of stuff will happen and go away.” But that is not the case.

We were made aware of an email between the Mayor of the Town of Port Hedland and the Labor Party. Quite rightly, both responses said that this is not the place to talk about Labor Party’s business, as indeed it is not the place to talk about the issues of the National or Liberal Parties. However, the email referred to what was claimed to be heavy-handed tactics by a person who was the president of the Labor Party branch on the mayor pushing for favourable outcomes with employment and favourable outcomes for the Town of Port Hedland for businesses that might be employed to do particular work. It is quite a serious issue. A number of other comments are made in the email, including the naming of Premier Mark McGowan and Stephen Dawson as seemingly —

Mr W.J. Johnston: Who is the email from and to?

Mr D.T. REDMAN: The email is from Camilo Blanco, who is the current Mayor of the Town of Port Hedland, and it is to info@walabor.org.au. It is to the Labor Party. We accept that.

Mr W.J. Johnston: Were they allegations by a person involved about a third party?

Mr D.T. REDMAN: Exactly, and I made the point, minister, that I do not raise this issue lightly. I made the point that if it was not the product of a couple of issues that —

Mr W.J. Johnston: So it has nothing to do with any minister in this place, because it has not come from a minister and it is not to a minister. It is a person making an unfounded allegation.

Mr D.T. REDMAN: There are issues raised in here about local government elections and the process of it, and I think rightly —

Mr W.J. Johnston: Just like there are all these Liberal candidates and National Party candidates

Mr D.T. REDMAN: Of course.

Mr W.J. Johnston: — and all these allegations that people want to make to me about them—do you want me to repeat them; is that what you are asking?

Mr D.T. REDMAN: Sure, the minister will make his judgement about what he raises in this place and what he does not.

Mr W.J. Johnston interjected.

Mr D.T. REDMAN: At the start of me saying this, I put a really heeded caution on what I am raising. I do not take that lightly.

References in the email are —

... directly suggesting Mark McGowan and Stephen Dawson are backing the branch president's attempt to corrupt systems in place that regulate local and state policy ...

Several members interjected.

Mr D.T. REDMAN: There are other issues raised there that I do not particularly want to put on record here. Other issues there —

Mr W.J. Johnston interjected.

Mr D.T. REDMAN: The minister will get his opportunity.

Point of Order

Mr V.A. CATANIA: I cannot hear the member for Warren–Blackwood speak to the motion because I am hearing someone screech over there, and I think it is the member for Cannington.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms J.M. Freeman): Thank you.

Debate Resumed

Mr D.T. REDMAN: The other question I raised, which is linked because the same person is involved, relates to the Warralong community. I am not going to dwell on it but —

Ms S.F. McGurk: You're going to raise it anyway.

Mr D.T. REDMAN: There are issues raised here that I think are right. I make the point —

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members, you have made the point. Let us move on.

Mr D.T. REDMAN: The Premier said yesterday that I should raise it with the appropriate authorities. We are absolutely going to. It is quite right that we do.

Mr P.C. Tinley interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Minister, I will call you.

Mr D.T. REDMAN: I am trying to focus here without screen dumping all this stuff on the public record. That is what I am trying to avoid. I am trying to cherrypick enough of a case —

Mr J.N. Carey interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Perth, you are called for the first time.

Mr D.T. REDMAN: I am trying to cherrypick enough of a case, without putting out a screen dump, to make the case that I think the government has some responsibility to look at these issues and be aware of them. I hope that the signal last week to the Minister for Local Government has triggered an outcome. Although he did not deny it

or accept it when I asked him the question, I would be very surprised if the minister's office was not aware of what is going on because a lot is happening in those areas. It is quite hot. There has been a bit of media commentary about it, although not as direct as that which is being raised here. Again, I hope the Premier raises the issues.

I am sure that as a result of this motion the Premier and the Minister for Local Government are now more aware of these two circumstances than they were before. Two issues came together because of the involvement of a person and that suggests that there is a bit more to that than perhaps meets the eye. At the very least, we need to look at it. That is what I am pushing. I am not laying claim to saying that the accusations are accurate. The Minister for Mines and Petroleum said, quite rightly, that people complain to our offices all time. If I lost sleep over all of that, I would not get a wink of sleep. I am very carefully cherrypicking enough information to claim that there is some reference here to the current Minister for Local Government to the point at which if I were the Premier, I would want to have confidence that that issue is not taken further than what it deserves to be. Indeed, the Premier should have confidence in and inquire into his minister's behaviour or involvement to ensure that he can have confidence in him. In my view, a couple of issues smell a little and there needs to be some sort of resolution.

I asked the Premier a question today about the Minister for Housing and the Premier really was flippant about it. I have been through the minister's financial interests, which always makes good reading. All of us, this side included, from time to time do not get things right. Therefore, it is appropriate that we fix that when it is drawn to our attention. However, that was not the point that I was making or the question that I was asking. Two fairly significant addendums were made to submissions from government members in the Assembly. I have not looked at the Council yet. One was from the Minister for Housing and I talked about them in question time today. He made changes going back to 2010 concerning property ownership and rental income. The Speaker also added a fairly substantial addendum to his financial declaration and added changes that went back to 2001. The Speaker of this house made a fairly significant addendum to his financial statement.

Today I asked the Premier: was he aware of these issues when he made the Minister for Housing a minister? He did not say whether he was or was not. In fact, he pointed the finger right back at me and asked why the hell I was asking this question. I will tell members why I asked the question. The screen outside the chamber shows which ministerial portfolios people have had and have not had. At the first cabinet meeting this year the Minister for Housing was the Minister for Mines and Petroleum from 17 to 22 March. He was the Minister for Mines and Petroleum for five days. Why? He went to the first cabinet meeting and, obviously, made some declarations that the Premier saw fit to say, and is on the record as saying, that there was a perceived conflict of interest. To deal with this perceived conflict of interest —

Mr W.J. Johnston: What was it? What was the perceived conflict of interest?

Mr D.T. REDMAN: I am quoting from a media statement on Tuesday, 21 March 2017, which states —

Premier announces minor change to Cabinet to avoid potential conflict of interest

Premier Mark McGowan today announced a minor ministerial change to Cabinet to avoid any potential or perceived conflict of interest.

This is the point I made before.

Mr W.J. Johnston: What was the conflict of interest?

Mr D.T. REDMAN: The minister would have to ask the Premier. But he saw unfit —

Mr W.J. Johnston: Read the announcement.

Mr D.T. REDMAN: It states —

At the first McGowan Labor Government Cabinet meeting, Cabinet was made aware that a family member of Mr Tinley worked in the oil and gas industry.

This is the point I make. The threshold for this was that a family member who works in the sector was sufficient for the Premier to say, "I am not going to make him a minister. He is going to back away from this portfolio." I like the Minister for Housing. He is a good guy and he is out there batting and having a crack at stuff. I raise this issue: I am not saying that the changes should have been made or it is a major issue that changes were made. I am making the point that the Premier saw fit not to have the minister in that portfolio because of perceived conflicts of interest, yet I just talked about the Minister for Regional Development not being at arm's length at various points in time and the outcome is that there is no perceived of conflict of interest. Today I asked the Premier whether he was aware of these massive changes to financial disclosure going back to 2010. He did not answer it. I do not know whether or not he was because —

Mr M.P. Murray: Why don't you go back a bit further to when a leader of your side snuck in under the cloak of darkness and changed the figures?

Mr D.T. REDMAN: Hang on; let me make my case. I am sure the minister is going to get a —

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: It is lovely to have you in here, minister. But we have all decided that we are going to let the member for Warren–Blackwood get on and pursue his argument. Thank you very much.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: The minister has just been called—twice.

Mr M.P. Murray interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Minister, I am on my feet—three times.

Mr D.T. REDMAN: I asked the question today because a circumstance had played out in which the Premier obviously was not aware that the current Minister for Housing's family member was involved in the resource sector and the Premier made a call that it would be inappropriate for that minister to hold a particular portfolio. I asked the Premier whether he is aware of the changes that the minister made on his financial declaration. The Premier could not answer that. History tells us that the Premier may not have been aware. My recollection of filling out the code of conduct and the ministerial declarations is that we attach a copy of the parliamentary declaration. Being a former member of Parliament, the member probably—I do not know, and this is the reason that we have this debate; some facts would be nice in this —

Several members interjected.

Mr D.T. REDMAN: Here is a chance for members to put some facts on the record.

If members opposite are going to run on a line of facts, the facts as I now know them are that the current Minister for Housing went to his first cabinet meeting as the Minister for Mines and Petroleum. Upon being identified as having some perceived or potential conflicts of interest, he lost that portfolio.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members!

Mr D.T. REDMAN: There has been a massive change from what I have seen made to financial disclosures going back to 2010 in the submissions that closed on 30 September, and were signed, from memory, in the middle of that month. My memory is that when you fill out and present your ministerial declarations, which go a step further in that they go to spouses and partners and people who are involved —

Ms R. Saffioti: You just said he attached the parliamentary one.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Minister!

Mr D.T. REDMAN: I did. I did because —

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members!

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members, I am on my feet. I have just called another minister and a member three times. Let us not do this again.

Mr C.J. Barnett interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Cottesloe, you are called for the first time.

Ms R. Saffioti interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Minister for Transport, you are called for the first time.

Mr C.J. Barnett interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Cottesloe, you will be called for the second time.

Mr D.T. REDMAN: To be accurate to the minister, I think three things need to be presented to the cabinet secretary.

Ms R. Saffioti: You just said you had the parliamentary report.

Mr D.T. REDMAN: I am going to go over that. The first thing is a signed code of conduct. You put your initials on the bottom of the code of conduct to say that this is what you undertake to do. You also put in a copy of your parliamentary declaration. That is what we did under the former Premier: we put in a copy of our parliamentary declaration, and we also filled out a ministerial declaration that took it a step further; it went back a couple of layers, which was in cabinet. That is my recollection of what we did. Unless there is something different happening here, which I will be pleased to hear about, one possible scenario—I have raised it to ask some questions—is that the current Minister for Housing has attached his parliamentary declaration, presumably the last one, which would have finished on 30 September last year, for the period up until the end of June 2016, the 12 months to that period, which as we know today was wrong.

Mr W.J. Johnston: What was wrong with it?

Mr D.T. REDMAN: The minister has just made his current submission for the period updating issues; that is what was wrong.

Mr W.J. Johnston: What was left out of the ministerial declaration?

Mr D.T. REDMAN: Would it not have been nice —

Mr W.J. Johnston: I am asking you: What was the problem? What was the amendment?

Mr D.T. REDMAN: I have it here somewhere, but I am not going to be able to find it quickly. I read the bulk of it in my question today. A number of properties were not declared for periods, and there was a failure —

Mr W.J. Johnston: What was wrong or amended in the 2016 return? The previous returns are irrelevant, because he wasn't a minister at any time, so what's amended in the 2016 return?

Mr D.T. REDMAN: I am making the point that amendments went in now for the 2016 return —

Dr A.D. Buti: No.

Mr D.T. REDMAN: Yes. What you sign-off on is up until 30 June this year. That had an amendment or addendum attached to it that was changed.

Mr W.J. Johnston: What was the amendment?

Mr D.T. REDMAN: There is an addendum attached to the back that talked about —

Mr W.J. Johnston interjected.

Mr D.T. REDMAN: Listen, so that I can answer the question!

For different periods of time, back to 2010, four properties were either not listed properly or were not there. Income raised from those properties was not declared and it said “nil return”, and there were a number of fairly significant changes for a time. Those things happen. The Speaker got a number wrong on his. Nevertheless, it is an issue. I am making the point that I asked the Premier. This is the issue. Things happen, but we are all measured on our actions. The Premier chose to dismiss the question I am raising about whether he was aware of those declarations. It may be that he was and maybe it was taken into account and found to be insignificant. I do not know that. That is why I asked the question. To me, it is reasonable for me to ask a question: did one of the Premier's ministers declare what we now know to be significant changes as of the most recent declaration at the point of being made a minister and at the point of the decision-making to be made a minister? I now have a copy of the amendment that the Minister for Mines and Petroleum asked me about. The member for Willagee signed it on 20 September this year. It talks about changes in the annual returns for the period 25 March 2010 to 30 June 2010 on four properties. It states —

For this return I should like to include, under Section 1 ‘interests in real property’, the following:

The next paragraph states —

I wish to provide additional information with respect to my Annual Return for the period **1 July 2012 to 30 June 2013**. For this return I should like to include, under section 1 ‘interests in real property’, the following:

Two properties are listed. It continues —

I wish to provide further information with respect to my Primary Return as at **25 March 2010**. For this return I should have included, under section 2(c) ‘other income’, the following:

Rental income—and it lists four properties —

Where rental income was not declared I also wish to provide additional information with respect to my annual return for the period **25 March 2010 to 30 June 2010**. For this return I should have included under section 2 (c) “other income”, the following:

It lists rental from three properties. The last point is —

I also wish to provide additional information with respect to my Annual Return for the period **1 July 2012 to 30 June 2013**. For this return I should have included, under section 2(c) ‘other income’, the following:

It then lists rental income.

I am not saying that this an issue in the portfolio. I am asking: was the Premier aware of this when he made the decision to appoint the current Minister for Housing into that portfolio? That goes to the point of the motion. It talks about accountability on transparency and accountability to the public of Western Australia. We know that at different turns, members may get trapped in some of these areas, but all I was doing was asking the question. I got it kicked back in my face saying, “Why are you asking that? Why are you lowering yourself to raise it?” It is right

that we do. The current Minister for Housing was dismissed from a portfolio at the start of this year because of perceived and potential conflict of interest. On the back of that, why should I not ask the question: was the Premier aware of these issues? It may be that he was not. The Premier is the only one who can make the call about whether that deserves an action or not—but maybe he was not aware. The Premier has been wearing this badge of honour on accountability at the election: “We are going to hold ourselves right on the top of that hill.” One step that he can take is to table the ministerial declarations.

Mr W.J. Johnston: As you did.

Mr D.T. REDMAN: Table it. This government is holding itself to a higher account. Tabling the ministerial declarations of at least three of the ministers I have referred to today would be a step the Premier could take to give confidence to the public and this house that indeed the Premier is maintaining an appropriate standard for public accountability and transparency.

I have been through a number of issues. It is timely at this time of the year to talk about the new government because it is easy to get casual about this stuff, particularly in those roles. We have experience on this side, as former ministers, of asking questions about the appropriate steps to distance yourself from decisions. I will use the example of me and Jacobs Ladder. I was a tad surprised, but that is the step I took. Seek advice and take the steps. There have been some shortcomings here, and the Premier is in the position to be able to put some of them right. Enough issues are being raised to say that perhaps a casualness is starting to set in and things are being defended that should not be defended, rather than saying, “Yes, I will take the step.” My advice to new members of Parliament—indeed in our party—and ministers is that you are measured by your actions. Things happen, things go wrong, people break out of prison and people do all sorts of stuff out there. Things happen in agencies that are beyond your control. It is your actions that are the real accountability step, and that is what you are being measured by. That is what I am saying. The Premier is in a position to look at a range of issues and put some actions on the table. One of those could be to table the ministerial declarations and make it clear that at the time that the ministers came into cabinet, they were open and transparent in what they declared to the Premier. The Premier and the Minister for Local Government took the “I’ll fight back” argument rather than saying, “Yes. I can have a look at that, member for Warren–Blackwood. I can take that away and have a look at it and make some judgements and make a call about whether it is something I have a role in.” I believe they do, but that is something that they can take a step on and get some advice on. We believe that it is timely to look at these things. We are very concerned. I will put in a freedom of information request about the Albany Carnegie Clean Energy project. I think there are some real concerns—in particular, about value for money—about the decision-making on that project and the steps the government has been taking. The project is based on a history that has led to a landing point that I do not think stacks up on the accountability front. Albeit, it is an exciting project and one that we want to see happen. We want to see wave energy coming to the fore. The other part was the company not wanting to be in Albany, which was raised in the upper house recently. It had a project operating off Garden Island involving federal funds. I think there has been a request for those federal funds to be redirected down to Albany. Again, we have some strong concerns about a minister who is very driven towards a particular outcome and the self-fulfilling prophecy that that leads to.

That is my contribution. I think that there are enough issues here that deserve some attention. One step that the Premier could take is to table the ministerial declarations, which would make a very clear statement to the public that he aspires to the highest levels of accountability that he wears as a badge of honour and took to the last election.

MR W.J. JOHNSTON (Cannington — Minister for Mines and Petroleum) [4.52 pm]: I love debates in which not a single allegation is made about any person on the Labor side of politics.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Are you the lead speaker?

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: Yes, I am the lead speaker. Not a single allegation has been made about any member of the Labor Party. Yet, we are supposed to somehow question ourselves to see whether we are free of conflicts of interest. For the benefit of members, I will read from the code of conduct that applies to members of this house. Clause (3)(a) states —

A conflict of interest exists where a member participates in or makes a decision in the execution of their office knowing that it will improperly and dishonestly further the Member’s private interest or another person’s private interest directly or indirectly.

That is what a conflict of interest is. Let me make a point about Hon Alannah MacTiernan. Hon Alannah MacTiernan cannot have a conflict of interest over Carnegie wave energy because she has never owned shares in that company while she has been a member of this Parliament or a minister. Let us make that clear. Before she became a minister, she disposed of her shares. How did she dispose of those shares? She gave them to a charity.

Mr C.J. Barnett: It is irrelevant.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: I am sorry. It blows my mind how the former Premier does not get conflicts of interest. I will address the former Premier in a few minutes.

It is not possible for Hon Alannah MacTiernan to have a conflict of interest over Carnegie wave energy. It is simply not possible because she has no direct or indirect interest in that business. She cannot obtain a benefit from it by way of shares because she has none. It is different from what happened with the Leader of the Opposition when he was making decisions and signed a contract for millions of dollars with Telstra Corporation when he was a shareholder. That was a conflict of interest. There was no doubt that it was a conflict of interest. Think about it! He was the minister responsible for making the decision and he executed the decision on behalf of the government to give millions of dollars to a company he owned shares in. That was a conflict of interest—no doubt! Everybody knows that it was a conflict of interest, except the member for Cottesloe. The member for Cottesloe thought it was okay. When we suspended standing orders to condemn the member for Riverton, the member for Cottesloe attacked us. That is his view of conflicts of interest. Hon Alannah MacTiernan does not own shares in a company that has a contractual relationship with the government but, according to the member for Cottesloe, that is a conflict of interest. His Treasurer owned shares in a company that he personally executed a contract with but that was not a conflict of interest.

There is the issue of the member for Riverton's QBE shares. When he was the responsible minister, he entered into insurance arrangements with QBE while he owned shares in QBE. The member for Cottesloe said that that was not a conflict of interest and defended him. What a disgrace! I love it. The man from Cottesloe rings talkback radio. It is normally the pensioners who do that. Perhaps that is the hint that it is time that the member for Cottesloe got on with his life. He is holding back the Liberal Party. It cannot move forward while the member for Cottesloe sits at the back. It cannot face its failure because the member for Cottesloe was the failure. Let us not forget that he is the only Premier in the history of Australia to have gone three years as the not-preferred Premier of the state. No Premier in the history of Australia, except the member for Cottesloe, has ever gone three years rating behind —

Point of Order

Mr V.A. CATANIA: I cannot see how talking about the previous government is relevant to the motion. This debate is about the motion in front of us; that is, that this house condemns the Premier for appointing ministers who have demonstrated a lack of public accountability and transparency. The minister is not talking about that.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms J.M. Freeman): There is no point of order.

Debate Resumed

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: We have not even started on what the member for Cottesloe did in giving millions of dollars to the original shareholders of Kingstream Steel.

Point of Order

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I seek leave to make a personal explanation. I never gave a dollar to Kingstream—not a dollar!

The ACTING SPEAKER: Take a seat, member for Cottesloe. You know that a point of order is not an opportunity to take up debate in this house. You will have an opportunity to get on your feet.

Debate Resumed

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: I had not even got to that, but I will get back to that later.

Let us talk about this ridiculous suggestion that there is a conflict of interest in making an amendment to a member's parliamentary return. Let us understand what is being said here. It is being said that because the Minister for Housing changed his previous year returns, that creates a conflict of interest in his operations as minister. That is simply mind-bogglingly stupid! How can it be a conflict of interest to amend a previous year return? If he made an amendment that stated that he owned 20 million shares in a housing company or a construction company, maybe we would think that that is a conflict of interest. Of course, if he had disposed of the asset, like the Minister for Regional Development did, it would not have been a conflict of interest. This is about correcting the record when something had been forgotten. What was forgotten? It was income from rental properties. People can own more than one property and not generate an income. Some people have more than one property and generate rental income. We expect that to be declared. It is not about a conflict of interest. I will get to decisions of government in a moment, but just because a minister has forgotten to declare their rental income does not create a conflict of interest. I am not saying that because somebody has more than one property, they generate income, but I note that the member for Warren-Blackwood has three properties and does not declare any rental income. I do not know whether he has a rental property, but I note that he has three properties listed on his disclosure return, but he does not declare rental income.

Mr D.T. Redman: The minister will see that there is income via a trust.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: All right. As I said, there is nothing automatically incorrect.

Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup: Here we go. So he has trawled but he has found nothing.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: No, I am not saying that. We have already found that the smoking gun is the member for Riverton who signed a contract with Telstra worth millions of dollars while he was a shareholder—a part owner—

in Telstra. Unlike Hon Alannah MacTiernan, who did not sign a contract with a company she did not own shares in. The idea that we are somehow taking equivalence is a bit ridiculous. A number of other members have more than one property and do not declare rental income. There is nothing automatically wrong with that. But let us make it clear again: it is not a conflict of interest for the Minister for Housing to update his return from a former year. He was not a minister at that time. Unless the member for Warren–Blackwood is suggesting that there was a conflict in respect of something the Minister for Housing did, there is no allegation about the Minister for Housing. What is the allegation?

Mr D.T. Redman: My question was to the Premier. My question was not in respect whether the change in declaration was a conflict of interest; my question to the Premier was whether in fact he knew about the full interest of the member who was made a minister under his government.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: The member for Warren–Blackwood asked a question going back to the member for Willagee’s return in 2010.

Mr D.T. Redman: I am making the point that there has been a major change to his declaration.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: That is not a conflict of interest and he was not a minister in 2010. He was not a minister in 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015 or 2016. He was not a minister! He was a minister in 2017 and the Premier was fully aware of all the issues regarding the declarations of the minister. But that was not the question the member asked in question time; he asked him about the past. That is a ridiculous question. A member cannot have a conflict with their past.

Mr D.T. Redman: Go back and read the question.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: I did. The behaviour of the National Party is extraordinary. As I said to the member for Warren–Blackwood, there are some people who have respect for him and the fact that he did this dirty work on behalf of the Leader of the National Party is a bit of a surprise to us. We do not expect much from her, but we do expect some from the member. We are disappointed with that. I love the fact that he raised the Albany pipeline, the great mirage of the former government. Every year they kept saying, “We are committed to the Albany pipeline. It’s going to win us the seat.” The former government allocated \$9 million for the Albany pipeline. We allocated that money to other renewable energy projects in Albany instead. Is it not interesting? The former government fought me all the way to the Supreme Court of Western Australia to prevent me from getting freedom of information documents about the Albany gas pipeline. Guess what? It was a \$320 million project. Talk about a conflict of interest. The previous government allocated \$9 million and went to the people of Albany and said, “We’re going to deliver this”, for a \$320 million project and the opposition comes in here talking about conflicts of interest and honesty and all those things that it wraps itself in. There was no more political dishonesty than the Albany gas pipeline. Maybe there are some other things that we could go through with the member for Cottesloe, but, clearly, the Albany pipeline was a dishonest effort to trick the voters in Albany that the Liberal Party and the National Party actually cared for them. They were involved in a scam against the people of Albany, making false promises that they knew were false. They knew that the project was going to cost \$320 million. They allocated \$9 million and then said, “We’re committed; we’re going to do it.” What an embarrassment. How the member for Cottesloe can get to work each morning after having done that to the people of Albany not once, twice or three times but four times, because he did it back in the 1990s as well, is a disgrace. At some time, the member for Cottesloe will have to face what he did in life and the failures that were there all the time.

Two conflicts were raised today in this debate. Hon Alannah MacTiernan cannot have a conflict of interest when the member never held shares at any time that she was in Parliament or a minister.

Mr V.A. Catania: Was she elected at the time when she gave up her shares? Did she give her shares up after she got officially elected?

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: All these things are public record.

Mr V.A. Catania: No, I just want to correct what you just said. She was a member-elect at the time that she had shares.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: I will say it again: talk about conflicts of interest. Here is the man who got elected as a Labor member and then ratted. He talks about conflicts of interest. The reality is exactly what I said. Before she was a minister she disposed of the asset. How can she have a conflict of interest if she does not own the shareholding? What is going through the member’s mind to think that somebody who does not own something can have a conflict? It is just bizarre! Is the member saying that she is friends with the directors? Is that the argument? Let us go through the directorship friends the National Party has. Does it want to start that game? I will quote the code of conduct again, which states —

A conflict of interest exists where a member participates in or makes a decision in the execution of their office knowing that it will improperly and dishonestly further the Member’s private interest or another person’s private interest directly or indirectly.

It goes on to make the point that a member does not have a conflict of interest when they are a member of a class of people in the general population. For example, if a member makes a decision to assist mothers and happens to be a mother, that would not be a conflict of interest because the member is there as a class. That is not a conflict of interest. Interestingly, the member for Warren–Blackwood says that if he had been asked to make a decision about a matter to do with a property that was next to his property, he would have excused himself from that decision process. That is an admirable approach, but, of course, it is not what all ministers do. I would be surprised, for example, if a minister was involved in a decision to spend \$100 million of taxpayers' money on a project right next to their property; imagine that. That would be a conflict of interest in my view. Certainly, if they participated in the decision process it would clearly be a conflict of interest.

We also go to former minister Brendon Grylls and his relationship to the Ponzi scheme that operated in the Pilbara. That was a matter that we raised with the minister when he was in this chamber. He was helping promote a scheme to have Asian investors put money into a Ponzi scheme for the benefit of a crooked woman in the Pilbara. He was warned about it and he kept defending his decisions. That was the National Party's attitude to conflicts of interest and we have not even got to the problems with Pelago.

Ms M.J. Davies: In relation to the first incident that you raised —

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: Which one?

Ms M.J. Davies: —what personal benefit was the previous member receiving?

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: It will be interesting to know how much was donated to the National Party.

Ms M.J. Davies: Nothing.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: Is the Leader of the National Party saying there were no donations at all to the National Party?

Ms M.J. Davies: I have to go and check.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: Okay, I look forward to her coming back and letting us know.

Ms M.J. Davies: I don't look at the donations. We have a state director. You're a former state director, you understand how that works.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: I am sorry, I accept that the member does not know about it. I accept that.

Ms M.J. Davies: I am saying to you that you raised Brendon Grylls in relation to the Ponzi scheme and you are saying that there is a conflict. You have explained the conflict.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: On a number of occasions, we raised in here the need for the member to distance himself.

Mr V.A. Catania: He wasn't a minister.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: He was. We asked a series of questions—go back and read the *Hansard*. We did a matter of public interest motion or a suspension of standing orders—members should go back and read it. For crying out loud, we did raise it with the minister at the time. He had plenty of opportunity to distance himself from that, and he refused to do so.

Ms M.J. Davies: That's not correct; you're rewriting history.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: That is exactly what happened, member. He could not admit that he had made a mistake. He could not admit that his dreams were used by somebody to make millions. I am not saying that Brendon Grylls was a direct beneficiary of the Ponzi scheme; I am not saying that. I am saying that he should have been bright enough, when he was challenged about it —

Ms M.J. Davies: That's what you intimated by raising it.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: No.

When we raised it with him, he should have been bright enough to work out that he had got things wrong and correct what had occurred. Instead, he came in here and defended it. That he defended his behaviour is what was wrong.

It is just like Kingstream and the member for Cottesloe. I have never accused the member for Cottesloe of executing a state agreement for improper purpose; I have never done that. I have always said, and I will say it again now, that the state agreement entered into by the member for Cottesloe was used by Kingstream improperly. It was not the execution of the agreement that was improper conduct; it was the action after that by those people. The member for Cottesloe should have understood that that was a risk he was running. He should never have signed that agreement, because it was never going to go anywhere. It was signed for a political purpose, because in the lead-up to the 1996 election the Liberal Party needed a story, and it chose Kingstream as its story. It was done for a political purpose by the member for Cottesloe—not for a corrupt purpose, but for a political purpose. It should never have been executed. The fact that Kingstream used it improperly is not the member for Cottesloe's

fault. I am not blaming him for it. I am saying that he should have been bright enough to work out that the politics should not have come first and that he should have done that properly. If the member for Cottesloe had listened to the Labor Party during the debate, when the Labor Party said that it was going to refer that matter to an upper house inquiry, that is what the member Cottesloe should have done. Instead, he came back in here the next day, when he found out from the Labor Party, and waved around a letter from the CEO of the company stating that a delay of the state agreement would affect its capital raising on the Australian Securities Exchange. It was totally inappropriate that the member for Cottesloe waved around that letter in this chamber in that way. He should never have allowed himself to be used like that. As I say, I am not accusing him of corruption in any way or in any circumstance. I am saying that he was politically naive and he got used by brighter people who used that state agreement for an improper purpose.

Mr C.J. Barnett: That is disgraceful.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: It is not disgraceful. That is exactly what happened.

Mr C.J. Barnett: In 27 years I have never misused one dollar of government money.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: I never said that you did. What I said, and I will say it again in case you misunderstood, was that you used it —

Mr C.J. Barnett: If you're going to make an accusation about me—make it!

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: I am going to.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Cottesloe!

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: What I said is exactly what I said four years ago. I have said it outside the chamber in a public forum, so it is not like I am scared of anything. The agreement between the government and Nik Zuks was a mistake. It was done for a political purpose because the Liberal Party needed a headline in the lead-up to the 1996 election. They said that they would sign the agreement. They then signed the agreement, and in March 1997 it came back to this chamber for approval. The Labor Party said that the appropriate response was to send this matter to an inquiry. The member for Cottesloe came into the chamber with a letter from the CEO of the company, which he read into *Hansard*. That letter stated, "If you refer this matter to a parliamentary inquiry, it will prevent us doing a capital raising on the ASX." It was not the member for Cottesloe who was acting improperly; it was the people involved with the company who acted improperly. Let me make that clear again: what the member for Cottesloe did wrong was that he was not bright enough to work out that the government of Western Australia was being used by these promoters who went out and raised money for a project that was never going to happen.

Mr I.C. Blayney: A lot of people thought that Kingstream would happen.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: I understand that that is what they thought.

Mr I.C. Blayney: We didn't hear voices from anyone else saying that it wasn't going to happen.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: Go back and read the *Hansard*, member. I will send the member for Geraldton a copy of my speech in *Hansard* when I spoke about this last time. I do not want to take another hour on this. It is a complicated issue, but it was wrong of the government to enter into that agreement at the time. The Labor Party knew it was wrong, and that is why the Labor Party wanted the matter referred to a committee.

There have been a lot of problems in the last eight years around conflicts of interest. I want to refer to the member for Bateman's behaviour as a minister. I refer to the memorandum provided to the Premier from the Cabinet Secretary of Cabinet Services on 4 December 2014. The subject is the cabinet-in-confidence ministerial code of conduct review of the interests of the Minister for Transport; Finance. The minister had very complicated shareholdings when he came to office and rather than behaving like Hon Alannah MacTiernan, who simply disposed of those shareholdings to make sure there was no conflict of interest, unfortunately, the then minister held onto his holdings. Not only that, but also he created new ones. He also arranged meetings, as is all detailed in the report. The minister became aware of his conflicts of interest and transferred to another minister the approval process for matters that the conflicts of interest related to. However, that decision apparently was never known to the Premier or cabinet.

When the National Party comes in here and does not raise a conflict of interest about any member of the government, I point out that it was party to the behaviour of the Liberal Party in government when there were actual conflicts of interest, as found by the Premier, that led to no action at all. I am happy for members to read the memorandum of 4 December 2014. It is a bit rich to want the Labor Party to now take this seriously. Somehow we have to be held to account for not having conflicts of interest when the Liberal and National Parties happily went into government with actual conflicts of interest and there were no consequences. That is one thing about our side of politics: if things go wrong, there are consequences. When things go wrong on that side of the chamber, there are no consequences. I give the example of the members for Riverton and Bateman, both of whom had actual conflicts of interest and it led to no action.

Ms A. Sanderson: How about the trip to China?

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: The trip to China, absolutely. In the end, the Premier saw it was so bad that he had the trip cancelled. The minister thought it was okay to take staff to China to do his personal business, as found by the cabinet secretary.

Again, I am not saying that it is a conflict of interest to appoint a former groomsman to a senior role in the public service. That is not, in my view, a conflict of interest. Some people would suggest appointing friends to senior roles in the public service is a conflict of interest. But if the person is capable and talented, of course they can be appointed to a senior role.

Mr C.J. Barnett: That is appalling.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: What is wrong?

Mr C.J. Barnett: That is appalling.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: What is appalling?

Mr C.J. Barnett: You are implying that a senior public servant was appointed to a position because he happened to be an acquaintance of mine from a long time ago.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: No, I am not saying that at all. I am saying that that is not a conflict of interest.

Mr C.J. Barnett: I did not appoint him. He had been a 40-year public servant.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: No, what I said —

Mr C.J. Barnett: I know exactly what you are saying, and it is sleazy.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Cottesloe.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: Let me make it clear again. Let me say this again.

Mr C.J. Barnett interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member of Cottesloe.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: I am saying it is not a conflict of interest to appoint a person that someone is friends with to a senior role in the public service if that person is capable. If they are capable, they are entitled to be appointed to a senior role in the public service even if they are friends with the person who appoints them. Let me make that clear; I will say it again. It is not a conflict of interest to appoint a friend to a senior role in the public service so long as the person appointed is talented. I do not understand why the member for Cottesloe makes inane interjections when I have said it is not a conflict of interest. Is the member for Cottesloe saying that it is a conflict of interest?

Mr C.J. Barnett: So why would you say it? Why would you raise a senior public servant's position—someone who has been in public service for 40 years?

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: Is the member saying that it is a conflict of interest to appoint a friend to that job?

Mr C.J. Barnett: I am asking why you even raise an issue if you are saying it is not a conflict.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: I am making a point. We are talking about conflicts of interest.

Mr C.J. Barnett: No, you are not. It is grubby and you know it.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: It is not grubby; I do not understand this. The motion states —

That this house condemns the Premier for appointing ministers that have demonstrated a lack of public accountability and transparency.

That is what we are debating, and I am saying that if a minister or a Premier appoints a person who is a friend of theirs to a senior role in the public service, so long as that person is capable of doing the job, it is not in my view a conflict of interest. I did not say it was; I said it is not a conflict of interest.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Minister, through the Chair.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: I said that in the same way that I said there was nothing wrong with the member for Riverton appointing a friend of his to the board of one of the power companies; I mean, that is what happens. As long as they are a capable person, we can accept those types of appointments. I am not saying that there is anything wrong with those things. I am saying that is what governments do. That is what occurs in the ordinary course of events—so there is accountability and transparency.

That is why I want to reflect on the attack by the Liberal Party on the police minister today. The police minister involved the Public Sector Commissioner, a person of integrity and trust, and I am sure the member Cottesloe agrees with me. The Minister for Police made sure that the Public Sector Commissioner was involved in the

appointment process even though she did not have to under the law and even though the former government did not do that when it was appointing a person as the police commissioner. So, the accountability standards that we get from the opposition are a bit bizarre. The Public Sector Commissioner is a fine public servant. He is a person who, as the member for Cottesloe says, has dedicated a long time of service to the community. That is something we should be all proud of. As a former public servant myself, it is something I think public servants should be very proud of. Yet, the Liberal Party spent all its time today attacking the Minister for Police for a decision that involved the oversight of the Public Sector Commissioner. It just does not make any sense. We have to get a straight line on what the Liberal–National Party opposition means when it talks about accountability. It cannot just be that they did not do it, therefore it is bad. There has to be some substance to it. That is what I just do not understand. I do not understand why the opposition undermines the authority of people like Public Sector Commissioner, who was involved in the decision-making process that led to the appointment of the police commissioner. Yet, the opposition comes in here and undermines that role and denigrates it. The opposition says it lacks accountability. When the Minister for Police involves the Corruption and Crime Commission in an appropriate way in vetting the decision about who is going to be made to police commissioner, the Liberal Party attacks it; it tries to undermine the credibility of the CCC. Maybe somebody will have to 'fess up, but I am unaware of any member of the Labor Party ever asking for their name to be removed from the transcripts of the CCC, yet we know that has happened on the Liberal side. We know that, we have been there and we do not want to go back there again. By the way, the circumstances leading to the removal of the member's name from the transcript of the CCC has never been properly explained in this chamber. There was an edited letter placed on the table of the chamber for a single day of sitting, but the names of the people involved were removed so no-one could see what had actually happened. No-one could check to see who had been involved in the decision-making process, particularly remembering that the CCC had rejected the request to remove the name and yet in the end it was still removed. By the way, I asked in estimates one year how many times this circumstance had occurred and I was told it had occurred once. On one occasion has a person's name been removed from the records of CCC without the commissioner himself issuing a suppression order. The way that occurred is very, very strange.

There is, as always, on the opposition side a huge double standard. There is the double standard that it applies to the Labor side. It attacks Hon Alannah MacTiernan, who is probably one of the few members of this Parliament who is known outside of the Parliament. As I made the point last week in private members' time, if each of us went down to the Hay Street Mall, leaving aside the member for Cottesloe and the Premier, and 10 people in the street were asked who we were, nine of them would not know. That is the reality. But Alannah MacTiernan is not one of those. Hon Alannah MacTiernan is well known because she is an effective person on behalf of the community in Western Australia, which is probably why the National Party attacks her. It attacks her when there is no conflict—not only is there no conflict, there cannot be conflict, because at no time when she was a minister did she have shareholdings in Carnegie Clean Energy. I also note that I asked the member for Warren–Blackwood by interjection whether Hon Alannah MacTiernan had ever been a member of the board of Carnegie and interestingly he said he was not aware that she had ever been a member of the board of Carnegie. Of course, Hon Alannah MacTiernan was a member of a company called Energy Made Clean, which was taken over by Carnegie. That is how come she ended up owning shares in Carnegie. She has never bought shares in Carnegie; she received shares for EMC as payment for her board role there. When Carnegie took over EMC, that is how she got shares in Carnegie.

Mr V.A. Catania: At any time did Hon Alannah MacTiernan partake, while she had shares, in any sort of promotion of Carnegie or anything like that?

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: Have you asked her that?

Mr V.A. Catania: I am just asking you.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: Certainly not to my knowledge.

Mr V.A. Catania: Or yourself?

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: As I make it clear, and as the Premier made clear in question time, and I think it is in a written answer provided to the question on notice, Hon Alannah MacTiernan was not even on the committee that made the decisions about our policies. Also, we never made a decision to support Carnegie. There was never a decision to support Carnegie.

Mr V.A. Catania: Never?

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: Never; not by the Labor Party.

Mr V.A. Catania: There was never any promotional material?

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: No, absolutely not. Go back and have a look. As the Premier pointed out, that was not what we said in our announcement. I had no involvement in the decisions of government on this topic, but I was party to the Labor Party decision-making process, because I was a member of the little committee that we had to look at these matters. We never agreed to give anything to Carnegie. We agreed to have a policy that would allow wave power in Albany and companies had to compete on merit. As I understand it, the result of that policy was that when there was competition on merit, Carnegie won the project.

Mr V.A. Catania: I just want to get some clarification.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: It is interesting that the member for North West Central now seeks clarification, yet there were allegations made of a conflict of interest on a number of occasions by the National Party. Now they want to clarify the decision process. It is ridiculous. The member cannot come in here and make an allegation and then ask for evidence. It happens the other way around. Find the evidence and then make an allegation. It is ridiculous. At some point, members opposite need to appreciate that Hon Alannah MacTiernan is a formidable opponent to them. I understand why they throw ridiculous mud at her: we all know that she is a person immensely respected in regional Western Australia, as she is in the metropolitan area. I am sure Hon Alannah MacTiernan's decision to return to the Parliament of Western Australia was a contributing factor in our winning so many regional seats.

Mr F.M. Logan: They do not like that farmers love her; they love her.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: Hon Alannah MacTiernan is a fine servant of Western Australia and that is probably why the National Party does not like her. They do not put the interests of regional Western Australians at the top of their list. If they did, they would support Hon Alannah MacTiernan and not attack her.

Mr V.A. Catania: What about royalties for regions?

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: The former Labor member interjects about royalties for regions. I make the point —

Mr V.A. Catania interjected.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: I know; you are the rat; that is true. The point is that the Labor Party is 100 per cent committed to royalties for regions. We have not cut one cent from royalties for regions. We will never cut one cent from royalties for regions. We continue to operate royalties for regions exactly in accordance with the law introduced by the National Party and passed by this Parliament. We are proud to do that because we are the party of the regions. We are born in the regions and we continue to be the major party for the regions. This is the problem: members opposite cannot get away from the fact that no allegations have been made.

The allegation against my good friend the member for Willagee, the Minister for Housing, is that he was careless. He is hardly the first member who has been careless filling in a form. It is not as though he snuck into the Clerk's office and stuck a piece of paper underneath another piece of paper in his file and told journalists that he had submitted an amendment. He has complied with every aspect of his obligations as a member of Parliament. If he had not, members opposite would be the first to come in here and move a motion about it. The facts are, as members know, he has complied with all his obligations. He has made all the disclosures he needs to make. None of the returns that were amended relate to any time that he was a minister. That is unfortunately the problem. If we are going down the track of saying that anyone who amends a return in Parliament is therefore guilty of a conflict of interest, that does not take them anywhere.

Mr F.M. Logan: God help all of you.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: God help everybody. God help me, most probably. I have no idea. I am sure that at some time I will make an error filling out a form.

Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup: Not you, surely!

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: Of course. The member for Dawesville gave this little love ballad to me last week. I must say that he talked about meeting me in 2007 and the deep impression I left on him; member, I do not remember you, and I doubt anyone ever will.

Mr F.M. Logan: Even John Howard doesn't.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: I am sure John Howard does not remember, either.

The member for Warren–Blackwood made errors filling in his form when claiming travel allowance. We all make these sorts of mistakes. That is what happens. The member for Warren–Blackwood did not resign as a minister when he made those errors on his travel allowance claim form—neither did Hon Kim Hames resign when he made errors on his return. It is interesting that, of course, the Liberal Party now does not like the parliamentary pension scheme that the member for Dawesville benefited from.

Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup: Hey!

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: I refer to the former member for Dawesville.

I refer briefly to an email sent by a former member of the Labor Party to the Labor Party's information@walabor.org.au. I will read the first line from the email referred to by the member for Warren–Blackwood. It states —

I refer to your correspondence not dated received by myself and my wife on 8 September 2017 expelling us from the Labor Party. I am objecting to the expulsion. I am not disagreeing rule 4.7.3 has been breached because I did campaign for the National's candidate, Brendon Grylls.

What a shock that a member of the Labor Party has been expelled for breaching our rules. In fact, he was not expelled. Because he breached rule 4.7.3, he ceased to be a member of the Labor Party. We are not an incorporation organisation, so we do not have to expel people. If a person breaches the rules, they cease to be a member. He was not actually expelled. The letter from the secretary would have been the notification that he had been —

Mr P.A. Katsambanis interjected.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: No; we are not an incorporated association; we do not have to apply. I am a former state secretary.

Mr P.A. Katsambanis: It sounds Stalinist to me.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: No; we are an unincorporated association. We are entitled to have people join or not as we choose. That is the one thing that the courts will not intervene on. They intervene on everything else, but not that issue. Imagine a person who is told they are no longer a member of the party admitting they have breached the rules and therefore cease to be a member and raising spurious allegations against people they have never met. What a shock! It is hardly headline news. We do not need to hold the front page when we find that a disgruntled former member of the Labor Party makes stupid allegations about people in the party. How ridiculous is it to expect us to call the Corruption and Crime Commission and get police involved when a person makes unsourced and unsubstantiated allegations against the Premier and a minister. How ridiculous! It is hardly a surprise that a person who is upset about ceasing membership of the Labor Party decides to vent their spleen in the middle of a local government election. What is surprising is that the member for Warren–Blackwood would deign to bring this matter to this chamber—not on one occasion but on several occasions. How ridiculous. It makes more transparent what is sought to be achieved by the member for Warren–Blackwood. If it was genuinely about accountability, he would simply refer it to the appropriate authorities, but, of course, he does not.

It contrasts with the defence by the National and Liberal Parties of the Lord Mayor. Let us make it clear. The Department of Local Government, Sport and Cultural Industries, the Corruption and Crime Commission and the State Administrative Tribunal have all found that the Lord Mayor acted inappropriately. Indeed, the SAT imposed a penalty on her of 18 months' suspension, yet the Liberal and National Parties have come in here and defended her. However, we are supposed to suspend ministers from cabinet on the basis of unsubstantiated allegations from a disgruntled former member of the Labor Party. I want to make this clear. The Department of Local Government, Sport and Cultural Industries, the CCC and the State Administrative Tribunal make a finding, yet it does not move the other side of politics, but an unsubstantiated allegation by a disgruntled former Labor member does. It is a very interesting contrast.

Again in today's question time, attempts were made to make something about a number of members' staff being in local government. One of the councillors that I happily deal with in the City of Canning is a staffer for the member for Riverton. He was elected when the member for Riverton was the Treasurer of the state of Western Australia. Did we ask for a Corruption and Crime Commission inquiry into that? These are scales—it is bizarre that it is only when a Labor staff member runs for office that there is a need for an inquiry, but not when people on the other side of Parliament run for office. Let us not forget the letters that were sent by Olwen Searle, a councillor of the City of Gosnells and now Mayor of the City of Gosnells, to the Premier and the former director general of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, raising questions about the involvement of Liberal Party members of Parliament using their office to support the campaigns for candidates in the City of Gosnells elections. Those letters were replied to by the DG and the Premier to say that it was acceptable for the office of those Liberal members of Parliament to be used for that purpose. That is what happened.

Mr P.A. Katsambanis: Really?

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: Yes. Olwen Searle wrote to complain about the fact that a couple of Liberal members of Parliament were using their offices—their photocopier and their phones; all those things that are provided by the department—to directly support individual candidates in the City of Gosnells. Olwen Searle wrote to the Premier and the director general at the time of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, Mr Peter Conran, and they wrote back to her and said that it was acceptable for Liberal Party members to use electorate offices for the purpose of assisting candidates in the City of Gosnells. That is what happened, and not only that, a private message was sent to Mrs Searle to say that it was improper for her to raise the question with the Premier. I do not know the author of that private message, but I make the point that that is what happened. Not only was it okay for Liberal members to use their offices and their office resources to campaign for candidates in the City of Gosnells, which begged belief, but also the letter stated—this is great; I am sure members will love this: “Whilst there is an exclusion for the use of your parliamentary office for your own election, it does not exclude it for the use of people running for different elections.” The implication was that a member could use their state office to support a candidate for federal Parliament or local government, but not for themselves when running for state Parliament.

Dr A.D. Buti: What about other state candidates?

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: Who knows? Let me make it clear that that was the position taken by the member for Cottesloe when he was Premier. This is why I found it so bizarre in question time today when Liberal Party members were asking questions of the Minister for Police about one of her staffers putting something on Facebook about closed-circuit television, or something like that, and yet they authorised members in Gosnells to use their electorate offices to campaign for Liberal candidates running for local government elections. Can members see the problem at the heart of the attack in question time today? I am sure that even the member for Cottesloe gets the idea that criticising the Minister for Police for adhering to the spirit and letter of the rules regarding a personal staffer in her ministerial office contrasts greatly with the expectation of the member for Cottesloe when he was Premier on the use of electorate offices for local government campaigns. I must make the point here: my view is that state members of Parliament should not get involved in local government elections. I can tell members that I do not get involved because there is only pain and agony down that path.

Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup: No-one would ask you for help with your record.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: Actually, Liberal members ask me for help, but that is okay. I just tell them the same thing that I tell Labor members: I am not going to help them directly. I am happy to give them encouragement and advice, but I am not going to get directly involved because it is not a good idea. That is why I find it bizarre that the Liberal Party authorised the use of electorate offices for those campaigns in the City of Gosnells, and then had the audacity to come in here, without any evidence of inappropriate behaviour, and criticise the Minister for Police. The Minister for Police strictly adhered to the rules regarding her staff. One of the questions asked by the Liberal Party to the minister today was—I cannot remember the exact words—along these lines: “Are you ensuring that nothing is being leaked out of your office?” The point is that that is what the law of Western Australia states; it already provides an obligation on staff members not to act improperly. A procedure is already in place, and guess what? It is exactly the same procedure that existed when members opposite were in government and when their staff ran for parliamentary office; that is my point. It is an absolutely ridiculous criticism. There is not a skerrick of suggestion from the Liberal Party that these staff members have broken any rules. Not once did they make that suggestion and yet they think it is okay to have candidates in the City of Gosnells running their campaigns out of a parliamentary office.

Mr C.J. Barnett: No-one said that.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: They did.

Mr C.J. Barnett: No-one has said that.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: Yes they did; Peter Conran said it.

Mr C.J. Barnett: So everybody is running a campaign out of a member’s office?

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: Yes.

Mr C.J. Barnett: No.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: Yes, that is exactly what the member’s letter said.

Mr C.J. Barnett interjected.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: I have got it. I have read all the letters, member.

Mr T.J. Healy: And they are doing it again.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: They are doing it again. They are doing it right now based on the instruction that the former Premier and Mr Conran gave.

Mr I.C. Blayney: Will you table those letters?

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: I am happy to table it. I will come back tomorrow and table the letters. Peter Conran said that it was okay.

Mr C.J. Barnett interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members!

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: No, I am very careful with what I said.

Mr C.J. Barnett interjected.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: Yes, that is right—propriety. We are talking about propriety. We are talking about people coming in here and throwing stones at a minister who has done nothing wrong—a proud Western Australian in Hon Alannah MacTiernan. She is one of those few people in the Parliament of Western Australia who is known and respected by the population of this state. Members opposite come in here and make an allegation with no substance about that member. They then go and make allegations with no substance or basis against the Minister for Police. Members opposite even drag in the Minister for Housing, whose only sin was to correct

a record to make sure it was accurate about a period when he was not a minister, and make an allegation of impropriety. It is just bizarre that that is the approach that the Liberal and National Parties take to us in this chamber. We are not going to put up with it. We are not going to have the Liberal and National Parties come in here and do this. We are not going to put up with it. It is not appropriate, it is not right and it is completely and utterly unreasonable.

I am going to finish with one last allegation—my favourite one. My favourite allegation is that Labor members used to work for trade unions. I love that allegation. Of course, let me make the point: the Premier never worked for a trade union and neither did the Deputy Premier. The problem with their allegation is that it is factually wrong, but let me go further. For those members like me who are proud to be a former union official, it is a terrible accusation. Their accusation is that I worked on behalf of working people to try to get them a fair go. What a disgrace! How terrible can members opposite make me feel about how I used to help people with their workers' compensation claims, how I used to assist people who were injured at work to get what was fairly and rightfully theirs, and how I would negotiate wages for low-paid workers to get them a little bit extra so that they could have a more comfortable life? What a terrible allegation to make about me. Well, guess what? I am guilty of caring for ordinary people in this state. I am guilty of being interested in making sure that working people get proper representation at work. The problem is that members opposite cannot have this both ways. They cannot say that unions have too much power and then that they do not have enough power. They cannot come in here and say we should give in to the WA Police Union, but we are in the pockets of the trade union movement. They cannot say that we need to give in to the police union, because next week it will be that we should give in to the nurses union, and the week after it will be the teachers union.

Mr P.A. Katsambanis: You gave in to the UFU.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: No, we did not. That is rubbish; it is completely wrong. That is absolute and utter rubbish. If the Police Union had accepted the former government's offer, its members would have their pay rise by now. The problem is that the police union rejected the former government's offer. Hopefully, we can come to an accommodation fairly soon because, as I always say about industrial disputes, they always come to an end. They always come to a settlement; there is always an endpoint. That is why I have never gone out of my way to inflame the situation between the police union and the government, because there will be a settlement; we all know that. All industrial disputes end.

The opposition cannot have this both ways. It cannot say that we are weak on the unions and then criticise us because we will not give more to the unions. It cannot criticise us for being in the pockets of the unions and then tell us that we are undermining the independence of the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal. The opposition must pick a side of the debate and stick with it. The first thing that the Liberal and National Parties have to do is admit they got it wrong. They had one of the largest victories in 2013, and now they have to face up to the fact that over half their members were defeated. They must at some time come to terms with that, and ask why it happened. The Liberals and the Nationals lost trust; they did not put the interests of Western Australians first, and they made bad decisions and drove the state to the brink of bankruptcy. At some point they will have to start developing a strategy and moving forward. As I said before, it is pretty hard for the Liberal Party to move forward with the member for Cottesloe at the back.

Mr C.J. Barnett interjected.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: That is just a fact, member. The member for Cottesloe could do the people of this state a favour and do something else. He does not enjoy himself in here. He has not been happy for a number of years now. He may as well go and do something that makes him happy, because there is no point coming in here and dragging down the Liberal Party, holding the Liberal Party back from rebuilding, and sitting up the back there whingeing about how life is unfair and that history has not treated him fairly. That is just the way things are. In a poorly executed opposition strategy over the last six months, this motion must be somewhere near the top. Members opposite coming in here and not making an allegation about Hon Alannah MacTiernan, and not making an allegation about the Minister for Housing, but then telling us that we do not have high enough standards, having protected all those ministers during their time in government, is just bizarre.

MR C.J. BARNETT (Cottesloe) [5.53 pm]: This is private members' time, and I am very conscious that the minister, the member for Cannington, has spoken for one hour. This motion was moved by the National Party, so I am going to make a comment for not more than a few minutes, and I hope that the National Party will get the opportunity to speak to its motion in private members' time.

I will not refer to some of the things that have been said; I will just let them go by, but I do not believe for a moment that Hon Alannah MacTiernan sought in any way to do something wrong. However, it comes down to the role of a minister, cabinet responsibilities, and dealing with perceived or potential conflicts of interest. Many people who are in cabinets today, and will be in the future, will always be vulnerable to accusations of a conflict, for the simple reason that many people, particularly as they come in as members later in their careers, will probably have superannuation funds from previous employment. Those superannuation funds will typically have shares in the ASX

top 100 companies. We will all probably find that our super funds have some interest in major mining companies in Western Australia. I do not think that that is a conflict of interest, because a decision is unlikely to in any way affect the value of an ASX top 100 company. However—this is the problem that I think Hon Alannah MacTiernan faced—a decision can affect the price of a smaller company such as Carnegie Clean Energy. Indeed, when the company was seen to be the preferred developer of the wave energy project in Albany, that had a material effect on its price. That was the problem.

The shareholding by the minister, which was indirect, was probably negligible in value. The share price of Carnegie changed, but the minister's holding, I suspect, was negligible. I do not think there was any financial interest at all, realistically. She gave away the shares, and they probably were not worth all that much; I do not know. However, the point is that she clearly had had an involvement with Carnegie, and the group she was involved in, Energy Made Clean. She clearly had an involvement with the company. She was an enthusiastic supporter of the technology, and she found herself in the position of indirectly having a share ownership. For that reason alone, the correct decision for her and/or the Premier to have made—not to pursue a conflict of interest issue, because I do not think that was significant—was for her not in any way to become involved with that project as a minister. She should not have been the minister who went down and announced and promoted it. That responsibility should simply have been handed to another minister. Indeed, if there was any discussion in cabinet about it, she should have simply exempted herself from that discussion. I do not accuse her in any way of doing anything wrong; I do not think that that was in any way her motive, and I do not think that accusation has been made, but the process here was not right. I do not think it was a deliberate conflict of interest in any sense, but she should not have been given responsibility to be involved in that project. I dealt with lots of those issues as Premier.

Ms M.M. Quirk: Badly or not at all.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I dealt with many issues as Premier relating to conflicts of interest and relating to potential conflicts.

Ms M.M. Quirk: Your view of conflicts of interest was that there was only a conflict if there was a profit made.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I cannot believe that, as someone who is legally trained, the member for Girrawheen would be so stupid as to say that.

I am actually speaking on behalf of Hon Alannah MacTiernan, but I think it was an error for her to have had any involvement in that project. She should have simply been exempted from cabinet and exempted from participation. I do not think she sought any pecuniary gain at all from it. That is the problem, and it is not always easy.

Mr M. McGowan: I don't know if you followed it closely, but she offloaded her shares before she became a member of Parliament.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: It does not matter.

Mr M. McGowan: She did not have any shares.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I know, and I understand that totally. However, she had an involvement with the company as a supporter. For that reason alone, she should have simply exempted herself from any cabinet discussion that took place, and she should have exempted herself, or the Premier should have exempted her, from playing any role in that project. There have been lots of examples like that, and the Premier will get many more in his time as Premier. That was the error. It was not a huge error, but it was wrong, and if there is anything to be learnt out of it, that is what should be learnt.

Mr M. McGowan: So let me just clarify—if you've ever owned a shareholding in anything, you can't involve yourself in an issue as a minister?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: No, I am not saying that.

Mr M. McGowan interjected.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: No, I am not going to debate with the Premier.

Several members interjected.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: No, you do not get propriety, and as I faced some accusations then, I can tell members right now, and they will all laugh, that in my 27 years in this house, I have never taken a dollar and never misappropriated one dollar of government spending, and I have never given a dollar to any company in Australia, Western Australia or internationally.

MR V.A. CATANIA (North West Central) [5.58 pm]: I rise tonight to echo what the Premier just said. I want to read out the motion —

That this house condemns the Premier for appointing ministers that have demonstrated a lack of public accountability and transparency.

The Premier is leaving the chamber, but I just wanted to ask him a question that I asked the Minister for Mines and Petroleum: has he ever participated in any promotion with Carnegie since we have been talking about Hon Alannah MacTiernan and her involvement? The answer from the minister was clearly no. The lead speaker for the government clearly said that he had engaged in no promotion for Carnegie, or the Minister for Regional Development. Unfortunately, the Premier has left the chamber, but in his answer today in question time he said —

Under the standing orders, I am under no obligation to answer matters occurring before the government was sworn in. However, it is worth noting that WA Labor’s release mentioned Carnegie as “a likely” not “the likely” proponent.

I will come back to those two things because it is interesting as we delve in and look at what is going on. The PerthNow website published an article titled “First cabinet meeting for WA McGowan government”. The media report states —

“I want to make sure we run a transparent, accountable government that is characterised by decency, and ministers and members who behave properly.”

It is pretty fair and pretty standard for a Premier to make those statements. I know we are getting to the end of private members’ business, but perhaps the Premier will come back into the chamber. I go back to what the Premier said. He said “a likely” not “the likely”. I looked at media statements from when the Premier said this and one from 23 February 2017 titled “Jobs boost: New facility to allow Albany wave energy to become a reality”. That is a pretty good headline. The article states —

A McGowan Labor Government will invest \$19.5million to develop Albany as a globally recognised energy hub to create hundreds of WA jobs.

...

A McGowan Labor Government will also work with the University of Western Australia ... Carnegie Clean Energy and other stakeholders to develop a Wave Energy Centre of Excellence in Albany.

...

Comments from WA Labor Leader Mark McGowan:

“A new common user facility will allow Carnegie Clean Energy and others to establish wave energy in Albany, to help power households and create jobs.

I looked for where the Premier said “a likely” not “the likely” but I could not find it. I kept on digging and I found the “WA LABOR: Plan for Albany And the Shire of Jerramungup”. Have I not said that right? It is in the south.

Ms M.J. Davies: Jerramungup.

Mr V.A. CATANIA: Jerramungup. The plan states —

Wave Power for Albany

...

Carnegie Energy is now trialling the world’s first renewable micro grid power station using wave energy as one of its sources. If the trial is successful, the micro grid model could be used in Albany, powering thousands of households with renewable energy.

A news clipping from *The West Australian* titled “Total green power plan for Albany” states —

Wave energy company Carnegie Clean Energy has been identified by Mr McGowan as the likely proponent of Labor’s project after demonstrating success with the technology off Garden Island.

As I said, I asked the Minister for Mines and Petroleum, who is still in the chamber, whether he has participated in any promotional material with Carnegie with the Minister for Regional Development. The answer was no. We have Facebook, and people with phones can take photos at the drop of a hat. Suddenly, I see this photo on 23 February 2017. I could see the shine off the top of his head; it is the minister for mines, the Carnegie CEO, Michael, the Premier—and who is that in the red top? It is Hon Alannah MacTiernan. What are the signs behind and in front? It says Carnegie. That photo is from 23 February 2017. Would members like me to table it? Did the now minister have a shareholding at that time? By her account, yes. Did the minister for mines just deliberately mislead Parliament and say that he did not participate in any promotional material with Carnegie? Did I ask that question? What was the answer? No. Did the Premier say “a likely” not “the likely” proponent? There he is announcing \$19.5 million if the Labor Party is elected to government.

Mr W.J. Johnston: No, it’s not true.

Mr V.A. CATANIA: It is not true but it is a photograph of the minister.

Several members interjected.

Mr V.A. CATANIA: Is that not the Minister for Mines and Petroleum? I think he is wearing the same tie as he is wearing now. It is unbelievable, members. There we have it. Can members see? Would the member like me to table it?

Mr W.J. Johnston: You can't table it. Give it to me and I will table it.

Mr V.A. CATANIA: I cannot table it. Fine! I will show everyone again. Hon Alannah MacTiernan, now Minister for Regional Development, on 23 February had shareholdings in Carnegie. The Premier said it was "a likely" not "the likely" proponent. I think it was pretty likely because I can see the CEO of Carnegie in this photo. Members can see the minister for mines was actively looking on and nodding.

Several members interjected.

Mr V.A. CATANIA: Hang on a second. Government members come into this place, cry foul and start accusing the former government of this and that. The Premier sets a standard for ministers from day dot and suddenly we see this potential conflict of interest. Quite a few members have been councillors in local government. A councillor who had shareholdings or who had divested shareholdings or had been a part of a \$19.5 million announcement who then had to vote on the matter, would simply declare an interest and step out of the chamber. What is the difference here? My understanding is that this \$19.5 million did not go to cabinet. The Minister for Regional Development solely made the decision.

Mr W.J. Johnston: No, that is contrary to the answer you were given in question time. Go read the answer.

Mr V.A. CATANIA: The whole point is to minimise the potential conflicts of interest. I know that the Minister for Regional Development is passionate about this. I know that and I admire her for that. But the process has not been open and transparent. Clearly, the Minister for Mines and Petroleum claimed that neither he nor the Minister for Regional Development partook in any promotional material.

Mr W.J. Johnston: That is right.

Mr V.A. CATANIA: But here we have it. The Premier said it was "a likely" not "the likely" proponent, but we realise it was pretty likely when we see this photo. I will show members.

Mr W.J. Johnston: What was the announcement?

Mr V.A. CATANIA: That was on 23 February. Perhaps I can table the media release of 23 February 2017, which states that the government "will invest \$19.5 million".

Mr W.J. Johnston: In what?

Mr V.A. CATANIA: It will invest it in wave energy. There is a photo. It will create hundreds of jobs. Here it is— wave energy, Carnegie Clean Energy —

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members! Thank you. This is highly entertaining but let us settle down.

Mr V.A. CATANIA: I will read the rest for the member —

Comments from WA Labor Leader Mark McGowan:

"A new common user facility will allow Carnegie Clean Energy and others to establish wave energy —

It refers to wave energy —

Several members interjected.

Mr V.A. CATANIA: Clearly, the member wants to mislead. I agree with the former Premier; I do not think that the Minister for Regional Development has done anything untoward. The issue is that her attendance on 23 February, while she had a shareholding, is a potential conflict of interest. The fact is she divested her shares a couple of days after the election result and was member-elect for the North Metropolitan Region, and was going to be made Minister for Regional Development, and the share price was going up. Come on, guys! Members of Parliament, come on! Clearly that shows that there could be a conflict of interest being portrayed out there in the community.

Mr D.T. Punch interjected.

Mr V.A. CATANIA: It is not a point about giving to charity. The point is that on 23 February Hon Alannah MacTiernan participated in a photograph, announcing \$19.5 million —

Several members interjected.

Mr V.A. CATANIA: Hang on a second. The now minister knew that she was going to be a minister if the Labor Party was elected.

Mr P.C. Tinley: Commonsense!

Mr V.A. CATANIA: It is commonsense, I agree, because we all knew that she was going to be a minister in the McGowan Labor government, if that was going to be the case.

Mr W.J. Johnston interjected.

Mr V.A. CATANIA: The minister had his chance. He answered the questions perfectly. He said that he had no involvement, but the photo shows otherwise.

Mr W.J. Johnston interjected.

Mr V.A. CATANIA: The photo shows otherwise.

If we have a look at the time frame, how can we say there is no potential conflict of interest? I just do not understand that.

Mr W.J. Johnston interjected.

Mr V.A. CATANIA: Madam Acting Speaker, I cannot even hear myself.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Thank you! Member, if you perhaps just direct your comments through me, they might be less likely to interject.

Mr W.J. Johnston interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Thank you, minister.

Mr W.J. Johnston interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Thank you!

Mr V.A. CATANIA: He is giving me a headache!

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members, thank you! Member, making a comment like that is not helpful in trying to get him to behave, so through me, all right? Thank you.

Mr V.A. CATANIA: Like I said, if I look at the timeline and the photographic evidence—something that the Minister for Mines and Petroleum denied here, probably only 40 minutes ago—I just cannot believe it. If a councillor in local government lives next door to something that they are going to talk about and make a decision on in council, they declare an interest and walk out. If they have a friendship with someone, they declare an interest and walk out. If they have had any business associations, they declare an interest and walk out. What is the difference here? The Minister for Regional Development has created a perception, and if we look at the timeline, it is concerning. It is concerning that the open and transparent nature of making this decision has been marred by the photographic evidence and by the then member-elect divesting her shares, knowing that she was going to become a minister, after making an announcement of \$19.5 million on 23 February.

I think we have said enough. I think Hon Alannah MacTiernan is a good person and would not do anything untoward, but this decision-making process lacks openness and transparency. I know the member for Warren–Blackwood has touched on a few other issues. It is important that, as an opposition, we keep the government accountable and make sure that the government is open and transparent, as the Premier said when he first became Premier of Western Australia. It is a very important position. Members who become ministers take on a very important position, and it is important that transparency is upheld.

When we look at some of the media coverage of Lotterywest —

Dr A.D. Buti: Will you take an interjection?

Mr V.A. CATANIA: I have only five minutes.

Dr A.D. Buti: I took yours last time.

Mr V.A. CATANIA: I will not say no.

Dr A.D. Buti: You've got to separate a conflict of interest from a bias. We all have biases. Hon Alannah MacTiernan has a bias towards renewable energy, but that does not disqualify her from any decision to do with renewable energy.

Mr V.A. CATANIA: It is a fair point the member makes, but the point I am making is that the now Minister for Regional Development was participating in a photoshoot with Carnegie in the background, announcing the money—\$19.5 million—back in 23 February 2017 when she had shares, and then she became Minister for Regional Development and made the decision about the \$19.5 million. Can the member see that it is not open and transparent?

Dr A.D. Buti: It's very open and transparent, because you said she's in the photograph!

Mr V.A. CATANIA: The member will know—we are on the Public Accounts Committee, and he is the chair—that we disclose any potential conflicts of interest in that committee when we are doing an inquiry, including even relationships with family members who may work for unions. We make that declaration straightaway and ask for advice straightaway about whether we need to leave the room. Am I correct, member for Armadale?

Dr A.D. Buti: You have an outstanding chair!

Mr V.A. CATANIA: If we do it at a committee level and at a council level, surely we must do it at a government level. I think it is important. I am not saying that anything untoward has occurred in that situation, but it is important that decisions are of an open and transparent nature so the whole community can see how they are made. I think the member for Cottesloe is right: the decision to award money to Carnegie Wave Energy should have been made by another minister; perhaps the Minister for Transport could have taken that decision and signed off on it so that people could see that it was at arm's length. That is what we are saying: it needs to be at arm's length.

Mr D.T. Redman: In fact, the Minister for Energy could have done it.

Mr V.A. CATANIA: The Minister for Energy, because it would actually create one megawatt of energy. That is right, member for Warren–Blackwood. That would have been a more sensible, open and transparent approach than the situation we have here.

The Premier has refused to answer a lot of the questions the member for Warren–Blackwood has asked over the last couple of days by batting them off and dismissing the opposition, and I urge him to make sure that the government is accountable. That shows a lot of arrogance, because it shows that he does not want to be held accountable. That is our job, and that is the job that the Labor Party did in opposition. The member for Cannington I think did it quite well; he stood up and screeched nearly every day about this very issue.

Mrs M.H. Roberts: That's not what you said at the time!

Mr V.A. CATANIA: The member for Midland is probably right, but she also jumped up about that as well! All we are doing is our job. The Premier says he is open and transparent, but when we ask questions in Parliament about potential conflicts of interest or issues that just need to be cleared up for the sake of public scrutiny, he just bats them off. Perhaps that is the arrogance of having 41 members and thinking that he is going to be in government forever and a day. I will just say this: as we know, things change, and who knows what will happen in four years' time, but I am confident that there will not be 41 government members.

MRS L.M. HARVEY (Scarborough — Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [6.18 pm]: I, too, rise to support this motion —

That this house condemns the Premier for appointing ministers that have demonstrated a lack of public accountability and transparency.

I have some further information to add to this, and I would like to go over some issues that have been previously canvassed in this place. I think it is indicative of the sensitivity of the government that during private members' business we had a minister of the government stand up and consume an hour's worth of private members' time. There are 41 members on the other side and the opposition has limited opportunities in this place to debate motions, bring forward issues and represent our constituents. Those opportunities are limited to questions without notice, debates on particular bills, private members' business for three hours on a Wednesday afternoon, the occasional suspension of standing orders, and debates on matters of public interest. It makes things difficult when a government minister filibusters for an hour. Two motions were listed for debate today and it is clear now that the opposition has the time to interrogate only one. This goes to the heart of transparency and accountability. A number of our members wanted to canvass issues as part of this motion and they have been silenced because the member for Cannington, the Minister for Mines and Petroleum, consumed our time this week.

Ms M.M. Quirk interjected.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Why does the member for Girrawheen not get up and contribute something?

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members!

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Honestly, the interjections are not even intelligent.

Today, there was a debate to suspend the standing orders so that we could debate a motion about the actions of the Minister for Police and the political interference in the appointment process of the Commissioner of Police. When we talk about transparency and accountability, we really are talking about ministers and the Premier just being straight with the community of Western Australia and honest in the Parliament. When a government wins a landslide victory in an election such as this government did on 11 March this year, it has a mandate in the community. If the government wants to effect cultural change in the public sector, that cultural change must start at the top. If it wants to move on director generals and senior executives in the public sector so it can put its footprint on the public sector and start its cultural change agenda in the public sector, why not just say to the community, "We've been elected. We want change in the public sector, and we are going to move a lot of directors general on. If they are not going to help us effect cultural change, they don't have a place in this new government."

Instead of doing that, what did we see the government do? We saw a difficult, truncated process to get a straight answer from the Premier around the removal of a number of senior public sector positions. Instead of being honest and saying, for example, in the case of Paul Andrew, the former CEO of Lotterywest, who was moved on, “The CEO and I had a disagreement. I need to have a close relationship with the CEO of Lotterywest. I don’t believe we can work together; it’s time for him to move on”, we had a painstaking process extracting information through this house of Parliament and through questions without notice in the other place and through the FOI process. The media was asking about it. Finally, after several months we found out that the former CEO of Lotterywest Paul Andrew did not leave by mutual agreement with the government. A decision had been made early on that it was time for him to move on. A media statement was prepared well in advance of the CEO even being notified. We do not know as yet whether the board of Lotterywest was involved in the decision-making process. Paul Andrew’s name was dragged through the mud. He was then made to look as though he was incompetent and not able to perform his role, even though he was keeping up with all his key performance indicators and, in fact, was ahead of achieving some of them. Instead of the Premier saying, “The CEO and I don’t get on. He doesn’t have a place in the new government. I’ve got a mandate to do this”, he dragged that man’s name through the mud. He then tried to inhibit him from his rightful expectation of a payout of his contract. He had set up his life for five years, expecting he was going to be running Lotterywest as CEO, earning a certain salary, and instead that was cut short. That is a pretty significant financial decision for a family to adjust themselves to.

Point of Order

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: I do not want to interrupt the member because I do not want it suggested that we are trying to hide something, but I draw attention to the motion that this house condemns the Premier for appointing ministers that have demonstrated a lack of accountability and transparency.

Dr M.D. Nahan: She is talking about the Premier.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Thank you, Leader of the Opposition!

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: Unless that is the argument the member is developing, that she is somehow talking about the Premier as a minister, not the Premier as the Premier—I do not think the Premier appointed himself. I think we need to get back to the motion, rather than going off on a tangent about somebody who apparently must be friends with the member for Scarborough and is disappointed that his career did not take the pathway that he expected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: That is not a point of order.

Debate Resumed

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: There we see it again. The member for Cannington has stood up and consumed more of our private member’s time. What did he do? He cast a slur on the former CEO of Lotterywest again and on me as the member for Scarborough because I am going to the heart of the accountability of the Premier and transparency. The Premier should have just come out and said, “I don’t want that guy there.” That happens in companies every day of the week. A new member will be appointed to a board, the board decides the CEO does not fit anymore, they have an adult conversation, the CEO moves on and a declaration is made. Everyone gets on with it.

We had the same process with Mr Kim Papalia, the former Road Safety Commissioner. We still do not know what happened there. We know from the debate today that the police minister separated herself from the entire process. We know from the suspension of standing orders motion today and the 40-minute debate in this house that the minister had to defend herself for the entire 20-minute government allocation. The Premier did not stand up and defend his minister. That is appalling. When Colin Barnett was Premier, in every single one of these types of debates, if any of his ministers was under attack, he came in and defended his ministers. That happened every time the Labor Party scurrilously attacked ministers during our time in government.

We still do not know what happened or who had the conversation with Mr Papalia, telling him that he was moving on. What did we see? We did not see a process whereby the Premier or the Minister for Road Safety came out and said, “We’re not happy with the performance of this guy”, or, “We’re not happy that he is going to effect the changes that we want in the Road Safety Commission; we need to part ways.” What did we get? Mr Papalia’s reputation was dragged through the mud. We had a painstaking process of trying to draw out information. We still do not have information because the Premier is withholding documents that we have requested under the FOI act, and we now have to go through a process with the commissioner to determine that. That is the process. It is not a normal process, for members who are new to this place. The FOI process is very straightforward. For all those government backbenchers, the Premier was elected on the basis of a new level of gold-standard transparency. Listen to what we are saying. Does what we are saying sound like gold-standard transparency? Trying to get information from the Premier and the ministers is like extracting teeth; it is a very painful process.

Look at the comments of the former police commissioner Dr Karl O’Callaghan.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order, members! I am having difficulty hearing.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Former commissioner Dr Karl O’Callaghan’s comment’s in the media —
Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition does not appear to be taking interjections. I am having difficulty listening to her.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Thank you, Acting Speaker, for your protection.

When the minister was given an opportunity in question time to clear the air about what was on the front page of *The West Australian* today, which shows that the former commissioner is apparently at odds with the selection process for the current commissioner, she did not clear the air. We did not get the minister’s perspective on that whatsoever. We got no comment, no clarity—nothing. That is what we expect in this place. The minister sat down and refused to answer a question. When I was a minister, the current Minister for Police used to ask me all the time, “Do you agree with this? Do you agree with that? Do you agree with your commissioner?” Do you know what, Acting Speaker? I took those questions and I answered those issues. Sometimes those issues were really tricky because sometimes the commissioner and I did not agree, but I answered those questions. I did not take the coward’s way out by sitting down and deciding that I would not speak and not clear the air or improve transparency and accountability for my government and for my Premier. The Minister for Police probably knew that her Premier would not stand to defend her. He was going to throw the Minister for Police under the bus. He had no problem doing that. He did not defend her. We are not really sure whether it was the Premier’s office that decided to remove the Road Safety Commissioner. Perhaps the Minister for Police was not involved in his removal—we do not know, because the Premier’s office will not release the documents. Hopefully, the Freedom of the Information Commissioner will help us bring transparency and accountability to this process. All this is unnecessary because all the Premier had to do was say that the Road Safety Commissioner was on a tangent to the purpose of government and that it was time for him to move to a different place. That is all he had to do.

Then we had the estimates process—talk about painstaking. It was a debacle. I was in estimates with the minister representing the Minister for Education. The minister representing is on leave today. I asked a simple question, which was: of the senior executive service positions that are being removed from the Department of Education, how many of those individuals are women and how many are men? I wanted to know the gender breakdown. The officer sitting behind the minister was waving a piece of paper. He handed it to the minister but the minister refused to answer the question and said that I needed to put the question on notice. We argued backwards and forwards about whether we could have the number of SES positions that have been spilt. Still the minister said no, even though it was an estimates process in which the opposition gets to examine the activities of government. That information was denied us during the estimates process. Some of it was provided by way of supplementary information, but I was told to submit the rest of it as a question on notice. We waited for 30 days. When the member for Dawesville submits questions on notice, we wait for 90 or 100 days. If a minister decides that he or she does not like the member and thinks that he is contemptible because of his age and that this “young thing” is asking too many questions, they might refuse to answer them at all. That is what we hear from these ministers and that is why this motion is before the house today. This is the lack of transparency and accountability we are talking about and why this motion has been brought to this place.

The Minister for Mines and Petroleum stood and talked about local government elections and made a range of veiled accusations against members of the Liberal Party and their involvement in local government elections; indeed, he took a very holier-than-thou attitude. I will read into *Hansard* some material that has gone out for local government elections. The material is headed “A message from Rita Saffioti” and reads —

Dear Residents

2017 has been an extremely busy year in politics, with the WA State General Election in March delivering a change in government. I am focused on delivering the new McGowan Government’s election commitments for the local area both as the member for West Swan and as a minister.

Local government elections are beginning this month and Brabham residents will have an important decision to make.

You should soon receive a postal vote form for the City of Swan Council elections in your mail box.

I am urging you to vote to re-elect **Councillor John M McNamara** to the City of Swan.

As your local member of State Parliament I have been able to work closely with **Councillor McNamara** on a range of issues affecting the community.

Over the years he has joined me in advocating for safer communities, higher quality roads, improved aged care and better support and services for the local area.

John McNamara has a proven track record and will fight for what is right for Brabham.

I urge you to vote for **John McNamara** and place a tick next to his name on the ballot paper.

Kind regards.

Rita Saffioti MLA

Dr A.D. Buti interjected.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Member for Armadale, thank you for your interjection. Who did authorise it? It is not clear. Contrary to the Electoral Act, there is nothing on the bottom of the material to indicate that it was written and authorised by a particular person. When you look after the pennies, the pounds take care of themselves. This is a small thing, but the Electoral Act states that during a campaign, campaign material needs to identify who wrote the material and who authorised it.

Several members interjected.

Point of Order

Mr D.T. REDMAN: The member for Girrawheen is calling out across the chamber but she is not in her seat. I ask you to put it right.

The ACTING SPEAKER: There is no point of order.

Debate Resumed

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Talk about a double standard. I will go to some of the other comments made in this place.

There was an accusation today that when I was the Minister for Police in the former government, the process for the reappointment of the former Commissioner of Police, Dr Karl O'Callaghan, was inappropriate. I inform Parliament and make it very, very clear that the Public Sector Commissioner was involved in the process of the reappointment of Dr O'Callaghan. Dr O'Callaghan's performance had been monitored. The Public Sector Commissioner made inquiries of me as the minister, the Premier and other cabinet ministers about whether the commissioner was doing an appropriate job. During that process, a recommendation was made by the Public Sector Commissioner to the then Premier to reappoint Dr O'Callaghan twice and twice Dr O'Callaghan was reappointed. Cabinet was informed of the decision. It approved the decision to make a recommendation to the Governor and, as is appropriate, the Governor reappointed the Commissioner of Police and renewed his contract. It was not an open selection process. An appraisal was done on the performance of the person in the job and a decision was made to renew his contract and, appropriately, the Public Sector Commissioner was involved in that deliberation. It is incorrect to say that there was some kind of bizarre, renegade process when we were in government.

Mrs M.H. Roberts interjected.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: The Public Sector Commissioner —

Mrs M.H. Roberts interjected.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: There she goes again! The Minister for Police is slurring the reputation of somebody who said something she does not agree with. She does not agree with what Dr Karl O'Callaghan said but it was not enough to say that she did not agree with him. Instead of the Premier saying that he did not agree with him, he said that he is suffering from relevance deprivation syndrome and insulted him and undermined him.

Mrs M.H. Roberts: When did I say that?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I said the Premier, Minister for Police. Perhaps if the minister stopped talking she might be able to hear what I am saying.

The commentary that we hear —

Mrs M.H. Roberts interjected.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Acting Speaker!

The ACTING SPEAKER: Thank you, members. Deputy Leader of the Opposition, I have to say that your last comment did not encourage people to listen in silence. I will get you to direct your comments to me.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Thank you for your guidance, Acting Speaker.

What I am trying to point out is that a pattern is emerging with this government. When accountability and transparency are challenged, there is an attack on the person who delivers the message. When the accountability and transparency of the removal of the CEO of Lotterywest became apparent, there was an attack on the former CEO of Lotterywest.

[Member's time extended.]

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: When the Road Safety Commissioner as an individual pushed back and used the protections of the Public Sector Management Act to seek advice about a direction that he had been given to break convention and release documents that he believed had cabinet in-confidence, he was moved off into purgatory on the fourth floor of Dumas House to await his fate of a new appointment. We then saw an attack on the individual, Mr Kim Papalia, around his integrity and whether he made the right decision in requesting legal advice about a direction that was given to him by his employer. That was what we saw; an attack on an individual. The former

police commissioner, Dr Karl O’Callaghan, has an outstanding reputation not only in this community generally, but also in policing across regions of Australasia and in the United Kingdom. We saw an attack on the police commissioner in which he was accused of having relevance deprivation disorder and that he should step down. I cannot remember the comments but they were not particularly kind. That is the kind of attitude we see.

If this continues, I expect it will probably be good news for the opposition in 2021. We would like to see the gold standard of transparency that the Premier promised. We would like to see accountability with ministers appropriately responding to questions and not putting slogans into their answers. We would also like to see the Premier and members on the other side just being open and saying why they are doing things instead of going through this exhausting, drawn-out process of trying to extract information and get on the public record the reasons for the decisions government members have made. That is not a big ask. It is what being in government is about. We ask members opposite to step up and provide that transparency.

MS R. SAFFIOTI (West Swan — Minister for Transport) [6.41 pm]: The member for Scarborough wanted to educate the new members about transparency and accountability. Let me educate the new members in this house about transparency and accountability. The current opposition never provided information to the then opposition. Even the Perth Freight Link business case is still hidden. This opposition is demanding transparency and accountability but it will not release a business case for a project that is not going ahead. It is incredible! The opposition tries this all the time, saying: “Oh, new members; your government’s hiding information and we were so much better!” Everyone knows that is not the case. I am glad that the member for Scarborough raised the estimates process. I remember being in opposition and the current opposition used to start the estimates hearings with dorothy dixers. Do members remember that? I will tell new members how it used to work.

Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup: Good times.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I am enjoying myself now too; I will tell members that.

When we were in opposition, we used to prepare; that is number one. We used to have questions and sometimes the first question was asked by the then government side. That is how it happened. When we talk about standards of accountability and transparency, business cases—for example, for the Perth Freight Link—are still hidden and there was an absolute abuse of the estimates process. Opposition members knew that. Most of the time, more than 50 per cent of the questions were asked by members on the former government’s own side.

Several members interjected.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: In every committee I was involved in, a significant—in some cases, over 50 per cent—percentage of dorothy dixers were asked by the other side. That is a little bit of history for new members.

The other key point is that when opposition members make allegations, they need to build a case. The opposition has failed to do that today. Let us start at the opposition’s initial point. It reflected on the Minister for Corrective Services’ comments about Roe 8 negotiations before the election. That is how it all started. What happened? We won government and we negotiated with the company. We were criticised for negotiating with the company and getting a great outcome. Opposition members went from saying that we had to work with these companies to saying that we should not be working with these companies. We renegotiated a good outcome and there are jobs out there and projects are underway. That is how it started. Then there was an attack on Hon Alannah MacTiernan. I still cannot understand the opposition’s case. I have been in opposition and yes, I went through a lot of issues in opposition, but a case has to be built. This is where the opposition’s argument is fundamentally flawed. The minister did not own shares when she made her decision. Now the scope for a potential conflict of interest is that if a member had an interest in something before they became a minister, then they should absent themselves from all decisions!

Dr A.D. Buti: Or you have a passion about something.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Or having a passion. The member for Warren–Blackwood used to own a liquor store. Did he absent himself from all liquor licensing decisions in cabinet?

Mr D.T. Redman interjected.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Of course they did. There were variations to the Liquor Licensing Act and issues to do with dry communities. There were a lot of issues but it is absurd to say that because the member for Warren–Blackwood had a passion or an interest in an industry before he was elected, then somehow he should have absented himself from decisions. The former Premier used to say that he was proud of the experience and knowledge that members brought to jobs when they had been active out there in the private sector. He wanted people with experience and industry knowledge around the cabinet table.

Dr A.D. Buti: Minister, I presume under their rationale, if you were a farmer, you could never be a minister for agriculture.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Of course; clearly! Under the new criteria, as the member for Armadale said, if a member had been a farmer, they could not become a minister for agriculture because they would know too much about it and they would be too passionate about it! I have studied conflicts of interests and I have been through these debates.

There needs to be a real conflict or a potential conflict, which is that a member benefits from a decision being made; that is the line. I have been through it time and again when I have come into this place. Sometimes, I have prepared my stuff and been to see my strategy group but it has said, “No, no; it’s a stretch.” That is fair enough but members opposite have none of that. They have no clearing process. They just come in and say anything. There is no clearing process. This type of private members’ business is not talking about issues in members’ electorates. This is alleging impropriety against the Premier and the cabinet—that it is okay and we should be standing up and defending our record and what we are doing.

Again in relation to Hon Alannah MacTiernan, she gave away the shares to a leprosy foundation. I cannot even begin to think that members opposite would think that was a bad thing. As I said, she did not hold those shares when those decisions were being made. The Minister for Mines and Petroleum raised issues about the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr V.A. Catania: Minister, I take what you said about decisions not being made while the minister had that shareholding, but I showed you a photo of the announcement of \$19.5 million on 23 February when she had the shares.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I understand what the member for North West Central is saying but that is like any candidate standing in front of a business and then ultimately, that business wins from a policy. In opposition and in elections, members do things everywhere. Members stand in front of something—they might be supporting a particular industry—and if they win government, that industry gets money. That is what happens. If ministers do not personally benefit from that, or do not have the potential capacity to personally benefit, there is no conflict of interest. As I said, the new bar members opposite have set is impossible. We might as well all pack up and go home because everyone has had an interest in something before. That is what happens. Everyone has interests before they enter this place. Hon Alannah MacTiernan had a particular shareholding, which she disposed of. She disposed of it basically before she was sworn in to the upper house. There is absolutely no case in this case. Members opposite came in and wasted all that time—I think the Minister for Mines and Petroleum made a great contribution—but they made no case. None of the members opposite made the case. Like I said, the opposition has to line it up. It has to do the research. The opposition cannot just come and say, “She had an interest.”

Mr J.N. Carey: “I got a random email”!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Yes.

I have watched politics over a long time. Labor is held to higher standards; it is as simple as that.

Several members interjected.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: It is. I am telling members opposite that if the Leader of the Opposition was in a Labor cabinet —

Several members interjected.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Let us go through this: if the Leader of the Opposition was in a Labor cabinet and held Telstra and QBE shares while Treasurer, making decisions for those companies, he would not have stayed!

Several members interjected.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Because the pressure on us would have been more. It is as simple as that.

Several members interjected.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The pressure on us would have been more.

Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup: Remind me how many Premiers of the Liberal Party have gone to jail.

Mr W.J. Johnston: Dozens.

Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup: From the Liberal Party in WA?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Yes. Yes. Yes.

So the standards are always higher. The opposition thinks it can just come in and say whatever. Some weird accusations have been made, and now this random email from someone who is fighting to be a mayor. They send it to—what?—“info@”. I do not even know who “info” is, but I would think if it were serious, they might have sent it to the state secretary. But “info@” —

Mr W.J. Johnston: “walabor”.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: “walabor”. The opposition comes into this place and asks the Premier why he is not across it! Members know how many emails we all get, and the opposition would be the same. We get spurious emails about everything—everything! I could not imagine sitting there saying, “Oh, strategy group, I have a great question. There was a random email by someone who’s disgruntled, fighting in a council election, to a party email about an allegation that no-one is really understanding. Why don’t we ask the Premier of the day—that’ll get ‘em.” I would have been laughed out of that room. Sometimes I was! But on that occasion I seriously would have been laughed out of that room.

The new standard is if someone—any small business person—had an interest. The member for Warren–Blackwood said he could not make decisions on Jacob’s Ladder because he used it, but he made decisions on liquor licensing and he held a liquor store. Is this crazy? “Oh, I was so pure I excluded myself from decisions on Jacob’s Ladder”, but as a former liquor store owner—I suspect the member knows the industry and has good friends there because I suspect that is what happens when someone participates in an industry—he made decisions regarding the Liquor Control Act. The member represented —

Mr D.T. Redman: Member!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: No.

Mr D.T. Redman: You are making some accusations. You can be assured —

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member. Thank you.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The member for Warren–Blackwood represented the Minister for Racing and Gaming in this house. That is what the member for Warren–Blackwood did. I am not saying he should not have participated, but I am using his new bar. I never thought he should not participate. Of course, if a small business person who was a minister who no longer has an interest should participate.

Mr P.C. Tinley: We wouldn’t function otherwise.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: It would not be functional if that person did not. I am not saying the member for Warren–Blackwood should not have, but I am now going to set the same bar that the opposition has set today in this spurious attack on Hon Alannah MacTiernan to everything I have seen across my desk. The National Party comes in here talking about relationships after what you guys acted like in government! It used royalties for regions up and down the state—the reports are everywhere. There were informal agreements. Do you know how many times I meet with companies and say, “Look, I don’t think we could possibly do that”, and they say, “Well, we had sort of an agreement with a former minister.” I am trying to work through many of those agreements to try to get the public interest back, because the National Party had these informal agreements up and down. We are trying to work through that. The opposition’s attack is as bad as I have ever seen. There is obviously no strategy group to go through and assess these things. There are a lot of other issues.

If we want to start talking about amending declarations to this Parliament, there are some interesting new developments on that front. If we want to talk about people owning property near government investments, let us talk about that. Let us talk about people who own investment properties that back onto a \$100 million development. Let us talk about that. Let us talk shareholdings if the opposition wants to come in and start doing this. I am not going to go into all those details, because, honestly, the opposition’s attack is not worthy of it. But if the opposition wants to keep going through all this—all the potential conflicts of interests the opposition had when in government—let us go through them. I know where I stand on this and I know where the opposition stands on this.

I have said to new members that this is part of the continuing education process. Everything the member for Scarborough said about transparency and accountability was wrong. The former government was not accountable or transparent. It fought freedom of information applications every bit of the way. When I sent a letter to the Minister for Transport, he would not even sign the letter back. I have had meetings with members of the other side. I do not even think I could have dreamt of asking for meetings with former ministers, but I have had meetings with a couple of members—members who treat me with respect and are serious about their electorates—but I never had a meeting with one of the former government’s ministers. I could not even have imagined asking for a meeting.

Mrs L.M. Harvey: Did you request one?

Mr P.C. Tinley: Don’t start!

Mrs L.M. Harvey: I’m just asking. I never had request for a meeting with you.

Several members interjected.

Mrs L.M. Harvey: I had a request for a meeting with the member for Collie–Preston, and I held a community forum with him when I was a minister.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I will tell you what you did—it was the politicisation of the police service. You came into my electorate, held a police community forum with the candidate for that seat and a member. You did not invite me and you did not inform me. That was your politicisation of the police service back then! That is what you did!

Several members interjected.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: That is what you did! There was a community police forum in Ellenbrook before the election.

Mrs L.M. Harvey: Were there police officers there? There were no police officers there. There were no uniforms there, and you know it. There were no uniforms there.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: There were uniforms—we have photos!

Mrs L.M. Harvey: No. There were no uniforms at the political ones with the candidates.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: That is how political the former government used to run the police service. A few months before the election they would come into a then part of my electorate—Ellenbrook—with the candidate for the area, and did not even inform me. That is what they did—and they talk about politicisation of the police service!

Mrs L.M. Harvey: I never did that with the commissioner. You were invited to all the ones with the commissioner.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: No, I was not!

Mrs L.M. Harvey: Yes, you were! Yes, you were!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I was not.

Mrs L.M. Harvey: You were so!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: You used to do it all the time—politicise the police service for your own benefit.

Mrs L.M. Harvey: The member for Armadale came to the ones with the commissioner —

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: That is what you did.

Mrs M.H. Roberts: You did that with the opening of police stations and didn't invite the opposition!

Mrs L.M. Harvey: That's not true at all.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The now Minister for Police told me that story about when she was not invited to the opening of that police station.

Several members interjected.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: We talk, as opposed to you guys.

As for the whole idea that members opposite are purer than snow, why do they think they lost by so much? It is because everyone saw that they were unaccountable, they did not deal with the public properly, and they never, ever justified their decisions. Like I said, there were agreements up and down.

[Member's time extended.]

Mrs L.M. Harvey: You've used half of private members' time—good on you!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: If the opposition comes in and moves private members' business about some key issues in its electorates, we will discuss it properly. The opposition came in and made allegations about our accountability and probity. That is what it has done. It has done it through private members' business so, yes, we are going to fight back, and yes we are going to put our point of view.

Several members interjected.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Of course we are going to do that!

As I said, the National Party has found the words “probity” and “accountability” in the dictionary. Let us go through what it did in relation to Pelago. Shall we go through that? Shall we go through what it did up and down the state? The National Party is having a go at Hon Alannah MacTiernan for holding shares before she had any capacity to make a decision and raising an email not once in this place—I would think that after the first time they would realise they were not getting anywhere—but two or three times. It is an email all about a local election. The National Party is still hurting because it lost the seat of Pilbara. This is all about the loss of Brendon and the impact it has had on the National Party's way to move forward. It just cannot do it. The big issue it has brought into Parliament is related to the loss of the seat of Pilbara. That is what it is about. It is not about the current Premier and probity; it is about the National Party still not being able to handle losing the seat of Pilbara. Even though the current member for Pilbara comes in here every day, they still see Brendon. He is like a mirage in this place! They still see Brendon, and they come in every day wanting Brendon.

The education process for new members is nearly complete, but we might need to continue. When the opposition stands and tries to tell new members that the government is being very secretive, it is not right.

Debate adjourned, pursuant to standing orders.

**COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND JUSTICE STANDING COMMITTEE —
INQUIRY INTO THE ADMINISTRATION AND MANAGEMENT OF THE
2017 STATE GENERAL ELECTION**

Extension of Reporting Date — Statement by Acting Speaker

THE ACTING SPEAKER (Ms S.E. Winton): The Speaker has received a letter dated 18 October 2017 from the Chair of the Community Development and Justice Standing Committee, advising that the committee has resolved to extend the reporting date for its inquiry into the administration and management of the 2017 state general election to 15 February 2018.

House adjourned at 7.00 pm

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Questions and answers are as supplied to Hansard.

MINISTER FOR POLICE — HAWKER BRITTON GROUP PTY LTD — CONTACT**1912. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Minister for Police; Road Safety:**

I refer to the Premier's answer to Legislative Assembly Question on Notice 250 and ask since 17 March 2017:

- (a) has the Minister or current Ministerial staff met or had any contact with representatives of registered lobbyist Hawker Britton Group Pty Ltd and if so:
- (i) what are the dates for each meeting or instance of contact;
 - (ii) who did Hawker Britton Group Pty Ltd meet with or contact;
 - (iii) what was the topic of discussion for each meeting or instance of contact;
 - (iv) what third party, if any, was being represented by Hawker Britton Group Pty Ltd;
 - (v) was any follow-up action agreed to by the Minister or Ministerial staff:
 - (A) if so, what action was agreed to; and
 - (vi) what form did the contact take (i.e. email, phone) or for meetings, where did they take place?

Mrs M.H. Roberts replied:

- (a) Yes
- (i)–(vi) As at 17 August 2017: Emails dated 25 and 31 May 2017 from Ms Megan Anwyl and Ms Liz Vivian requested a meeting with the Minister regarding CHC Helicopters. A Ministerial Adviser meet with representatives from CHC Helicopters on 8 June 2017 to discuss their products and technology. CHC Helicopters was referred to the Western Australia Police Force for general information regarding tender processes. Ministerial staff and myself may have had contact with representatives for administrative purposes or may have had social contact.

PREMIER — PORTFOLIOS — CONFERENCE, SEMINAR AND WORKSHOP ATTENDANCE**2022. Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup to the Premier; Minister for Public Sector Management; State Development, Jobs and Trade; Federal-State Relations:**

Since 1 January 2017, have any officers or board members of a department, agency, Commission or Government Trading Enterprise (GTE) within the Premier's portfolio of responsibilities attended a conference, seminar or workshop organised by a private organisation for which attendance was paid for by the department, agency, Commission or GTE, and if yes:

- (a) what was the name of the event attended by the officer or board member;
- (b) on what date was the event;
- (c) where was the event held;
- (d) how many officers or board members attended;
- (e) what is the name of the organiser or facilitator of the event; and
- (f) what was the ticket or entry cost of attendance for each officer or board member, and what was the cost of any travel or accommodation as part of the officer or board member's attendance?

Mr M. McGowan replied:Goldcorp

From 1 January 2017 to 16 March 2017

Event	Date	Location	Attendees	Organiser	Total Cost Each
World Money Fair	Feb-17	Germany	5	World Money Fair	\$4,976
Asian Wealth Management Forum	Feb-17	Hong Kong	1	Hubbis	\$3,152
Retail Leaders Forum	Mar-17	Sydney	1	Connect Events	\$2,795
India International Bullion Summit	Mar-17	India	1	India Bullion and Jewellers Association	\$3,463
LBMA Assaying & Refining Conference	Mar-17	UK	2	London Bullion Market Association	\$7,049
Singapore International Coin Fair	Mar-17	Singapore	1	Singapore International Coin Fair	\$1,346

From 17 March 2017 to 28 June 2017

Event	Date	Location	Attendees	Organiser	Total Cost Each
CPA Week Conference	Jun-17	Perth	2	CPA	\$1,509
Asia Pacific Precious Metals Conference	Jun-17	Singapore	2	Foretell Business Solutions	\$2,460
Futures Industry Conference	Apr-17	Dubai	1	FIA	\$11,584
Tokyo International Coin Convention	Apr-17	Tokyo	1	JNDA	\$8,957
WA State Heritage & History Conference	May-17	Perth	1	Meeting Masters	\$100
World Fair Convention	May-17	Perth	1	Meeting Masters	\$100

From 28 June 2017 to 30 June 2017

Nil

(a)–(f) Not applicable.

From 1 July 2017 to 7 September 2017

Event	Date	Location	Attendees	Organiser	Total Cost Each
World's Fair of Money	Aug-17	USA	2	American Numismatic Association	\$8,309

Lotterywest

From 1 January 2017 to 16 March 2017

(a) Event	(b) Date	(c) Location	(d) Attendees	(e) Organiser	(f) Cost Entry	(f) Travel Costs	(f) Accommodation Costs
WA Homelessness breakfast	24/01/2017	K&L Gates Perth	2	Tenancy WA	154.55		
The Funding Network Conference	31/01/2017	King Street Perth	1	The Funding Network	18.18		
The Funding Network Conference	31/01/2017	King Street Perth	1	The Funding Network	27.27		
AIM Professional Member sundowner	27/02/2017	AIM Floreat	1	AIM	61.82		
Financial Review Business Summit Meeting	7/03/2017	Sydney	1	Retail Leaders Forum	879.03	*3917.85	848.00
Australian Computing Society (ACS) State Conference	16/03/2017	Pan Pacific Hotel Perth	1	ACS	718.18		
Australian Computing Society (ACS) State Conference	16/03/2017	Pan Pacific Hotel Perth	1	ACS	718.18		

*includes costs of travel to another meeting attended in Melbourne in the same trip

From 17 March 2017 to 28 June 2017

Please refer to Legislative Assembly Question on Notice 1545.

From 28 June 2017 to 30 June 2017

(a) Event	(b) Date	(c) Location	(d) Attendees	(e) Organiser	(f) Cost of Entry
IPAA Awards	30/06/2017	Hyatt Perth	4	IPAA	600.00

From 1 July 2017 to 7 September 2017

(a) Event	(b) Date	(c) Location	(d) Attendees	(e) Organiser	(f) Cost of Entry
Corporate Responsibility Research (CRR) Conference	26/07/2017	Perth Zoo	4	WACOSS	619.27
WA Association for Mental Health (WAAMH) Conference	13/07/2017	Perth Concert Hall	1	WA Association Mental Health	363.64
Social Impact Conference 2017	18/07/2017	UWA Business School	1	Centre for Social Impact UWA	22.73
Mental Health First Aid	20/07/2017	Cockburn	1	St John of God	181.82
Ending Homelessness Seminar	5/08/2017	Hyatt Perth	1	Shelter WA	20.00
Innovation workshop	5/08/2017	11 Mounts Bay Road	1	Ernst & Young	91.18
Housing and Homelessness Lessness Forum	8/08/2017	The Platform Perth	1	Shelter WA	90.00
Cranlana Alumni Masterclass	26/08/2017	Mt Eliza House Kings Park	1	Cranlana	54.55
Digital Government Session	30/08/2017	Pan Pacific Hotel Perth	1	IPAA	227.27
Facilitation	22/11/2017	AIM Floreat	1	AIM	1,236.36

Premier and Cabinet

From 1 January 2017 to 16 March 2017

Event	Date	Location	Attendees	Facilitator	Entry Cost (each)	Other Costs
Compulsory Land Acquisition Claims.	8 March 2017	Perth	One	Legalwise Seminars.	\$480	Nil

From 17 March 2017 to 28 June 2017

Please refer to Legislative Assembly Question on Notice 1545.

From 28 June 2017 to 30 June 2017

Nil.

(a)–(f) Not applicable.

From 1 July 2017 to 7 September 2017

Event	Date	Location	Attendees	Facilitator	Entry Cost (each)	Other Costs
Advanced Strategic Planning	20 July 2017	Perth.	One	WA Institute of Public Administration Australia	\$660.	Nil
Turning Plans into Outcomes – NDS WA 2017 conference	11 – 12 September 2017	Crown Perth	Two (shared ticket).	National Disability Services	\$500 (1 ticket – 2 staff attend)	
IPAA WA Public Sector Young Professionals' Conference: Fresh Thinking for a Changing Environment	1 September 2017	Deloitte Building, Level 9, Tower 2, Brookfield Place, St Georges Terrace, Perth	Seven	Institute of Public Administration Australia WA	\$180	
Mindfulness Circuit Breaker	21 July 2017	Floreat.	One) Australian Institute of Management.	\$795.	
Developing a Sound Business Case	26 July 2017	Perth	One	WA Institute of Public Administration Australia	\$660.	

Public Sector Commission

From 1 January 2017 to 16 March 2017

Event	Date	Location	Attendees	Facilitator	Entry Cost (each)	Other Costs
Policy development workshop	23 January 2017	South St, Murdoch, WA	1	Institute of Public Administration, Australia	\$561.00	\$0.00
Fringe Benefit Tax workshops	14 February 2017	Havelock St, West Perth, WA	4	Thompson Reuters	\$660.00	\$0.00

From 17 March 2017 to 28 June 2017

Please refer to Legislative Assembly Question on Notice 1545.

From 28 June 2017 to 30 June 2017

Nil

(a)–(f) Not applicable.

From 1 July 2017 to 7 September 2017

Event	Date	Location	Attendees	Facilitator	Entry Cost (each)	Other Costs
Contract Management workshop	1 August 2017	South St, Murdoch, WA	1	Institute of Public Administration, Australia	\$605.00	\$0.00
Service Priority Review workshop	10 July 2017	St George's Tce, Perth, WA	2	Institute of Public Administration, Australia	\$50.00	\$0.00
The Economic Impact of Domestic Violence	3 August 2017	St George's Tce, Perth, WA	1	Committee for Economic Development, Australia	\$185.00	\$0.00
Freedom of Information Conference	10 August 2017	South St, Murdoch, WA	2	Institute of Public Administration, Australia	\$49.50	\$0.00
Fresh thinking for a Changing Environment - Young Professionals	1 September 2017	South St, Murdoch, WA	5	Institute of Public Administration, Australia	\$290.00	\$0.00

Salaries and Allowances Tribunal

From 1 January 2017 to 16 March 2017

Nil.

(a)–(f) Not applicable.

From 17 March 2017 to 28 June 2017

Please refer to Legislative Assembly Question on Notice 1545.

From 28 June 2017 to 30 June 2017

Nil.

(a)–(f) Not applicable.

From 1 July 2017 to 7 September 2017

Nil.

(a)–(f) Not applicable.

State Development, Jobs and Trade

From 1 January 2017 to 16 March 2017

[See tabled paper no 877.]

From 17 March 2017 to 28 June 2017

Please refer to Legislative Assembly Question on Notice 1545.

From 28 June 2017 to 30 June 2017

Nil.

(a)–(f) Not applicable.

From 1 July 2017 to 7 September 2017

[See tabled paper no 877.]

