

Mr Mark McGowan; Dr Kim Hames; Mr David Templeman; Mr John Kobelke; Mr John Hyde; Mr Tony Simpson; Speaker; Mr Eric Ripper; Ms Margaret Quirk; Acting Speaker; Mr Christian Porter; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Bill Johnston; Dr Tony Buti

MINISTER FOR EMERGENCY SERVICES — NO CONFIDENCE

Standing Orders Suspension — Motion

MR M. MCGOWAN (Rockingham) [10.04 am] — without notice: I move —

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

That this house has no confidence in the Minister for Emergency Services and calls on him to accept ministerial responsibility for the management failures within FESA and resign from the portfolio.

This is an extremely important issue. We are dealing with one of the most dramatic events in recent Western Australian history, whereby 71 houses were lost and people's lives were put at risk. Enormous failures have been revealed in a report by an eminent Australian into our fire management authority in Western Australia. It is an extremely important issue. We have brought this matter before the Parliament today and we expect that the government will agree with the urgency of this matter and allow a full debate of these issues, not some half-baked debate or some shortened examination of these issues. We have now had this report for a day. We have had time to digest the issues involved. This Parliament needs to have a full debate of the issues, not a short, 30 minutes for each side fraud of a debate that does not allow full examination of all the issues.

This report is 211 pages long. It is complex and involved. It requires full examination by this house. It should not be a restricted examination of the issues. We call upon the Leader of the House and the minister responsible, who is one and the same person, to allow that full debate to take place. The member for Armadale, whose electorate directly borders the area in which the fires took place, should have the opportunity to fully examine this report so that Parliament can get to the bottom of these matters. The member for Darling Range, a Liberal member of Parliament, was in the area at the time. He should have an opportunity to have his say on these matters. All the members who had a direct involvement in these issues should have such an opportunity. There should not be some sterilised, shortened debate of this issue, because it is a matter of grave importance, particularly to those people who, as outlined in the report, were out there on those days battling for their houses. Those people's lives were under threat. The people who fought the fires were concerned and confused by the management failures in this area. All those people should have the knowledge that Parliament has examined all the issues in a comprehensive fashion. The government should not say that there are more important matters than this one to be brought on today, such as the first order of the day, the State Superannuation Amendment Bill 2011. The State Superannuation Amendment Bill can wait until the next sitting of Parliament. It is not that urgent that it should take priority over a debate into a 211-page report that outlines a litany of failures and, in my view, a litany of failures by a minister. If the government wants to cover up and not allow its members to have a say, be it on its head. Be it on its head if it wants to have a sterilised, truncated fraud of a debate.

The reason that this matter is urgent is that the Minister for Emergency Services has some very important questions to answer about these massive failures. He needs to allow the suspension of standing orders because a full debate is required into this report. He has some important questions to answer. The first question relates to the cover of the report. The report is titled "A Shared Responsibility". It is shared by everyone—except the minister! So everyone has responsibility except for the Minister for Emergency Services, who says, "It's nothing to do with me". What did he say? We can read it on the front page of today's *The West Australian*—"I haven't done anything wrong". It is not his responsibility; it is nothing to do with him. He is only the minister! Whereas the title of the report is sending a message to him, and it is not so subliminal: it is a shared responsibility, and he is the minister. He needs to take responsibility. He needs to stand in this Parliament, allow a full debate and explain to the house exactly what he did on the day. Where was he? Was he out having dinner on the day? We need to know exactly where he was on 6 February and what he was up to. We need to know what he did in the weeks following. We need to know about all the meetings and activities he went to in relation to his agency in the weeks beforehand and the weeks after. We knew it was going to be a difficult fire season; we know that the climate is drying. We know all those things, but we need to know exactly what the minister did, rather than blaming other people.

We also need to know what the minister has done in the period since this report was handed to him, on my understanding, six or eight weeks ago. What has he done in the time since?

Mr R.F. Johnson: I'll tell you.

Mr M. McGOWAN: Yes, exactly, and that is why we need a full debate, so we can find out all those things. What was the minister up to on that Sunday? What did he do that evening? Was he out at dinner? What did he

Mr Mark McGowan; Dr Kim Hames; Mr David Templeman; Mr John Kobelke; Mr John Hyde; Mr Tony Simpson; Speaker; Mr Eric Ripper; Ms Margaret Quirk; Acting Speaker; Mr Christian Porter; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Bill Johnston; Dr Tony Buti

get up to? What did he know about the Fire and Emergency Services Authority cover-up? What did he know about the report that FESA submitted to the inquiry? What did he know about the relationship between FESA and the Department of Environment and Conservation, and what did he do to fix that relationship, which had such obvious catastrophic consequences on the day of the event?

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Eyre, I formally call you to order for the first time. Member for Joondalup, I formally call you to order for the first time today. Members, I have given the opportunity to the member for Rockingham, the manager of opposition business, to put his case. He does not need assistance from anybody else in this place.

Mr M. McGOWAN: We need to know answers to those questions, and that is just scratching the surface. That is just scratching the surface of the answer we need from the minister. We do not accept that he should scapegoat a public servant just because he can. We think that the concept of ministerial responsibility, a Westminster tradition laid down in the texts under which ministers are responsible for the actions of their departments, actually means something. We think that the minister should be removed from that part of his portfolio for which he is responsible, but for which he has thrown up his hands and said, "It's nothing to do with me". We think he should be removed from that part of his portfolio, and we think the Premier should have been here for this debate this morning, when it was obvious that it would come on, so that we could get to the bottom of all these matters.

I saw the Premier on television last night saying, in the most remarkable case of doublespeak I have ever heard, "We're sacking Jo Harrison-Ward, but we're not coming up with any scapegoats". That was worthy of *1984*! George Orwell would have been proud of that one! We think that there is one party the Premier has missed, and that is his Minister for Emergency Services. We need to know what responsibility he took, what he did before the event, what he did on the day of the event, what he did subsequent to the event and what he has done since this report arrived on his desk, to repair the problems over the past six to eight weeks. All those questions need to be answered, and the minister needs to give this Parliament a full opportunity to debate this matter.

If the minister stands and says, "We're only going to allow 30 minutes each side; that's fair and reasonable", we will not support that, and we will not support it in a vote before this Parliament. We will not support a one-hour debate on this issue; we think that members of Parliament, elected by their constituents who have an interest in this matter, should have an opportunity to debate this matter prior to the bringing on of the State Superannuation Amendment Bill 2011. We think all members who have concerns, including members of the Liberal Party, should have the opportunity to debate this matter. I can tell the minister that a lot of members of his own party are not happy with him, and a lot of them want to hear him apologise; a lot of them want to hear him say sorry. I want the minister to stand in this Parliament, accept this motion, stand down from that part of his portfolio, and actually say sorry. It would be nice to hear. I think his colleagues would also like to hear him say that. This is his opportunity to do that. We want to set out the case, and he needs to give us a full and complete opportunity to do so.

DR K.D. HAMES (Dawesville — Deputy Premier) [10.14 am]: It is the usual story here; give an inch, and someone wants to take a mile. What we would usually be debating in this situation is whether we agree, as a government, to suspend standing orders, not how long we are going to be debating this matter. The mistake I made in standing in for the Premier was that as soon as I received the request, I agreed to suspend standing orders to have this debate. The opposition having gained that first step so easily—without any argument whatever on my part, because I regard any no-confidence motion against a minister of this government to be extremely serious—suddenly the debate is not about whether we suspend standing orders, but about how long the debate goes on for.

I do not accept that we need to have an extended debate on this motion, because this motion is not about the report; this motion is a motion of no confidence in a cabinet minister. It is totally about the minister and his actions, not —

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Mandurah, I formally call you order for the first time today. Member for Girrawheen, I formally call you order for the first time today.

Ms M.M. Quirk interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Girrawheen, I formally call you to order for the second time today.

Dr K.D. HAMES: This motion —

Mr Mark McGowan; Dr Kim Hames; Mr David Templeman; Mr John Kobelke; Mr John Hyde; Mr Tony Simpson; Speaker; Mr Eric Ripper; Ms Margaret Quirk; Acting Speaker; Mr Christian Porter; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Bill Johnston; Dr Tony Buti

Mr A.P. O’Gorman interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Joondalup, I formally call you to order for the second time today.

Dr K.D. HAMES: As it is clearly worded, the motion before the house today is not about the report or the contents of the report; it is a motion of no confidence in the minister. I believe that half an hour on each side under matter of public interest rules gives ample opportunity for the opposition to make its case, and for the government to defend the minister in his actions. I repeat: there was nothing in the report whatsoever that reflected adversely on the Minister for Emergency Services. It is the usual practice of any opposition to call for scalps from the government; it is what we would have done, and did do, when we were on the opposition side, and we were somewhat more successful. But I quite clearly remember, when we were on that side and debating motions of no confidence in Labor government ministers, that debate took place under MPI time frames. The government seeks to do nothing different from what the Labor Party did in government. We accept that this is a very serious motion, and we think half an hour is adequate for the opposition to present its case, as it was for us in the past to present similar cases against former ministers.

Standing Orders Suspension — Amendment to Motion

Dr K.D. HAMES: I move —

To insert after “moved” —

and the debate proceed according to the time limits of a matter of public interest

MR D.A. TEMPLEMAN (Mandurah) [10.18 am]: The government is again attempting to gag a very important debate that this Parliament must hear. The Minister for Emergency Services is under very serious scrutiny, as he should be, after the bringing down yesterday of a major report which highlights a range of failings by the Fire and Emergency Services Authority, and which also goes to the very top of who is in ultimate control of the operations of that department. That goes very much to the minister of the day, and the minister of the day is the Minister for Emergency Services—the Leader of the House. Now we have heard from the Deputy Premier—the Premier is not here this morning; he has gone to Canberra—and the government is in disarray because it does not know how to handle this.

The simple fact is very clear: this Parliament should be able to have a full and open debate to ensure that we have an opportunity without the constraints of half an hour—which is what we just heard the Deputy Premier move—in which to have a full, frank and transparent debate about the incompetence of this particular minister. I appeal to those members on the other side, particularly those new members who came into this place in 2008 and who claimed they wanted to make sure that this Parliament was able to debate transparently and have accountability—we remember them! Some of them claim to have been brought here with a mandate to ensure transparency and accountability; where will they stand when this comes to a vote in a minute? Where will the member for Carine stand? What will the member for Carine do? He will not do anything to show accountability and transparency as he argued in his maiden speech in this place. What about the member for Southern River? He has shown some guts by introducing a bill about trading franchises, but where will he stand in a minute when he is called upon to vote to have only half an hour for the opposition to interrogate this minister?

This minister stands condemned if members support this amendment. Members are condemning this minister if the government is going to gag us and allow only half an hour in which to pursue him in his responsibilities with regard to this motion. Where will the member for Wanneroo stand? His mouth flaps open every now and then when he thinks something is important, but I want to hear what he says when we get to this vote. Why does the member not stand up for the people of Wanneroo who are also under threat from bushfires in the future —

The SPEAKER: Member for Mandurah, I have given you the opportunity to speak to the motion before the house. I have not given you the opportunity to speak about every member in this place and what he or she might or might not do. Member for Mandurah, I am going to pull you back to the motion before the house.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: The motion is very clear. We have brought forward a motion that ultimately questions the capacity and the abilities of the minister with responsibility for emergency services in this state. We have a right as an opposition, and backbench members of the government have the responsibility, to ensure that we have the opportunity to have a frank, proper, and transparent discussion and a very strong debate in this place. If government backbenchers support a gagging of only half an hour, those members stand condemned, as does any member of the government who decides that we will have only half an hour during which the minister will at some stage get up and babble on like he did in the press conference yesterday—an embarrassing press conference under any standards in this place! Government backbenchers are going to support that and allow a

Mr Mark McGowan; Dr Kim Hames; Mr David Templeman; Mr John Kobelke; Mr John Hyde; Mr Tony Simpson; Speaker; Mr Eric Ripper; Ms Margaret Quirk; Acting Speaker; Mr Christian Porter; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Bill Johnston; Dr Tony Buti

couple of people who sit in the front of this place to override them. We all know that some people on the other side have some guts. We all know that on Tuesday there was some very frank debate in the government's party room. In fact, I am assured that one or two of the members who are now under the microscope were very critical—one or two backbenchers who have the guts to stand up about a couple of other issues.

The SPEAKER: Member for Mandurah, I think that you are starting to stray again. Although that often engages many people in this place, on this occasion I am going to bring you back to the motion at hand.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: I simply say this to the backbenchers of the government and the members of the National Party: this is an opportunity for those members to show where they really stand. National Party members are part of an alliance and a Liberal–National government, but they continuously claim, as they have done with retail trading hours, that they are prepared to stand up and have a say.

Why do we not simply have a debate that allows members of all backgrounds, such as the member for Armadale, to have an opportunity to go point by point through the issues with this report that was released yesterday and, particularly, the responsibilities of the minister, which this report goes to the head of? That is what we are asking for. We cannot have that debate in half an hour. The government knows that as well as anybody else in this place. The member for Murray–Wellington is an ex-police officer and a member who represents an area that will be continuously prone to wildfire and bushfires. He should have the responsibility and the opportunity to debate this very important matter, but the government will not allow him to because it is going to vote for only half an hour each side. The government is going to vote for only half an hour in which to protect that minister who stands condemned. He should stand condemned and should stand down and resign from his portfolio because he is incompetent, yet the government is going to support his incompetency!

MR J.C. KOBELKE (Balcatta) [10.25 am]: I wish to speak to the matter before the house, which I understand is an amendment to the motion and that amendment would restrict the amount of time available to members to speak to the substantive motion, which calls for the resignation of the Minister for Emergency Services. I would like to put to the house that that amendment really makes sure that we do not do justice to this report, which contains a range of important issues, many of which reveal the incompetence of the minister. We cannot get to debate the incompetence of this minister as revealed in this report, because the government will not give us time to extract the many aspects in it.

Mr R.F. Johnson: Tell us what page it is on.

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: If the Speaker will allow me, I will take the interjection. On page 163 it states in bold print —

The Special Inquiry was repeatedly told that the relationship between FESA and DEC was not collaborative ...

Was the minister aware of that?

Mr R.F. Johnson: Were you aware of it when you were a minister?

Several members interjected.

Mr B.S. Wyatt: You are a clown minister; you left your big shoes at home!

The SPEAKER: Member for Victoria Park, I formally call you to order for the first time today.

I am going to return the call to the member for Balcatta. I am not going to accept anything but your argument or your case and I am not going to give anyone the opportunity to respond to what you might say at this point.

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: What I wish to say goes directly to the amendment before the house. The minister interjected on me and I was hoping to have the opportunity to show that his interjection in this case is a very good example of why the minister is incompetent and not able to fulfil the role of introducing the reforms. He has not even read page 163 and does not understand why his incompetence should lead him to resign.

The specific matter before us at the moment is the timing available to lay out in debate before this chamber the matters in the report that clearly reflect the incompetence of the minister. The report is lengthy and detailed. We cannot do justice to the connection between the report and the minister's incompetence if we have only an hour all up and half an hour for each side. The amendment would make it impossible for this house to debate in any full and meaningful way the contents of the report and its connection to the minister's incompetence. That goes to the length of the report and the complexity of the report, but underlying this is the loss of 71 homes. That is an incredible loss for which this minister is failing to accept any responsibility. The sheer magnitude of the issue

Mr Mark McGowan; Dr Kim Hames; Mr David Templeman; Mr John Kobelke; Mr John Hyde; Mr Tony Simpson; Speaker; Mr Eric Ripper; Ms Margaret Quirk; Acting Speaker; Mr Christian Porter; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Bill Johnston; Dr Tony Buti

cannot be dealt with in one hour. Again, referring directly to the matter of the timing that this amendment would impose on us, we cannot deal with the seriousness and the consequences of the minister's incompetence in only one hour. We see that this report goes to the fires in the Perth hills, but we have had a range of other serious fires. We know that with climate change, there is the potential that we will have more serious fires.

So the issue of all that and the reforms that have to be driven from this report, and the incompetence of this man as minister to actually implement them, could not be covered in one hour. The amendment to restrict the debate would simply rule out the opportunity to open up the consequences for this state of not actually being able to put in place the reforms we need to better protect the people of Western Australia, and particularly in the south west of Western Australia, where climate change is increasing the propensity for serious fires and the damage that they will actually produce.

The further argument that goes to why this amendment to reduce the time is totally inadequate is that we have many members here directly involved. There are three or four members on the government side who are currently actively involved with volunteer bush fire fighting. They are experienced people. Perhaps that is why the deputy leader has moved this motion to restrict the time; he does not want to give time to his own members, who are experienced and dedicated and know the scene, and he wants to shut them up. He does not want to allow enough time. His own people, who are dedicated, have knowledge, and are really committed in this area, will not be given the time to speak to this important motion relating to the incompetence of this minister, which is clearly reflected in the report that was tabled yesterday. We can see, Mr Speaker, that the amendment to reduce the time is really about running for cover. It is about trying to stop this Parliament properly debating a very serious issue.

There have been occasions in the past, regardless of who is on that side and who is on this side, when a motion of no confidence in a particular minister has been fairly limited, so it could possibly be handled with some degree of appropriateness in an hour. But that is not the case here. As I have already indicated, we have a situation of 71 homes lost; we have a situation with climate change that means that this is an ongoing and growing problem in the south west of Western Australia; and we have a situation of having a long and quite detailed report that clearly fingers this minister as incompetent. We cannot do that in an hour!

Finally, we have many members on both sides—particularly on the government side—who could make a valuable contribution to the debate, but this government does not want them to get up because when they speak from their knowledge, from their understanding and from what they have been told by the people they know out there who are volunteer firefighters, the consequences are not going to be good for this minister. That is why this amendment should be defeated, to enable a proper and full debate on such a serious issue before this house.

In closing, I say to members opposite that when they go out to their electorates—particularly those who have electorates on the fringe of the metropolitan area—and talk to people, they know that those people are very concerned about what happened, as is reflected in this report, and what is likely to happen in their districts in those members' electorates. Those people will want to know why those members were not able to get up in this place and debate this important issue, why those members were running for cover because they would not allow the debate to proceed, and why their leader, here, was shutting them down and not giving them the opportunity, on an issue of such importance to Western Australia, to represent the interests of the people who elected them.

MR J.N. HYDE (Perth) [10.33 pm]: The government has failed to justify why this debate should be limited to one hour. We have seen that the government's strategy all this week has been predicated on featherbedding and looking after the Minister for Police. Importantly, there is a huge conflict of interest in the roles of this minister as he is also the leader of government business. We were told we would be staying late on Tuesday night to complete the Metropolitan Redevelopment Authority Bill 2011. We were closed down at 11.30 pm by the Leader of the House because he knew he needed a good night's sleep because this report was coming out Wednesday. We, and the departmental officers, were here and were prepared to go to 1.00 am to complete that important legislation. Then we were told we would be staying late last night, but, again, because the minister had performed so badly yesterday, he used his position as Leader of the House to close us down at 7.00 pm, instead of completing that legislation last night, so he would be fit and chirpy for his interview on 6PR or on the ABC this morning.

Several members interjected.

Mr J.N. HYDE: The minister has a huge conflict of interest in the way he has been managing time management in this house, and to now try, at the back end of the week, to say that we can have only an hour to debate this motion, after he has closed down debating time for other important legislation, is a disgrace.

Question to be Put

Mr Mark McGowan; Dr Kim Hames; Mr David Templeman; Mr John Kobelke; Mr John Hyde; Mr Tony Simpson; Speaker; Mr Eric Ripper; Ms Margaret Quirk; Acting Speaker; Mr Christian Porter; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Bill Johnston; Dr Tony Buti

MR A.J. SIMPSON (Darling Range) [10.35 am]: I move —

That the question be now put.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Pilbara, I will formally call you to order for the first time today. Member for Bassendean, I formally call you to order for the first time today. The question is that the question now be put.

Question put and a division taken with the following result —

Ayes (26)

Mr P. Abetz
Mr F.A. Alban
Mr I.C. Blayney
Mr I.M. Britza
Mr T.R. Buswell
Mr G.M. Castrilli
Mr V.A. Catania

Dr E. Constable
Mr J.H.D. Day
Mr J.M. Francis
Mr B.J. Grylls
Dr K.D. Hames
Mr A.P. Jacob
Dr G.G. Jacobs

Mr R.F. Johnson
Mr A. Krsticevic
Mr J.E. McGrath
Mr W.R. Marmion
Mr P.T. Miles
Ms A.R. Mitchell
Dr M.D. Nahan

Mr C.C. Porter
Mr D.T. Redman
Mr M.W. Sutherland
Mr T.K. Waldron
Mr A.J. Simpson (*Teller*)

Noes (25)

Ms L.L. Baker
Mr J.J.M. Bowler
Dr A.D. Buti
Ms A.S. Carles
Mr R.H. Cook
Ms J.M. Freeman
Mr J.N. Hyde

Mr W.J. Johnston
Mr J.C. Kobelke
Mr F.M. Logan
Mr M. McGowan
Mrs C.A. Martin
Mr M.P. Murray
Mr A.P. O’Gorman

Mr J.R. Quigley
Ms M.M. Quirk
Mr E.S. Ripper
Mrs M.H. Roberts
Mr T.G. Stephens
Mr C.J. Tallentire
Mr A.J. Waddell

Mr P.B. Watson
Mr M.P. Whitely
Mr B.S. Wyatt
Mr D.A. Templeman (*Teller*)

Pairs

Mrs L.M. Harvey
Mr C.J. Barnett
Mr M.J. Cowper

Ms R. Saffioti
Mr P. Papalia
Mr P.C. Tinley

Question thus passed.

Standing Orders Suspension — Amendment to Motion Resumed

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Armadale, I will formally call you to order for the first time today.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Armadale!

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members, I am sure there will be opportunities in this place for people to stand, seek the call, and make their points. At this moment, member for Joondalup, I am formally going to call you to order for the third time today, I believe; and, member for Armadale, I formally call you to order for the first time today.

Mr T.G. Stephens interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Pilbara, I formally call you to order for the second time today. Members, we have a question in front of us, the question being that the words to be inserted, be inserted.

Amendment put and a division called for.

Bells rung and the house divided.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: We may be in a division but I am not interested in aggressive conversations across the floor of this place at the moment. If you wish to have an aggressive conversation with somebody, take it outside this place. I am sure you do not want to do that during a division.

The division resulted as follows —

Extract from *Hansard*
[ASSEMBLY — Thursday, 18 August 2011]
p6203a-6221a

Mr Mark McGowan; Dr Kim Hames; Mr David Templeman; Mr John Kobelke; Mr John Hyde; Mr Tony Simpson; Speaker; Mr Eric Ripper; Ms Margaret Quirk; Acting Speaker; Mr Christian Porter; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Bill Johnston; Dr Tony Buti

Ayes (27)

Mr P. Abetz
Mr F.A. Alban
Mr I.C. Blayney
Mr J.J.M. Bowler
Mr I.M. Britza
Mr T.R. Buswell
Mr G.M. Castrilli

Mr V.A. Catania
Dr E. Constable
Mr J.H.D. Day
Mr J.M. Francis
Mr B.J. Grylls
Dr K.D. Hames
Mr A.P. Jacob

Dr G.G. Jacobs
Mr R.F. Johnson
Mr A. Krsticevic
Mr J.E. McGrath
Mr W.R. Marmion
Mr P.T. Miles
Ms A.R. Mitchell

Dr M.D. Nahan
Mr C.C. Porter
Mr D.T. Redman
Mr M.W. Sutherland
Mr T.K. Waldron
Mr A.J. Simpson (*Teller*)

Noes (24)

Ms L.L. Baker
Dr A.D. Buti
Ms A.S. Carles
Mr R.H. Cook
Ms J.M. Freeman
Mr J.N. Hyde

Mr W.J. Johnston
Mr J.C. Kobelke
Mr F.M. Logan
Mr M. McGowan
Mrs C.A. Martin
Mr M.P. Murray

Mr A.P. O’Gorman
Mr J.R. Quigley
Ms M.M. Quirk
Mr E.S. Ripper
Mrs M.H. Roberts
Mr T.G. Stephens

Mr C.J. Tallentire
Mr A.J. Waddell
Mr P.B. Watson
Mr M.P. Whitely
Mr B.S. Wyatt
Mr D.A. Templeman (*Teller*)

Pairs

Mrs L.M. Harvey
Mr C.J. Barnett
Mr M.J. Cowper

Ms R. Saffioti
Mr P. Papalia
Mr P.C. Tinley

Amendment thus passed.

Standing Orders Suspension — Motion, as Amended

Question put and passed with an absolute majority.

Motion

MR E.S. RIPPER (Belmont — Leader of the Opposition) [10.44 am]: I move —

That this house has no confidence in the Minister for Emergency Services and calls on him to accept ministerial responsibility for the management failures within the Fire and Emergency Services Authority and resign from the portfolio.

The Keelty report is devastating for FESA. It is devastating for FESA in relation to its preparation for the fire, its management on the day and its accountability afterwards. It is also devastating for the Minister for Emergency Services. We have a minister in denial. He is a rabbit in the spotlight and he cannot understand what is happening to him. The report of the inquiry is entitled “A Shared Responsibility: The Report of the Perth Hills Bushfire February 2011 Review”. The minister is perhaps alone in this whole debacle by not accepting any responsibility. Even the minister’s own backbench is disgusted at his refusal to accept responsibility. His refusal to accept ministerial responsibility is a sign of immaturity in this government. It is part of a pattern. We have seen the Minister for Lands blame Landgate for the problems with houses being sold without the consent of their owners, we have seen the Minister for Education blame public servants from the Department of Education for two reports on a critical issue that have been circulated, and we have seen the Minister for Housing blame public servants in the Department of Housing. Now we have seen Ms Harrison-Ward and Mr Hynes become the scapegoats in this exercise, the shields behind which the minister will hide. We will not allow the minister to hide behind the ruins of public service careers. We will hold him to account for his role in this issue.

This is not just a case of saying that something bad has happened in the minister’s portfolio and therefore the minister has to go. Many ministers who have held any substantial operational portfolios have seen something bad happen on their watch. It is not always the case that such a minister has to go. Let me cite an example. The Premier of this state, as energy minister, presided over a very significant electricity crisis in the middle of the 1990s. He blamed Western Power but he did not see fit to resign on that occasion. He also presided over a significant payroll crisis as education minister in the late 1990s. Even in those cases, ministers are responsible and have to accept responsibility. It is a separate question as to whether ministers have to go. Now we are looking at much more serious issues in the performance of this minister. This minister had warning of a serious fire season ahead. Everyone in this state knew that a serious fire season awaited us. We had a dry winter and there were forecasts for a hot summer. Everyone knew that we were in for a dangerous time. Moreover, we had the warning of the Toodyay fire. We had the reports from the Toodyay fire. The minister had a responsibility to get FESA in shape. The minister failed in that responsibility. He knew about the conflicts. He knew that there was a conflict between FESA and the police. He knew that there was a conflict between FESA and the Department of Environment and Conservation. He knew that there were multiple conflicts between FESA and volunteers. What did the minister do to resolve those issues? He was simultaneously the minister for two of the

Mr Mark McGowan; Dr Kim Hames; Mr David Templeman; Mr John Kobelke; Mr John Hyde; Mr Tony Simpson; Speaker; Mr Eric Ripper; Ms Margaret Quirk; Acting Speaker; Mr Christian Porter; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Bill Johnston; Dr Tony Buti

departments that were fighting—Western Australia Police and FESA—and he did not take any decisive action to make sure that those matters were resolved.

These are not insubstantial matters; these are life-and-death matters. If available Western Australian firefighting resources are not moved to a serious fire because of bureaucratic turf wars, lives can be lost. More property was certainly lost than needed to be lost. That is the only conclusion we can draw from the report. Evacuation measures are also life-and-death matters. If there is confusion on the ground, if there are turf wars over evacuation powers, people can lose their lives. We are very lucky that there were not multiple deaths as a result of this Roleystone fire, particularly when we see that unresolved turf wars that should have been resolved by the minister before the advent of a very serious and threatening fire season caused resources that were available not to be used in the fire and caused confusion over evacuation powers on the ground.

The first charge against the minister is his absolute failure to decisively get FESA in shape ahead of a fire season that everyone knew would be very dangerous.

The second charge against the minister is his responsibility for an agency that clearly performed badly on the day. I am not talking about the individual firefighters, who fought bravely; I am talking about what this report shows about the management by FESA of the fire on the day. An absolute debacle! A litany of failure! Those are the only words that can be used to describe what this report states about the agency's performance, for which the minister is responsible.

I think that is all compounded by the third charge. As I said yesterday, actions taken in the heat of the moment and in a chaotic and dangerous situation can be judged, with hindsight, more harshly than is warranted. I might say that Mr Keelty has been "in the heat of the moment" and could be expected to take that into account. What I find most unforgivable is the FESA cover-up that followed the events. I used the word "cover-up" yesterday and the Premier disputed it. Mr Keelty uses the word; it is here in the report. I do not think that I have ever seen a report like this in which an inquirer of the status of Mr Keelty has actually used the word "cover-up". The minister has to take responsibility for his agency's lack of cooperation, and for his agency's attempt to mislead and confuse the inquiry. He had a chance to look at the submissions FESA was to put to the inquiry. He is the minister. He would —

Mr R.F. Johnson: No, I didn't.

Mr E.S. RIPPER: Well, you should have! The minister says that he did not have any chance to look at what FESA was to put to the inquiry. What does he do? He is the minister! It was a major fire. It was the worst fire for property damage in the history of the state, his agency is making a submission to the inquiry, and he does not ask to look at the submission! This only compounds what I am saying is the major charge against the minister. He has been weak, he has been incompetent, and in the wake of those events, he has been arrogant! That is an insult to the people who lost their properties. The minister has been weak in the preparation of FESA for a dangerous fire season; incompetent in managing the bureaucratic conflicts that have severely compromised the state's ability to deal with such dangerous fires; and, in the wake of the event, absolutely arrogant. The minister is trying to hide behind public service scapegoats. "What have I done wrong?", he asks, "I've done nothing wrong; therefore, I can't be held responsible". Inaction is the minister's defence. However, I say that there could have been multiple deaths in this fire and that we are very fortunate as a state that that did not happen. Inaction is not a defence. Inaction is our charge against the minister. Inaction is why this minister has to go. He is not fit to preside over the portfolio. He does not have the capacity to act, and to act decisively, to get a grip on the issues and to make sure that FESA is in shape. If the minister thinks that he did what he should have done, he should table the documents. He should table all the communications between himself and Ms Harrison-Ward. He should table all communications between himself and the board. He should table the file notes for all his discussions with Mr Hynes. He should demonstrate what he did to get FESA ready and to prepare for a dangerous fire season.

The fourth issue that I want to raise about why this minister has to go is the question of the future. No-one believes that the minister is the right person to preside over the reform program that FESA needs. The Premier does not believe it; that is why he has made the Director General of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, Peter Conran, the operational officer in charge of the reform program. The Premier does not believe the minister is the right person to preside over the reform program. His party colleagues do not believe it. The public does not believe it. The minister is the only one; he is the person in denial. He cannot see the point that everyone in Western Australia can see. Everyone in Western Australia can see that the minister has to go from this portfolio. In fact, what we are putting forward is almost too moderate. We are not saying that the minister has to go from the cabinet, but he has to go from this portfolio. These are life-and-death issues—life-and-death issues!—and a

Mr Mark McGowan; Dr Kim Hames; Mr David Templeman; Mr John Kobelke; Mr John Hyde; Mr Tony Simpson; Speaker; Mr Eric Ripper; Ms Margaret Quirk; Acting Speaker; Mr Christian Porter; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Bill Johnston; Dr Tony Buti

serious and substantial response from the government requires nothing less than a new minister. Nothing less than a new minister!

I am very disappointed with the Premier's media management of this issue. The Premier dropped the report the day before he went to a Council of Australian Governments meeting. The Premier knew that he would not be available for the parliamentary debate. He knew also that a week's parliamentary recess is coming up. The Premier could have been here, but he left early for COAG. This is all part of the government's media management and spin to make sure there will not be the focus that there should be on this minister, his performance and his future. However, we are not going to let this minister off the hook. He has been incompetent, arrogant and weak, and he has to go.

The SPEAKER: Before I give the member for Girrawheen the call, at the start of this debate, I neglected to inform members—I do apologise—that there is an absolute majority and therefore the debate can continue. I need to get those words into *Hansard*.

MS M.M. QUIRK (Girrawheen) [10.56 am]: When the word “Westminster” is mentioned to the Minister for Emergency Services, he is minded to think of a carpet. He does not think of the word “responsibility”. In fact, his performance in the press conference yesterday was unedifying—others have said worse than that. However, when I think of the word “carpet”, I think that is exactly what should happen to the minister; that is, he should be “carpeted” for his lack of action. On Tuesday, I chronicled the minister's sins of omission. He cannot evade his ministerial responsibility by saying he did nothing. That is the problem. He cannot handball his responsibility to the Fire and Emergency Services Authority board. He would have been aware that, because of the dysfunction of the very agency that he is responsible for, the FESA board has been dysfunctional for some time. It has been drip fed information. For example, when stakeholders were given access to the Keelty report, the board was not. The chief executive officer gave the board an account of what was in the report. How can the minister realistically say to us that the board was running the show when that is what was happening? Given that the minister chose to retain the board, which a parliamentary committee recommended be abolished, it was his responsibility to make sure that it was a functional board. It was not a functional board, yet the minister has the hide to say in the media, “It was not me. It was not my fault; it was the board's.” Thinking of his comments in the media, I am also reminded of Sergeant Schulz and the words, “I see nothing!”—which is what this minister has been doing for three years—or, alternatively, something a bit more modern in popular culture, Bart Simpson and his, “I didn't do it. I didn't do it!” Whatever it was, the minister did not do it. The minister has presided over a loss of corporate knowledge and a loss of operational capacity and over a culture of nepotism, a culture of bullying and a culture in which dissent has been quashed. It is very important in the emergency services area that people who know that things are not working properly—people with capacity, knowledge and expertise—are able to express their opinions on how things could work better. But not in FESA—no, no, no! People who expressed an opinion about how things needed to work better at FESA were disciplined, told it was none of their business and sidelined. That is exactly what the minister has presided over for the last three years. As the Leader of the Opposition said, the minister has presided over ongoing cultural issues and downright blues between the Department of Environment and Conservation and FESA, and between FESA and WA Police.

The minister agreed to the reappointment of Jo Harrison-Ward and, in fact, defended that position as late as May of this year during the estimates committee when he said that he had no reason not to reappoint Ms Harrison-Ward. That was after the minister had seen the Ellis report into the Roleystone–Kelmscott fires. The minister was at the time still exercising what I call reckless, wilful blindness in saying that nothing was wrong. We have to look further than Jo Harrison-Ward; we have to look at Craig Hynes and the whole organisation. One sacrificial lamb will not solve these highly endemic problems, which the minister is not prepared to look at.

As I said on Tuesday, we have had the Boorabbin report, the Toodyay reports, the Ellis report, and the Keelty report. To use that age-old expression, “it is like *deja vu* all over again”. What is the minister going to do about it? Nothing, apparently, which is really worrying.

The Leader of the Opposition raised a very good point. The Premier has said, “I don't trust you”, so the implementation of these recommendations will be overseen by the director of the Premier's department, but the Minister for Emergency Services is still going to be the minister in charge. That is going to work well, is it not, members? That will work extremely well! If there is not already some tension between the two offices, I suspect it will increase with that arrangement.

In the last 15 years or so the management of the Fire and Emergency Services Authority has gone from 40 to 400, yet, at the same time, the number of career firefighters has increased from 850 to 900. That speaks volumes about the focus of FESA at the moment. At the same time, the basic preparatory work that needed to be done, which Mr Keelty has raised, was lacking. For example, I am aware that the Toodyay report, the Boorabbin report

Mr Mark McGowan; Dr Kim Hames; Mr David Templeman; Mr John Kobelke; Mr John Hyde; Mr Tony Simpson; Speaker; Mr Eric Ripper; Ms Margaret Quirk; Acting Speaker; Mr Christian Porter; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Bill Johnston; Dr Tony Buti

and now the Keelty report, highlighted the need for more training for incident managers at level 3, but I am told that FESA is doing that in November or December this year, which seems very late, and it is doing it at Yanchep because the Forrestfield training centre does not have the capacity. That is extraordinary when that is such a crucial thing that needs to happen.

As the Leader of the Opposition has said, there has been a cover-up. The crime is the cover-up; these repeated inadequacies, which have been reinforced, iterated and reiterated, are not being addressed. The minister is not asking the hard questions and he is not demanding answers. That is a sin, and that is why the minister is in this position today.

We are expecting a report from the University of Western Australia's psychology department on community education, and the lessons from the Victorian royal commission are that just putting something on a website, dropping a kit in the mail and telling the community what it needs to do is not enough. FESA needs to engage with the community. That should be Mr Caporn's job; he is in charge of community engagement. I think it will be clear from the UWA report that the community was really puzzled about when it needed to go and what it needed to do beforehand, and, essentially, that people were left high and dry once they were evacuated—in some cases, for many days—not knowing whether their houses had been burnt or what was happening. Hindsight is a wonderful thing and we can all say that it happened in the heat of the moment. However, the preparation was not there; the capacity building after the fire was lacking and community engagement was lacking. These are all matters for which the minister is responsible. It is not good enough to say that it is the board's fault—a board that a parliamentary committee recommended in 2006 should be abolished. A year ago the minister was still saying that the board needed to remain, and the minister was giving the chief executive officer assurances that the board would stay. The minister was not prepared to take the hard decisions or to ask the hard questions. The minister is now paying the price and he is totally responsible.

DR K.D. HAMES (Dawesville — Deputy Premier) [11.04 am]: Mr Acting Speaker, you might have heard me say in the earlier debate that when there were motions against ministers in the former Labor government, they arranged for them to be debated only for the time that is allocated for a matter of public interest. I would like to address that issue first. I did not have to go back very far to find an example. In fact, the people who were the main speakers against the government's amendment to the standing order suspension were involved in a similar motion when they were on this side of the house.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr A.P. O'Gorman): I remind members that this is a very important issue. The motion is that this house has no confidence in the minister. It is not about a range of other ministers or previous ministers or anything else; it is about this minister. I ask the Deputy Premier to address the motion before the house, and then maybe he will not have the barrel of interjections from the left-hand side.

Point of Order

Mr E.S. RIPPER: On that same point, having gagged an earlier debate, the Deputy Premier should not be speaking to that earlier debate; he should be speaking to the motion that is before the house.

The ACTING SPEAKER: I think the Deputy Premier knows where I want him to take the debate; it is about this motion.

Debate Resumed

Dr K.D. HAMES: I just have to say that when I am debating a motion of no confidence in the minister, the arguments that were used in the previous debate to go outside of the contents of that debate to criticise the length of time for debate are critical to the issue of whether this minister is incompetent. When in government, the Leader of the Opposition had a motion of no confidence moved against him by the current Premier and we called for it to be debated over an extended time period. The Leader of the House at the time, who has already been on his feet criticising the time for this debate, moved the same motion that I moved to make it similar to debating time in an MPI. I moved exactly the same motion that the Leader of the Opposition moved at the time, and at that time the Leader of the Opposition had lost \$780 million of taxpayers' money through the Western Power fiasco. That was what that motion was about.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members, we have a very serious motion in front of the house. We have already gone past the amount of time that we debate this—whether it is an MPI or anything else. That debate has been had; it has been voted on. The resolution of that vote was that we have the time normally allocated to an MPI to discuss the motion in front of the house. That motion is —

Mr Mark McGowan; Dr Kim Hames; Mr David Templeman; Mr John Kobelke; Mr John Hyde; Mr Tony Simpson; Speaker; Mr Eric Ripper; Ms Margaret Quirk; Acting Speaker; Mr Christian Porter; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Bill Johnston; Dr Tony Buti

That this house has no confidence in the Minister for Emergency Services and calls on him to accept ministerial responsibility for the management failures within FESA and resign from the portfolio.

That is the only motion in front of the house at the moment. That is what I want to hear in this debate—anything else I will stop. That is the motion.

Dr K.D. HAMES: The member for Girrawheen went on about a series of reports that should have alerted this government and the minister to problems within the Fire and Emergency Services Authority and the management of fire in this state. She did not go back to her own time in government in October 2006 when the Community Development and Justice Standing Committee tabled a report recommending 88 major changes that needed to be put in place to manage the way the system operated in Western Australia. What did the Labor government do about that report? Absolutely nothing!

I would like to point out that we listened to members opposite in virtual silence, because this is a very serious issue.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Albany!

Dr K.D. HAMES: Thank you for your protection, Mr Acting Speaker.

When this government came into office, it made changes, and the Minister for Emergency Services will go through some of the changes he has put in place since he has been the minister. However, I point out that the report released by Mr Keelty made absolutely no critical findings whatsoever against the minister. There was nothing to stop Mr Keelty doing that if he found there were issues; yet, there was nothing. On this issue, sheeting home what happened with this fire to the minister is quite clearly nonsense. The minister should receive praise, not condemnation, for his attitude.

Let me tell members what it is like as a minister—some members on the other side will know what it is like—when an organisation is created at arm's length of government. Over the past four years, during our time in government and opposition members' time in government, there have been rumblings about the relationship between FESA and the Department of Environment and Conservation and about the operation of that structure. However, the minister cannot go out personally and investigate whether those individual claims are true, because he would get different sides of the story all the time. I am sure that the minister would have had people complaining about FESA; he would have had people complaining about DEC; and he would have had people complaining about all sorts of issues. So, what did the minister do? Once we had an issue that created an opportunity for a serious investigation, the minister got one of the best investigators in the land to come over here and do that investigation. He could have picked anyone —

Several members interjected.

Dr K.D. HAMES: Do members think a recommendation would go to cabinet and be successful without the very strong support of the minister? Of course not. We appointed, through the Minister for Emergency Services —

Mr E.S. Ripper: Over the minister's objections!

Dr K.D. HAMES: That is not true. We appointed someone who is the best investigator in the land. The minister could quite easily have found someone in Western Australia to do this inquiry, but he got someone at arm's length, with no bias in terms of FESA or DEC, or the operation of the system—the best investigator in the land—to come in and do a full and thorough inquiry on this matter. That is what he did. What has happened? As soon as that report has come out, the minister has gone out, with the strong support of cabinet and the government, and made changes, and will make changes, that address those issues in the report. They are very serious issues. They are very critical of FESA. The government accepts that. But this minister has been very strong in his action to make sure that those changes are being put in place. I have nothing but admiration for a minister who stands up to what an opposition will always do. An opposition will always call for the head of the minister. An opposition will always call for the scalp of the minister. If that call had been successful every time, the Leader of the Opposition would have resigned as minister when he was on this side of the house. In fact, a large number of the Labor Party's ministers did resign because of the actions that they took, and they were shown to have done significant wrong on many occasions. This minister has been shown, by a clear, concise inquiry, to have done nothing wrong.

Several members interjected.

Dr K.D. HAMES: This minister has been shown to have done nothing wrong.

Several members interjected.

Mr Mark McGowan; Dr Kim Hames; Mr David Templeman; Mr John Kobelke; Mr John Hyde; Mr Tony Simpson; Speaker; Mr Eric Ripper; Ms Margaret Quirk; Acting Speaker; Mr Christian Porter; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Bill Johnston; Dr Tony Buti

Dr K.D. HAMES: Where does it say that he has done something wrong? It is a report on some failings within the FESA organisation. But the reality is that our firefighters, both FESA and our volunteers, did an amazing job and they saved many lives. By their action, and the action of the volunteers, and ordinary people in the street, they did an amazing job to save lives throughout that fire. I think that a huge amount of credit should go to the organisation as well. Sure, we found through this report that there are issues to do with management coming from the top. But at the end of the day, their effort was nothing short of amazing, and to get through a fire of that severity and have no lives lost was in itself a miracle.

I think this motion is just the standard motion that oppositions tend to run—beating the chest; calling for the head of the minister. The reality is that there is no substance in the opposition's motion. There is no substance in the argument that the opposition has put forward that somehow that failure is connected with the minister.

Mr E.S. Ripper: So who does take responsibility?

Dr K.D. HAMES: We will hear from the minister shortly. Talking about responsibility, there is a Westminster system that requires that the minister take overall responsibility. But that responsibility does not entail a requirement to step down from a portfolio. If it did, the Leader of the Opposition would not be there. If it did, the Leader of the Opposition would have resigned. The changes to Western Power have been an absolute failure and have resulted in these huge increases in fees that have gone out to the public of Western Australia.

MR C.C. PORTER (Bateman — Attorney General) [11.13 am]: Given that this motion is essentially about ministerial responsibility, which is, of course, the constitutional English convention that ministers bear the ultimate responsibility for the actions of their ministry or department, it is worth just commencing with a bit of an assessment of that idea.

Several members interjected.

Mr C.C. PORTER: In its original English form, that meant that even if ministers were completely ignorant of criminal behaviour by someone in their department, they were expected to resign; and in fact there were many prosecutions taken against ministers in England on that basis, and they were successful. But, it is, of course, a convention, and it has changed over time both in Westminster itself and in state and federal parliaments in commonwealth nations, and is now quite a different convention from what it was originally in England, where ministers, even without knowledge of serious criminal conduct by people in their department, could be expected to resign or, indeed, be prosecuted.

Now it is the case that we ask a question that is twofold: in the circumstances as we find them to be, what can a minister reasonably be held responsible for, and what can a minister not reasonably be held responsible for? That is a question that applies to the way in which ministerial responsibility has developed as a standard in this Parliament right here, with ministers of this government, ministers in the previous government, and ministers in governments prior to that, and it relates to the facts as we have them before us as to what actually occurred, what did the minister know and not know, and what were the actual problems that are now being complained of.

I have gone through this report in some detail now, and I have listened to everything that the opposition has had to say, and it seems to me that the opposition makes five general complaints. The first is the time that was taken to release this report publicly. The second complaint relates to the reappointment of Ms Harrison-Ward earlier this year.

Mr E.S. Ripper: Over the objections of Mr Keelty.

Mr C.C. PORTER: I will come to that in a moment, but, as I understand it, she was reappointed effectively in January of this year.

Mr E.S. Ripper interjected.

Mr C.C. PORTER: Okay, but that is one of the complaints, clearly, that the opposition has.

The third issue that arises is that there were clearly failures in the judgement and performance of senior people in FESA on that day, and that much is clear from the report. Fourth—the opposition complains of this, and it does so properly—there were failures of certain persons in their presentation of evidence before the inquiry; that is, to give proper evidence before the inquiry. Fifth, and finally, there is a complaint from the opposition—and, indeed, this is pointed out in the report—that there were structural shortcomings internal to FESA that had a bearing upon this incident. They were the five complaints.

I just say briefly that I think the Leader of the Opposition has raised some fair points. I would say that one of them is not necessarily, in my view, the time that was taken to release this report. What the government did with a range of recommendations was release a report; and, contemporaneous with that release, we said that we give

Mr Mark McGowan; Dr Kim Hames; Mr David Templeman; Mr John Kobelke; Mr John Hyde; Mr Tony Simpson; Speaker; Mr Eric Ripper; Ms Margaret Quirk; Acting Speaker; Mr Christian Porter; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Bill Johnston; Dr Tony Buti

in-principle support to following through on every one of these recommendations. There are some quite serious recommendations that I would describe as machinery-of-government recommendations, and recommendations that FESA become a department. They had to be thought through. There are other recommendations in the report that I must say, even though we have given in-principle support to them, we will need to think very, very carefully about. If members look at page 21, one of those recommendations that struck me during the long briefing that we had with Mr Keelty was titles of land. The recommendation is basically that the state government mandate that the title deeds for relevant properties be amended to indicate whether the property is in a declared bushfire-prone area. We have given in-principle support to that. That was worth taking some fair amount of time to think about, because there will be a range of foreseen and unforeseen implications from that, including potentially to property values in the electorates of members here. Therefore, I think it was fair and reasonable in all the circumstances to give a fair amount of reasonable time to think that through before giving it in-principle support.

The second thing we have touched on briefly is the reappointment of Ms Harrison-Ward. As I understand it, she was reappointed earlier this year, well before the findings of this inquiry, of course, ever came through, and, indeed, before the fires. To me, it does not seem to be unreasonable in all the circumstances that she was reappointed, in the absence of some clear evidence that there should not have been a reappointment or that someone else was better suited to the position.

Mr E.S. Ripper: When was the contract signed?

Mr C.C. PORTER: I do not have that information to hand, but I am informed that her reappointment effectively occurred in January of this year, before these bushfires. But the important things, Leader of the Opposition, are the failures on the day, and the Leader of the Opposition has raised some of them—and I have read this report.

Mr W.J. Johnston interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr A.P. O’Gorman): Member for Cannington!

Mr C.C. PORTER: When we look at page 133 —

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members! The only person who has the call is the Attorney General. I ask that we hear him in silence. It is a very important issue, as I have mentioned a few times already. We want to hear him properly and clearly, so I ask that members hold their interjections and let the Attorney General complete his remarks.

Mr C.C. PORTER: These are incredibly serious failures; there is no doubt about that. At page 133 of the report, Mr Keelty refers to “shortcomings on the part of senior FESA management to properly consult and coordinate”. I take that to mean a failure on the day in question. Indeed, he goes on later in the report to refer to structural impediments to that level of cooperation and coordination. It was a failure on the day. What is emblematic of the failures that occurred on the day is in annexure 7 on page 208, which the Leader of the Opposition mentioned—that is, the incident action plan. I am not an expert in these areas, but, as I understand it, this is a standard procedure. There is a well thought through process that has to be gone through on the day. This is the form that must be filled in. There are precedents and training for how this form should be properly filled in. There is absolutely no doubt that there was a serious failure on this day by the people who were in charge to properly fill in this form. It was not merely filling in the form; the form exists to demonstrate that the people who are running the show are giving thought to all the things that they are trained as a matter of best practice to give thought to. Annexure 7 states merely “Protect Life–Property” and the rest is effectively blank. That is emblematic of the serious failures of the personnel at the very top on the day. The idea that a minister should be held responsible for someone basically breaching and abrogating their duty to do what they are trained to do and to do what everyone agrees should be done is, in my view, an unreasonable interpretation —

Mr F.M. Logan interjected.

Mr C.C. PORTER: I will come to the structural failings in a moment.

The idea that a minister should be held responsible for an individual failure such as that is not right.

The fourth thing is the failures of the presentation of evidence. At page 133, the report states —

The Special Inquiry further finds that the FESA submission and the evidence it provided to the Special Inquiry attempted to cover up these shortcomings.

Mr Mark McGowan; Dr Kim Hames; Mr David Templeman; Mr John Kobelke; Mr John Hyde; Mr Tony Simpson; Speaker; Mr Eric Ripper; Ms Margaret Quirk; Acting Speaker; Mr Christian Porter; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Bill Johnston; Dr Tony Buti

The idea that a minister should be held responsible for a senior public servant having been found to have not given evidence in a fulsome, fair and appropriate manner is ridiculous. That is a failing of the public servant before the committee.

Mr F.M. Logan interjected.

Mr C.C. PORTER: I think what the opposition is saying is that —

Mr F.M. Logan: You're saying that; we're not saying that.

Mr C.C. PORTER: The Leader of the Opposition said words to that effect yesterday.

The fifth thing is the structural failures. At page 163, the report indicates that FESA and the Department of Environment and Conservation had a relationship that was not collaborative. At page 133, it states —

... optimum coordination of available resources ... was not provided because of a series of shortcomings on the part of senior FESA management to properly consult and coordinate.

There is a blurred line about whether and to what extent those failures to cooperate and coordinate are structural or whether they manifested on the day. In fairness to the report, it suggests that they are structural. It suggests that what happened on the day was a manifestation of a wider problem inside FESA. That is a problem now that the government is intent on fixing through accepting these recommendations.

I come back to the original point, which was about what things a minister should be held responsible for, particularly when there are structural problems within a department. I listened intently to the member for Girrawheen. I do not believe that that was an accurate reflection of the standards in this place. I know how difficult the job was that she had when she was Minister for Corrective Services, because I have had the job and the present minister has it. She was head of a department that suffered a great tragedy. I do not recall that she was ever asked to resign or move away from that portfolio.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: We have heard the debate in relative silence. The Attorney General has addressed the member for Girrawheen directly and she has responded. That is not an indication for everyone else in the house to join in. Leader of the National Party, I call you to order for the first time.

Mr J.N. Hyde: This is about your minister. You're wasting time.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Perth!

Mr C.C. PORTER: I think that the member for Girrawheen would have thought about it. I think she made the right decision. I do not believe that she should have been held personally responsible as a minister for that event. However, when we look at that event and at the State Coroner's report, we see that it bears eerie similarities to what is before us. The structural problems inside the department and a direct failure of the cabinet of the day to fund the necessary replacement of the vehicle fleet, mixed with terrible decisions on the day, produced a tragic result. I think that the member for Girrawheen made the right decision. I do not think that she could or should have been held personally responsible for that. But the standard that she is now seeking to apply is entirely different. We must keep in mind that the Department of Corrective Services has indeed been fined by a magistrate for failing to keep a safe workplace in that incident and that this government handed out \$3.25 million to show contrition for that. The standards are dubious and double.

Point of Order

Mr M. McGOWAN: I note that the Leader of the National Party is about to seek the call. This motion to suspend standing orders relates directly to the Minister for Emergency Services. It is the most serious of motions—a motion of no confidence in a minister. I am very concerned that other ministers are taking up the time that should be occupied by the minister whose confidence is being questioned. I am very concerned that that minister is not going to address this most significant motion about him. I seek your advice, Mr Acting Speaker —

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr A.P. O'Gorman): Members! A point of order is being taken. It is customary in this place that a point of order be heard in silence so that the Presiding Officer can hear it and make a decision on it. I ask that everybody hold their tongues for a bit and let the member for Rockingham make his point of order, after which I will make a decision and we will move on.

Dr K.D. HAMES: On the point of order, Mr Acting Speaker —

Mr Mark McGowan; Dr Kim Hames; Mr David Templeman; Mr John Kobelke; Mr John Hyde; Mr Tony Simpson; Speaker; Mr Eric Ripper; Ms Margaret Quirk; Acting Speaker; Mr Christian Porter; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Bill Johnston; Dr Tony Buti

The ACTING SPEAKER: We are on a point of order.

Dr K.D. HAMES: I think I am allowed to speak on his point of order.

The ACTING SPEAKER: When the member for Rockingham has finished.

Mr M. McGOWAN: I seek your advice, Mr Acting Speaker. The minister has not answered the questions and the most serious arguments put to him. It looks as though most of the time will be taken up by other ministers. It is incumbent on the minister in whom confidence is being questioned to stand and answer the allegations.

Dr K.D. HAMES: Further to that point of order, that is clearly not a point of order; it is a point of view. There is no such requirement within standing orders. The member has abused this house by trying to use standing orders to make a point.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members, as much as we would like to hear from the Minister for Emergency Services, any member can stand in this place at any time and make a contribution to the debate. The only person seeking the call at the moment is the Leader of the National Party, so I give the call to the Leader of the National Party.

Debate Resumed

MR B.J. GRYLLS (Central Wheatbelt — Leader of the National Party) [11.27 am]: I will be quick, because the Minister for Emergency Services wants a full complement of time to prove that this motion has no standing. Members opposite berated me for not wanting to be part of the debate, yet when I stood, they criticised me for wanting to be part of the debate! The reason I want to be part of the debate is that the Attorney General has clearly spoken to the report and the issue.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members! Only one person should be speaking in this house. I cannot hear the Leader of the National Party, and I am sure that the Hansard reporter is having trouble hearing him. I ask members on both sides of the chamber to be quiet and to let the member on his feet deliver his comments so that they can be recorded accurately in *Hansard*.

Mr B.J. GRYLLS: I think opposition members have made a major tactical blunder on what they believed was going to be one of their better days in opposition in this term of government by leading with the member for Girrawheen prosecuting the case against the emergency services minister and by talking about the principles of the Westminster system. Members on the opposition front bench have the report on their desks and they have referred to it. But if they actually believed in the argument, the person who led the prosecution of this argument would have resigned when she had the job of Minister for Corrective Services. It is not good enough for the member for Girrawheen to say that she considered it and spoke about it with the then Premier. If the member wants to use —

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr A.P. O’Gorman): Members, I think I have pointed out a few times that the motion before the house is what I have read out before. That is what we are debating and that is the only thing we are debating. I ask the Leader of the National Party to come back to the motion that is before the house, as well as every other member who gets to their feet in this place. The motion is here; I am not going to read it out again. Members all know what it is; that is what we need comments and debate on at the moment.

Mr B.J. GRYLLS: I think it is absolutely relevant; the opposition is prosecuting an argument to censure the Minister for Emergency Services, yet the very person prosecuting the argument did not follow the exact principle she is asking the minister to follow. The member talked about the member for Armadale being involved in this in his own electorate; I would have thought he would have taken the opportunity to contribute to this debate. Maybe the member for Armadale should have been the person prosecuting that argument. More than 100 houses have been lost in three fires, at Toodyay, Lake Clifton and Roleystone–Kelmscott. That has been devastating for those families affected, but having watched the television coverage of the Victorian bushfires and those families dealing with not only loss of property but also loss of life, Western Australia can stand proud that we have been able to deal with major catastrophic bushfires without any loss of life. The government, by agreeing in principle with all the recommendations of the Keelty report, is saying that we understand that there are some challenges, but that we are going to address those challenges. This government has a track record of identifying challenges and getting on and fixing them. The Minister for Emergency Services has my full support to do that. This very year we are investing \$40 million in improving the emergency radio communication network for the very volunteers we are talking about in this debate today. The Minister for Emergency Services said that this needs to happen to ensure that we have good management of fires and emergency services, and I am very confident that

Mr Mark McGowan; Dr Kim Hames; Mr David Templeman; Mr John Kobelke; Mr John Hyde; Mr Tony Simpson; Speaker; Mr Eric Ripper; Ms Margaret Quirk; Acting Speaker; Mr Christian Porter; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Bill Johnston; Dr Tony Buti

the minister can roll out that program. The rolling out of new emergency communications was a project that the previous government considered and ignored; it was not overly concerned about it.

Several members interjected.

Mr B.J. GRYLLS: Absolutely; the Minister for Emergency Services has my support. He is going to roll out that program and we are going to make the changes to emergency services that are needed. That is why the government sits on this side—because when we identify problems, we act on them and we make the right decisions.

The ACTING SPEAKER: It was very loud in this place during that last contribution. I will mention once again that this is a very serious motion. The minister in question is answering and I ask that he be heard in complete silence so that he can defend himself properly and so that Hansard can get his contribution into *Hansard* properly.

MR R.F. JOHNSON (Hillarys — Minister for Emergency Services) [11.32 am]: There is one very brief area I want to cover before I address the areas of: What did I do before the fire? What did I do after the fire? I will cover that. The Leader of the Opposition has come in here with a holier-than-thou look on his face and his comments about the Westminster system and ministerial responsibility. I must touch on that, because I take that very seriously.

Let us look at what happened when the opposition was in government. Under the watch of the then Minister for Corrective Services, we had a mass breakout from the courts of dangerous criminals. Where was she? She did not cancel her dentist appointment. Closer to home —

Several members interjected.

Withdrawal of Remark

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: The member for Jandakot used an unparliamentary term in respect of members of the Labor Party, and I ask him to withdraw.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members, I did not hear any such comment, and this is the point I was making earlier. When everyone is shouting, it is very difficult to hear what is being said. We need to hear the Minister for Emergency Services and nobody else.

Debate Resumed

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Let me get closer to home for the Leader of the Opposition, and a very good friend of his, Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich. What did she do when there were allegations of sexual misconduct in the Department of Education? What happened? She said that she had never heard anything about it. I think other agencies found that she had, but what happened then? Did she resign? No, no, no. The Director General of the Department of Education was forced to quit, and so was another member, but she stayed. Did she take the Westminster system of ministerial responsibility? Absolutely not. Under the watch of the member for Girrawheen—this has already been touched on—when she was Minister for Corrective Services, a person died in one of the substandard vehicles that was transporting a prisoner. A tragic event; did she resign? No. She said she considered it. She did not consider it for very long.

Mr E.S. Ripper: You didn't care enough to move an MPI.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I am coming to you, sunshine; I am coming to you! This was the tight-fisted Treasurer who refused any funding to upgrade those vehicles, so I ask: who has blood on their hands in this chamber? Not me; nobody died under my watch. Three people died in the Boorabbin fires—not under my watch, under the opposition's watch. Did any minister resign? Absolutely not.

It is a tragic event when anybody dies, but I can say that, since I have been Minister for Emergency Services, in relation to not just fires but other emergency areas—bushfires, cyclones, storms and earthquakes—I have to tell members that I think, overall, we have done a pretty good job. There were mistakes on the day in relation to the Kelmscott–Roleystone fire. There were mistakes on the day and they are not acceptable, because procedures were not followed. All I can say is that it was a horrendous day, but I was not out having dinner when that was happening. I was not at the dentist or anywhere else. I was kept in touch all day long on that day and further, and I attended an emergency meeting later on in the evening to deal with that situation. That is what I was doing. I was not at the dentist, or just sitting in denial of the things that happened, when people lost their lives. I think I did a reasonable job for a minister. I cannot be responsible for being on the ground, on a fire ground, directing our fire officers, our volunteers, who I say again did a fantastic job. There were errors made, absolutely, but I have been trying to address those for a long time. Under the Labor government, I am told that the previous

Mr Mark McGowan; Dr Kim Hames; Mr David Templeman; Mr John Kobelke; Mr John Hyde; Mr Tony Simpson; Speaker; Mr Eric Ripper; Ms Margaret Quirk; Acting Speaker; Mr Christian Porter; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Bill Johnston; Dr Tony Buti

minister was made fully aware that there was a purple circle in FESA; I was not aware of that, until Mr Keely found that out, and he reported that. That is what he said. He was aware of it. He was aware, absolutely, of the conflict between FESA and DEC. What did the previous minister do? Nothing. He took no notice of a parliamentary report that highlighted so many things. He did nothing for two years; it sat on a shelf and gathered dust. He did absolutely nothing. What did I do before the fire?

An opposition member: What did you do?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I will tell the member what I did. I got cabinet to agree to funding for two type 1 helicopters, which each dropped 4 000 litres at a time on the fire. If we had not had those we would have lost more properties in Toodyay, Lake Clifton and Kelmscott–Roleystone. I did that. I also made sure that I got FESA properly funded—\$128 million for front-line vehicles. Our volunteers have the best vehicles they have ever had in their lives, and the equipment that they need. That is what I did; I have done all those things. What have I done? I also made FESA and DEC and local government sit down; I formed an interagency committee because I wanted all those things to be resolved where there had been conflict in the past, and it was working.

Several members interjected.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I did that last year, in 2010, my friend. I did that before the fire. I did that as soon as I became aware that there was that —

Mrs M.H. Roberts interjected.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: You are a disgrace, you are. You are a disgrace. Go to the dentist!

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members! Member for Midland.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: They do not like it when the truth comes home to hit them. She was a useless minister; she does not like it.

I formed that interagency —

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members!

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: This is a very serious motion, Mr Acting Speaker, and it is against me. You are allowing these people to interject on me.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Minister for Emergency Services, when you attack somebody directly across the chamber, you have to expect them to arc up back against you. If you are asking me to call them to order, clearly, do not attack them straight across the chamber, because that is what will happen. Members on my left, I urge you to remain silent and to let the minister respond so that we can get exactly correct on *Hansard* exactly what he says.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I have done a lot and I am very happy, at some stage, to roll out all the things that I have done before and since the fire—in fact, ever since I have been a minister. I have instructed FESA that these protocols must be put in place. The only way that we will be able to address —

Mr E.S. Ripper: How can you instruct FESA if the board runs the show?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I have instructed them verbally, if you like. I have told them that it is not good enough. Use whatever words you like, but as a minister I have told them that it is not acceptable for policies, protocols and for the things that have to be done during a major incident to not be recorded properly. That is what happened on the day and that was a fault.

Mr P.B. Watson interjected.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: The opposition wants me to talk to this motion, yet all I get is inane comments from the member for Albany and other members opposite.

I can assure members that I have done everything possible as a minister to ensure that not only the legislative safeguards and guidelines are put in for FESA to operate, but also they are funded, with more funding than ever before and more funding than from any government in history. I believe that it is the job of the minister to make sure that the agency has enough funding and resources to do the job that it is supposed to do. There have been inadequacies in FESA; I accept that. I accept the Keely report, and I can assure members that I will address any

Mr Mark McGowan; Dr Kim Hames; Mr David Templeman; Mr John Kobelke; Mr John Hyde; Mr Tony Simpson; Speaker; Mr Eric Ripper; Ms Margaret Quirk; Acting Speaker; Mr Christian Porter; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Bill Johnston; Dr Tony Buti

area that I am able to. They talk about Peter Conran and other people overseeing the establishment of something new; that is a normal practice.

MR J.C. KOBELKE (Balcatta) [11.41 am]: The motion we are dealing with relates to the incompetence of the minister and the lack of confidence that this house has in him. That is very soundly based on the very detailed and lengthy report titled “A Shared Responsibility: The Report of the Perth Hills Bushfire February 2011 Review”. Today we have seen the government try to put in place a cover-up. It has done this by saying things that are not true. We know what we call it when someone says something that is not true and they know it is not true. The government has also done it by saying that the minister cannot be responsible for certain things. Certainly the report is “A Shared Responsibility”. We are not saying that all the things that went wrong can be laid at the feet of the minister, but the report outlines quite critical things for which the minister was responsible, and he has to be held accountable for not doing anything about those things. In the debate so far the government has done everything it can to not address the issues. That confirms why this minister is not competent and cannot have our confidence to put in place the major reforms required.

The government cannot even address the issues. I am not going to try to canvass the nonsense he said about me—it was untrue. Let us use one example. The Attorney General, in rising to the Minister for Emergency Services’ defence, said that Jo Harrison-Ward was reappointed back in January or sometime. That is a lie! The media statement put out by Mal Wauchope shows that Jo Harrison-Ward was reappointed on 7 April 2011. I do not need to give members more examples of the cover-up by this government. The government will say anything—it does not matter how false it is—because it is simply doing a cover-up to try to protect this minister.

I want to go to one issue. There are many issues, but we have limited time. I refer to one issue in the Keelty report for which this minister has to accept responsibility, but he has failed to even deal with the issue. When the minister was on his feet, if I heard him correctly, he said that he did not know there was a relationship problem between Fire and Emergency Services Authority and the Department of Environment and Conservation. Is that true, minister?

Mr R.F. Johnson: No, that is not what I said. Stop putting words in my mouth. Were you aware; and if so, what did you do about it?

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: Minister, you are the one on trial. I am happy to answer about me, but this is what you do. This is why you are incompetent and totally inadequate for the job: you will not answer questions truthfully and honestly!

Mr R.F. Johnson: You used to fall asleep in meetings, I am told!

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: Again, here is the evidence from the minister’s own mouth; he wants to attack me because he cannot accept any responsibility for his role as minister overseeing this major shemozzle. He was the minister. We have a huge report from Keelty and he cannot accept any responsibility. He wants to attack me for falling asleep at a meeting. I occasionally fall asleep at meetings, but that is not the issue of importance to people. Most people would fall asleep if they had to put up with the boring person we have as a minister! The point is that this is a serious issue and the government wants to make light of it because it will not have the minister accept responsibility.

I come back to the one single point. There are many, but we have limited time. Minister, were you aware of the breakdown in the relationship between FESA and DEC? Were you aware of it?

Mr R.F. Johnson: I became aware of it. I am happy to answer your question. I became aware that there was not the cooperation needed between FESA and DEC on both sides.

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: When were you aware of that breakdown?

Mr R.F. Johnson: Probably about a year ago.

Ms M.M. Quirk interjected.

Mr R.F. Johnson: Why don’t you be quiet? After the Toodyay fire, that is when I think I became aware of it.

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: What did you do about it?

Mr R.F. Johnson: That is when I formed the interagency bushfire committee to make the Western Australian Local Government Association, DEC and FESA sit down in that committee and to work through it, particularly after the results and the recommendations that came out of the Victorian bushfires.

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: Did you think that committee was successful?

Mr Mark McGowan; Dr Kim Hames; Mr David Templeman; Mr John Kobelke; Mr John Hyde; Mr Tony Simpson; Speaker; Mr Eric Ripper; Ms Margaret Quirk; Acting Speaker; Mr Christian Porter; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Bill Johnston; Dr Tony Buti

Mr R.F. Johnson: Sorry?

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: Did you think that committee was doing the job?

Mr R.F. Johnson: It certainly appeared so from the minutes of the meetings.

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: That is not what Keelty says.

Mr R.F. Johnson: It broke down. I know; on the day —

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: Keelty on page 166 calls that very much into doubt.

Mr R.F. Johnson: He said that it broke down on the day, certainly, and it did break down on the day.

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: Did you have discussions with the then Minister for Environment about how you would deal with it?

Mr R.F. Johnson: I have spoken with the Minister for Environment and I have spoken to my cabinet colleagues. I am not going to go into detail of what is said in cabinet —

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: Was this prior to the Roleystone fires?

Mr R.F. Johnson: It was a different minister then, but, yes, I had spoken to that minister.

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: Where were the results? What came out of that?

Mr R.F. Johnson: I will tell you what happened. There certainly appeared to be more cooperation. There seemed to be more agreement that they would work more closely together, and that is as I understood it to happen, which was good.

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: Obviously, the minister did not go to the extent of making sure that it was working. When I was the minister, I was aware of that tension; it has been there for years. I had a number of meetings with the member for Mandurah, who was then the Minister for the Environment, to try to get on top of it.

Mr R.F. Johnson: What did he do? Nothing.

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: We went to cabinet with resolutions, which, when you came in, were then handed to you on a plate because we had done all the work on it.

Mr R.F. Johnson: I went to cabinet with resolutions, I can assure you.

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: The issue here, minister, is that when there was the Dwellingup fire, a major fire in 2007, the actual incident controller was from DEC. When I was down there on the ground with the firefighters and the controllers, I did not see any evidence that it was not working well. Although I knew there were tensions, and we worked on it, I had the evidence on the ground with a major fire—it was a very serious fire and we were looking at having to invoke emergency powers—that it was working; but under you, it did not work. The minister has to accept responsibility for that. Just on this one point, when the minister got to his feet, he refused to actually deal with the issues. Now by interjection we are starting to get a bit of an understanding that he was aware of it, but he did not succeed in dealing with it. That is just one of a number of reasons why he should resign so that someone competent can get on with rebuilding FESA and the relationship it must have with a number of other agencies.

DR A.D. BUTI (Armadale) [11.48 am]: I stand to conclude the argument for our side and I do so as a representative of my community. I am sure I am speaking also for the community that the member for Darling Range represents.

From what we have heard from the government today, it seems that its response to the motion is to attack us and give us a legal history lesson. That is the substance of the government's defence. We are dealing with the most important and devastating disaster in contemporary Western Australian history. How does the government deal with it? It attacks us and gives us a legal history lesson. I think the Attorney General was outside the chamber at some stage, but, as reported by the member for Balcatta, Ms Jo Harrison-Ward was reappointed after the bushfires, not prior to the bushfires. This statement from the Public Sector Commission is dated 7 April 2011 —

The Public Sector Commissioner, Mr Mal Wauchope today announced that the Governor has approved reappointment of Ms Jo Harrison-Ward ...

Blah, blah, blah. That is dated 7 April 2011. What we are arguing is not a normal motion. It is not a mundane motion. This motion deals with a matter of grave importance to my local community and to the community of the member for Darling Range. It is a community that is still suffering from 71 homes having been destroyed. I actually had morning tea here yesterday with a mother and son who have lost their home. They were appalled

Mr Mark McGowan; Dr Kim Hames; Mr David Templeman; Mr John Kobelke; Mr John Hyde; Mr Tony Simpson; Speaker; Mr Eric Ripper; Ms Margaret Quirk; Acting Speaker; Mr Christian Porter; Mr Brendon Grylls; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Bill Johnston; Dr Tony Buti

that it took this government so long to release the report, and they were appalled that this minister said: “I wash my hands of it. I had a FESA board.” I tell the minister to speak to the Minister for Planning, because I have served on a board for which he was responsible when I was a member of the Armadale Redevelopment Authority, and that minister took a much greater interest in how that board operated. If he thought the board was not operating properly, he did something about it! A minister should not appoint a board and not do anything; otherwise, we will just appoint boards and not have ministers. The minister is responsible, and the Minister for Emergency Services is responsible for FESA! For the purposes of this review—that, of course, had terms of reference that sought to not include the minister’s responsibilities—as the Acting Premier said today, they appointed someone with a great reputation. He has a great reputation and he has produced a great report, but what is the minister doing? He is washing his hands of the report.

Mr R.F. Johnson: No, I’m not!

Several members interjected.

Dr A.D. BUTI: Yes, you are, because the Attorney General spent considerable time mentioning this dysfunction on the day of the bushfires, and that there was a malfunction on the day. Page 163 does not refer to a malfunction on the day; it refers to systemic problems in an organisation under the control of this minister. There can be a board, but if a board is going to be appointed, there has to be some control over that board. How can there be a Westminster system of ministerial responsibility, even if it has changed over the last couple of hundred years, as the Attorney General has told us, if ministers do not accept responsibility for their portfolios? Also, minister, a constituent of the member for Darling Range, and someone with whom I have also had conversations, is Pam Story. What has been done? What compensation? Pam Story was a volunteer firefighter who suffered significant injuries on the day. Has compensation been awarded to her? Minister, has Pam Story been awarded compensation?

Mr T.R. Buswell: You’re on the big issues now, aren’t you?

Several members interjected.

Dr A.D. BUTI: What about ex gratia payments? My community is actually absolutely appalled. Look, I understand that the member for Darling Range cannot say anything, but he, also, must be appalled, because he, also, is a very good local member.

Question put and a division taken with the following result —

Ayes (23)

Ms L.L. Baker	Mr W.J. Johnston	Mr A.P. O’Gorman	Mr C.J. Tallentire
Dr A.D. Buti	Mr J.C. Kobelke	Mr J.R. Quigley	Mr A.J. Waddell
Ms A.S. Carles	Mr F.M. Logan	Ms M.M. Quirk	Mr P.B. Watson
Mr R.H. Cook	Mr M. McGowan	Mr E.S. Ripper	Mr M.P. Whitely
Ms J.M. Freeman	Mrs C.A. Martin	Mrs M.H. Roberts	Mr D.A. Templeman (<i>Teller</i>)
Mr J.N. Hyde	Mr M.P. Murray	Ms R. Saffioti	

Noes (28)

Mr P. Abetz	Mr V.A. Catania	Dr G.G. Jacobs	Dr M.D. Nahan
Mr F.A. Alban	Dr E. Constable	Mr R.F. Johnson	Mr C.C. Porter
Mr I.C. Blayney	Mr J.H.D. Day	Mr A. Krsticevic	Mr D.T. Redman
Mr J.J.M. Bowler	Mr J.M. Francis	Mr J.E. McGrath	Mr M.W. Sutherland
Mr I.M. Britza	Mr B.J. Grylls	Mr W.R. Marmion	Mr T.K. Waldron
Mr T.R. Buswell	Dr K.D. Hames	Mr P.T. Miles	Dr J.M. Woollard
Mr G.M. Castrilli	Mr A.P. Jacob	Ms A.R. Mitchell	Mr A.J. Simpson (<i>Teller</i>)

Pairs

Mr P. Papalia	Mr C.J. Barnett
Mr B.S. Wyatt	Mrs L.M. Harvey
Mr P.C. Tinley	Mr M.J. Cowper

Question thus negatived.