

Mr John Day; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Chris Hutton; Acting Speaker; Speaker; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Jan Norberger; Deputy Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Terry Redman; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mrs Glenys Godfrey

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND JUSTICE STANDING COMMITTEE

Membership Change — Motion

MR J.H.D. DAY (Kalamunda — Leader of the House) [10.04 am]: I move —

That the member for Balcatta and the member for Vasse are appointed as members of the Community Development and Justice Standing Committee.

Dr A.D. Buti: Did you override the Premier?

Mr J.H.D. DAY: The member for Armadale, I think, Madam Acting Speaker, has invited me to make some comments about the background to this nomination.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms J.M. Freeman): No, Leader of the House, I am sure he did not.

Mr J.H.D. DAY: Effectively he did—so I shall therefore do so. I might even make some comments that assist to further the career of the member for Armadale, Madam Acting Speaker.

This motion seeks to fill the two vacancies that have existed on the Community Development and Justice Standing Committee since around the middle of last year when the two government members of this committee made a decision to resign from the committee. My understanding is that they were completely dissatisfied with the chairmanship of the committee and the way the committee was being managed and guided by the chair.

Dr A.D. Buti: Disgraceful! Absolutely disgraceful—you are much better than that!

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Armadale, unless you would like to take a point of order, interjections are not welcome.

Dr A.D. Buti interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Armadale! I am on my feet; I call you for the first time. It is very difficult to protect you, Leader of the House, so can we just move to the substantive motion? Thank you very much.

Mr D.A. Templeman interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Mandurah—shush!

Mr J.H.D. DAY: We are seeking to fill the two vacancies that have existed, but I should also point out that the government has not had confidence in the way this committee has been operating, in particular in relation to the report presented around the middle of last year entitled “Review of the Police Investigation into Traffic Incidents involving a member of Parliament”. The government in good faith agreed to the opposition having a majority and therefore chairing one of the standing committees of Parliament after the last election when committees were being put in place. That is in accordance with I think what has become accepted practice now over the last two Parliaments—this one and the previous Parliament in that the government will not have a majority on all of the committees, and, as I said, in good faith —

Ms R. Saffioti: You do with the Public Accounts Committee, actually. That was a deal the Premier did.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members!

Mr J.H.D. DAY: Well, at least in good faith, and I think the precedence has now been established that the government of the day will not have a majority on all committees of the Legislative Assembly. It was the Community Development and Justice Standing Committee where that practice has been put into effect, so the Labor opposition has had three members and the government has had two members.

The report that was produced in June of last year was presented. It was not so much the fact that the inquiry was undertaken and the highly political nature of the inquiry, but it was clearly a blatant political exercise with a prejudged outcome and a completely unprofessional majority —

Dr A.D. Buti: Where is your proof of the prejudged outcome?

Mr J.H.D. DAY: I will quote in a moment from responses to the report provided —

Dr A.D. Buti: Yes, but that doesn't determine a prejudged outcome; that's after the report. Where is your evidence that we have prejudged it?

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Armadale!

Mr J.H.D. DAY: A majority report was produced by three members of the committee and minority reports were presented by the two government members of the committee. It does not matter quite so much perhaps what the

Mr John Day; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Chris Hatton; Acting Speaker; Speaker; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Jan Norberger; Deputy Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Terry Redman; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mrs Glenys Godfrey

government has to say, although the Minister for Police tabled a response to the report in August of last year, but the minister's report attached responses from the Commissioner of Police and the State Solicitor, together with the State Counsel. I think it is important to put on the record what those senior officers of the state had to say. Putting aside whatever the government's views may be, clearly this is an area of great political activity and interest, and I can understand that. The government has a view that committees and the Parliament have a responsibility to treat with due respect the senior officers and institutions of the state who do their job in a proper and professional way. The Commissioner of Police, amongst other things, in his response stated —

It is clear that the three members of the Committee contributing to the main report have only a rudimentary understanding of Police investigation and response. Consequently, erroneous assumptions and conclusions are found throughout the report, highlighting a lack of objectivity by three members of the Committee.

Mrs M.H. Roberts: That is disgraceful.

Mr J.H.D. DAY: Is the member saying what Karl O'Callaghan, the Commissioner of Police, said is disgraceful? Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms J.M. Freeman): Members! Can you bring this to a conclusion, Leader of the House. Thank you.

[Quorum formed.]

The ACTING SPEAKER: Leader of the House, I would love this to be drawn to a conclusion.

Mr J.H.D. DAY: I can assure Madam Acting Speaker that I will certainly not take another 55 minutes.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Good.

Mr J.H.D. DAY: The Commissioner of Police, in other paragraphs in his response, stated in reference to some conclusions on page 21 of the Community Development and Justice Standing Committee's report —

The Committee has simply invented both of these conclusions. It has no evidence before it of how police conducted the interview or how the officer felt when conducting the interview.

Further down that page, the statement is made by the Commissioner of Police —

The Committee again shows its rudimentary understanding of police investigation.

Near the bottom of the page, the Commissioner of Police states —

There is a theme running through this report which continually suggests interference by Government in the process of the Police investigation. This is a mischievous allegation without any apparent foundation which impugns the reputation of those involved. The committee protects itself by using 'might have' or 'may have' to shelter behind a conclusion for which there is absolutely no evidence. In this way the Committee appears to be manipulating facts to fit a predetermined position.

Mr M. McGowan interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Leader of the House, you have the floor. Please draw it to a conclusion.

Mr J.H.D. DAY: It is also important, to ensure that it is on the record and to remind members, of what the State Solicitor had to say about the committee's report. Amongst other things, he wrote —

The Report of the majority of the Committee raises criticisms that relate directly to the SSO.

That is the State Solicitor's Office.

Comments made by the Committee in relation to SSO legal advice and legal professional privilege are, with the greatest respect, erroneous and misleading.

Further on, he said —

However, the Committee has misrepresented the actual SSO legal advice given and instead relied on its own assumptions, inferences and conclusions in relation to the Vehicle Examination Report.

There is much else that I could quote, but I will simply go to the conclusion of the letter from Paul Evans, State Solicitor, and George Tannin, SC, State Counsel. Under the heading "Concluding comments", they note —

The Committee's most striking proposition, if it is a proposition, appears towards the end of the Report.

The review has revealed the extent to which police are constrained in doing their job by policies and law. (Report Page 30)

Mr John Day; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Chris Hatton; Acting Speaker; Speaker; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Jan Norberger; Deputy Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Terry Redman; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mrs Glenys Godfrey

This concluding comment by the Committee is perplexing and reveals an ignorance of Parliamentary history and the role of Parliament in securing the rule of law.

The fact that the “*police are constrained in doing their job by policies and law*” —

That quote is from the committee —

is unsurprising, and surely to be lauded as a benchmark of any just and democratic society that values respecting and upholding the rule of law. How could the police responsibly act otherwise?

It is baffling that the Committee would conclude its Report by apparently criticising the police for adhering to relevant policies and laws, particularly given the Chair’s remarks in her foreword ...

That is what the Commissioner of Police, the State Solicitor and State Counsel had to say in response to the Community Development and Justice Standing Committee’s report. It is not surprising that the government has a view that this committee has not been well led. The government accepts that it is chaired by the opposition but it does not believe that a professional and proper approach has been taken by the majority of the committee in relation to the report that it produced. Those comments from the Commissioner of Police, and in particular from the State Solicitor and State Counsel, are absolutely damning given that the chair of the committee —

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members, please do not interject. The Leader of the House assures me that he is coming to a conclusion. I would welcome the conclusion of this.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members, I am on my feet!

Mr J.H.D. DAY: The comments made, even if members want to put aside the comments from the Commissioner of Police, take into account the views of the State Solicitor and the State Counsel in some of the extracts that I just referred to. They are absolutely damning comments about a report that was produced by a majority of members from the Community Development and Justice Standing Committee, which has been chaired by the member for Girrawheen, who in fact is a lawyer, and a lawyer of some significant experience, as I understand it. If I were in that position, I would feel very uncomfortable and highly embarrassed, given that she, and in fact the member for Armadale, have significant legal experience.

The government’s view is that it would be preferable for the chairmanship of the Community Development and Justice Standing Committee to be changed from the member for Girrawheen to the member for Armadale. That is a matter for the committee to consider, but that is the government’s view. The government is not suggesting that the member for Girrawheen should not be a member of the Community Development and Justice Standing Committee but the government’s view is that it would be appropriate for the member for Armadale to take over the chairmanship of this committee, albeit he was a member of the committee that produced the majority report. I believe it is incumbent on members of committees of this Parliament to act in a fair manner, and to at least pay account to what are the well-established principles of the rule of law and the role of Parliament in making laws, and in accepting the fundamental principle that the police should not operate outside the law, because that is effectively what last year’s majority report of the committee suggested.

I have just provided background on the government’s views about the Community Development and Justice Standing Committee and why it has had two vacancies for a number of months. The government is now of the view that it is appropriate to reinstate government membership of the committee, but it believes that the committee should take on board the comments that I have made. I commend the motion to the house; namely, to appoint the members for Balcatta and Vasse to the Community Development and Justice Standing Committee.

MRS M.H. ROBERTS (Midland) [10.18 am]: What an extraordinary diatribe we have just heard from the Leader of the House. Although I support his motion, some matters he raised in the course of moving this motion simply need to be addressed. One assertion made was that the government had acted in good faith when it gave the opposition a majority of members on a committee so that the opposition could chair a committee. He said that this was an agreement that had been reached post the 2008 election that in future Parliaments the precedent should be set that the opposition should take the chairmanship of one committee. First and foremost, that was not the agreement that was reached. What the Premier said when he was in opposition was that he believed the opposition should chair the Public Accounts Committee—the committee colloquially referred to as PAC. That is what the Premier said when he was in opposition, and when he came to government in 2008, the Premier said he would stand by that. It was his view that we should agree from hereon in that the opposition should chair the PAC and the opposition should also probably get chairmanship of one other committee. The Premier reneged on

Mr John Day; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Chris Hatton; Acting Speaker; Speaker; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Jan Norberger; Deputy Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Terry Redman; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mrs Glenys Godfrey

that commitment after the result of the 2013 state election. Buoyed by an increased majority in this house, the Premier said he no longer believed the opposition should get chairmanship of the PAC but he said he would consider it. He considered for some time what he was prepared to offer and, eventually, the opposition was told that one committee would have a majority of opposition members. As the Minister for Planning identified, that is currently the Community Development and Justice Standing Committee. That was the only committee in this Parliament that the opposition was given the majority of members on. It is not what had been agreed to previously; it was a diminution of that.

One of the other few things that the Minister for Planning got correct was that he said the committee reported midyear last year. Indeed, to be specific, it reported in June last year.

Mr J.H.D. Day: I said that.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: The minister is correct if he said that. The committee did report in June last year, so the full context of that report and so forth were known in June last year. Guess what? The Liberal members of that committee, the members for Balcatta and Morley, did not resign until July. What they did was go off on their overseas trip. They participated in the committee's inquiries in Manchester, New York and Dallas even though that was after the Buswell report had been released and after those members had given their dissenting report. I think that the member for Morley was more piqued with the fact that he was written up in an article in *The West Australian* by Daniel Emerson and others for skipping a high-level meeting in New York with the New York Police Department to go to his wife's home in the state of Texas while on tour with the parliamentary committee that he quit weeks later. I think that had a little bit to do with it. I can understand why the member for Morley might not have wanted to show his face at that committee again. Why did the member for Balcatta pull the pin? It was all around this place that a certain person in the Premier's office was putting pressure on him to do so, not that he wanted to do so. Guess what? Since then he has been complaining about his lesser income. In recent weeks people around this place have been hearing him say that he would like to be back on the committee so he can get some more money.

Point of Order

Mr C.D. HATTON: Do I have a right of reply at all? My point of order —

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms J.M. Freeman): Members, points of order will be heard in silence!

Mr C.D. HATTON: My point of order is that the member is discrediting individuals in their role of committee work.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members! Thank you very much, member for Balcatta; you cannot use a point of order for a debating opportunity. If you want to debate the issue, you can stand and debate it after the fact. There is no point of order.

Mr C.D. HATTON: Further to that point of order —

Mr D.A. Templeman interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Mandurah, silence during a point of order!

Mr C.D. HATTON: My point of order is not about debate; the point of order is that the member is not factual in what she is saying.

The ACTING SPEAKER: There is no point of order. If you want to respond, you can respond when you have an opportunity.

Debate Resumed

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: I can see why a motion has been moved today to reinstate the member for Balcatta, but not the member for Morley, to the committee, because I know that the member for Morley is a man of some principle, and I think he would be too embarrassed to put his name forward to rejoin this committee.

Mr N.W. Morton interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Forrestfield, I heard that.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Let us look at what this article by Daniel Emerson says. It states —

Mr John Day; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Chris Hatton; Acting Speaker; Speaker; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Jan Norberger; Deputy Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Terry Redman; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mrs Glenys Godfrey

Morley Liberal MP Ian Britza skipped a high-level meeting with the New York Police Department to go to his wife's home State of Texas while on tour with a parliamentary committee he quit weeks later.

It was the third time since being elected in 2008 that Mr Britza has gone to Texas on the WA taxpayer.

Speaker Michael Sutherland is investigating Mr Britza going absent during the community development and justice standing committee's \$120,000 trip last month to Britain and the US to research seniors and police policy.

Mr Britza and fellow Liberal Chris Hatton quit the Labor-dominated committee this week after Police Commissioner Karl O'Callaghan and the Premier claimed its June report into Troy Buswell's traffic crashes was biased.

But the move has prompted questions over why the pair went overseas with the committee last month if they no longer wanted to be on it.

Committee chairwoman Margaret Quirk yesterday confirmed Mr Britza, who was deputy chairman, missed a scheduled meeting with NYPD deputy commissioner Dermot Shea on July 11.

"He didn't even tell me, he just nicked off," she said. "When I went down to the hotel foyer and said, 'Where's Ian', the research staff said he's gone to Dallas a day early."

The delegation was in Dallas for a conference on the ageing between July 12 and 16.

Ms Quirk said Mr Britza had been keen for the committee to attend the conference but also left that event midway through the last day to visit an in-law in nearby Fort Worth before staying on in the US.

Mr Britza's two other research trips to Texas, costing taxpayers \$12,000, were during the festive seasons of 2008-09 and 2011-12.

Mr Britza told Channel 7 that committee research officers had told him the NYPD meeting had been cancelled and gave him permission to leave early, a claim Ms Quirk disputed.

He defended his three Texas trips on taxpayers.

"I don't care if it was six times," he said. "It's the only in-law I have. My family matter to me more than what you matter."

That is the full content of the article. We can see why Mr Britza would not want to put his name forward to rejoin the committee that he absented himself from on those occasions. Of course, the claims he made do not hold water. Here we have the following situation: the report came out in June; they do their dissenting report; they are not happy; supposedly, they want to resign from the committee because of that, but, no, they are more than happy to go off on the trip to Manchester, New York and Dallas —

Point of Order

Mr C.D. HATTON: I have a point of order —

A member interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Points of order will be heard in silence. Member for Butler, do not move back to your seat because you are going to interject; points of order will be heard in silence. Member for Cannington, I can see what you are doing. I am in the chair, member for Cannington, not you.

Mr C.D. HATTON: My point of order is that the member for Midland is misleading Parliament and the reason I say that —

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members, points of order will be heard in silence!

Mr D.A. Templeman interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Mandurah!

Mr C.D. HATTON: The member for Midland is grossly misleading Parliament, and the reason I say that is that it needs to be categorically stated that when I, as a member of that committee, gave a dissenting report—I think this needs to be said —

The ACTING SPEAKER: Sit down, member. There is no point of order.

Debate Resumed

Mr John Day; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Chris Hatton; Acting Speaker; Speaker; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Jan Norberger; Deputy Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Terry Redman; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mrs Glenys Godfrey

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: It would appear that the member for Balcatta does not like me saying these things, but, of course, they are not my words; they are words directly quoted from *The West Australian*. I have said nothing more than that this is what was reported in *The West Australian*. I read out verbatim what was printed in *The West Australian* and the member for Balcatta said he disputes that. Let him get up and speak. All I assert here is that these are the words that were printed in *The West Australian* newspaper, and they were. I have quoted them directly. I will provide that article to Hansard so it can appear on the parliamentary record. Those same members who were prepared to go to Manchester —

Mr N.W. Morton interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: I can hear you, member for Forrestfield.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Those same members who were happy to investigate seniors and have their inquiries in Manchester, New York and Dallas were not, however, prepared—they drew the line—to travel with the committee to Melville and Mandurah. They were not available for that. They said, “We’ve had enough. We’re not going to Melville and Mandurah. We have to resign! Our principle has suddenly kicked into action and we’re not prepared to go there with that committee; we’re not prepared to go there with that chairperson. We are not going to Melville and Mandurah with her.”

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members!

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Government members may not like this debate, but their Leader of the House effectively asked for it. He re-canvassed every issue this morning. He made lots of claims. I do not think he got a good briefing this morning. I do not think he has updated himself since the dissenting members’ first response on this issue in this place. The Premier has, of course, made a lot of criticism of the Chair of the Community Development and Justice Standing Committee; criticism that he has not recanted, yet we are seeing today an incredible backflip. Suddenly he is saying, “Actually we do care about the conventions of this place and we are reluctantly going to put two people back on it. We’re going to let the member for Balcatta rejoin the committee and get the few thousand dollars extra per year that he’ll get by being a member of a committee.”

Mr C.D. Hatton: Point of order!

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: That is a fact.

Point of Order

Mr C.D. HATTON: The member for Midland is misrepresenting again and misleading —

The SPEAKER: That is not a point of order. Sit down, please.

Debate Resumed

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: I look forward to seeing the member for Balcatta take on the role for nothing and not get the few thousand dollars that committee members are paid additional to their base salary as a member of Parliament, because if I am misrepresenting him I will apologise. If the member for Balcatta is not going to take the money, I will apologise—no problem whatsoever.

Point of Order

Mr S.K. L’ESTRANGE: I refer to standing order 92, “Imputations and personal reflections”. I believe the member is now making assessments over the member’s financial situation and motives.

The SPEAKER: Member, there is no point of order.

Debate Resumed

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: I look forward to the member for Balcatta advising the house, if he chooses to respond to comments today, on whether he is going to get extra income by rejoining the committee or whether he is not going to take that money. I also look forward to him advising the house on whether he had a phone call or any conversations with a member of the Premier’s staff recommending to him that he take himself off the committee and join the member for Morley in leaving the committee last year. I am not sure from the government’s perspective what has changed from when those members resigned last year and why they are now prepared to rejoin the committee. The only explanation we really got from the Leader of the House today was that after due consideration, they need to respect the conventions of the house and are prepared to go back to the arrangement they put in place post the last election. The fact is that the Premier, we all know, is a hothead; he gets a rush of blood to the head in a fit of pique and he makes a statement. Of course it was inappropriate that members resign

Mr John Day; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Chris Hatton; Acting Speaker; Speaker; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Jan Norberger; Deputy Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Terry Redman; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mrs Glenys Godfrey

from the committee in the circumstances. There are conventions in this house. There are occasions in which minority reports are written. There are occasions when a member or two members disagree with the majority report of a committee. The way to do that and the convention to handle it is to put in a minority report so that the two reports can be seen side by side—the majority report and the minority report. That is the convention. There was no reason for these resignations—none at all.

Mr C.J. Barnett interjected.

The SPEAKER: Premier!

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: I think it is fair to say that the member for Morley could not work with the chair of the committee. Frankly, if I were the member for Morley, I would not have shown my face at that committee again after what had gone on overseas and the comments that had been made. I therefore understand that. However, it was a political decision to withdraw the member for Balcatta at that time. I do not think he was actually keen to withdraw but he was encouraged into that position by someone from the Premier's staff.

Another claim was made in this place today by the Leader of the House. The Leader of the House read into the record some of the criticisms of the committee's report by the Commissioner of Police. The central assertion in the Commissioner of Police's letter has been unequivocally disproven. The Leader of the House should have had a briefing on that and if he had, perhaps he would know differently. The member for Armadale may be able to go into this matter in better detail than I can, but one of the things that surprised me when I read that letter tabled in the house by the Minister for Police was the assertion in words to the effect that the committee could not possibly fairly comment on something because the committee members had not interviewed the two young officers involved. However, we know that prior to his attendance at the hearing, the Commissioner of Police spoke with the chairperson in the presence of other witnesses to that conversation and suggested to the chairperson that there was no need to call the individual officers as they were young officers who may be intimidated by the committee process and whatever, and that there was nothing they could contribute or add of which he personally could not advise them. I understand that subsequent to that the Commissioner of Police has written a letter back to the committee saying that he is very happy to continue working with the committee in a constructive way. That is therefore the extent of his problem with the committee, so he actually got something wrong there.

There are other opinions on this matter to which the member for Armadale will refer. I was listening to the member for Girrawheen's very good interjection earlier when she said that there is a silk's opinion that is contrary to the advice that the State Solicitor's Office gave the government. This is therefore not an open-and-shut case. I recognise that the Leader of the House reflected on the legal careers and knowledge of both the member for Girrawheen as chair and a committee member, the member for Armadale. Both of them are quite distinguished when it comes to law practice. The member for Girrawheen, for example, has worked in major law firms. She worked in the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions, I believe in the Australian Capital Territory and potentially elsewhere. In fact, she worked for the National Crime Authority as its legal counsel for Western Australia; I think the title is regional counsel. She did that for some years and indeed provided high-level advice to the commonwealth government in that role. She is not a novice, therefore, when it comes to this matter. I would certainly put her opinion higher than the opinion of a whole lot of other people. As someone who actually worked as a lawyer in the area of policing law enforcement—she was not a commercial or family lawyer—it is an area of which she has detailed knowledge. I suspect in fact that both the member for Girrawheen and the member for Armadale have given lectures and tutorials at university level in these matters.

Mr J.H.D. Day: And that makes the majority report all the more surprising.

The SPEAKER: Leader of the House!

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: What I will say is this. These are people with an academic background in law. They are people with relevant legal experience in law. In my view they are both people of the highest personal integrity. I believe that if anyone has been out of order here, it has been the Premier. He has been completely out of order in his criticism of those individuals. He has been bullying and belligerent towards the member for Girrawheen. He takes every opportunity to attempt to belittle her. I think that he is the one who needs to make an apology here. He has also thumbed his nose at the conventions of this place. The Leader of the House knows this. The former Leader of the House knows this. This was no way to behave. Withdrawing those members from the committee was a political decision taken by the Premier, and it was wrong.

My daughter last night was preparing for a politics and law—P&L—test today. I said to her, "What topics are you looking at?" She ran through a few of the topics with me and one of them was the separation of powers. She asked me, "What's executive government, Mum?" I said, "Well, that's really the cabinet. That's the Premier and

Mr John Day; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Chris Hutton; Acting Speaker; Speaker; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Jan Norberger; Deputy Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Terry Redman; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mrs Glenys Godfrey

cabinet. That's executive government." I talked to her about the separate roles of executive government and Parliament, and I hope she gets that right in her test today. However, it is a shame that the Premier does not take the doctrine of the separation of powers more seriously. I went through it with my daughter. I said, "There is executive government, there is Parliament and there is the judiciary, and they've got to be separate." But this Premier blurs them altogether. I think the Premier's criticisms of the member for Girrawheen have been entirely inappropriate. His treatment of this Parliament is inappropriate. I think with these members rejoining the committee, he should apologise to the member for Girrawheen. I think today the Leader of the House was put in an invidious situation; he had to come into the chamber and speak on this and try to justify the government's backflip and why it has changed its mind. Towards the end of what he had to say he said: "We still don't really like the member for Girrawheen being chair of the committee. We would prefer that the member for Armadale was chair of the committee." I think that is the royal "we"; I think he is speaking on behalf of the Premier there, because it is really the Premier who does not like the member for Girrawheen being chair of the committee. We know that the member for Girrawheen is pretty fearless, she will not be intimidated and she will speak her mind. That is not the kind of woman the Premier likes. He does not like having a chair of that committee who is absolutely fearless, knows her stuff, knows the law and does things very thoroughly indeed. Government members are saying in a very mealy-mouthed way that they want the member for Armadale. Of course he would be a very capable chair as well, but he is not our choice and the member for Girrawheen has done nothing to justify this change. Quite apart from anything else, the member for Armadale wholly endorsed the report and actions of the committee.

Dr A.D. Buti: It wasn't her report, it was our report.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Exactly; the majority report was signed off by three committee members, and the member for Armadale was part and parcel of that along with the member for Girrawheen. I can only assume that when it comes to the Premier, it is personal about the member for Girrawheen, because there is no argument that the member for Armadale had a different view, came to different conclusions or in any way disagreed with the committee's report. They were his findings as much as they were hers.

I am told that since the departure of the Liberal Party members, the committee has conducted another 10 hearings, considered another nine submissions and 11 supplementary submissions, as well as actively participated in the writing up of that work. The committee has got on with the job. I think that the Premier thought he could potentially intimidate the member for Girrawheen to drop her bundle and think: Well, we will just not do much. Quite to the contrary, this committee, under her leadership, has got on with the job. The committee is holding hearings, receiving submissions and writing reports. I support the Leader of the House's motion because the committee should have representation from both sides of the house.

I will leave it for a couple of my colleagues to make remarks, but let us be very clear that this is an enormous backflip by the Premier. We know that on occasion he just loses his lolly, he takes his ball and he wants to go home, and in a fit of pique he said, "You guys have got to resign from the committee. The Liberal Party shouldn't participate on this committee anymore." That is wrong. They are individual members of Parliament who have an individual responsibility on that committee and they have to make individual decisions about that. I look forward to hearing the member for Balcatta explain why he left the committee and is now prepared to come back on, because there is no change to the chairmanship or to the Labor members of the committee. The only potential change is that we now know more about the committee's recommendations and how right they were. The committee was right on several aspects that the commissioner was not right about and it was right on matters of points of law. This is an embarrassing backdown for the government. The government should be embarrassed about both of its members who wrote the minority report on that committee. In particular, I think the member for Balcatta needs to make an explanation. I hope that the Premier will not let his ego get in the way and he will have some considered reflection on his behaviour in this matter, and perhaps he will think about the way that he has treated the member for Girrawheen in this Parliament and make a sincere apology.

DR A.D. BUTI (Armadale) [10.46 am]: I also support the motion before the house and I look forward to having the member for Balcatta back on the committee and also the member for Vasse. I think the committee will work better with five members. I was surprised by the Leader of the House's comments today. I think the Leader of the House is a person of high morals and he is well respected in this house. I would have expected those comments to have come from the Premier. It is a shame that the Premier is not here today, because I want to ask him whether he or his office pressured the member for Balcatta and to a lesser extent the member for Morley to resign from the committee. Did the Premier or someone from his office put pressure on the members for Balcatta and Morley to resign from the committee? My assumption is that if the Premier answered that question in the negative, he would be misleading Parliament.

Mr John Day; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Chris Hatton; Acting Speaker; Speaker; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Jan Norberger; Deputy Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Terry Redman; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mrs Glenys Godfrey

The Leader of the House talked about the police commissioner and State Solicitor's responses to the report. Their responses to the report had many holes in them. The police commissioner mentioned in his response and also in his media comments that the majority report had no credibility because there was a minority report. That is a really interesting interpretation of how the committee system works.

Mr J.H.D. Day: I do not think that was his reasoning.

Dr A.D. BUTI: The member should listen to all the police commissioner's comments to the media. He said that we cannot have confidence in the report because there was a minority report, and that committee members cannot even agree among themselves. The most famous High Court case in the last 100 years is Mabo No 2, which was a 6–1 decision, and the Mabo No 1 decision was split four–three. On that logic, we cannot have confidence in the Mabo decision. Of course, the Premier is part of the despicable government response to the Mabo decision back in 1993 that sought to override the recognition of native title. But luckily the High Court struck that down seven–nil.

Mr B.S. Wyatt: There was no minority on that one.

Dr A.D. BUTI: There was no minority on that one; that judgement was seven–nil. The idea that because there was a minority report the majority report has no substance is a silly interpretation of how the committee system works and it is a silly interpretation of how the court system works. I think the police commissioner and State Solicitor's responses also stated that we did not follow precedent. The committee is not a court of law and it does not have to follow legal precedent. The responses did not show where we had not followed legal precedent. One of the responses also made the argument that we did not properly read the law on parliamentary privilege vis a vis legal professional privilege. There is legal advice that fully supports the committee's decision that parliamentary privilege overruled legal professional privilege. There is legal opinion to that effect.

Mr J.H.D. Day: Was it really necessary to release the names of the witnesses?

Dr A.D. BUTI: I think the names of the witnesses were pretty well known. As far as I am aware, we were not the first to disclose the names of the witnesses, but that is quite an immaterial fact to the report, in any case. The Leader of the House also made the statement that we had a predetermined outcome to the report and that there was a presumption of bias. All five committee members, including the member for Balcatta and the member for Morley, agreed to the terms of reference. They did not see the terms of reference as being biased.

Mr J.H.D. Day: I didn't say that.

Dr A.D. BUTI: They did not see the terms of reference as being biased and there was no predetermined outcome to this report.

The Commissioner of Police mentioned in his comments that the committee used language like "may", "shall" or "could have". Yes, that is the language we used, because that was the appropriate language to use.

Ms M.M. Quirk: If it were predetermined, we would have used "absolutely".

Dr A.D. BUTI: Exactly right, member for Girrawheen. We would have been more absolute in our determination.

I turn now to the issue of the member for Balcatta. The member for Balcatta was a very enthusiastic member of our committee and is now rejoining it. On the overseas trip we took, one could not doubt his enthusiasm and dedication to the various tasks that the committee undertook; of course, one could not say the same of the member for Morley, and that is probably one of the reasons why he is not back on the committee. The member for Balcatta has always been a very enthusiastic member of our committee, and that goes to further evidence that the Premier or his office bullied or put pressure on the member for Balcatta to resign. That is a disgraceful act by the Premier. The committee system has a special significance in our parliamentary system; that is why we are not allowed to talk to non-committee members about deliberations of our committee—it is confidential. For the Premier or someone from his office to seek to put pressure on a member to resign because they did not approve of a report is a disgrace, an absolute disgrace.

Let us now go to the chair of our committee, the member for Girrawheen. The Leader of the House made a number of assertions or allegations today about how the chair of our committee goes about the business of chairing our committee. In any committee meeting that we have held, whether a committee hearing, agency hearing or inquiry, there has never been a time when one could have criticised the way in which the chair has chaired the meeting, inquiry or hearing—none whatsoever. It would be interesting to know whether the member for Balcatta or the member for Morley have criticisms of the way in which the member for Girrawheen has chaired the committee. They may disagree with her or other committee members' findings in respect of the so-

Mr John Day; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Chris Hutton; Acting Speaker; Speaker; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Jan Norberger; Deputy Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Terry Redman; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mrs Glenys Godfrey

called Buswell inquiry, and that is fine, but that does not go to prove that the member for Girrawheen did not appropriately chair a meeting.

The Leader of the House made some quite disparaging comments about the member for Girrawheen, and he is far better than that. I would expect that sort of thing from the Premier, but I think the member for Girrawheen is owed an apology for the accusations or allegations that the Leader of the House made with regard to the way in which she has chaired this committee.

Mr J.H.D. Day: I was referring to that particular inquiry and drawing on the comments of the State Solicitor and the Commissioner of Police.

Dr A.D. BUTI: This raises an interesting point, does it not? What happens in the committee is confidential, so how would the Leader of the House know how the member for Girrawheen chaired the committee?

Mr J.H.D. Day: I talked about general leadership, and was drawing on the comments —

Dr A.D. BUTI: But how would he know that? Has the Leader of the House received information from the member for Balcatta or the member for Morley?

Mr J.H.D. Day: The evidence was the comments of the State Solicitor and the Commissioner of Police.

Dr A.D. BUTI: No, I do not think so. The State Solicitor and the Commissioner of Police did not talk about how the chair conducted the hearings—not at all. The Leader of the House could only have found out that information —

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms J.M. Freeman): Members! The member for Armadale has the floor. He is perfectly capable of taking up this argument.

Dr A.D. BUTI: Given the comments that the Leader of the House has made about the way in which the chair has handled or conducted the inquiry, he could have obtained such information—if there ever were such information, it would be erroneous—only if he had received a leak from the member for Balcatta, which I am sure did not happen because he is a man of high integrity, or the member for Morley. That is the only way he could have received that information, unless he made his own assumptions based on no facts, which would be ironic because he has tried to criticise the findings of our report as being based on erroneous assumptions. The Leader of the House must be very careful; he is very well aware of the operation of confidentiality of committees, and he also knows of celebrated cases in which people have breached their confidentiality obligations.

The member for Midland mentioned that after the so-called Buswell report, this committee engaged in a number of agency hearings and inquiries. We undertook a very important inquiry into ageing and we handed down the report last year. We are still waiting for a response from any government minister. I think that the Leader of the National Party sent us some correspondence about a reply that he is working on, but we are still waiting for the government's response to the recommendations and findings of our report on ageing. For the Leader of the House to come into this house today and move a motion to have the member for Balcatta rejoin the committee and for the member for Vasse join it, and to then use that as an excuse to try to engage in a further attack on the chair of the committee is, I think, quite disgraceful, and unbecoming of the Leader of the House. If we are talking about precedent, this is not how the Leader of the House operates; it is how the Premier operates. I hope the Premier has not bullied the Leader of the House, as he has surely bullied the former members of this committee. This committee has engaged in some very important work since the last election, has made some important findings and recommendations in various reports and has held a number of agency hearings, and there has never been any criticism of the way in which the committee has operated or of how the chair has handled those hearings. She has the absolute support of me and the other Labor member, the member for Collie–Preston and I think, overall, she has the confidence of the two former members of the committee. I am sure that the member for Balcatta would be very keen to rejoin the hearings of our committee. It is a fantastic committee, chaired by a person who works very hard and has an incredible grasp of committee procedure and the legal system. I ask the Leader of the House to please not continue with the bullying activities that the Premier engages in on a daily basis. We stand by our report.

In the end, Leader of the House, the court of public opinion determines whether that report has validity. He should go out there and ask people: do they actually believe that a possible reason for the former member for Vasse behaving in an erratic manner was that he had a headache? That is one of the reasons the police commissioner gave. It is quite interesting. Let us go back to the report, which is quite interesting. The response to the committee's report from the police commissioner and the State Solicitor was that they could not prove

Mr John Day; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Chris Hutton; Acting Speaker; Speaker; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Jan Norberger; Deputy Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Terry Redman; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mrs Glenys Godfrey

conclusively that he may have been influenced by alcohol. There could have been other reasons; he might have had a bad headache.

Mr M. McGowan: He probably did the next day.

Dr A.D. BUTI: Yes, he probably did the next day. There is a thing known as circumstantial evidence. Many people are sentenced and serve long terms of imprisonment as a result of circumstantial evidence. We cannot exclusively eliminate other possibilities. That does not mean that on the balance of probabilities, if we were in a criminal court, it is beyond reasonable doubt. I would say that if we were in the court of public opinion, it is beyond reasonable doubt that it would agree with the findings of our committee. We would get the same response if we asked people in St Georges Terrace, Adelaide Terrace, Kalamunda, Armadale, Balcatta or Morley whether they agree with the findings of the so-called Buswell report or the minority reports or the possibility that the former member for Vasse had a headache and that is why he was driving in an erratic manner.

MR W.J. JOHNSTON (Cannington) [11.01 am]: I was expecting the member for Balcatta to rise because I know that he said on a number of occasions through points of order that he wanted to have a say. I did not think I would get up before the member for Balcatta.

Mr F.M. Logan: He's just writing notes. He'll get up.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: Okay. I look forward to his contribution. Perhaps he can tell us how Wimbledon was last year, which he visited as part of his committee trip. Was it good at the tennis? I have not been to Wimbledon; I am sure it is a lovely place to visit. Maybe he could help us with that. I want to congratulate the member for Balcatta on showing his steely determination. I congratulate him on his unbending moral compass. That unbending moral compass led him to resign from the Community Development and Justice Standing Committee because he said he would not work with the member for Girrawheen as chair. That unbending moral compass is taking him back onto the committee to work with the member for Girrawheen. I am told that over the millennia, the earth's magnetic field swaps occasionally from one end of the world to the other. My daughter is a geologist. She says that if we examine the rocks, it demonstrates this reversal of the magnetic fields in the world. Perhaps that is what happened with the moral compass of the member for Balcatta that let him off the committee—the magnetic morals took him one way and then led him back onto the committee because the moral compass took him in the other direction. We have seen a 180-degree change.

Mr F.M. Logan: Plus the money.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: Do not mention the money. That is not his motivation. That would not be overrunning his moral compass. The member for Balcatta cannot be bought for \$8 500 a year. I imagine it would cost a lot more than that.

I am also glad that there has been criticism of the committee's report into what we will call the Buswell matter. In fact, it was not an inquiry into Mr Buswell; it was an inquiry into the police's response to Mr Buswell getting pissed—getting drunk. I take that back.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, member! Please watch your language.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: Yes, I apologise. He was getting drunk and crashing his car repeatedly in Subiaco.

Mr P. Papalia: How many crashes did he have?

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: The member for Butler is probably in a much better position to answer that because I know that he has given a detailed explanation about the journey around the corners and back up the road on a previous occasion.

Something was missing from the committee's report. I understand that the police reported that they knew that Mr Buswell had been driving the car because his fingerprints were on the car. I wondered why the police knew what Mr Buswell's fingerprints looked like. That was never canvassed in the report. I think the report was inadequate because it did not examine all the issues that were brought to the attention of the community.

Mr F.M. Logan: I wonder why that happened.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: I do not know. That is the point. I think the committee was lacking in its performance because it did not examine that issue.

Mr F.M. Logan: Were the former Treasurer's fingerprints on record?

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: I do not know any of the details but I understand that the police commented on that. They knew that the former minister's fingerprints were on the car but the committee never examined whether that indicated that the police already had his fingerprints and, if they did, what were the circumstances that led them to have them?

Mr John Day; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Chris Hutton; Acting Speaker; Speaker; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Jan Norberger; Deputy Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Terry Redman; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mrs Glenys Godfrey

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! This debate is about the appointment of two members to a committee. The content of one of the committee's reports is starting to be a bit marginal in this debate. I would like you to return to the motion please.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: I understood that that was a significant component of the Leader of the House's contribution to the debate—the performance of the member for Girrawheen and the contents of the report. I will not canvass the review. I am making the point about why I was at the point that I was at.

I think it is good that the new member for Vasse is going onto the committee. The great thing about committees is that they provide an opportunity for bipartisanship. I made a minority report on an inquiry in the last Parliament; that is, the Economics and Industry Standing Committee's investigation into matters relating to franchising in Western Australia. People should be prepared to make a minority report if they wish to comment on a particular issue of principle. I suggest to the member for Vasse that she does not take the view that a minority report should be about politics. That is my view of the minority report that led to the situation we are in today. Clearly, that minority report had no value because it was a politically inspired report.

The Premier has attacked the member for Girrawheen's performance as chair of the committee a number of times. I want to make a point about the chair of that committee, who was a significant component of the Leader of the House's contribution today. I am fortunate to have been friends with the member for Girrawheen since about 1985. I first met her when she was working in the commonwealth Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions in Canberra. Even though she was a new lawyer, she had a senior function in the DPP and worked directly for the commonwealth DPP. Let us understand that working in the office of the commonwealth DPP is a very important role. That role does not just include prosecuting people over car parking fines; it is a senior function, effectively working directly for the DPP. Here in Western Australia, she spent a number of years in a senior counsel role at the Australian Crime Commission, which was Australia's premier crime-fighting body. When other members were doing noble things, such as running small businesses, teaching in high schools or working for a trade union, the member for Girrawheen was fighting organised crime in Australia. She did not have to get here to demonstrate her commitment to community safety and fighting organised crime; she did that as her life's work.

It is a bit rich for members to attack the integrity of the member for Girrawheen. I am sure that being a dentist is a noble profession, but fighting bikies and being threatened by them, as the member for Girrawheen was in a former occupation, is not something to be sniffed at. The attack on her integrity is unacceptable in any circumstance.

Mr J.H.D. Day: I referred to that report and I gave the evidence.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: The evidence is not there, unfortunately. I agree that it was inadequate because we do not know what the circumstances of the whole issue around the fingerprints were.

Mr J.H.D. Day: I was not questioning her integrity by the way.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: Minister, you are. I am glad that the minister is starting to back down. I look forward to the Premier coming in here and making the same remark. I look forward to the Premier joining the minister in acknowledging the integrity of the member for Girrawheen. If that happens, it will be great; it would show some integrity from the Premier, but I do not expect it. In September last year there was also criticism of the member for Girrawheen when she went through and pointed out the inconsistencies in the Commissioner of Police's criticism of the report. I will not delay the house unnecessarily and read it, but the *Hansard* of 8 September last year shows that the member for Girrawheen pointed out the situation regarding the police commissioner's commentary. The community has a long history of understanding the importance of the Westminster system of government. As an analogy, during the Fitzgerald inquiry in Queensland, the former Premier Joh Bjelke-Petersen was asked in his evidence to explain the concept of the separation of powers, and he was unable to do so. Sometimes that is what happens in our Parliament; some people are confused about the role of the Westminster system. I point out to ministers that commentary about the Westminster system is included in the Ministerial Code of Conduct, so I urge them to look at it. One of those concepts is the idea of the separation of powers. What does that actually mean? It means that each role of government is separate and does its own business. We make the laws, the executive runs the administration, and the courts determine what the laws mean. Each party is best at doing its job when it does its bit properly, and that is what that parliamentary inquiry that has become so controversial was about. It was about the Parliament exercising its proper functions. I noted a point of order from my good friend the member for Victoria Park on 14 August when he pointed out to the Premier standing order 249. I urge members to look at standing orders 249 and 252. It is the Parliament's job to decide who goes onto a committee; it is not the government's role.

Dr A.D. Buti: Or who comes off.

Mr John Day; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Chris Hatton; Acting Speaker; Speaker; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Jan Norberger; Deputy Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Terry Redman; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mrs Glenys Godfrey

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: Or who comes off. It is not the government's role, it is the Parliament's role. Parliament would be meaningless if the executive simply said, "This is what we want", and Parliament bends over and does whatever it is told. That is not the way it should work. The member for Girrawheen is the sort of parliamentarian who members want to chair a committee such as that; she is prepared to stand up to any amount of bullying. No wonder the member for Balcatta wants to rejoin the committee. He knows that in the member for Girrawheen he has the sort of leadership that a parliamentary committee needs. The member for Vasse is very lucky to be joining a committee with such an outstanding chairperson as the member for Girrawheen. The member for Vasse will do well to listen and talk to the member for Girrawheen. The member for Vasse will learn a lot from the member for Girrawheen because she is a great servant of the people of Western Australia, and she demonstrated that through the whole process of that so-called Buswell inquiry, which of course was not an inquiry into Mr Buswell; it was an inquiry into the response of police.

My next comment about that whole saga will be my last comment in this contribution. I was listening to the radio on the day that the story broke all those months ago. The police commissioner went on radio with Paul Murray in the afternoon and gave an explanation about why the police did not respond in the way that people might have expected at the time. I had no reason to doubt what he was saying. Interestingly enough, member for Forrestfield, a caller rang up from Forrestfield and said—I do not remember his exact words—something like, "It's just unfair; it's a conspiracy." Paul Murray said, "Hang on; come on; it's a bit early to be saying there's a political conspiracy." The caller said, "No, no, not a political conspiracy; it's a conspiracy. If that had happened in Forrestfield, the cops would have kicked the door in." One of the problems with this whole saga is that many people in my community and in the communities of all of us think that the police should have done more at the time—not because it involved Mr Buswell, but because some guy was driving around drunk and crashing into cars, and that is the fundamental problem. If the member for Girrawheen has been able to expose some of the problems that led the police not to do what the community expected, she is to be congratulated.

MR M. MCGOWAN (Rockingham — Leader of the Opposition) [11.16 am]: I am happy to join in this consideration in considerable detail of this motion moved by the Leader of the House, who might have, in light of subsequent events, taken a different course of action this morning. The motion reads —

That the member for Balcatta and the member for Vasse are appointed as members of the Community Development and Justice Standing Committee.

It is a straightforward motion that could have been moved with limited debate and limited comment, and I must say very loaded comment, from the Leader of the House. The Leader of the House chose to do the opposite. He chose to turn the issue of membership of two members of the house of a parliamentary committee into a partisan attack. As part of his strategic genius in deciding on this course of action, he based it upon a report conducted into the actions of Mr Troy Buswell, the former member for Vasse. It was strategic genius to raise the most controversial issue of the past year and use it as an assault on the opposition. I am a keen military historian and one the key lessons that I have always learnt is, "Don't ever attack Russia." Yet we have Napoleon sitting on the other side. I can just imagine him with his hat on, his arm in the sling, sitting on the horse and going through the snow with the big band behind him, and the Cossacks attacking. We have Napoleon over here, Madam Deputy Speaker—a strategic genius. Someone else did it, but I know we are not allowed to compare people with the other individual who made that mistake as well; I will not compare him with the other person who made that mistake. We have Napoleon as the Leader of the House, camped in Moscow. There is no food, the troops are revolting, and he has decided to launch his counterattack based upon the conduct of the member for Vasse, as he formerly was. What a great strategic decision. If I were the Leader of the House, I would adopt the other course, which is to sit there quietly, as he normally does, and hope that everything goes well. However, he has adopted this course, so now it is incumbent on us to examine what the Leader of the House had to say and the government's strategic approach. Leader of the House, two members want to join the Community Development and Justice Standing Committee. The current member for Vasse is, I must say, a breath of fresh air compared with the former member for Vasse. She seems like a decent person and I am sure that membership of this committee will be a good experience for her and a chance to learn about government actions and get across a range of activities in the community development and justice areas. That is a good thing. Committee membership is important for members of Parliament and I hope it will be a good and worthwhile experience for her. I might also add that we should always remember that we are members of Parliament, elected by the people of the state. We are not elected to sit here and accept everything that is bowled up to us. We are not elected to sit here and accept whatever decisions government agencies, departments or the executive make. We are elected to question, to speak out and uncover issues and, potentially, injustices. That is our role. One of the reasons the committee system was established was to delve into the actions of government agencies and uncover where mistakes might have been made.

Mr John Day; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Chris Hatton; Acting Speaker; Speaker; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Jan Norberger; Deputy Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Terry Redman; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mrs Glenys Godfrey

I was a member of a committee for about a year or two. It was a worthwhile experience because we engaged a little more in the actual running of government rather than sitting in this place and letting everything happen around us without any involvement or any capacity to question the heads of government agencies. The heads of government agencies should be questioned by parliamentarians. We should have that opportunity. That is our role. We are elected; they are not elected. Members of the Liberal and National Parties should not forget their role. Heads of agencies are not elected. By and large, in my experience, they do a good job and are hardworking. They work under a lot of stress and a lot of pressure and juggle many issues. We are elected and our role is to hold them to account. That is what standing committees are for.

The Leader of the House launched an attack on the conduct of the member for Girrawheen in that committee. Of the five standing committees of this house, one is chaired by the opposition. That committee elected to examine the actions of the police in relation to the most controversial issue that has occurred in the last couple of years.

Mr R.F. Johnson: Quite rightly.

Mr M. McGOWAN: As the member for Hillarys interjected, quite rightly. Considering what I have said about the committee's role, was that committee wrong to do so? I do not think so. I did not want to launch an attack on the former member for Vasse, but he has kind of forced me into it. He has gone off and got his life outside this place, although I understand he is standing outside the chamber right now, so it is an unlucky coincidence. I did not want to get into him; he has gone and can no longer defend himself in this place. His parliamentary career is over. His career was controversial at times and I wished him all the best for his future, but you raised this, "Bonaparte"; you raised it!

Mr J.H.D. Day: I did not raise anything about the former member for Vasse.

Mr M. McGOWAN: The Leader of the House raised the issue, so he cannot expect us to sit here and not respond. The most controversial issue last year was that former member's actions. I would have thought it was reasonable to hold an inquiry into the police conduct and its investigation into the actions of the second most senior elected official in the state to find out what happened and why he was not breathalysed.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Leader of the Opposition, I think you need to return to the motion at hand, please. I have given that direction to other members, so I am being consistent. This motion is about the election of members of a committee.

Mr M. McGOWAN: I take your advice, Madam Deputy Speaker, but whoever was in the chair did not issue that instruction to the Leader of the House when he delved into the operations of that committee and those concerning the member for Vasse.

Mr J.H.D. Day: I spoke for 10 minutes about why there was a vacancy on the committee and the government's view about the report.

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order members!

Mr M. McGOWAN: I come back to the appointment of these two members.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you.

Mr M. McGOWAN: If a similar circumstance arose, I would expect these two members to want to inquire into the police conduct during that matter. The two and a half million ordinary citizens of Western Australia would want to know why the second most powerful person in Western Australia was not charged with a drink-driving offence, why he declined to be interviewed in relation to a drink-driving offence and why he was not interviewed on the night in question about a drink-driving offence. Their view is they would have been. That is a significant issue in the administration of justice, and this committee is a justice committee. I therefore hope those members, particularly the new member for Vasse, would want to conduct a similar inquiry to that which was conducted by this committee.

They are important questions and I do not think we have yet got to the bottom of it. Should a similar circumstance arise with the current Treasurer, I hope this committee, with the new member for Vasse, would want to inquire into why that person was not charged, why they refused to give evidence, why they were not questioned on the night in question and why the facts came to light only two weeks after the events had occurred. That is what I hope that committee, with the new member for Vasse on it, would want to investigate.

Mr John Day; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Chris Hutton; Acting Speaker; Speaker; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Jan Norberger; Deputy Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Terry Redman; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mrs Glenys Godfrey

The Leader of the House raised the internal deliberations of the committee. In his address, he talked about the conduct of the committee's internal deliberations. From my limited experience on a committee, the internal deliberations of the committee should not be known by others; they are meant to be private.

Mr J.H.D. Day: They are.

Mr M. McGOWAN: Why did the Leader of the House know about the internal deliberations of that committee?

Mr J.H.D. Day: I don't.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Leader of the House!

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order members!

Mr B.S. Wyatt interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Victoria Park, I have asked the Leader of the Opposition to resume.

Ms R. Saffioti interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for West Swan, I call you for the first time.

Mr M. McGOWAN: Anyway, Madam Deputy Speaker, on all those questions —

Mr B.S. Wyatt interjected.

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

Mr M. McGOWAN: — I hope the new committee will have the confidence to delve into those questions if the Treasurer were to fall into that trap.

I want to raise one of the issues raised by the Leader of the House. He referred to the police commissioner's report who, in his response to the committee's deliberations, was very unhappy about the fact that the committee did not call the officers involved in the inquiry on the evening in question. The member for Girrawheen informs me that in a conversation she had with the police commissioner prior to the conduct of the inquiry into the deliberations, the commissioner asked the committee not to call them because they were junior officers and it might be too much for them to go through such a process. The member for Girrawheen tells me that she accepted that request from the police commissioner along those lines. I find it unusual that the Commissioner of Police's submission, consequent to the inquiry's deliberations, would be critical of the committee, following his verbal advice to the member for Girrawheen. I find that unusual. I do not understand why the police commissioner would criticise the committee for doing what he asked it to do. I thought that point needed to be made as genuinely as possible about that set of events.

Coming back to the committee members, I wish the members for Balcatta and Vasse all the best. The member for Vasse will be a new member of the committee. Good luck to her. The member for Balcatta is being recycled back onto the committee. I am sure he may have lived and learned in the period since his resignation from the committee. After his outrage at its conduct, he is now going back onto it. I hope he enjoys the deliberations of the committee in the future and I hope he reads the standing orders about what points of order are meant to be about. I look forward to his contribution to this debate.

MR P. PAPALIA (Warnbro) [11.31 am]: Like the Leader of the Opposition, I had been reluctant to revisit the sorry tale surrounding the behaviour of the former member for Vasse that subsequently led to his sacking, resignation and departure from Parliament. As the Leader of the Opposition indicated, the matter has been raised by the Leader of the House in this debate in a pretty inappropriate and completely unjustified attack on the member for Girrawheen. I would like to place on record at the outset that I have absolute confidence in the integrity of the member for Girrawheen. Not only is she undoubtedly a learned individual in the law, but she is also a highly responsible and honest individual who always conducts herself in an appropriate fashion, particularly when it comes to leading the Community Development and Justice Standing Committee in its inquiries. Like the Leader of the Opposition, I found it unusual to hear the Commissioner of Police make comments, immediately upon revelations about Mr Buswell's behaviour, to the effect that it would be unlikely that Mr Buswell would be prosecuted for drink-driving. It was unusual to hear those comments when such a short time had elapsed between the revelation of the incident and the police commissioner going into the public domain.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, member. Can you direct yourself to the motion at hand.

Mr John Day; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Chris Hatton; Acting Speaker; Speaker; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Jan Norberger; Deputy Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Terry Redman; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mrs Glenys Godfrey

Mr P. PAPALIA: Addressing the matter at hand, as I said, I was reluctant to revisit this matter. Now that it has been raised again by the Leader of the House—by the government—in a completely inappropriate fashion, I must place on the public record some information that I do not believe has previously been put in the public domain. I am sure the police commissioner and others will be listening. I expect they will respond appropriately now that they are aware of this information, which I became aware of in October last year—some time after Mr Buswell's departure from his role, and hence my reluctance to raise it. I can now tell the house that on 24 October last year, while at a function celebrating the 100th anniversary of the Royal Western Australia Regiment, I met a gentleman who I had served with in the Special Air Service Regiment many years ago—a man whose integrity I trust absolutely. This man has close personal knowledge of the two witnesses to Mr Buswell's behaviour on the evening in question. They are the two individuals who raised it with the media, who rang the police and whose recordings were played publicly in the media. At that time they gave the description suggesting that the individual looked like Mr Buswell. I will refer to a report in the media relating to the Commissioner of Police. I am not sure of the actual date. I believe it was three days post the incident involving Mr Buswell damaging some cars. The police commissioner responded publicly about the event. I will get that date for *Hansard*. Sorry, it was two weeks subsequently.

Point of Order

Mr J. NORBERGER: I really struggle to see even the remote relevance of this in consideration of the motion.

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, members! Points of order are to be taken in silence.

Mr J. NORBERGER: I cannot for the life of me see the relevance of where the member for Warnbro wants to take this. It has nothing to do with the motion at hand. I know the Deputy Speaker has made rulings in relation to this previously —

Mr J.R. Quigley: What standing order?

Mr J. NORBERGER: I do not need a standing order number to make a point of relevance.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Joondalup. There is no real point of order.

Debate Resumed

Mr P. PAPALIA: I refer to the comments by the Commissioner of Police that were referred to by the Leader of the House in his contribution. I refer to exactly the same reports and exactly the same comments that the Leader of the House referred to. The police commissioner said —

“The original complaint, it seems to me, hasn't been closed off properly. The original complainant was not interviewed and had made allegations, so today I've asked police officers to follow up those allegations.

I can tell the house, and the people of Western Australia, that I was informed on 24 October last year that at that point in time, many months after the investigation and many months after the Commissioner of Police had made this public statement, those two individuals have never been interviewed by police. The two individuals who had the most knowledge about the behaviour of the former member for Vasse—according to my information, from an individual whom I trust implicitly—were never interviewed by police. If that is the case, that is a disgrace. That is confirmation that the Community Development and Justice Standing Committee's report, a committee led by the member for Girrawheen, and seconded by other members of this place, was entirely appropriate. The condemnation of the police inquiry was entirely appropriate. It was completely accurate. It shoots holes and raises many questions in the argument proffered by the Leader of the House today that he somehow believes the member for Girrawheen should resign. If those two individuals were not interviewed, I believe the Community Development and Justice Standing Committee, reconstituted with government members, should look at this entire incident again. It should once again hold an inquiry into the police investigation. It is essential that if the two eyewitnesses who were driving some 10 metres or so behind the drunken Mr Buswell on the evening in question were never interviewed in the police investigation, it is a disgrace. I am sorry; I have great respect for the police commissioner and I have respect for the police of Western Australia, but I share the committee's view of this inquiry: it let down the people of Western Australia.

As I say, I am relying upon hearsay. I can provide the name of the individual to the police commissioner, if he wants it. I have not sought his approval to name him in this place, so I will not. But I can give the name of the individual who spoke to me, who is a close friend of the people who were in the vehicle. I can give that to the police commissioner. I welcome any contact from any reopened investigation into this matter.

Mr John Day; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Chris Hutton; Acting Speaker; Speaker; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Jan Norberger; Deputy Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Terry Redman; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mrs Glenys Godfrey

Mr J.R. Quigley: Perhaps you could give it to the chair of the committee, too, and the committee could have a look at it.

Mr P. PAPALIA: I have no doubt that the individual who raised this matter with me on 24 October, of his own volition, would be happy to speak to any inquiry. He would probably be more than willing to speak —

Mr J.R. Quigley: Would he talk to Balcatta?

Mr P. PAPALIA: I do not know about him, but he would be more than willing to speak to the chair of this committee because I think he would respect her in the same way that everyone on this side of Parliament does, and the other side should. It was a disgraceful attack today. It was shameful that the Leader of the House led it. I am sure he is regretting it. I am certain it is the work of the Premier —

Dr A.D. Buti: Where is the Premier?

Mr P. PAPALIA: He has cowardly departed the chamber.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Watch your language, member for Warnbro.

Mr P. PAPALIA: He departed the chamber in a cowardly fashion. He has failed to stand here and confront the consequences —

Withdrawal of Remark

Mr J.H.D. DAY: It has been a wideranging debate, but I think the comments just made by the member for Warnbro regarding the Premier's behaviour are unparliamentary.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think it does rate as a personal reflection under standing order 92.

Mr P. PAPALIA: I withdraw, Madam Deputy Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you.

Debate Resumed

Mr P. PAPALIA: That aside, to push the no doubt reluctant Leader of the House into that role of headkicker, which he does not fit into comfortably, and then depart the chamber raises a few questions about the character of the person who did that.

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, members! Leader of the House!

Mr P. PAPALIA: I will finish my contribution with a reflection on two things. Only today I raised the matter of, as I understand it, the two witnesses never having been interviewed. That is a pretty good argument for revisiting this entire inquiry, or at least revisiting the police investigation. I also have to say, on reflection, that the fact that the two investigators never appeared before the committee, on the advice of the Commissioner of Police, is another reason the committee should question whether it needs to revisit this whole matter. There are two powerful reasons that we need another inquiry into this police investigation. If it is shown that the original witnesses were never interviewed and we also know that the police commissioner advised that the investigators not be interviewed, those are two serious gaps in the inquiry. It is not the committee's responsibility; it is not its fault. It is just a consequence of circumstances and advice from the police commissioner. Maybe now is the opportune time, now that we have a fully reconstituted committee, to consider another inquiry. Nevertheless, I will finish with the observation that it was a disgraceful attack on the member for Girrawheen. It was unjustified and, coming from the side of the house that for many, many months defended the behaviour of the former member for Vasse, it is laughable.

MR J.R. QUIGLEY (Butler) [11.42 am]: I am not surprised in any way by the personal attack on the Chair of the Community Development and Justice Standing Committee, as launched this morning by the Leader of the House. It is totally unsurprising. The Liberal government has a history in Western Australia of attacking those independent fact finders with whom it wishes to take issue. For example, in the course of the last two years we have seen a substantial attack upon the independent judiciary of Western Australia, because the government takes issue with independently arrived at decisions. The default position of this government is that if an independent fact finder makes a call that is adverse to the government's interests or perceptions, it does not deal with the issue; it just attacks that person. This is why I think people become a little cynical. The issue before the chamber this morning is the nomination, and apparently the acceptance of the nomination, of the member for Balcatta to rejoin the committee. The member for Balcatta has an explanation to offer this chamber, because, as was pointed out earlier in debate this morning, at the time of his resignation, it was a matter of high moral principle that he had to resign. He interjected on the member for Midland on more than one occasion seeking to

Mr John Day; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Chris Hutton; Acting Speaker; Speaker; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Jan Norberger; Deputy Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Terry Redman; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mrs Glenys Godfrey

raise points of argument camouflaged as points of order. As the Chair pointed out, he has, and will have, his opportunity to meet the strict and severe criticisms of him.

Mrs M.H. Roberts: Member for Butler, there have been about six speakers since I spoke, and he is still making no attempt to get up and address the points.

Mr J.R. QUIGLEY: That is what I am inviting him to do, because at times the people of Western Australia express cynicism at parliamentarians acting in their own interests. Here we have a member of Parliament putting before this Parliament and the people of Western Australia the high moral principle that he could no longer in good conscience serve on a committee chaired by the member for Girrawheen. I do not know whether the member for Balcatta appreciated at the time that he was going to take an eight per cent hit to his pay—that is the remuneration for a committee member, as you and I know, Madam Deputy Speaker. An invitation has now been put by the government to the member for Balcatta: “Would you now like to go back onto the committee and we’ll organise 30 shekels for you? You can betray your principles like another man did on the evening of the Last Supper; you can sell out on your principles. You can become one of the Denarians and you can sell out your principles for 30 shekels.” I suppose I am being a little unfair on the member, because I have done my research and 30 shekels today equates to about \$435. I am sure the member would not betray his principles for \$435; in fact, it is thousands of dollars that he wants to clutch, more than Pilate had on offer on Shrove Tuesday.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, member for Butler! I think you are really straying into a personal reflection on the member for Balcatta.

Mr J.R. QUIGLEY: I am not; I am seeking his —

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, you are imputing improper motives under standing order 92.

Mr P.B. Watson interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I call you, member for Albany, for disputing my call.

Mr J.R. QUIGLEY: I will not go there again, but if I am wrong, Madam Deputy Speaker—I see the member for Balcatta has been taking notes—I now invite him to stand up and say that what I am putting is false. He now has a moral imperative. He either stands up now to meet this criticism of what I am saying, that he has no moral principles, that he is selling out on his moral principles—he can stand up and meet this now —

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Butler, again, you are making personal reflections. We will you please refrain from that.

Mr J.R. QUIGLEY: I will refrain from it, Madam Deputy Speaker. However, this issue goes back to the trial of James I, members will remember, who remained mute in the Great Hall. The member for Balcatta can go back and, like James, be condemned by his silence, or he can rise in his defence. They are the two options. Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. It is over to you, Mr Balcatta!

MR C.D. HATTON (Balcatta) [11.49 am]: I stand here actually in dismay and with disappointment at the appalling statements made today by opposition members. Today there has been a host of mistruths and Parliament has been grossly misled. Opposition members have willingly attacked my integrity. I must say that one truth I heard today from the opposition was when an opposition member, and I believe a number of other members, actually said that my integrity is intact. But on this particular issue that opposition members have brought up today, they seem to have centred on one small inquiry. They have gone on and on about it and have attacked my integrity on this particular inquiry. I therefore want to put the opposition debate into some context that we in this Parliament can understand better and that perhaps the broader Western Australian public can understand. I want to do that because on these committees, we represent the people of Western Australia. There is no doubt that when I was a member of the Community Development and Justice Standing Committee there were occasions in my committee work when some things happened with opposition members of Parliament that were, in my opinion, not representative of the people of Western Australia. Those things happened in that inquiry particularly when members from that side of Parliament were unable to stick to the terms of reference. By not doing that, they compromised the integrity of not only Parliament but also senior public officials by denigrating them, putting them down and making the public of Western Australia believe that they were not doing their job.

I do not want to talk just about that inquiry today. I want to put some context into what the Community Development and Justice Standing Committee work was about. The committee inquires into a range of very valid social issues: Aboriginal affairs, child protection, citizenship, corrective services, disability services, road safety, police, seniors and volunteering, and several other things—19 different areas. I am proud to have been a member of that committee because I was so proud of the input I gave to what was done on the

Mr John Day; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Chris Hatton; Acting Speaker; Speaker; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Jan Norberger; Deputy Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Terry Redman; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mrs Glenys Godfrey

reports on inquiries that were delivered before my departure. However, it was how it was done that I was not proud of. If we put a time line to it, our committee “In Safe Custody” inquiry looked at Aboriginal deaths in custody; we reported on the inadequate accommodation services for people with disabilities in Western Australia; we reported on the toll and trauma on WA emergency staff and volunteers, which I do not think I got to complete; and there was the topical investigation into a member of Parliament—things were going pretty well until the time of that investigation. The conclusion of that investigation was tabled in Parliament at about the same time as two other inquiries of this committee commenced. One inquiry was into the provisions for seniors in Western Australia and the other was into good police models for Western Australia. Apart from the inquiry into the member of Parliament, we were working towards producing some good findings and recommendations for the people of Western Australia. I therefore went on with my committee work and worked very hard, as has been attested to today. My integrity towards those issues was very solid.

On continuing that important work and after doing some overseas inquiries, I came back to Parliament and, on reflection, I thought very deeply about the way that the report on seniors and the report on the police model would be delivered in the future. That is because, on reflection, I thought that the committee had been compromised.

Mr D.A. Templeman interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Mandurah!

Mr C.D. HATTON: It had been compromised by committee members on the opposition side of Parliament. The political bias shown in that inquiry —

Mr F.M. Logan interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Cockburn!

Mr C.D. HATTON: The political bias shown in that inquiry from that side of Parliament and the bullyish behaviour at times of the chair of that committee —

Several members interjected.

Withdrawal of Remark

Mr J.R. QUIGLEY: Madam Deputy Speaker, he is impugning the integrity of the member for Girrawheen.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Balcatta, I ask you to withdraw.

Mrs M.H. Roberts: Withdraw, you coward!

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I beg your pardon! Member for Midland, I call you for the first time.

Mrs M.H. Roberts: It is acceptable.

Mr J.H.D. DAY: I think the member for Midland needs to withdraw that comment.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Further to that point of order, we had a ruling. I actually made the same point of order myself in the past couple of days and I was told that that term was not unparliamentary. So, I now feel free to use that term given the ruling we had from an earlier Chair.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: On that point of order, that was during the debate on the mandatory sentencing bill and the Chair at the time was the member for Southern River, who specifically permitted the term to be used.

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, members! Member for Mandurah!

Mr J.R. Quigley: What about him!

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: One at a time. I am sorry, I am just not that capable of calling several people. Member for Mandurah, I call you for the first time. I was taking advice on the point of order and my advice is that personal reflections, words like “cowardly”, can be delivered in very many ways. With the vehemence it was delivered today, I think it should be withdrawn.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Further to the point of order, Madam Deputy Speaker, I draw your attention to standing order 112, “Dissent from Speaker’s ruling”. I think you might want some further consultation on this matter because I certainly will be looking at that standing order very closely in the next couple of minutes if you insist upon asking me to withdraw this. Maybe you were not in the chamber, Madam Deputy Speaker, when the member for Southern River was in the chair and that term was flung at our side of the house with equal

Mr John Day; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Chris Hutton; Acting Speaker; Speaker; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Jan Norberger; Deputy Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Terry Redman; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mrs Glenys Godfrey

vehemence, but I do not think that we can sit here in Parliament and have one standard for the government and another standard for the opposition. So at this stage I would ask you to reconsider your request to me.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Midland. I made my ruling and I ask you to withdraw.

Dissent from Deputy Speaker's Ruling

MRS M.H. ROBERTS (Midland) [11.59 am]: I move —

To dissent from the Deputy Speaker's ruling.

[The Speaker resumed the chair.]

MR W.J. JOHNSTON (Cannington) [12.00 noon]: The functioning of the Parliament of Western Australia needs to continue with the consent of the chamber. We cannot have a functioning Parliament when we have completely opposite rulings from one day to the next. When the opposition was being accused of being cowards, of being in bed, effectively, with criminals and of being as soft as butter on criminals, most of us in this chamber copped that, even though those statements were all untrue. Even though all those statements were false, lies, dishonest and untrue, we copped that because the member for Southern River was in the chair, and those were the terms that he permitted to be used in the chamber. Yesterday, we had this whole question about “ass” and whether members can call somebody an “ass”, meaning donkey, and that is okay, but not “arse”, meaning backside, and that is not okay. I do not know whether the member for Riverton would cope with that ruling. This is just not acceptable. This chamber cannot function with this type of situation. If the member for Southern River continues on the panel and does not resign, where are we to stand? He allowed the term “coward” to be used in respect of all the members on this side of the chamber, including me, yet today, with a different member in the chair, we are not allowed to use the exact same word. This is not an acceptable functioning of the chamber; we cannot allow this to happen. The chamber can function only with the consent of those here, and we cannot allow the idea that it all depends on who is in the chair at that particular moment. That is not the way this place can function; there has to be consistency.

We are prepared to respect the Chair, as we did when the member for Southern River was sitting there allowing the member for —

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Cockburn! Leader of the National Party! I now want to hear the member for Cannington.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: We cannot have a functioning Parliament when Liberal members make a comment about the Labor side of Parliament, they yell and scream and say “Oh, it's true! We're allowed to say that 'cos it's true!”, but when we say the exact same word under the exact same circumstances about a member of the Liberal Party, it is no longer permitted, it is no longer allowed, it is no longer the way it is to operate. We cannot have a functioning Parliament in that circumstance. That is not even getting to the situation of the bullying of the Premier; I have not even got to that. The hectoring of the member for Girrawheen has been the subject of the debate here today; not because it was part of the resolution moved by the Leader of the House, but because it became part of the debate when he raised it. Then a series of Liberal members moved points of order saying that that was not part of the debate, and yet the Leader of the House had included it. And the Deputy Speaker, acting in the chair at the time, directed members on this side of the chamber to refrain from discussing the performance of the Chair on the basis that that was not part of the resolution even though that had been the basis of the conversation by the Leader of the House. We cannot have a functioning Parliament without the consent of both sides of the chamber. Both sides of the chamber need to consent, otherwise it will not work. It is not about the numbers when it comes to the Parliament, and that is half the problem here. Half the people in the chamber on the other side do not understand what they are being paid to do in this chamber. I was interested and had a look at the member for Balcatta's contribution to the Parliament. Ninety-two occasions in two years the member has made a contribution; most of those were questions.

Point of Order

Mr J.H.D. DAY: Mr Speaker, the motion that was moved by the member for Midland is to dissent from the Deputy Speaker's ruling. It is not about the wider debate; it is simply about whether the Deputy Speaker's ruling should be dissented from. Any debate needs to be confined to that particular motion.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: On the point of order, I am making the point that the decisions of the Chair have to reflect the values of the chamber. That is the point I am making and I am trying to make that very clear to the chamber.

Mr John Day; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Chris Hatton; Acting Speaker; Speaker; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Jan Norberger; Deputy Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Terry Redman; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mrs Glenys Godfrey

The SPEAKER: I am getting confused, because you are speaking about somebody speaking for 82 times or something. Come back to the point, thank you.

Debate Resumed

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: This chamber needs to be respected by its members and currently it is not being respected by its members. Otherwise, why is it that the member for Southern River rules that calling members a coward is okay—it is part of the debate, he says—and yet when a Labor member uses the exact same word, it somehow now becomes unparliamentary? That is not the way this chamber can function. We cannot function if we do not know what the limits are.

Now, I am one of the rascals in this chamber—I sail close to the wind—but I make it clear that on every occasion I have been asked to withdraw, I have. That is not reflected on the other side of the chamber. We have this situation where we are called names, outrageous slurs are made, and that is acceptable. Even as late as now in this debate I have had members do that exact thing from that side of the chamber. When I said that a member had called us cowards, there was a call of, “That’s right! That’s true!” When, during this discussion, I say I am accused of being in bed with criminals, they say, “You are!” That happened during this discussion. Then people wonder why we dissent from the ruling of the Chair. We cannot have a functioning Parliament where this sort of behaviour occurs. It is a constant failure of leadership in the chair and in this chamber and it cannot be allowed to continue. I made a very, very considered contribution to a debate last year regarding the handling of question time. On this occasion this dissent, Mr Speaker, is not about your ruling, but the points that I made at that time are as relevant today as they were when I made them last year. The chamber cannot allow this sort of situation. Now, if the member for Southern River was wrong to do what he did when he was in the chair, then there is only one course of action. He should resign from the panel of Acting Speakers. He should never be permitted to sit in the chair again—never, never, never, never! If the Parliament today endorses the position and the ruling of the Deputy Speaker but does nothing about the incompetence that was reflected the other night, we cannot allow this situation to occur. If the dissent ruling is defeated today, then the member for Southern River has no choice but to resign his position on the panel of Acting Speakers.

I do not need to tell you, Mr Speaker; you know the long history of the fact that the carriage of a dissent ruling is considered a vote of no confidence in the Chair. You know that very well. We can go through the history if you want and I will get guidance from the Clerks and I will read out all the occasions that happened. If the dissent is not carried in the Deputy Speaker today, then the member for Southern River must, in accordance with precedent in the Westminster Parliament going back for hundreds of years, resign from the panel. That is the only way that this can happen. Let me make it clear: if the dissent ruling passes, the Deputy Speaker has to resign. They are the only two ways that can happen today. If the dissent ruling passes, the Deputy Speaker resigns; if the dissent ruling does not pass, the member for Southern River must resign because I bet he will say he has integrity. I bet he will say that he has the right spirit to be involved in these things. The Parliament cannot function when the opposition does not know from Tuesday to Wednesday to Thursday what is acceptable in the chamber. The one conclusion that can be drawn right through this issue is that what Liberal Party members do in the chamber is acceptable and what Labor Party members do in the chamber is not acceptable. That is why we are dissenting from the ruling. On Tuesday it was okay to say “coward” but on Thursday it is not okay to say “coward”. On Tuesday a Liberal member could say “coward” and that is acceptable, but on Thursday members cannot say “coward”.

Mr N.W. Morton: It was a Labor member who said “coward”.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: No, it was not; it was a government member.

Mr N.W. Morton interjected.

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

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: There is no question that after the word “coward” was permitted by the chair that we used the word “coward” for the rest of the debate. The member for Midland used “coward” today, because we were allowed to use it by the member for Southern River. It is very, very clear that that is the way that it happens.

Mr C.J. Barnett: This must be the biggest issue in Western Australia; it is silly.

Mr M. McGowan interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members! I do not want to hear from the Premier or the Leader of the Opposition; I want to hear from the member for Cannington.

Mr John Day; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Chris Hutton; Acting Speaker; Speaker; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Jan Norberger; Deputy Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Terry Redman; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mrs Glenys Godfrey

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: The Premier said that it is just silly to have a functioning Parliament. That is the problem; he does not understand the Parliament's function. The Parliament's function is not to make him feel better, it is to hold the executive to account—that is what our job is. I did not make the member for Cottesloe the most unpopular Premier in the history of Western Australia; he did that himself! I bet one of the reasons —

Mr F.A. Alban interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Swan Hills, I call you to order for the first time. Member for Cannington, just remember that this is a speech on the dissent from a ruling of the Chair.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: I do not remember the last time that this particular resolution was moved. It is not a minor decision to move a dissent from the ruling of the Chair. It is about how this Parliament will function. Will this Parliament function properly and do its duty to hold the government to account or is it simply going to be a bully pit for intimidation by the most unpopular Premier in the state's history? The current incumbent is the most unpopular Premier in Western Australia's history. There has never been a Western Australian Premier as unpopular as the man currently holding that office. We need to know that this Parliament can function in the way that it is supposed to in order to hold the government to account. We have to know from one day to the next that the rulings from the Chair will be consistent to do that. The use of the word "coward" was allowed by the member for Southern River in the chair on Tuesday, but it has now been ruled unparliamentary by the Deputy Speaker. If the resolution is carried, of course, in accordance with precedent, the Deputy Speaker will resign. If the resolution is defeated, the member for Southern River will have to resign his position on the panel of Acting Speakers. Those are the only two outcomes of this debate.

MR D.T. REDMAN (Warren–Blackwood — Leader of the National Party) [12.14 pm]: I want to speak against the dissention motion. Somebody told me that today represents the tenth year that I have been a member of Parliament. We could go right back over all the debates in my short time in this place and we could cut holes through all sorts of decisions. If we wanted to compare what was said on one particular day with another day, we could do that over the lifetime of the Parliament. The challenge for the Speaker, Deputy Speaker and all the Acting Speakers is to try to keep a course of debate such that we can have a good Parliament and get on with business to make good decisions and judgements for the people of Western Australia. I have seen, even in the debate this morning, with a lot of leeway from the Chair, the opposition taking the time to raise a whole lot of issues, but nothing today departed from anything I have seen over the last 10 years. For members to question the good running of Parliament is fundamentally wrong. The respective Chairs have actually held good Parliament. We have had a chance to have good debates, and I am sure that a decision will be made. But to raise something like this and use little nuances that might happen to try to say that that is a foundation of the fundamental breakdown of how this place is run is fundamentally wrong.

MR M. MCGOWAN (Rockingham — Leader of the Opposition) [12.15 pm]: I will briefly contribute to this motion to dissent from the ruling of the Deputy Speaker. Today's proceedings and the reason that this has happened is because the Leader of the House, in moving that two new members be appointed to a parliamentary committee, decided to make a partisan attack.

Mr J.H.D. Day interjected.

The SPEAKER: Leader of the House!

Mr M. MCGOWAN: To make his attack he decided to use last year's committee report into the most controversial political issue in this state last year. What did he expect would happen? The Leader of the House has been a member of Parliament for 22 years, but he could not foresee that we might get upset about that. The Leader of the House should use his brain before he does things in the future.

The second point I want to make is about the management of this house. Without naming any members in particular, the role of Speaker, Deputy Speaker and Acting Speakers is normally for senior members of Westminster Parliaments. Ordinarily, these are people who have seen the ebb and flow of the lower house chamber for many years. The roles are an acknowledgement of long service and members' knowledge of the way that the place works. It is acknowledgement that a member understands the standing orders, the precedents and that the opposition has an important role in a parliamentary democracy. Those are the normal procedures in Westminster Parliaments.

I want to point out a few members of this house who have long experience in this place: the members for Pilbara, Hillarys and Eyre. None of those members are Acting or Deputy Speakers, but maybe they should be, because they have seen this place in operation and they understand the historical precedents and that debates are to be undertaken and conducted with fairness. I will go back through our history. Hon Fred Riebeling was here a long

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Thursday, 26 February 2015]

p781b-806a

Mr John Day; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Chris Hutton; Acting Speaker; Speaker; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Jan Norberger; Deputy Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Terry Redman; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mrs Glenys Godfrey

time before he became Speaker. Hon George Strickland had been in this place a long time before he became Speaker. I must say George Strickland was a very fair, very experienced and very knowledgeable Speaker.

The issue at hand today is the use of the word “coward”. The definition of coward is “a person who lacks courage in facing danger, difficulty, opposition or pain; a timid or easily intimidated person”. The Deputy Speaker ruled that that was an unparliamentary word. I guarantee—I am getting the research done now and maybe it will arrive —

Mr C.J. Barnett interjected.

The SPEAKER: Premier!

Several members interjected.

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

Mr M. McGOWAN: I refer to one issue for the week. What about what the Premier said about Dr Capolingua and the management of Healthway?

The SPEAKER: Leader of the Opposition, this is about dissenting from the ruling of the Deputy Speaker. Please come back to that.

Mr M. McGOWAN: That is the definition of “coward”. I am getting research done and if it arrives in time I will use it. But I will lay you London to a brick—I will stand and apologise if I am wrong—that that word has been used on numerous occasions by government members and was not required to be withdrawn on many of those occasions.

I would say to the house that there needs to be consistency in rulings, otherwise this is what is going to happen. Perhaps the government needs to consider the experience of the members it appoints to positions in this place.

MR J.H.D. DAY (Kalamunda — Leader of the House) [12.20 pm]: The government most certainly does not support this motion of dissent from the Deputy Speaker’s ruling. I will not speak at any length except to briefly defend the actions of the Deputy Speaker. It was me who took the point of order in relation to the comment called out across the chamber by the member for Midland to the member for Balcatta; I think her words were, “Withdraw, you coward!” It was my view that it was delivered in an unparliamentary manner; it was not an appropriate use of the word. I took the point of order, but naturally I would have accepted the decision of the Deputy Speaker if her ruling was that the comment could stand. She had in fact already called the member to order, if I recall correctly, in relation to the fact that interjection had occurred.

I agree that it is highly preferable that there is consistency across the chamber in rulings from the Chair, but over the history of this Parliament there is always going to be some variation, particularly when we have different members acting in the chair. It is also the case that the context of the comment and the vehemence with which the comment is delivered needs to be taken into account. The Deputy Speaker took advice from the Clerk and made a ruling. In my view, there is no way, from what I saw and given the overall circumstances, that the Deputy Speaker was acting in a partisan manner at all. The decent thing for the member for Midland to have done would have been to simply accept the ruling, as most members do, including most members of the opposition—they accept the rulings of Chairs when they are asked to withdraw. I do not believe that the Deputy Speaker was acting in a biased or partisan manner at all, and this motion most clearly should be rejected.

Division

Question put and a division taken with the following result —

Extract from Hansard
[ASSEMBLY — Thursday, 26 February 2015]
p781b-806a

Mr John Day; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Chris Hatton; Acting Speaker; Speaker; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Jan Norberger; Deputy Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Terry Redman; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mrs Glenys Godfrey

Ayes (19)

Ms L.L. Baker
Dr A.D. Buti
Mr R.H. Cook
Ms J.M. Freeman
Mr W.J. Johnston

Mr D.J. Kelly
Mr F.M. Logan
Mr M. McGowan
Ms S.F. McGurk
Mr P. Papalia

Mr J.R. Quigley
Ms M.M. Quirk
Mrs M.H. Roberts
Ms R. Saffioti
Mr C.J. Tallentire

Mr P.C. Tinley
Mr P.B. Watson
Mr B.S. Wyatt
Mr D.A. Templeman (*Teller*)

Noes (34)

Mr P. Abetz
Mr F.A. Alban
Mr C.J. Barnett
Mr I.C. Blayney
Mr I.M. Britza
Mr G.M. Castrilli
Mr V.A. Catania
Mr M.J. Cowper
Ms M.J. Davies

Mr J.H.D. Day
Ms W.M. Duncan
Ms E. Evangel
Mr J.M. Francis
Mrs G.J. Godfrey
Mr B.J. Grylls
Dr K.D. Hames
Mrs L.M. Harvey
Mr C.D. Hatton

Dr G.G. Jacobs
Mr R.F. Johnson
Mr S.K. L'Estrange
Mr R.S. Love
Mr W.R. Marmion
Ms L. Mettam
Mr P.T. Miles
Ms A.R. Mitchell
Mr N.W. Morton

Mr D.C. Nalder
Mr J. Norberger
Mr D.T. Redman
Mr A.J. Simpson
Mr M.H. Taylor
Mr T.K. Waldron
Mr A. Krsticevic (*Teller*)

Pairs

Mr M.P. Murray
Ms J. Farrer

Mr J.E. McGrath
Mr A.P. Jacob

Question thus negatived.

Motion Resumed

The SPEAKER: The member for Balcatta.

MR C.D. HATTON (Balcatta) [12.26 pm]: Thank you, Mr Speaker.

Withdrawal of Remark

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: The Deputy Speaker made a ruling with regard to the member for Balcatta. The member for Balcatta accused the member for Girrawheen of being “bullying” in her role as chair of the Community Development and Justice Standing Committee. Further to that, the Deputy Speaker asked the member for Balcatta to withdraw. I do not recall the member for Balcatta actually withdrawing.

The SPEAKER: Member for Balcatta?

Mr C.D. HATTON: May I speak on that, Mr Speaker?

The SPEAKER: No. If you were asked to withdraw, will you please withdraw.

Mr C.D. HATTON: Are you asking me to withdraw that?

The SPEAKER: Yes.

Mr C.D. HATTON: Okay, I withdraw that.

Debate Resumed

Mr C.D. HATTON: Mr Speaker, on withdrawing that, I would like to say that I used that terminology —
Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Sorry, I was just talking to the Clerk. From what I understand, that comment has been withdrawn. Member for Balcatta, carry on, please. Are you finished, member for Balcatta?

Mr C.D. HATTON: No, I have not. In withdrawing that, I must say that it was in the context of —

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: You have withdrawn; please move on.

Mr C.D. HATTON: Okay, moving on.

I stated that the committee work that I was involved in covered a broad range of social issues—very important ones—that I believe are necessary to be involved in. The committee had already handed down a number of reports, of which I am very proud, and we were reporting on the inquiry into the police response to a member of Parliament. However, as I said earlier, we were also entering into an inquiry on seniors and ageing in Western Australia, and the police model that we are introducing into Western Australia. Yes, I travelled with the committee on the recommendation and negotiation of that committee to look into two other inquiries that are

Mr John Day; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Chris Hutton; Acting Speaker; Speaker; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Jan Norberger; Deputy Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Terry Redman; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mrs Glenys Godfrey

very important to Western Australians. I did so proudly and with integrity, as has been stated by members of the opposition; I did my work, and I did it very well.

Then, upon returning from that important committee work, I had reflections about my dissenting report on the previous inquiry, and deep reflections on whether I could report without being compromised on the two future inquiries. I made a decision on whether my contribution to the committee was compromised by the behaviour of committee members. After one inquiry, I spoke to the research officers about the behaviour of committee members. On one occasion I confronted the chair and the committee members, stating that I was not happy with some of the behaviour. That is on the record.

Mr P. Papalia interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Warnbro, do not yell across the chamber. If you want to interject, please ask and see if the member on their feet wants to take an interjection, otherwise I will call you.

Point of Order

Mr P.B. WATSON: The member is talking about situations that occurred in a committee. He is not allowed to do that. We cannot talk about committees.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms L.L. Baker): Member, just remember the rules relating to committees, please, and do not contravene them.

Debate Resumed

Mr C.D. HATTON: On reflection, I felt compromised in being able to contribute to the committee as I had done on previous inquiries. I made a dissenting report and then decided that my committee work could not continue.

Dr A.D. Buti interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Armadale, I have asked you once before to seek permission to interject, not just to yell across the chamber. Can you please do that in this house.

Mr C.D. HATTON: Committee work is very important to me. When I resigned from that committee and when I wrote a letter to a certain authority in Parliament, I always declared that when the dust had settled I wanted to recommence my committee work, hopefully on that committee. Obviously, it has not settled because opposition members cannot let go of it. I am willing to return to that committee and serve, along with the member for Vasse, giving it the balance that it needs and the integrity that it deserves and not allow political bias to creep back into it.

Today's debate, led by the opposition, has again been appalling. Members have misled Parliament through some of their attacks on me by saying that I was influenced by the Premier or his department. I can categorically state, as I have before in Parliament, that I was not phoned, it was not discussed and there were no appointments. I felt that the committee had been compromised. I felt that it would be very hard to work on seniors and ageing, and the inquiry into our police model. There is good work to be done. It needs to be recognised that we need two more committee members to give the committee balance with members from both sides of Parliament.

I want to talk about some truths, not mistruths. I am glad that my integrity has been supported today by the opposition. I was not influenced by the Premier or anyone else in my decision-making. I did feel compromised and I felt that the committee was compromised. I was not happy with the conduct of some people but I will not talk about those people because I have been told not to. I was disappointed at the attitude sometimes that was maybe brought out in the media—this was directed by someone, though I do not know who—about the integrity of our senior public officers. However, I am very willing to contribute to this committee for the people of Western Australia and for the integrity of this Parliament. Today's debate has again, unfortunately, been a bit of a witch-hunt. This reconstituted committee, with the member for Vasse on this occasion, may get back on track. I am willing to help it do that.

MR R.F. JOHNSON (Hillarys) [12.35 pm]: Oh, God, no—he may not help us, not in this instance. I am probably one of the longest serving members in this chamber, together with the Premier, the Leader of the House and the member for Dawesville, although the member for Dawesville had a gap when he lost his seat in 2001. I have seen how this chamber has operated in the last 22 years. If the Leader of the House had simply moved the motion that two members be appointed to the Community Development and Justice Standing Committee and let it go at that, we would probably have saved two and a half to three hours of vitriol and debate in this chamber. I would suggest that the Peta Credlins in the Premier's office put the Leader of the House up to it, telling him to have a whack at the member for Girrawheen again as she deserves it because the committee she chairs came

Mr John Day; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Chris Hutton; Acting Speaker; Speaker; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Jan Norberger; Deputy Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Terry Redman; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mrs Glenys Godfrey

down with a report that had adverse findings—it reflected adversely on the former member for Vasse. The Premier should have carried out a proper investigation into what happened rather than being aware of a cover-up. He says that there was no cover-up. There was a cover-up for at least two weeks until a member of the public came forward and informed the media about these cars that had been smashed up. He said the person he saw looked like the member who was the Treasurer at the time. If that member of the public had not come forward, the former member for Vasse would probably still be the Treasurer in this house and probably would have brought down the last budget.

I commend that committee for carrying out that investigation. I found it extraordinary—I have a lot of respect for the Commissioner of Police; I worked with him closely for four years—to read the sort of phrases that he used in his response. I think one of the words he used was “unhinged”, which was mentioned in the committee report. I believe that that is almost a contempt of Parliament. The other comments were from the State Solicitor and State Counsel; once again, they are debatable. The committee has the absolute right to present whatever report it deems necessary. In this instance, it had three Labor members. It is the only committee that is dominated by Labor in this chamber. It came down with a report that had adverse findings. It has a right to do that. I have respect for both the member for Balcatta and the member for Morley; I have known them both for some time. I think the new addition to the committee will be fantastic. New blood and a fresh face—they are the sorts of words that the Premier used in other instances—will be a welcome change. I wish the member for Vasse well on that committee.

Committees are very important instruments of Parliament. When anybody reflects adversely on a committee, I believe they are in contempt of Parliament, whether it be outside Parliament or inside Parliament. We have heard some denigrating remarks. I feel absolutely ashamed to be on this side of the house and hear some of my colleagues, including the Leader of the House, denigrate members of a committee, in particular the chair. I have known the chair for a long time; we have crossed swords in this chamber on many occasions. We have different points of view on certain things but I respect her and I think she respects me, even when I was the minister. To denigrate her is unparliamentary.

I have known the Leader of the House for 23 years. I have the utmost respect for him. I do not believe for one minute that of his own volition he would come into this chamber and make the denigrating comments that started this ball rolling and that started the arguments on the other side of the house. I do not blame members from the other side of the house. If I and most of my colleagues were over there, we would be saying exactly the same thing because it is not parliamentary. It was a very simple motion—that two members be appointed to that committee, and that is the way it should have gone, but it did not. Members started criticising other members. I do not criticise them. If I was the manager of opposition business—I was in that position for quite a few years—I would be doing the same thing; I would be making a meal of what I think were disgraceful comments. I have been there, done that; been over here, been over there. I have rebounded backwards and forwards across the chamber so I know what it is like on both sides of the house. Unfortunately, comments were made by somebody whom I respect highly. I have even suggested that he would be a good Premier. I have offered to move a spill motion and move that he become the Premier because I believe he is a very good man and I respect him enormously. I am very disappointed that he let himself down this morning and let his emotions run away from him. I suggest that he was influenced by other people to make unparliamentary and denigrating remarks against a member of this house.

MR B.S. WYATT (Victoria Park) [12.40 pm]: I rise to speak after that very sensible contribution from the member for Hillarys. I have a sneaking suspicion that this motion has not gone as planned. I know that the member for Hillarys is right. I like the Leader of the House. We like the Leader of the House. We think he would be—like the member for Hillarys said—a good Premier. He would be considered, popular, fair, reasonable, and stable—not erratic. Clearly, what happened today was that this fella from Cottesloe jazzed up the Leader of the House: “You need to get in there, John, and give them all a performance. Give them some of that “50 Shades of Day”. Get on in there and give the opposition some of that “50 Shades of Day””. After watching the Leader of the House for some years, I know that his political tastes are conventional. The political tastes from Cottesloe are unconventional, which is why I know that this “50 Shades of Day” performance was not him. The member for Hillarys was quite right when he said that the Leader of the House has been put up to it. I know that the Leader of the House has to come in occasionally to do the Premier’s dirty work if the Premier drops a little bomb and takes off for lunch. I know he must do that. The Leader of the Opposition summed it up perfectly—except he is wrong on one thing: I do not think that the leader of government business is Napoleon because Napoleon sits two seats down. Poor old John Day is the junior officer staring out across the —

Point of Order

Mr John Day; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Chris Hutton; Acting Speaker; Speaker; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Jan Norberger; Deputy Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Terry Redman; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mrs Glenys Godfrey

Mrs G.J. GODFREY: The member for Victoria Park is not addressing two members on this side by their correct title.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms L.L. Baker): I quite agree with the member. Member for Victoria Park, you need to address people in this chamber by their seat, thank you.

Debate Resumed

Mr B.S. WYATT: You are quite right, Madam Acting Speaker.

The leader of government business is the junior officer staring across that Russian tundra, wondering why his Premier keeps saying, "Surge forward; we will get there. Moscow is in sight." I do not hold the Leader of the House responsible for any of this. As I said, we know what is going on here. The Leader of the House has to do the dirty work for the big fella from Cottesloe occasionally—I get that. That is obvious.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member, refer to other members in the house by their seat.

Mr B.S. WYATT: But what I understand is this —

Mrs L.M. Harvey interjected.

Mr B.S. WYATT: Is the minister reading out a media statement?

Mrs L.M. Harvey: I was just saying that this sounds like a leadership pitch. The member would make a wonderful Leader of the Opposition.

Mr B.S. WYATT: No, no, no. Thank you for that interjection. I am disappointed that the Treasurer is not here because now that we know the Minister for Health is on his way out—mentally checked out some time ago, but physically on his way out—there is this deputy issue going on in the government. I know that the police minister is desperate for that position, and I also know that the Minister for Emergency Services and the Treasurer are desperate for that position. But we all know the real issue: when will the Leader of the House take over the premiership? That is the real issue. The Minister for Police should stick to reading her media statements; I think that is her strength. Law is certainly not her strength, as the member for Butler showed. I hope the Attorney General has spoken to the minister now and corrected her on a couple of points of law.

Sorry about that interjection, Madam Acting Speaker, I come back to the issues at hand. We cannot get ourselves into a position in which the government of the day can bully outcomes on parliamentary committees. I will come to the member for Balcatta in a minute. The reason we have standing orders is to protect Parliament from the authority of the executive. That is why when a committee tables a report, a committee member is entitled to table a minority report whenever they like—as the member for Balcatta did back then; I know that report did not make a complaint about the member for Girrawheen, but the member tabled that minority report. The government must respond to committee reports. I expect a robust government response when the government is being critiqued and when the Commissioner of Police is being critiqued and found wanting. The Commissioner of Police is not a shrinking violet; he is a powerful political player in his own right and I expect a response. But I do not expect the government of the day to bully outcomes in the parliamentary process. Government members are not conservatives if they agree with that. They are reactionaries, not conservatives, if they think that is a fair outcome and the way that the parliamentary system is to be used. I note, by way of passing, what is going on with Gillian Triggs in Canberra. I suspect that a toxic element is entering the conservative movement in Australia because when Independents, whether they be individuals or Parliament, critique the government of the day, there is an audacious smash back on the system. It is not a response—we saw the response—but an attack back on the system. Government members are not conservatives but reactionaries. They are beating up on the system that their political philosophy is apparently there to protect and preserve. The member for Hillarys was bang on when he made that point.

I for one was thinking that the member for Balcatta should sit down and not get up because he has found himself in a position most wanting. I do not think that anyone believes for a minute that he was not badgered into quitting from that parliamentary position last year with the member for Morley. The member for Balcatta got up earlier today and said that he found himself on a committee that "compromised the integrity of the Parliament". He was worried about "political bias". That is why we have minority reports. Those issues are raised and let the system sort it out. But the member chose to quit, and he will forever be held to account that his reflections in his dissenting report conveniently took place after he had travelled the globe. That is something for the member to explain, because ultimately some time passed between his angst and worries and the time he quit. During that time, he spent a lot of money travelling the globe. Ultimately, that is for the member to have to answer for. What was that Premier?

Extract from *Hansard*

[ASSEMBLY — Thursday, 26 February 2015]

p781b-806a

Mr John Day; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Chris Hatton; Acting Speaker; Speaker; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Dr Tony Buti; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Jan Norberger; Deputy Speaker; Mr John Quigley; Mr Terry Redman; Mr Peter Watson; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mrs Glenys Godfrey

Mr C.J. Barnett: I am just talking to my colleague.

Mr B.S. WYATT: Right; okay. Members opposite should stand for themselves—they are either conservatives or reactionaries. We support the motion.

Question put and passed.