

Mr Shane Love; Mr Simon Millman; Deputy Speaker; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman; Ms Jessica Shaw; Acting Speaker; Mr Donald Punch; Ms Meredith Hammat; Speaker; Ms E.J. Kelsbie; Ms Hannah Beazley; Mr Chris Tallentire; Ms Christine Tonkin; Mr John Quigley

LEGISLATION BILL 2021

Second Reading

Resumed from 5 May.

MR R.S. LOVE (Moore — Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [4.16 pm]: I am very pleased to be here today to talk on this very important Legislation Bill 2021, a bill that the Attorney General has described to me in conversation as being as dry as the bottom of a cocky's cage! I am sure we will all enjoy discussing it in consideration in detail, which will occur after the second reading debate, of course, because it is such an important bill. We need to go through the nuances of the bill because it goes to the very heart of the way our legislation is drafted, how it is recorded and how people can access it. Everything we do in this place is about establishing government. One big part of that is passing budgets and another one is making law. This bill appears to be about how that law is drafted and presented to the community, and how the community can access it. There is an excellent guide to everything the bill is about, because a very similar bill was debated in this place in 2018. It was read a third time and passed through this chamber on 30 October 2018, and it was received in the Legislative Council the next day, 31 October 2018, but the government never brought it on for debate again, so, of course, it just disappeared at the end of the fortieth Parliament never to be seen again.

A few of the more problematic pieces of discussion in debate on the previous bill were quite interesting. I note that the former member for Hillarys, who is a very fine lawyer with a very fine legal brain, had a lot to say about these matters in 2018. I am sure it was a very interesting debate for all those people who took part in it. Unfortunately, I was not one of them. I had to read the *Hansard* to get an appreciation of some of the discussion, although in reading it, I saw that I was Acting Speaker through quite a bit of it, but, unfortunately, I have absolutely no memory of it, so there is a bit of a problem there!

A couple of questions that come to mind are about some of the powers of Parliamentary Counsel to change legislation—just how extensive the editing powers will be. A lot of those editorial powers are limited to updating references to laws that have changed or changing expressions that might indicate gender. I wonder whether that might interfere with the law to some extent. The Attorney General might be able to let us know about some of those issues.

The bill seeks to number or renumber provisions. It also seeks to update references to things that have been replaced, such as statutory bodies that have changed over time, or a particular water board or whatever that has ceased to exist and been incorporated into another body and whose functions have been taken up by somebody else. Interestingly, the bill also seeks to change grammar, spelling or punctuation to conform with current drafting practices. Some of the nuances of legal drafting can appear quite complex to a layman. I wonder sometimes whether changing the grammar or the punctuation might have some negative or unforeseen consequences. We might think that having a comma in a particular place is not very important, but it might well have some material effect on the legislation. I am sure that Parliamentary Counsel knows these things. It is sometimes not a simple matter of just changing the grammar; it could change the meaning.

The bill also seeks to omit obsolete or redundant provision of Western Australian legislation; incorporate validation, saving, transitional or similar provisions; and make format or layout changes to conform with current drafting practices.

I understand that changes will be made to the website that is operated by the Parliamentary Counsel's Office. Legislation will not necessarily be published in hard copy; it will be published on the website. It will be up to the PCO to determine what other matters, apart from statutes and regulations, it might choose to put on the website. I guess there will be some questions around some of those issues and what types of matters could be foreseen to be published on that website, other than those things that are expected to be published on the website by provisions that are in the act.

The pertinent question is more around what editorial changes will be able to made perhaps without parliamentary oversight. Will people have to trawl through the website every day to see whether there has been a change? Will there be some sort of automatic way of enabling people to keep up with the changes? What will be the layout of the website? I understand that all the changes to the law will be detailed on the website. Will there will be a key, such as a summary document, to enable people to understand whether a particular piece of legislation has changed on a particular day?

To what extent will the amount of editing that takes place be subject to some sort of review? Will the Parliament have an opportunity to review that? Will there be a body that will look at the changes that are made? Will the changes be disallowable in the Parliament? Will the Parliament put in place a body—such as an upper house committee or one of the existing committees—that will keep a watching brief over what occurs and take on the job of ensuring that none of the changes that occur go beyond simple editing and make serious changes to the law without the Parliament realising what is going on? Over time, if we follow the progression of any document that has been around for a long while, it might undergo changes. If we look at the reinterpretations of a book like the Bible, which has a very long history, certainly in western literature, it has gone through different translations. Over time,

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Tuesday, 1 June 2021]

p1022b-1050a

Mr Shane Love; Mr Simon Millman; Deputy Speaker; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman; Ms Jessica Shaw; Acting Speaker; Mr Donald Punch; Ms Meredith Hammat; Speaker; Ms E.J. Kelsbie; Ms Hannah Beazley; Mr Chris Tallentire; Ms Christine Tonkin; Mr John Quigley

some of those translations might add up to being real changes in understanding what is meant by those terms, or in how a particular society or group in society might view what has been written and whether it has changed the interpretation of that document over time.

I do not have a lot more to contribute at the moment. Probably the best thing is to go through the bill, specifically clause 10, which deals with what is published on the WA legislation website, and part 3, which deals with the power to make editorial changes. Those are the issues that I would like to delve into a bit. I do not intend to take up too much of the Parliament's time on this matter. I am sure that weightier contributions can be made than those that I am making here. I think that the Legislative Council will want to go through this bill in greater detail, because its purview is to ensure that correct grammar, spelling and emphasis is put into legal documents. We as a house often do not spend as much time on the detail of the law as we do on the political ramifications of the law.

Having worked with upper house members now and in the past on committees and the like, I understand that the upper house has a much more detailed understanding of the need to go through legislation in detail. That is the proper function of the Legislative Council and one of the reasons that we need a house of review. The Legislative Council plays a very important role in the Parliament. I often wonder how states like Queensland get on when they do not have a group of experienced lawmakers to oversee some of the things that are brought into the Parliament. In the previous Parliament, we had plenty of examples of some very good changes that were made to flawed legislation that this government had brought into this house. The government would often not listen to the opposition in this house and would push on with its flawed legislation, only for the Legislative Council to find that there were serious errors of grammar or of legal consequence in the legislation that may or may not have been pointed out by the members down here. The upper house members showed the value of that chamber in bringing those matters to the attention of the government, and by dint of the fact that the opposition had the numbers at that stage, that house was able to make those changes. It will be interesting to see what happens in this next stage of the Parliament. We know that we no longer have a balanced upper house. We have an overwhelming government majority in that chamber. I think many people have come to accept that as situation normal in Parliaments in which the government of the day does not necessarily enjoy an overwhelming majority in the upper house. We have certainly seen the operations of good governance over many years. It will be interesting to see what transpires in the upper house over the next three or four years when there is not an effective grouping that can override the government on a particular issue, and whether debates will be curtailed. I understand that the upper house will be reviewing its standing orders very shortly. This may mean that there will be less oversight of some of the changes that might occur under this legislation. The actual legislation itself will perhaps lead to a difference in the way the law is written.

I shudder to think what will happen if we do not have effective members in the upper house going through these matters. I do not know whether members on the government side are going to be committed enough to stand up to the Attorney General and say, "Well, Attorney General, we don't agree with these clauses you have put in. We think they should change", or whether they will just wave everything through with a rubber stamp. If the upper house will be just a rubber stamp, we will have a real problem. As we know, a discussion is going on around the state about representation and so-called equality in the upper house. We contend that the upper house functions best when it has significant regional representation and significant diversity in its representation. We know that the government is now trying to strip away that diversity to mirror, if you like, the situation in this house in the upper house. When legislation goes from this house to that house, there will be no effective checks and balances.

The whole idea of an upper house is to have a little bit of diversity and another look. It is great to have all these other groupings in the other place that prevent a government from having an overwhelming majority so it has to negotiate its way through issues and take people seriously and listen when other members of Parliament point out that legislation it is trying to put through is flawed. That is very important. We have come to expect the upper house to have the ability to say, "Hang on; you need to have another look at this." Now we have achieved a situation in which that house will not be able to do that. Over the next three or four years, we will see whether members opposite allow the upper house to do its job properly and take seriously its concerns when it comes to back to them and says that it does not think a bill is very well drafted. If individuals in the upper house vote on party lines on every matter, we will see a rubber stamp in the upper house and all sorts of flawed legislation put through.

I noticed today that the Minister for Local Government sounds very much as though he is putting through another puppy farming fiasco, and we know how flawed that bill was last time. He did not refer to puppy farming, but he certainly referred to sterilisation and sale of dogs and all sorts of other matters. It sounded very much like the puppy farming legislation is coming back—and we know that the previous bill was a real dog of a thing, was it not? When the bill got to the upper house, what happened? The legislation did not go anywhere because the good members of the upper house could see how flawed it was, unlike the pack of hounds down here who just let it through without any oversight or meaningful contribution! We moved many, many worthwhile amendments to that legislation in this house that would have made it much better. The minister of the day refused to listen to any of them. It went up to the upper house unchanged, and, of course, it stalled forever. It was never going to get through with a reasonable

Mr Shane Love; Mr Simon Millman; Deputy Speaker; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman; Ms Jessica Shaw; Acting Speaker; Mr Donald Punch; Ms Meredith Hammat; Speaker; Ms E.J. Kelsbie; Ms Hannah Beazley; Mr Chris Tallentire; Ms Christine Tonkin; Mr John Quigley

bunch of lawmakers like the group that the former members of the upper house comprised. Now it is my great fear that such a piece of flawed legislation will simply be introduced and run through this chamber and we will end up with more dogs of legislation like the government tried to get through last time.

This is a vital bill, apparently, but a whole list of legislation was sitting on the notice paper at the end of the previous Parliament with no discussion on them. I think the government identified 17 or so bills as a priority in the dying days of the fortieth Parliament. None of them was anything to do with this bill, which at that stage had already been sitting around for two years. I wonder whether the commitment is still there. I wonder how long it will sit around this time. Probably it will go there and the government will have rammed through its changes to standing orders in the other place and be able to put through all sorts of flawed legislation in its own good time. Then people will amend it, and nobody will be able to say no because there effectively will not be such a thing as a parliamentary disallowance. When was the last time members opposite saw a piece of legislation disallowed in this chamber? They have not. Why? It is because the government will not disallow its own legislation and regulations. Traditionally that has occurred often in the other place. When flawed regulations or statute is put through, there is a process whereby the upper house will regularly examine it, and if it is a flawed regulation, it is able to —

Mr J.R. Quigley interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Deputy Leader of the Opposition, direct your comments through the chair.

Mr R.S. LOVE: I cannot see him then. I will look at the member for Bunbury.

Ms S.E. Winton: That's a good point. Can he actually answer that question?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, member for Wanneroo, he cannot. Deputy Leader of the Opposition, carry on.

Mr R.S. LOVE: Thank you. Very instructive of you, Deputy Speaker.

Getting back to the legislation that the government will be able to push through once it has total control of the upper house, we know it will include more flawed legislation on electoral reforms. The government has its group running around the country doing so-called consultation so that it can cement its hold on the upper house chamber for years to come. That is what that is all about. It has nothing to do with equity or fairness. It is about keeping these guys in control of that chamber along with this one as well. We do not have anyone giving the government oversight. The government does not like oversight; I know that.

We will not be opposing the Legislation Bill. We will support it, but I am sure there will be discussion in the other chamber until the government finally guillotines it and moves it through. That discussion will hinge on some of the matters around the ability of people outside Parliament to amend, edit, tweak or make changes to legislation and regulations. We are in an era in which the two houses of Parliament are completely dominated by one party. As we know, that is not a good situation to have in any democracy. The only hope we have, I guess, is that the government will show its true colours and there will be overreach; it will bring in lots of flawed legislation and the people of Western Australia will wake up to the fact that the government ain't really that good after all.

MR S.A. MILLMAN (Mount Lawley — Parliamentary Secretary) [4.37 pm]: I rise to make a contribution on the Legislation Bill 2021. I thank the Deputy Leader of the Opposition for confirming that the opposition will support the passage of this important legislation. I have one issue with the contribution made by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. The Labor Party does not have total control. The voters of Western Australia have total control. I am flabbergasted by the repeated attitude of the conservative parties that seem to undermine the role of voters in a democracy as though the will of the people can be ignored when it does not suit their purposes. The reason we bring in legislation such as the Legislation Bill is that it provides for a fundamental Labor values: It provides access to justice. It provides for the legal process to become clearer and simpler and easier for people who are involved in litigation, and that is only a good thing. If the upper house cannot fulfil a function that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition imposes upon it, because the opposition does not have enough numbers in the upper house, responsibility for that rests with the opposition. It should have run a better campaign during the election. If it does not have the numbers, that is not our fault. We just did the best that we could do and we won the seats that we won because the people of Western Australia are the ones who have total control and they placed their trust in us.

This legislation does not need me to expand on it. The Attorney General is prolific in the number of pieces of legislation that he brings before this chamber. This Attorney General, who broke all records during the course of the last Parliament in bringing legislation before this place, has done it again. He is straight out of the gate. This is a man with an agenda and he is driving that agenda.

Mr P.J. Rundle: We've seen that with electoral reform. He's certainly got an agenda!

Mr S.A. MILLMAN: I do not know about the member for Roe, but I believe in democracy and I believe in equality of votes. I am more than happy to see the debate take place on electoral reform. I think it is long overdue. The panel

Mr Shane Love; Mr Simon Millman; Deputy Speaker; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman; Ms Jessica Shaw; Acting Speaker; Mr Donald Punch; Ms Meredith Hammat; Speaker; Ms E.J. Kelsbie; Ms Hannah Beazley; Mr Chris Tallentire; Ms Christine Tonkin; Mr John Quigley

that the Attorney General has put together, under the leadership of Malcolm McCusker, is one of the most eminent panels of experts to inquire into electoral reform.

Mr P.J. Rundle: He used to work for DPC and the Labor Party.

Mr S.A. MILLMAN: Hang on, I do not think that is right! Dr Martin Drum, Professor John Phillimore and Professor Sarah Murray are eminent scholars on legal and political matters.

I wanted to rise and speak on the Legislation Bill 2021 because, as members who were here during the course of the fortieth Parliament will know, access to justice is something that I am passionate about. I will not regale the house with the arguments about the importance of access to justice from all the contributions that I made during the fortieth Parliament, but I want to highlight some of the people in my community who supported me to be re-elected to this place. These people share my commitment to, and passion for, access to justice.

Before I do that, I note that there is one member of the opposition still in the chamber, and I acknowledge his presence. During the course of my speech during the Address-in-Reply, I acknowledged Hon Colin Holt, who is a former member of the Legislative Council and who discharged his functions as a member well. He did a great job as the deputy chair of the Joint Select Committee on End of Life Choices and I noted that in my contribution during the Address-in-Reply. I noticed today that Hon Colin Holt has been appointed to the Voluntary Assisted Dying Board by the Minister for Health, in a typically generous and bipartisan move and in a way that respects and recognises the expertise that the former honourable member brings to that position. He also, I believe, has a commitment to access to justice.

Some of the people in my electorate who have a commitment to access to justice and to whom I am incredibly grateful for their support of me during the most recent election campaign include Ryan Anderton, Will Baitup, Julius Beyer, Joanne Boots, Danielle Brady, Gary Budrikis, Don Burnside, Andrew Carver, Steve Catania and Milan Chetkovich, who is a neighbour of mine. I am also grateful to John Clancy, who is a staunch doorknocker, and Justin Cvitan, who is a lawyer. I am grateful to Rory Deegan and David D’Orazio. These are great people who recognise the importance of this legislation and recognise that this legislation underpins access to justice.

I am grateful to Bonnie Durmic and to Tim Dymond, who works at Unions WA and is a great supporter of our campaign. He advocates on behalf of workers in minimum wage cases and recognises the importance of reforming legislation to provide better access to justice. I am grateful to Jeanette Evans and Yaron Fisher, who has moved to Broome. I am grateful to Brad Geatches, Graham Giffard, Jeremy Gilchrist, Elle Golek and Rob Green, who was a candidate for the Legislative Council and was one of the few WA Labor Party candidates who was unsuccessful. He was number five on our Legislative Council ticket for the East Metropolitan Region and a fantastic volunteer during the course of the last campaign.

I am grateful to Mike Hatzidakis, Mike Hilliard, Kerren Hughes, Tatyana Igonina, Brendan Jackson, Thomas Jarratt and Councillor Viktor Ko from the City of Perth; he is a doctor who recognises the fantastic work that the Minister for Health has done in tackling the COVID pandemic. I am grateful to Carl Kobelke, Pat Lamerton, Reyes De Lara, Nicolette Lenihan and Melita Markey, who, as the Deputy Speaker knows, is a fantastic advocate for victims of asbestos-related disease. She knows firsthand just how important access to justice is and how important this sort of reform is.

I am grateful to Natalie Mast, who is a lecturer at the University of Western Australia, and Emily and Thomas Meagher. Peter Mudie is a phenomenal telephone campaigner and was on the phone every night that we had a phone bank. I am grateful to Cynthia and Shane O’Brien–Lynch and Philip O’Donoghue, whom members here would know very well. I am grateful to Agnes O’Kane, Brett Osler, Rob Pearson, Ken Randall, Hugo Seymour, Kim Silverstone, Kyle Sinclair, Hope Smith—I will come back to Hope in a second—Lee Smoire, Simon Stokes, Rex Tion, Cyril Toman, Tiffany Venning and Greg Wallace. Greg is a fantastic advocate for his local community and lives in Dianella. I am grateful to Regan Whitby—the brother of the member for Baldivis—and his wife. I am also grateful to Roy White, Patrick Wyburn and some of the fantastic volunteers who worked on the polling booths on election day, such as Ben Riley, Karla Benites, Kylie Tuner, Jai Wilson, Marisa at Sutherland Dianella Primary School, Colleen and Jess from the Vedanta Church of Universal Religion, and Hugo Seymour and everyone at the North Perth branch.

Ms J.J. Shaw: He gets two guernseys; you mentioned him twice! He’s so good, you had to name him twice!

Mr S.A. MILLMAN: He is a constituent!

I am grateful to staff at Yokine Primary School and North Metropolitan TAFE Mount Lawley. I am grateful to all these people who have a wonderful commitment to access to justice, to social justice and to making WA as great as it can be.

Before I finish my contribution, I want to mention some of those people who, during the course of the fortieth Parliament, worked very hard on the Mount Lawley electorate office. These people shared my passion for and commitment to legislative reform and important bills like this one. I want to acknowledge Jack Eaton and Hope

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Tuesday, 1 June 2021]

p1022b-1050a

Mr Shane Love; Mr Simon Millman; Deputy Speaker; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman; Ms Jessica Shaw; Acting Speaker; Mr Donald Punch; Ms Meredith Hammat; Speaker; Ms E.J. Kelsbie; Ms Hannah Beazley; Mr Chris Tallentire; Ms Christine Tonkin; Mr John Quigley

Smith—who I have already acknowledged—Ben Latham, Rewi Lyall and Rachel Macy. They all made a terrific contribution to the Mount Lawley electorate office during the course of the last Parliament. I am excited about the contribution that will be made by those members who have decided to come on board the Mount Lawley electorate office. I want to acknowledge Lyric Duckett, Sam Brace and Emily Meagher, who I have already mentioned. In the few short weeks since the state election took place, they have hit the ground running and are representing the people of Mount Lawley, whether it is by talking about the election commitments in the local community or funding for a diverse range of initiatives. Those initiatives include upgrading Breckler Park, Hamer Park Reserve and Alexander Park in Menora; supporting local businesses by revitalising local streets such as Bayley Street in Dianella and Michael Street in Yokine; supporting residual urban bushland, such as the Coolbinia bushland and the Inglewood triangle; funding for the Knight Avenue Reserve community and a new major playground; and all the money that we are going to put towards the local primary schools and early childcare centres. We will refurbish Yokine Primary School, install solar panels at Marjorie Mann Lawley Day Care Centre, create a new playground at West Morley Primary School and install air conditioning at Sutherland Dianella Primary School. On the banks of the Swan River, down at Derbarl Yerrigan, we will make a contribution towards the money that is being spent by the City of Vincent to upgrade that pavilion. We will give more than \$100 000 towards LED lighting.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Yes, thank you, member.

Point of Order

Mr R.S. LOVE: Are we on order of the day 19 or 1?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: One. Thank you. The member will refer back to the bill.

Debate Resumed

Mr S.A. MILLMAN: The important thing about the lighting upgrades is that they will shine a light on the importance of legislation and the importance of access to justice. One of the great things about this legislation is that access to justice is an important issue that this government is driving. I, for one, am incredibly proud of the work that the Attorney General did in the fortieth Parliament and I am proud of his undertaking in the forty-first Parliament. I know that all the people whom I have mentioned in my contribution this afternoon are incredibly proud to be part of the Labor movement and incredibly pleased with our fantastic election result on 13 March.

MS S.E. WINTON (Wanneroo — Parliamentary Secretary) [4.48 pm]: I, too, rise to make a contribution to the Legislation Bill 2021. I am certainly chomping at the bit to make a contribution to what I think is a riveting piece of legislation.

I note, from the member for Moore, that the opposition is going to take this bill to the consideration in detail stage. We certainly need to interrogate this important legislation in fine detail tonight. We look forward to the member's interrogation of the bill in that manner. I also felt a bit nervous when the member for Moore mentioned the former member for Hillarys, and I thought he might remind us of the former member for Hillarys' contribution when this bill was last before this Parliament in 2018. I listened to the member for Moore's speech and, towards the end of it, I actually thought he might have been better just reading the contribution from the former member for Hillarys because, despite the fact that I do not miss him, I acknowledge that his ability to get across the legal aspects of the bill was much better than the contributions of the opposition I have heard thus far during the forty-first Parliament. The member should read the contribution of the former member for Hillarys. I learnt a lot during the preparation for my contribution.

The Legislation Bill 2021 is an important bill that will make the laws that we make in this place more accessible to the people of WA. Of course, this is of fundamental importance because it is everyone's responsibility to know the laws, and ignorance of them is no excuse. All sections of our community are presumed to know the law, and ignorance of the law is no excuse. These principles can only operate if we make the laws easily accessible to people. To that end, this bill seeks to do that by modernising the processes by which we publish legislation in WA.

In preparing to contribute to the second reading debate of this bill, I was surprised by the fact that our current system is so antiquated and inefficient. Prior to coming to Parliament, while I was a schoolteacher, starting in about 2008, I got involved with a local issue in my community, which resulted in me becoming what some would describe as a serial pest at local council meetings. Some members who were in the chamber at that time would also remember that I probably repeatedly bombarded their email addresses on the issue over many years. During that time of local activism, I very much hunted out local planning laws, and I got across the State Administrative Tribunal legislation at various stages throughout that campaign. I am really surprised that in all that time, I did not understand that those versions I was accessing were not the official versions of the law. Stay with me, member for Mandurah; I am building.

Just quickly, by way of background, the responsibility for making legislation publicly available in Western Australia lies with the Parliamentary Counsel's Office and the government printer. Under our current system, individual acts are passed and bound volumes of acts are published in hard copy. Subsidiary legislation is generally published in

Mr Shane Love; Mr Simon Millman; Deputy Speaker; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman; Ms Jessica Shaw; Acting Speaker; Mr Donald Punch; Ms Meredith Hammat; Speaker; Ms E.J. Kelsbie; Ms Hannah Beazley; Mr Chris Tallentire; Ms Christine Tonkin; Mr John Quigley

full, which is published in both hard copy and electronic forms. The WA legislation website provides public access to WA legislation in electronic form. This website is now hosted by the Parliamentary Counsel's Office. Currently, the electronic versions of the WA legislation website and the electronic version of the *Government Gazette* have no official status. Bizarrely, only printed copies of WA acts and subsidiary legislation are given evidential status in judicial and other proceedings. This is completely inefficient, expensive and inconvenient for users. It is also highly confusing and can lead to a lack of confidence in the accuracy and reliability of the electronic versions that we use. Our current system does not reflect our modern society at all and the digital age in which we live. I can complete the entire process of divorce online, I can do all my banking online, I can have medical consultations and get prescriptions for medicines online, yet currently, whilst I can access laws online through the WA legislation website and the *Government Gazette*, those versions do not hold official status, nor is it guaranteed that what I access is up to date or includes the subsidiary legislation. This new bill, in essence, will bring the legal status of electronic versions of legislation into line with hard copies and, with that, improve accessibility to the written law. This bill, essentially a machinery bill, will bring us into the twenty-first century and into line with community expectation and modern workplaces where we rely on getting our information from online sources, and we usually do so with great confidence.

COVID-19 has shown us more than ever that we have an ability to be flexible in the workplace and to use digital platforms to do our work. In the last 12 months, certainly the residents that I have spoken to, and also a number of businesses and other organisations, have learnt to utilise digital platforms to still be able to carry out the work that needs to be done when they are not able to meet face to face. COVID has provided us with the ability to embrace technology more and be confident enough with it to serve our purposes in many workplaces and environments.

Last year, in 2020, my daughter Meg had the great honour of being an associate in the Federal Court for Justice Perram. She was involved in quite innovative work in the Federal Court. She was involved with Justice Perram in running the first ever trial by videoconferencing platform in early March once the lockdown had begun. The court has since rapidly expanded its use of technology to all aspects of its work. This legislation is long overdue in making sure that we, too, respond to the way technology is used by many places outside of this place, including the court system.

The bill will also bring us into line with a majority of other jurisdictions for which this already exists. It will also improve efficiencies and reduce the cost of publishing subsidiary legislation. This streamlining will obviously save taxpayers money as well. Importantly, this bill will also give the Parliamentary Counsel's Office a more useful set of editorial powers so that WA legislation can be kept up to date and modernised and errors can be corrected without the need for changes to be enacted by Parliament. I am very confident of the checks and balances in place. Providing more editorial power to the Parliamentary Counsel's Office does not mean that we will diminish the intent of the laws that exist. I am very confident that it will be an official way of editing our legislation to make it as up to date as possible.

This place is steeped in history and tradition. It is our purpose to make laws in this place. We do so by drafting, debating and sometimes amending bills, and ultimately passing bills that become the laws that determine the way we live our lives. The way in which we do so seems quite old-fashioned and not really in tune with modern society in many ways. Just look at our sitting hours when we do our business, the way we debate bills and the time it takes to debate bills. I enjoy going to the library and showing it to visitors when they come to this place. The library is one of the most beautiful areas in this building, but it also reminds us of the bygone era of this place. We could imagine a couple of members sitting by the fire with their cigars discussing how many sheep they had lost on their property in the week prior. This place does have that kind of feel to it but bit by bit, we are modernising it. It was quite extraordinary that it was only during the fortieth Parliament that we finally adopted the acknowledgement of country to start the day's proceedings. It was introduced only four years ago. Let us not forget that.

We have come a long way in making this place more progressive and representative of the community we serve. We have a record number of women in this and the other chamber. In fact, 39 women make up part of the Mark McGowan Labor government. We have representation like never before. We have Hon Ayor Makur Chuot, the first South Sudanese member of Parliament in Australia, representing us in the Legislative Council. We have the first Aboriginal woman in Hon Rosetta Sahanna taking her place in the Legislative Council, and, of course, we have the first woman Speaker in this place. I wrote this speech before her statement earlier today. I said that she is beginning to leave her mark in modernising this place. Not only is she a woman, but she is also the longest serving member in this place and with that comes great experience and understanding of this place and how we can best modernise it. Her statement today of how she now interprets the standing orders to allow for breastfeeding in this chamber left me with goosebumps. I am sure that is something that we will proudly look back on when we reflect on our time here in the forty-first Parliament.

The McGowan Labor government has been driving reform. This bill—essentially, an administrative reform bill—will finally see access to justice and our laws being more accessible to our community. I acknowledge the Attorney General for bringing this bill to the house. The member for Mount Lawley is right; it certainly looks like the Attorney General is going to continue where he left off in the fortieth Parliament. That might scare the opposition, but it excites us on this side because he is a reformer, he is a machine and he is driven to legislate to bring our laws into the twenty-first

Mr Shane Love; Mr Simon Millman; Deputy Speaker; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman; Ms Jessica Shaw; Acting Speaker; Mr Donald Punch; Ms Meredith Hammat; Speaker; Ms E.J. Kelsbie; Ms Hannah Beazley; Mr Chris Tallentire; Ms Christine Tonkin; Mr John Quigley

century. I suggest to the member for Moore that he might want to support him and join in or perhaps just get out of the way. The Attorney General is a reformer and a fixer, and it is refreshing to see his work ethic and the good change he is bringing to the people of WA. I take exception to the comment made in the member for Moore's contribution earlier when he suggested that the Attorney General might just ram through legislation in the upper house because backbenchers and members on the government side might be too frightened to stand up to him. I can tell the member for Moore that whilst outwardly the Attorney General might seem like a tiger and scares the member for Moore, we on this side of the chamber are collaborative, inclusive and well able to take our points of view to any minister in this place; we do so with great passion, and because of that this government is a better government. I cannot help but compare the record of this Attorney General with that of the previous Attorney General who, in his six years of government, introduced 21 pieces of legislation. Attorney General, there is a bit of debate going on between the member for Swan Hills, the member for Mount Lawley and I. Is it 59 bills that the Attorney General brought to this place in the fortieth Parliament?

Ms J.J. Shaw: It is 59.

Ms S.E. WINTON: Although this place sometimes has that bleak and old-fashioned look about it, it is not all gloom. We are innovative in this place and certainly modern aspects are built in. One of my favourite things about this place, which I think is brilliant because it brings this place and the laws that we contemplate and make in debate to the people, is, of course, that we broadcast live proceedings, and have *Hansard*, which is quickly and readily available electronically. To that end, I hope my daughter, who is currently in year 11 and sitting at home studying for exams, is watching me live so that she can give me some feedback on my speech tonight. As soon as I sit down, I know she will get back to the work of preparing for her next round of exams.

Several members interjected.

Ms S.E. WINTON: I will FaceTime her later.

Of course, broadcasting live is a really important way to bring what we do in contemplating laws to the people. My experiences in local council were not so good. I hope and wish that more local councils would take on the reform of broadcasting live their deliberations during council meetings. I know that some councils like the City of Wanneroo make audio recordings available, but I have to say that it is a really cumbersome process and people would really desperately need to know what happened at a council meeting to go through that process to get the audio recording. In this day and age, with technology so easily available, I was hoping that because of the COVID-19 situation and more councils starting to work remotely, that that would have spurred some of them on to live broadcast their council meetings for the people. I encourage local governments and the City of Wanneroo to do that.

When this bill was previously debated in the Legislative Assembly, I very much enjoyed members' contributions. Of course, a lot of that debate involved a reflection on people's previous professions and the technology, or lack of it, in the workplace. I had a bit of a think, too, about my past professional life and how I managed without technology. My first job while I was studying at university was working for a local pathology centre. It was my job to fax the medical records, one by one, to the GPs. When the line went down, I had to start all over again, churning them through the machine. My girls probably would not know what a fax machine is. Of course, if I reflect on teaching—this will show my age—when I first started, there were no photocopiers; rather, we used a gestetner machine.

Mr D.A. Templeman: I used to get high on methylated spirits when I used that.

Ms S.E. WINTON: It just gave me a headache, member for Mandurah.

We also used a stud book, which we probably finished using in about 1995. For those members who do not know what the stud book was, every year the Department of Education would produce what looked a bit like the *Yellow Pages* but it was an entire collection of every single staff member in the Department of Education and that way we could keep a track of who was at which school. It was a really interesting way to find out where your mates were, who had got promotions —

Mr D.A. Templeman: Where your enemies were?

Ms S.E. WINTON: Yes, where your enemies were or perhaps where your lost loves were.

Ms J.J. Shaw: It was Facebook for teachers!

Ms S.E. WINTON: It was Facebook for teachers. Perhaps the library would have an old copy of those. What year did the member for Mandurah teach? Perhaps I will find the one that the member for Mandurah is in.

Mr D.A. Templeman: I was usually unattached!

Ms S.E. WINTON: Of course, when we started we did not have electronic devices to put our worksheets together in terms of desktop publishing; we literally cut out bits and pieces to make a worksheet to then—eventually when the

Mr Shane Love; Mr Simon Millman; Deputy Speaker; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman; Ms Jessica Shaw; Acting Speaker; Mr Donald Punch; Ms Meredith Hammat; Speaker; Ms E.J. Kelsbie; Ms Hannah Beazley; Mr Chris Tallentire; Ms Christine Tonkin; Mr John Quigley

gestetner went—photocopy. The biggest drama in schools was the stealing of photocopy paper. We were allotted an amount of photocopy paper but that used to get pinched from the teachers' pigeonholes.

[Member's time extended.]

Ms S.E. WINTON: I want to take a few minutes to say that recording what we do here and making it easily accessible, whether it is the debates that we undertake, consideration in detail or getting access to electronic versions of the legislation that we pass, is also incredibly important for our young people. If members go to any school now, they will see that they are incredibly modern places. Indeed, NAPLAN takes place online now so it is only reasonable that the work that we produce here by way of legislation is produced in an easy and readily digitised way for young people.

Our schools do an incredible job teaching civics and democracy. I continue to enjoy visiting my primary schools to support teachers in that endeavour. I want to particularly highlight to members—they will find out about this at the end of the year if they were not here previously—that before being elected to Parliament as the member for Wanneroo, over the last 10 years, I was a primary extension and challenge teacher. For the last few years, except last year, obviously, because of COVID, I collaborated with Kirsteen McCrory, who is still a PEAC coordinator and a dear friend of mine, on a course called PEAC Parliamentarians, which we hope to run again later in the year. We bring in a group of incredibly inspirational and young gifted and talented people to become familiar with this place, learn a bit about their local members and ministers and how this place is run and to make a contribution in this place. Look out for that when we run that program again. Of course, politics and law are important areas of study for many young people in our secondary schools, particularly those who study ATAR politics and law. I want to take this opportunity to do a cheeky shout-out to an extraordinary teacher of politics and law in Telma Keen, who is a politics and law teacher at Lake Joondalup Baptist College. She taught Meg, who has now gone on to become a lawyer in Sydney, and also my second daughter, Emma, who is currently at university and looking to pursue law potentially after engineering. There is no doubt about it; those two young ladies, whom I am very proud of, were inspired to think about politics and law because of Telma Keen's passion and enthusiasm. My third daughter, Kate, is listening to me tonight and about to switch off and go and study politics and law for her exam next week. I give a shout-out to her teacher, Reuben Farr, who is doing an extraordinary job engaging and enthusing young people to take an active interest in politics and law. That school does a great job in not only its curriculum, but also its extracurricular activities. All three of my daughters have had the incredible opportunity to be a part of the mock trials program, which is such a fantastic way for young people to understand the system by which we make laws in this state.

I want to give a shout-out to a few people who have been involved in the YMCA Youth Parliament program, who, later tonight—shortly, actually—will be arriving at Parliament House. Many members would have met some of the young people who are participating this year; many members are sponsoring them and I thank them for that. Fifty-nine very talented and passionate young people ranging from year 11 to second and third-year university will this year again participate in Youth Parliament. Although they had to modify the program last year by running it out of the Constitutional Centre, we hope very much that, all things being normal, they will be able to run this fantastic program in this chamber, I think, in July. I encourage members to take an active interest, because they are inspirational people and they are doing incredible work. I have had a chance to review some of the legislation that they have drafted for this year's YMCA Youth Parliament, and they are exceptional young people. To Taylor Watson, Justin Pereira, Haeden Miles, Doug Jackson, Roman Booth and Lars O'Neill, all the best for this year's Youth Parliament and I look forward to having a chat with you over dinner in a little while when you visit.

Finally, I draw on the member for Morley's contribution to the Legislation Bill 2018. In the same way that the member for Moore referenced the member for Hillarys, I will draw attention to the member for Morley's contribution in that debate. She very accurately highlighted the opposition's failure in its fundamental role in this place. It is, of course, the opposition's job in this place to scrutinise legislation clause by clause to ensure that it is appropriate and good legislation. I am thrilled that the opposition will have a go at doing that tonight, rather than letting the Legislation Bill go straight to the third reading stage, because in the previous Parliament, many, many bills proceeded straight to the third reading stage, bypassing the consideration in detail stage without any scrutiny or input by the opposition in this place. Goodness knows what the forty-first Parliament will do. There were 13 members in the opposition in the fortieth Parliament and they did not do much work; now there are only six members opposite, which is less than half that number. Perhaps the scrutiny the member for Moore talked about as so important to the parliamentary process will be even less significant! Like many occasions in the fortieth Parliament—I can bet my house on it, member for Moore—in the next few years, when opposition members have an opportunity to scrutinise legislation in this place, I bet they will skip out and wimp out; they will not do the work that the member for Moore says is so important to this Parliament. Rather than whinge about the people who are not in the Parliament to help the member, he should do that scrutiny; he can pick up the tools and do the work himself!

Of the many bills the member for Morley highlighted for which there was no or very little scrutiny by the opposition in this place, I could not help but notice her highlighting that the Human Reproductive Technology and Surrogacy

Mr Shane Love; Mr Simon Millman; Deputy Speaker; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman; Ms Jessica Shaw; Acting Speaker; Mr Donald Punch; Ms Meredith Hammat; Speaker; Ms E.J. Kelsbie; Ms Hannah Beazley; Mr Chris Tallentire; Ms Christine Tonkin; Mr John Quigley

Legislation Amendment Bill 2018 also went straight to the third reading stage with no scrutiny here. On the one hand, in this chamber in the fortieth Parliament, we had no scrutiny at all by the opposition on that bill—none at all! On the other hand, we had the absolutely outrageous situation in the Legislative Council when Hon Nick Goiran spent over 21 hours holding up the business of the Legislative Council, not allowing us to get through some of the legislation that the member is now whingeing about that he could not get to do. Imagine what 21 hours' worth of debate could have allowed us to proceed with, but people like Hon Nick Goiran spent 21 hours filibustering on a bill that, at the outset, he said he was not going to support. I can reflect back on this when I am talking about schoolchildren and young people who are participating in the Youth Parliament and they are learning about debating. It is inconceivable to me that an opposition member would get up and hold up debate with 21 hours of debate on something he would vote no to. That is unreasonable and it is inefficient. If it means that we will get the opportunity to have a look at that as part of the standing orders of the Legislative Council, I personally say, bring it on! If a member cannot execute an argument in an hour or two, it is not reasonable to use the good time of this Parliament, which is designed to pass legislation, to hold up the process, particularly when they are opposed to it. What did Hon Nick Goiran do at the end of the 21 hours? He did not even sit down and vote no, he moved to send the bill to a committee. All that was done, despite, at the outset, indicating he would vote against the bill and that no matter what happened in that committee, he was going to vote against it. That was an absolute waste and misuse of the resources of this Parliament.

I will finish on this, because the phrase “total control” has come up a few times. I was not sure whether I was allowed to include it in this debate or whether it was relevant, but given that the member for Moore has highlighted this notion of total control, I think it is appropriate that I, too, pass a few remarks in that regard.

In the lead-up to the state election, the opposition ran an outrageously mischievous scare campaign about the Mark McGowan government gaining total control of the Parliament. The messaging opposition members used was, “Don't give McGowan total control, vote for your local Liberal.” That might have worked if people had had a local Liberal candidate to vote for! I know that some members had Liberal opponents in their electorates, but I have to say that the local Liberal candidate in my electorate was not much of an opponent or a local Liberal that my constituents could in all conscience vote for. The fact is that the people of Western Australia totally rejected that premise. They totally rejected it! The people of Western Australia have given control of the Legislative Council to the McGowan government—that is what they have done! What the opposition tried to scaremonger as total control is actually a mandate. It is democratic, as the Attorney General said. It is a democratic mandate to progress the McGowan government's legislative agenda to, ultimately, be judged at the next election.

The member for Moore failed to remind this house that this has happened before. We have had Liberal governments in power that have had control of the other place, and the sky did not fall in then and the sky is not going to fall in this time. It is the opposition's job to scrutinise and to improve legislation; it is certainly not the opposition's job to block legislation just because it does not like it. The opposition can vote against legislation and tell the community that it voted against it, but blocking legislation is undemocratic and does not allow a government that has received an overwhelming level of support to progress its legislative agenda. By all means, criticise us and make contributions during consideration in detail, but blocking us is undemocratic. If the opposition chooses to do that in this Parliament, it will be left with even fewer people here, and members will be judged on it. I have no doubt about that.

In summary, this bill to modernise the way our community accesses legislation is well overdue. Giving official status to electronic versions of the law is absolutely critical if our practices are to reflect the views of the broader community. Members, I am very proud to be part of the forty-first Parliament. The Attorney General has made it clear that he is a reformer and he is going to use the opportunity that the good people of Western Australia have afforded us by forming a majority in the other place, and we will craft sensible, considered legislation that represents the people of Western Australia.

MR D.A. TEMPLEMAN (Mandurah — Leader of the House) [5.18 pm]: The impassioned speech by the member for Wanneroo on the Legislation Bill 2021 has stirred me to a sense of nostalgia. I will not speak for very long, because I know that my very hardworking parliamentary secretary also wishes to make a contribution, along with other members.

It is a nostalgic moment as we seek to jettison old practices and bring in new ones. I am not against it, but as many members will know, I am a republican with monarchist tendencies. My wife calls me old-fashioned sometimes—actually, regularly! And, if you are watching, Kate, go and study as your mother has said; do it now, and do it often!

I am sort of between two worlds, Attorney General, in this debate, because I am a nostalgic person. The member for Wanneroo is right. I remember when I was first elected to Parliament—20 years ago last February—and the practices then in Parliament of how our speeches were recorded. We were encouraged to acquire copies of the bound volumes of *Hansard*. They then became very expensive, so very few of us actually acquired them, although I think a couple of former members may have nicked a couple! There was a reluctance to acquire them by paying

Mr Shane Love; Mr Simon Millman; Deputy Speaker; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman; Ms Jessica Shaw; Acting Speaker; Mr Donald Punch; Ms Meredith Hammat; Speaker; Ms E.J. Kelsbie; Ms Hannah Beazley; Mr Chris Tallentire; Ms Christine Tonkin; Mr John Quigley

for them. I think in the end one of those green bound *Hansard* volumes, which would encompass most, if not a significant proportion, of a year's speeches were about \$250 each to buy. When one is on a meagre salary, one prioritises one's costs.

Ms J.J. Shaw: Particularly if you hadn't said much during the year!

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: That is right! It is a bit like when people get a letter from *Who's Who*, saying, "We'd love to have you in *Who's Who*. By the way, it'll cost you 250 bucks, but we'd love you to be in it." Members will get that letter. *Who's Who*? Who cares!

But these records are important. I can remember, as the minister responsible for archives, that it pained me to reflect on the fact that we were moving into the digital age and that most of our records would be digitised. There are appropriate mechanisms in place to ensure that the integrity of those records are maintained in their digital form. I am getting emotional now! That was just a little cough, Dr Jags; I am okay, but you might want to check me later! I can remember when people predicted the end of libraries and bookshops.

Ms S.E. Winton: You love the library!

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: I love a good library! I like to immerse myself in the written word and written language. When computers became much more prevalent, the demise of the book was predicted because of the advent of ebooks. I do not know about other members, but I hate ebooks. I have never used an ebook. I know the member for Moore might have had one on the front dash of his tractor while harvesting late at night, but I have never used one.

Ms S.E. Winton: What book have you got on your bedside table?

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: An *Archie* comic! I am a collector of comics. I have a very big collection of *Archie* comics, and I am glad I have because they are actually worth a lot of money now. *Archie Digest*! For some reason, when I was younger, I used to call them "Archie Diggest"; I did not quite work it out! Anyway, I digress.

The fact is that when we pass legislation like this—I think it is important, and will ensure that Western Australians will have appropriate access to important legislation in a meaningful and effective way—we still have to remind ourselves of the important practices of the past as well. There was the gestetner machine, with its steaming smell of methylated spirits as it clack, clack, clacked. I do not know how *Hansard* will get that sound, but it was an articulated movement and the machine would spit out the methylated spirit copies. When I was a councillor at the City of Mandurah, we did our reports on constituent matters on carbon copies; there was a booklet. The officers at the City of Mandurah hated me because I went through about five booklets every year. I would go and meet a constituent about a road problem, like a pothole, and I would say, "Right, here's the carbon copy." The first copy would go to the CEO, the second to the appropriate officer and I would have the third copy. Members remember the old carbon copies, yet we are not that ancient. We may be relics of the past, but we are not ancient at this point in time! But that is important to consider.

The member for Wanneroo highlighted a couple of recent positive changes. One was the announcement today by the Speaker about breastfeeding in Parliament. Those of us who were in the fortieth Parliament will remember the toing and froing on that issue and the debate that went on and on; we could not reach agreement. With some swift decision-making, the Speaker has dealt with it. Well done to the Speaker, because she dealt with that very quickly; we all sat there thinking, "Why was it so difficult? Why was it so hard?"

One of the things we have not done in this Parliament is deal with petitions. Petitions in this place conform with the standing orders only if they are submitted on paper and are in the correct template wording. They have to be signed by the appropriate Clerk as conforming with the standing orders. I spoke with the Deputy Clerk some time ago about how we might reform petitions so that people could present petitions that conform with the standing orders but are of a non-paper or electronic nature. As we know, members can present a paper petition that might have only one signature, and they will refer to several hundred or thousand people who have indicated their support for that petition; it is a nonconforming petition because it is submitted via an online method. The problem I have with petitions is that we have no mechanism to effectively deal with them. The reality is that a petition can be presented and yes, we might get some good feedback because we can say to our constituents that we have presented the petition, but there is actually no obligation on the Assembly to action that petition. It is a register, at a given point in time, of the views of a constituency or a group within a constituency.

The Deputy Clerk did some interesting research into that and discovered that there are Parliaments around the world that have mechanisms for dealing with petitions. One that I recall is that if a petition has a certain number of signatures, it triggers a response from the house. For example, debate on the petition may be required if a certain threshold of signatures is met. If a petition refers to a particular portfolio area, it may require a minister to formally respond to it in the house. That is an interesting consideration.

Mr Shane Love; Mr Simon Millman; Deputy Speaker; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman; Ms Jessica Shaw; Acting Speaker; Mr Donald Punch; Ms Meredith Hammat; Speaker; Ms E.J. Kelsbie; Ms Hannah Beazley; Mr Chris Tallentire; Ms Christine Tonkin; Mr John Quigley

Mr R.S. Love: That’s why everyone sends their petitions to the Legislative Council.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: That is very true, but as we know, petitions in this house are still an important register of concern by a local member. It is something that I think is worthy of consideration.

This is bill 59, and the Attorney General will go down in the annals of this place as one of the most prolific legislators in the modern history of parliamentary democracy. RUN ON I do not say that lightly, given that I think I put only three bills through the last Parliament! They were quality, I might say, member for Kalgoorlie, despite the criticism I might have received from those opposite, particularly the member for Moore! The Attorney General’s bills are not only voluminous in number, but also quality, and for that I admire him. I aspire to be that prolific. With those comments, I shall take my seat.

MS J.J. SHAW (Swan Hills — Parliamentary Secretary) [5.30 pm]: I thank the member for Moore for such an extraordinarily broad-ranging second reading contribution on the Legislation Bill 2021. I also thank the member for Wanneroo for going through the legislation in quite some detail. Both the speeches of the member for Moore and the member for Wanneroo made me think, “What am I going to speak about?” Because the member for Moore went to such pains to discuss where this bill got to in the upper house, I thought I would have a quick look through the history of it. It was introduced on 27 June 2018 and then we had the winter recess. It came on for the second reading debate on 30 October, and we gave our contributions. I think we started the debate at 3.55 pm and we passed the bill at 9.06 that evening, so we whipped through it in the Legislative Assembly, despite the voluminous contributions of the former member for Hillarys. I actually sat in the chamber for that debate, although I was working on other stuff.

Ms S.E. Winton: Do you miss him?

Ms J.J. SHAW: Like a hole in the head. We have an outstanding member for Hillarys now, and I look forward to the many contributions she will no doubt make.

We passed the bill. I read *Hansard* as well, which jogged some memories for me. *Hansard* noted that when this bill was introduced in the fortieth Parliament, it was the twenty-sixth bill that the Attorney General had introduced. During the debate it was commented that the former Attorney General in his entire tenure, I believe, passed only 21 bills. Significant attention was given to the current Attorney General’s productivity and his reforming nature.

This caused to me to think. The observation was made that this bill languished in the upper house. Given the broad range of the member for Moore’s speech, I thought I would dig up Legislative Council notice paper 236 from Thursday, 26 November 2020, where we can have a good look at the other bills that also expired with the prorogation of the fortieth Parliament. The first four orders of the day listed on the notice paper are some disallowance motions. Item 5 is the Building and Construction Industry Training Fund and Levy Collection Amendment Bill 2017. Items 5 to 47 are government bills that languished in the upper house because it just could not get its job done. Items 54 to 75 are private members’ bills that, again, the Council just could not seem to get its act together to appropriately debate, consider and pass. The member for Wanneroo’s contribution was fantastic in pointing out that very often the reason that those bills did not pass was, frankly, the inability of the Liberal Party to bring to heel the ultraconservative, right-wing, Christian rump that is now the majority of its party. We are going to go through these bills, because the member for Moore was so very generous in outlining the scope of them. It is important to put on the record at the commencement of this Parliament just how many lost opportunities there were in the last Parliament and how culpable those opposite—or in the forward pocket!—should feel for their astonishing tone-deafness to the electorate. They should now recognise the mandate this government secured at the last election and the spiteful, petty contributions made by members like Nick Goiran, who continues to be at number one on the ticket for the Liberal Party. The Liberal Party is culpable, and if it continues to put people like that in the first spot on the upper house ticket, it will relegate itself to even more irrelevance in the Western Australian community.

Ms S.E. Winton: Wasn’t it ironic that the Liberals were saying that the Minister for Health should divest himself. Perhaps it should be time to encourage someone else to go for a run!

Ms J.J. SHAW: Exactly! A fish rots from the head down, and in that instance the Liberal Party should have a good look at who is doing its numbers.

Let us have a quick look through the notice paper. Item 11 is the Legislation Bill 2018, which is now this bill. As I say, it got to the upper house in October 2020, the day after it passed through this place, and then languished. Item 15 is the Human Reproductive Technology and Surrogacy Legislation Amendment Bill 2018. I thank the member for Wanneroo for her contribution highlighting the pettiness of the opposition’s filibustering purely out of, I would say, spite and tone-deafness to the electorate and the failure to put that bill to a vote, preventing same-sex couples from having access to reproductive technologies. That was an astonishing act that undermined a lot of people’s faith in the democratic and parliamentary processes. When those processes were abused in such a horrific way, there is no doubt that the people then decided to send this Parliament a clear message to vote in a Labor majority in the Council so that we could get on with the job and would not have to subject our democratic processes to such

Mr Shane Love; Mr Simon Millman; Deputy Speaker; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman; Ms Jessica Shaw; Acting Speaker; Mr Donald Punch; Ms Meredith Hammat; Speaker; Ms E.J. Kelsbie; Ms Hannah Beazley; Mr Chris Tallentire; Ms Christine Tonkin; Mr John Quigley

abuse. Looking down the list, the next item is the Metropolitan Region Scheme (Beeliar Wetlands) Bill 2018. That is another issue that the Liberal Party is absolutely tone-deaf to. There have now been three elections at the state and federal levels with Roe 8 having gone to the electorate and the electorate has resoundingly said, “We don’t want this”, yet the Liberal Party would not pass the legislation through the house. I must say that it is fabulous to see that legislation coming back on now and that we will finally, hopefully, be able to stop Roe 8. The next item is the Ticket Scalping Bill 2018. Obviously, the Liberals were not too keen to stop people being ripped off.

Mr R.S. Love interjected.

Ms J.J. SHAW: I am not inviting interjections.

Point of Order

Mr R.S. LOVE: I am actually raising a point of order. I think we have now reached the point at which we are just hearing a never-ending attack on the operations of the other chamber of this Parliament. It is not considered parliamentary to reflect poorly upon the other place, and I think, Acting Speaker, you should direct the member to refrain from any further —

Ms J.J. Shaw: Point of order!

Mr R.S. LOVE: I made the point of order.

Ms J.J. SHAW: The member himself made running commentary on the operations of the upper house. If he seeks to open and broaden out the debate, he should be prepared to debate that for all the perspectives that are offered in this chamber, not just his own narrow worldview.

Mr R.S. LOVE: Further to the point of order, I did not reflect negatively upon members of the other place or its operations; I was indicating what might happen in the future.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mrs L.A. Munday): It is okay to reflect generally on the processes, but we need to be a bit more general about how we go about it.

Debate Resumed

Ms J.J. SHAW: Thank you, Acting Speaker, for your direction.

I will move on to the Family Court Amendment Bill 2019, which is yet another bill that got clogged up. That was basically intended to stop victims of domestic violence from being subjected to cross-examination by the alleged perpetrators of the crimes against them. That was an incredibly important bill that the Liberal Party decided it would hold up in the upper house and failed to pass. We again see that the Legislative Council was not able to operate in an effective manner.

The next bill that I draw to the attention of the house is order of the day 28, the Criminal Law (Unlawful Consorting) Bill 2020. We basically tried to introduce that legislation to stop bikies from associating or communicating with convicted offenders. Again, our efforts to try to thwart organised crime were stopped in the upper house.

The next bill is the Aquatic Resources Management Amendment Bill. Again, that bill, which sought to adopt approaches towards ecologically sustainable development and management of our aquatic resources, was held up.

Today after question time, we gave notice to introduce the Dog Amendment (Stop Puppy Farming) Bill, which was order of the day 30 on the Legislative Council’s notice paper. Again, we all know that the opposition shamefully opposed measures intended to stop practices that are the most abhorrent and cruel. Again, the opposition was tone deaf to the electorate, and the Legislative Council was not able to do the job that was intended of it.

The next bill is order of the day 26, the Family Court Amendment Bill. That bill was intended to protect victims of family and domestic violence.

The next bill is the Children and Community Services Amendment Bill. This is a cracker. That bill highlights the major problem with the way in which the upper house operated in the last term of government. Hon Nick Goiran used his influence in the upper house to prevent the implementation of a royal commission recommendation that would make it a crime if a priest failed to tell the police when a person had confessed to sexually abusing children. I want to quote from an article in *The West Australian* online of Thursday, 10 September 2020 by Annabel Hennessy. It is a direct commentary on these issues. The article is headed “Liberal MP Nick Goiran recommends priests be exempt from mandatory reporting of child sex abuse in confession”. The quote reads —

WA Liberal power broker and conservative Nick Goiran is again trying to stifle the McGowan Government’s agenda—this time using his influence in the Upper House to prevent a royal commission recommendation that will make it a crime if a priest failed to tell police when someone confessed a child sex crime to them.

Mr Shane Love; Mr Simon Millman; Deputy Speaker; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman; Ms Jessica Shaw; Acting Speaker; Mr Donald Punch; Ms Meredith Hammat; Speaker; Ms E.J. Kelsbie; Ms Hannah Beazley; Mr Chris Tallentire; Ms Christine Tonkin; Mr John Quigley

This is the same man who campaigned fiercely against our voluntary assisted dying laws. We have already commented on his agenda against allowing same-sex couples to access reproductive technologies. These are the issues that happen when recalcitrant members of the upper house use a conservative ultra-right-wing agenda to try to thwart a democratic mandate. That was a significant bill.

The next bill, which I will mention briefly, is the Arts and Culture Trust Bill. I cannot wait for that bill to come down, because my new job is supporting the Minister for Culture and the Arts; Heritage. I am very much looking forward to the debate on that bill, hopefully, when we reintroduce it. Again, that bill was clogged up in the upper house.

The next bill is the Animal Welfare and Trespass Legislation Amendment Bill. That legislation was brought into this Parliament to strike a balance between the, frankly, inappropriate forms of trespass that we do see and the very legitimate concerns about practices by some people against animal welfare. That bill seeks to introduce a right of inspection, tempered with the creation of an offence of aggravated trespass. Again, that bill was held up in the upper house.

Another bill is the Sunday Entertainments Repeal Bill. That will be a good one when it comes back.

We then come to the famous one, order of the day 42, the Corruption, Crime and Misconduct Amendment Bill. We all know what happened there. The opposition shamefully blocked the reappointment of this state's most effective corruption fighter. The opposition utilised the Legislative Council and would not pass the legislation required to reappoint Commissioner McKechnie. That is absolutely shameful.

The next bill—we are dealing with this now in real time—is the Building and Construction Industry (Security of Payment) Bill. The Legislative Council failed to pass that bill, so we are trying to deal with that now.

Point of Order

Mr R.S. LOVE: Asserting that the Legislative Council has somehow failed to pass something does not imply that that is entirely the fault of any particular individual, nor does it imply that that was a fault of the Legislative Council. If the government refuses to bring a bill into the Council and debate it, there is nothing that the opposition members have to address.

Ms J.J. SHAW: It is not the intention that points of order be used as debating mechanisms. You have had your go. Wait for the third reading debate or take it into consideration in detail.

Mr R.S. LOVE: The member is misleading the house by asserting that these matters were not addressed by the Legislative Council because of opposition from other parties. Some of these matters were not brought on for debate by the Leader of the House.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mrs L.A. Munday): Thank you. Continue, member for Swan Hills.

Debate Resumed

Ms J.J. SHAW: Thank you for your ruling, Acting Speaker.

The next one is order of the day 45, the Electoral Amendment Bill. Am I looking forward to that coming back! I think that will be an absolutely fabulous debate when it does come back, hopefully, in this term of Parliament. I am very much looking forward to the independent review that has been commissioned and the outcome from Mr McCusker, who is a very eminent Western Australian jurist and our thirty-first Governor of Western Australia. I am looking forward to seeing his recommendations.

Mr R.S. Love interjected

Ms J.J. SHAW: I am not taking interjections. I seek your protection, Acting Speaker.

Mr R.S. Love interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Moore!

Ms J.J. SHAW: I am very much looking forward to further debate on electoral reform. I do hope that a revised version of the Electoral Amendment Bill comes on. It is absolutely outrageous that a member in the upper house can be elected with 0.2 per cent of the vote. It is ridiculous in the extreme that with 98 votes, we can have a member of Parliament, a man who secured only three votes below the line in the Mining and Pastoral Region, yet his brother next door got four votes below the line and he did not get elected. That is clearly a significant defect in our parliamentary system. There has been a lot of discussion about the disparity between Wooroloo and Wundowie. Wooroloo is in my electorate. It is a beautiful little town. Obviously, the community there is really struggling. It is outrageous that a vote in Wooroloo is only worth four votes in Wundowie. That is absolutely outrageous. I am certainly looking forward to the Electoral Amendment Bill coming on.

Mr R.S. Love interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Moore, please.

Mr Shane Love; Mr Simon Millman; Deputy Speaker; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman; Ms Jessica Shaw; Acting Speaker; Mr Donald Punch; Ms Meredith Hammat; Speaker; Ms E.J. Kelsbie; Ms Hannah Beazley; Mr Chris Tallentire; Ms Christine Tonkin; Mr John Quigley

Ms J.J. SHAW: I am sorry. A vote in Wundowie —

Mr R.S. Love interjected.

Ms J.J. SHAW: I seek the protection of the chair.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Moore, I am going to have to call you to order.

A member interjected.

Ms J.J. SHAW: I seek your protection because it clearly is a —

Point of Order

Mr R.S. LOVE: It has become the practice of the government backbenchers and even some ministers to refer to members of this place as “mate”. I am not your mate.

Mr D.T. PUNCH: I ask for that to be withdrawn. I have never referred to anybody in this place as “mate”.

Mr R.S. Love: Somebody on that side did.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mrs L.A. Munday): There is no point of order.

Debate Resumed

Ms J.J. SHAW: A vote in Wundowie is worth four times a vote in Wooroloo. I think that is outrageous. I know it is a touchpoint for the Nationals WA, but when we consider the outcomes for the Nationals, they should be really worried about the outcomes for them in the Mining and Pastoral Region, where a person can be elected with 0.2 per cent of the vote. That is absolutely outrageous. I certainly look forward to the Electoral Amendment Bill coming on.

Finally, I had a quick look. The last piece of legislation on the list is the Public Health Amendment (Safe Access Zones) Bill. Again, that is another bill that, unfortunately, expired at the conclusion of the fortieth Parliament. That bill sought to guarantee that women who are seeking reproductive health services are able to attend and seek medical attention without being spat on, without being abused, without having to face protesters and without having all sorts of dreadful material thrust into their face, but, yet again, those in the Liberal–National coalition in the upper house could not bring themselves to pass legislation that would bring us up to speed with most other progressive and free-thinking jurisdictions around the world.

I sincerely hope that this bill, based on a bill that died such a death in the last term of Parliament, along with so many other quality pieces of legislation, does not suffer the same fate. I am very much looking forward to seeing a statute that will make the law more generally accessible and allow legislation to be updated and modernised in a much easier way. It will be a simpler process to make minor edits to acts. We will keep up with community expectations of how we like to access public documentation and indeed the processes of government.

As, hopefully, my speech has highlighted, an awful lot could have been updated in the last term of government but was not. An awful lot of conservative views held up an awful lot of good work that this government wanted to do in its last term. Hopefully, with such an overwhelming mandate for this term of Parliament, the government can get on and do it.

MS M.J. HAMMAT (Mirrabooka) [5.51 pm]: I rise to speak in support of the Legislation Bill 2021. I thank members for the contributions that they have made to date on this important piece of legislation. I rise to make three main points on the bill that is before the house.

In the first instance, I think this legislation reflects the changing nature of work and the increasingly digital world in which we live. It is therefore a very sensible change that will assist that move to a more digital world. We have already heard contributions from other speakers identifying that more and more of our records are kept in electronic form. The member for Wanneroo commented that it is possible to get a divorce online. We know that we can confirm our identity with the federal government online. Our health records are increasingly kept online and, of course, we had an excellent contribution from the member for Mandurah about *Hansard* records and the fact that they are now increasingly kept in digital form.

Listening to the member for Mandurah’s contribution, I recalled my time as a young industrial officer at the Australian Services Union when we would receive transcripts from commission hearings. These were important records of what was said in cases. They would arrive in the office in a draft form after we had been to the commission and made submissions. They would then be corrected and come back to us in their final form, whereupon they were greatly prized in the union office because, if we lost the transcript of proceedings and then needed to refer to it, it was indeed very time consuming and costly to lay our hands on another set of those transcript records. In the office we had files full of transcripts from industrial proceedings that we would then refer to, perhaps only infrequently, but we had to keep them in paper form because it was the only way that we were able to access those records easily if we needed to.

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Tuesday, 1 June 2021]

p1022b-1050a

Mr Shane Love; Mr Simon Millman; Deputy Speaker; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman; Ms Jessica Shaw; Acting Speaker; Mr Donald Punch; Ms Meredith Hammat; Speaker; Ms E.J. Kelsbie; Ms Hannah Beazley; Mr Chris Tallentire; Ms Christine Tonkin; Mr John Quigley

Reflecting on transcripts also brought to mind the fact that at one stage I organised the workers who were court reporters—the people who came to court and typed the transcripts. I think it is important to acknowledge that that is incredibly skilled work. I similarly admire the work of our Hansard reporters in that they do skilled work that requires great patience, and I commend the work that they do.

I think these contributions highlight the move over time towards a more digital world, and it is easy to reflect on how that has changed the work many people do in the areas of law and, from my experience, in the union movement—and for those of us who are members of Parliament here as well. It is appropriate that we update our ability to access legislative records and what the courts consider to be the important final versions of them.

I think it is also important to reflect that the previous 12 months have seen us move in unprecedented ways towards working in a remote and online fashion as workers left their office buildings and started working from home as they dealt with the impact of COVID. Even as we have seen some of those restrictions lifted all around the world, many workers and many businesses are choosing to continue to perform their work at home, relying increasingly on digital records and online access to information. I think this trend will not quickly or easily be reversed. People will continue to work from home for a variety of reasons, so they will continue to want to access their records in digital form. Workers are more mobile than ever before and increasingly we know that the world of work is a digital world.

Although the world of work is changing, so, too, the world of education is changing for our schoolchildren and our other young people. I want to reflect on one of my important election commitments to the people of Mirrabooka—that is, the provision of 25 tablets or iPads to each public primary school within my electorate. I am very excited about this election commitment. It comes from a recognition that today's students will learn and, ultimately, they will work in a digital world. I think it is essential that our young people learn to engage in a digital world and that they have the tools and resources necessary to do so. These will be essential skills for workplaces in the future. For our young people to have these skills will be essential to their success. I look forward to this election commitment being rolled out to schools across my electorate very soon. I recently visited a number of schools and talked to them about this election commitment, and I know many in school communities are equally excited about this addition to their school resources. This commitment will go at least some way to equipping the young people of Mirrabooka with the skills that they need to succeed in the jobs of the future.

The second reason I rise to support this legislation is that the people we represent should have access to the laws that govern them. We have already heard submissions from other members on this exact point. It is important to remember that legislation confers not only rights but also responsibilities on citizens. I think it is important that people are aware of their responsibilities and their obligations. I think that point was well made by the member for Wanneroo. A well-known principle in law is that ignorance of the law is no defence. People are required to be informed of their responsibilities and remaining ignorant is no excuse. Legislation is also important for conferring rights on people. In this regard, I think it is important that people have access to legislation and understand what rights are being conferred upon them.

One issue that I spent some time on previously is the underpayment of wages, or wage theft, whereby people are underpaid for the work that they do. There are many reasons that this occurs, but research tells us that one reason it occurs is that people are ignorant of what they are entitled to. There are also occasions when employers are ignorant about what they are required to pay. Ignorance is not the only factor that results in underpayment. We know that other factors are important as well, such as the power imbalance between employees and their employer. These things are often worse when people are employed on a casual or fixed-term contract. Being ignorant of entitlements, rights or responsibilities is one of the things that are behind some of the underpayments that we see. This legislation, which will move us ever so slowly towards a more digitised world, is a good way of making sure that people have access to the information that affects them and confers on them both rights and responsibilities. Ignorance of such rights and responsibilities could have unwanted consequences. It is a very timely piece of legislation. I think it is important that we give consideration to how laws that govern people are explained and made available to people in a way that is both timely and accurate for their needs. Moving to a more digital world is one excellent way in which we can do that.

A number of other things should also be considered as a matter of policy. I reflect that as someone who represents an electorate in which 45 per cent of people speak a language other than English at home, it would be remiss of me not to mention on this occasion that I think we also need to ensure that appropriate language interpretation services are an essential part of making sure that our citizens understand the laws that affect them. Although I do not submit that we should produce legislation in a range of different languages, I think it is important that we think about people having access to professional interpreter services when they access state government, federal government or local government services. This legislation is an important first step to making sure that we democratise, if you like, the legislative process and provide information to people about the legislation that applies to them. I think

Mr Shane Love; Mr Simon Millman; Deputy Speaker; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman; Ms Jessica Shaw; Acting Speaker; Mr Donald Punch; Ms Meredith Hammat; Speaker; Ms E.J. Kelsbie; Ms Hannah Beazley; Mr Chris Tallentire; Ms Christine Tonkin; Mr John Quigley

important further steps should also be considered in due course such as ensuring there is education on rights and an understanding that the material that affects people should be presented to them in relevant languages.

The final point that I make about why we want to move to electronic legislation is that I recognise that we live in a world in which it is becoming increasingly important to consider the environmental sustainability of all our actions. I am the mother of two teenage sons, and I know that the next generation will approach the question of sustainability in a way that is very mindful and very conscious of minimising the impact of our decisions on the world in which we live. The member for Mandurah, reflecting on *Hansard*, told us that indeed volumes and volumes of paper were taken up in this way. Clearly, moving towards a more digital world will reduce the paper that goes along with legislation and ensure that, for a very small part at least, we will reduce the environmental impact of legislation.

Sitting suspended from 6.00 to 7.00 pm

Ms M.J. HAMMAT: I will pick up where I left off prior to the dinner break. I was commenting on the Legislation Bill 2021 in the context of how it will be an important step towards sustainability and how we are increasingly weighing the decisions about the resources we use, including paper. I was remarking that, as the mother of two young sons, the coming generations will not only work in a digitised world, but also be much more cautious about and conscious of their decisions about the use of resources. The member for Mandurah reflected on the volumes of *Hansard* transcript that members of Parliament used to have. There is lots of evidence of the extensive use of paper in the production of hard copy resources of not only *Hansard* transcripts but also legislation, which is the focus of this bill. Therefore, it is quite right that we find new ways of engaging so that we reduce our environmental footprint. The other significant improvement that will arise from this legislation is that it will be not only more environmentally sustainable, but also more cost-effective, as we will save significant costs associated with the production of paper records. We live in a time when conscious decisions about government spending are important, so that we make sure that we expend funds on the things that will have the greatest impact on our community and will make it better and fairer for everyday people. It is appropriate to reflect on the savings that will come from the introduction of this legislation and the real and direct impacts that this will have on the community in terms of the sorts of things we will be able to spend money on.

In that vein, I want to reflect on Balga Soccer and Social Club, which recently celebrated its fiftieth anniversary. This club is a really important part of my community in that it provides fee-free soccer for juniors. The way this works is that children can play at the club without incurring the normal fees associated with soccer. In return, their parents are required to volunteer and put in significant hours to support the club. This club is a really important part of the community. It provides important sporting activity to young people in an area where many of them might not otherwise be able to participate in sport because of the cost. One of my election commitments was to extend the verandah on the Balga Soccer and Social Club. Through a quirk of history, the clubrooms have a verandah around approximately seven-eighths of the building. There is one bit where it was not built. It is an unfortunate coincidence that the piece without the verandah is where the canteen window is located, where people come to buy their coffee and sausages.

Point of Order

Mr R.S. LOVE: I am struggling to see where this relates to the Legislation Bill. It sounds like a very broad discussion. It would be fine for an appropriation bill, but this is a piece of legislation about drafting legislation. I am wondering where the relevance is.

The SPEAKER: My inclination is to consider it relevant at this point in time, but I bear in mind that you have made a point of order and I will give that further consideration.

Debate Resumed

Ms M.J. HAMMAT: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I was reflecting on the savings that will result from moving to a more digital and online world. Balga Soccer and Social Club will be able to extend its verandah—there is a small cost of only \$12 000 associated with that—which will prevent the canteen volunteers from getting wet all winter or standing in the hot sun all summer.

Mr R.S. Love: I'm glad you could find the correlation!

Ms M.J. HAMMAT: I think it is a really important point that we are able to save funds and, more importantly, save the canteen volunteers from the elements of the weather and, hopefully, ensure they sell more sausages in the future to raise valuable funds.

This bill will improve people's access to information in many ways. I have reflected on the reality that we are now engaged in a more digital world and that this legislation is an important step on the path towards a digital world at both work and school.

Mr Shane Love; Mr Simon Millman; Deputy Speaker; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman; Ms Jessica Shaw; Acting Speaker; Mr Donald Punch; Ms Meredith Hammat; Speaker; Ms E.J. Kelsbie; Ms Hannah Beazley; Mr Chris Tallentire; Ms Christine Tonkin; Mr John Quigley

This legislation is important because, in a way, it will democratise people's access to information so they are able to understand the laws that apply to them and can better access information about their rights. It is important that this legislation improves sustainability and cost-effectiveness, which remain important considerations. We need to ensure that funds are expended on things that will make a real and demonstrable difference to people in the community, rather than on the production of paper records that will perhaps sit in leather binding and be referred to no more.

The final point I will make is that this bill will allow for greater editorial powers and, particularly, for the updating of gendered language in a more streamlined fashion. As someone who has spent some time in my working career reviewing awards, many of which have many references to gendered language, I think it is great that we ensure that the documents that set out legislation are expressed in a way that recognises both men and women.

I conclude by saying that this an important piece of legislation. It is easy to be dismissive of something that could perhaps, at face value, be described as dry, as I think the member for Moore said, and perhaps it is!

Mr R.S. Love: That was the AG, I think.

Ms M.J. HAMMAT: Perhaps it is dry, but it is an important step on the pathway towards a more digital world, which we know we are progressing towards—it will come at us whether we are ready for it or not. Therefore, I commend this legislation to the house as an important step on the road.

MS E.J. KELSBIE (Warren–Blackwood) [7.08 pm]: I would like to add to the debate on the Legislation Bill 2021. It is 2021—can members just hold that thought for a moment. I step back to 1983 when I had just left high school at the age of 17. I then completed business studies and secured my first full-time job with a law firm in an office along the Esplanade. I remember it pretty well. There was lots of dark wood. We had a Wang computer, floppy disks, four male lawyers and a library out the back full of beautiful leather-bound books of the acts published for that year.

One of my jobs was to keep these books up to date. It was one of my favourite parts of my job. The process went something like this: the updates were published and we received them in printed format. I would cut out the relevant bits, find the relevant tome in the shelves and the relevant paragraph or the line and then I would stick the update in with tape or handwrite the update into the book. It was pretty time consuming.

Skip ahead to the late 1990s, I am in my 30s and the internet has been launched. The World Wide Web and electronic publishing are becoming mainstream. I have a job at Curtin University and am getting up to speed with publishing online. I am responsible for updating important documents again in an online capacity this time, as well as in print. In the 90s, print is still how many people prefer their published documents but the trends are starting to change. Updating published materials, managing consistency, style, structure and format is swifter and easier to manage in this modernised world of e-versions.

Now I go back to 2021. The internet and online publishing is now run-of-the-mill. It has been mainstream for a good few years now. Publishing in an online format allows for cost efficiencies, as well as productive efficiencies. I am pleased to support the Legislation Bill 2021, which will enable e-versions and hard copy versions of legislation to have the same legal status. This bill is important as it will enable legislation to be moved into the digital age, improve accessibility, sustainability and efficiency, and provide cost savings. Currently, WA subsidiary legislation is accessed through several different channels, including via the printed version of the *WA Government Gazette* and electronically via the Western Australian Legislation website. Most people accessing legislation prefer to use the e-version. It is quicker, searchable by keyword and accessible from a range of platforms, including a smartphone, tablet and computer. This bill will ensure that e-versions have the same legal status as hard copy versions and will allow for all published and consolidated versions of WA subsidiary legislation, along with WA acts, to be accessed from one convenient, one-stop shop via the WA legislation website.

Readers can be confident that the legislation they access electronically is accurate and can be relied on. This bill will bring WA into line with most Australian and overseas jurisdictions. It will modernise our systems. This move not only makes sense from an access point of view, but also creates a significant cost saving of approximately a quarter of a million dollars a year. This money can be better spent delivering other initiatives for people in WA—for example, my election commitment to revitalise and refurbish the Bridgetown and Greenbushes Railway Stations. That \$250 000 could redevelop the Bridgetown Railway Station into office space to accommodate the Blackwood Environment Society and the Blues at Bridgetown music festival.

Point of Order

Mr R.S. LOVE: I know the bar has been set pretty low, but I am struggling to see the relevance of this to the Legislation Bill, which we are discussing.

The SPEAKER: It is a second reading stage debate and it is generally my attitude to allow for a relatively general debate, so long as there is some attempt to make the comments relevant to the legislation. I also listened to the

Mr Shane Love; Mr Simon Millman; Deputy Speaker; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman; Ms Jessica Shaw; Acting Speaker; Mr Donald Punch; Ms Meredith Hammat; Speaker; Ms E.J. Kelsbie; Ms Hannah Beazley; Mr Chris Tallentire; Ms Christine Tonkin; Mr John Quigley

Attorney General's interjection previously and I will seek some further guidance from him if he thinks that comments are not relevant to his legislation. But for the time being, I am prepared to continue to hear from the member for Warren–Blackwood. Although there may be some tenuous links to the detail of the legislation, she is certainly providing an excellent commentary.

Debate Resumed

Ms E.J. KELSBIE: It could also provide for the development of the Greenbushes Railway Station as an interactive display—heritage module—alongside the Bridgetown–Greenbushes Visitor Information Centre and the museum.

With these changes and as people begin to rely less on the printed versions of the *Government Gazette*, further cost savings will occur when the publication is able to move to an electronic-only format. Although cost savings are important, I am also excited about the positive impact that going digital has on our environment. Reducing the need to print legislation will ensure that we are more sustainable in the way that we work and will bring us into line with community expectations about reducing our environmental impact. Less paper will also mean less ink, toner and the packaging and freight that accompanies this. Reducing the need for printing will ensure that we are more sustainable and spend less money.

The Legislation Bill 2021 will mean authorised editorial improvements can be delivered sooner and more easily using the online environment. Imagine there is about 20 years of legislative activity reflecting different approaches to legislative drafting over this period. That is a lot of different styles, structures and formats to try to seek consistency throughout, let alone trying to streamline keywords for ease of search facilities. The bill will enable consistency in format and structure to enable the Parliamentary Counsel's Office to assist with the drafting process and for timely publishing. I, personally, am a stickler for style guides, consistency in proofing, formatting standards, accessible content and copy. I am also a believer that we should provide publishing consistency in legislation to ensure that it is easy to understand and digest and accessible for all who need it. If we expect people to read, use and be bound by legislation, they need to understand what they are reading and have free access to up-to-date and reliable official versions of laws. Currently, any changes that need to be made have to wait for the next available hard copy reprint. The proposed editorial powers in this bill relate to drafting and formatting issues and to citations from other jurisdictions. The Parliamentary Counsel's Office will be able to correct errors, but it will not have the editorial powers to change the substance of the law. This change will bring WA legislation into line with current legislative drafting practices and will allow employees to work more efficiently, for example, by correcting cross-referencing errors in a time-efficient manner.

I am pleased to support this bill; it will modernise the processes for publishing WA legislation, reflect contemporary expectations regarding the official status of online legislation and give people in the Parliamentary Counsel's Office a more useful set of editorial powers so that WA legislation can be kept up to date, including the ability to update grammatical, spelling and punctuation errors on which I am sure they will be well trained.

During my time as an interactive media producer at the BBC, I worked on many sites, including Crimewatch where data security was paramount. As part of our due diligence in publishing in an online environment, we had to ensure that our site was secure, hacker proof and backed up regularly. The WA legislation site is protected by a high level of security. The server hosting the site is in line with current ICT industry security practices and it is hosted behind a state-of-the-art firewall managed by the Department of Justice. It is not like Wikipedia where anyone can update the content; content is modifiable only by using security certificates held by the PCO and from a computer within the PCO network. The site is backed up regularly, with a copy of the website "as built each night" being kept within PCO, backed up locally on the production server as well as being published as a live site. The status of the site is constantly monitored so that any outage can be detected and addressed as soon as possible. The WA legislation website has an electronic certificate that allows people to check that they are accessing the official legislation. The entire site is read only and locked down.

Clause 30 of the bill will permit language that indicates, or could be taken to indicate, a particular gender can be expressed in gender-free terms and practices. This practice of gender-free drafting has been adopted to overcome a male-centric approach to legislative expression, and it is very much welcomed.

The Legislation Bill 2021 will ensure that we modernise our Parliament and bring WA into line with other Australian and overseas jurisdictions. I fully support this bill. Let us get on with it!

MS H.M. BEAZLEY (Victoria Park) [7.19 pm]: I rise to speak in support of the Legislation Bill 2021. The opportunity to increase people's access to their democracy is a noble one. Members of this Parliament can understand the desire to make substantive change for the people they represent. When talking to people in my electorate, I have heard of people's difficulties with understanding governance and political processes. They desire change and up-to-date reliable information but know very little about what is available to them already. Although discussing legislation on legislation may seem a little dry, it is a great opportunity to change how we engage with the public for the benefit of the public and to make the legislation that we fight for work harder for the people of Western Australia beyond these walls.

Mr Shane Love; Mr Simon Millman; Deputy Speaker; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman; Ms Jessica Shaw; Acting Speaker; Mr Donald Punch; Ms Meredith Hammat; Speaker; Ms E.J. Kelsbie; Ms Hannah Beazley; Mr Chris Tallentire; Ms Christine Tonkin; Mr John Quigley

With improved accessibility to the written law, we allow all future legislation to gain greater scrutiny, giving access to a broader diversity of people and greater buy-in to the legislative framework that governs our state. This bill will improve accessibility to the law for all Western Australians. Better public accessibility to laws and confidence of use by regular members of the community is a great by-product of this legislation. Digital versions of legislation are already being used in other regions worldwide and departments such as the Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage in WA.

This bill aims to create an efficient and accessible platform that provides the same rights as current access to hard copy versions of the law. This legislation is an opportunity to bring WA into line with the majority of other Australian jurisdictions regarding the legitimacy of electronic legislative documents. This bill will also create better accessibility for students. Students instinctively turn to online material for learning, particularly domains that act as a database for a one-stop shop of all their academic needs. This bill, digitising legislation, will assist with streamlining the process of research and ensure students' time is well spent in learning rather than attempting to navigate where to source information in a hard copy form.

Kent Street Senior High School in my electorate offers politics and law at an ATAR level, which aims to foster students' understanding of laws to become informed, active and effective participants in the political decisions that affect their lives within society. Students like those at Kent Street may continue their studies at a tertiary level, such as studying law locally at Curtin University, also in my electorate. Meeting students' needs shows them that we are coming into the modern age and that the government is here to support the next generation of skills and knowledge, and that we are capable of meeting our community where they are at in a very simple way to meet growing expectations for ease of access to information. Access at every level of learning and understanding is crucial, whether a member of the community is interested in finding out about one piece of legislation or whether their future career is dependent on their access to a wide range of legislation.

The implementation of this Legislation Bill will result in an efficiency saving of \$250 000 a year. The member for Moore knows what is coming. I do not need to tell the members of this place what a difference this money can make to a multitude of community organisations across our respective electorates. At the moment, this quarter of a million dollars each year is spent on the printing and administration of hard copy legislation and reflects a significant opportunity cost. This amount of savings—\$250 000—can be life changing for many community groups, schools and non-profits. To put this into perspective, to community groups and local schools in my electorate of Victoria Park, \$250 000 is more than the funds needed to install two much-needed new basketball courts at East Victoria Park Primary School or Wilson Primary School, both election commitments of the McGowan government that will soon be delivered. I am looking forward to helping East Victoria Park Primary School get rid of its current “cheese grater” basketball courts, which is what the kids have not so lovingly nicknamed their current basketball courts. I have the feeling that they may not have been updated in the 30-odd years since I attended. The same situation exists at Wilson Primary School, where I know that school community is looking forward to being rid of the large cracks veining its current basketball courts.

Additionally, \$250 000 is more than enough—almost four times more than enough—to help buy a new boat for the WA Disabled Water Ski Club in my electorate of Victoria Park. This disability-inclusive boat has been needed for some time. I am very happy to have made a commitment during the recent election to this great local inclusive sports group. I look forward to seeing people living with disability enjoying water sports on a new boat on our Swan River very soon. Every year, the Victoria Park WA Disabled Water Ski Club works with the WA Disabled Sports Association, also based in Victoria Park, and other community groups to deliver around 900 waterski opportunities for people living with disability. The sum of \$250 000 is more than enough to help the wonderful Connect Victoria Park deliver new energy efficiency measures, as supported by the McGowan government.

Point of Order

Mr R.S. LOVE: I think the \$250 000 has already been spent. Albert the Magic Pudding does not exist to provide for 53 members of Parliament to stand up and talk about spending \$250 000 each.

The SPEAKER: Thank you, Deputy Leader of the Opposition. That is your point of view. Each of the members is entitled to say how they believe the money could be spent in a worthwhile manner in their electorate. They are effectively making the same point. I am not going to rule some people in order and other people out of order. It is an illustrative point that money saved means that money can be spent on other things. I have allowed it for the other speakers and I will certainly be allowing it for the member for Victoria Park.

Debate Resumed

Mr D.T. Punch: And very useful things too.

Ms H.M. BEAZLEY: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Absolutely, minister.

Mr Shane Love; Mr Simon Millman; Deputy Speaker; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman; Ms Jessica Shaw; Acting Speaker; Mr Donald Punch; Ms Meredith Hammat; Speaker; Ms E.J. Kelsbie; Ms Hannah Beazley; Mr Chris Tallentire; Ms Christine Tonkin; Mr John Quigley

Connect Victoria Park provides access to affordable housing for people over 60 on low incomes, and creates opportunities for older adults to connect, engage with community and age healthily, which I am sure the member for Moore would support.

In addition to residential units on Mackie and Cargill Streets in Victoria Park, Connect also runs a well-known community venue, The Homestead, also on Mackie Street. At the moment, older community members can attend regular fitness and exercise classes, a creative writing group, and meet others to go for a walk or bike ride. I know that that group is looking forward to the new cycle and pedestrian bridge that we are building parallel to the Causeway from Victoria Park to Perth. A lot more activities and festivities are available at the Homestead. It has been a joy to be able to join residents and locals at these events.

For the last three years, Connect Victoria Park has also been implementing Western Australia's first Village Hub, building a community of people over 55 who help each other, share knowledge and skills and work together to enjoy full and purposeful lives, which was particularly relevant over the last year of COVID-19. In delivering our election commitment to Connect Victoria Park, the McGowan government will be delivering \$60 000 to Connect for energy efficiency measures, including solar panels, batteries and LED lighting. The Connect team estimate that this \$60 000 investment will save it around \$200 000 over the next 20 years, easing pressure on rents to its residents and allowing for investment in other key areas. This investment also helps minimise Connect's environmental footprint.

The efficiency saving of \$250 000 a year saved by the Legislation Bill is enough to pay for new basketball courts at East Victoria Park Primary School and energy efficiency measures at Connect Victoria Park, or new basketball courts at Wilson Primary School and a new disability-accessible boat for the WA Disabled Water Ski Club. These are some of the election commitments that the McGowan government and I made during the recent election, and indicates that cutting costs like this can assist in providing much-needed services to our community. More savings like this means more opportunity for investment in other areas that desperately need assistance. It is always important to keep in mind why we make savings. It is not just to bank them; it can be to ensure moneys are invested where they will make the best impact.

This Legislation Bill will improve sustainability. It will allow the government to transition to an online only *Government Gazette*, which means far less paper. Similar to the way the McGowan government is diversifying our energy sources and investing in renewables, we need to move away from paper as a form of communication and move to more sustainable measures that will provide an ongoing and efficient solution to information dissemination. We have invested \$35 million towards processing materials, such as paper, in recycling plants. Reducing the need or demand for paper products in this form will reduce the demand on these recycling facilities and allow for other materials to be recycled and repurposed. Moving to online platforms means more trees are kept standing, which acts as a natural carbon sink and assists with our goals of a just transition to a net zero public sector in Western Australia.

Along with all these benefits from a relatively simple legislative change, the new Legislation Bill 2021 will also allow for editorial improvements. Legislation, new and amended, will also be delivered sooner, keeping in line with community and judiciary expectations of accessibility to the most up-to-date legislation. Importantly, these new editorial allowances will not allow the Parliamentary Counsel's Office to change the substance of the law. That is what Parliament does, which keeps the integrity of the legislative process intact. The new editorial powers will include the ability to update language indicative of gender. This will allow the Parliamentary Counsel's Office to change expressions in existing legislation that have previously indicated gender in the text and replace it with neutral terms. This includes changing "his" and "her" to terms like "a person" and "their". This will improve inclusivity of all people in our community, no matter how they identify themselves on a gender basis.

Increasing accessibility to the written law is increasing accessibility to democracy itself, giving rise to a more robust democracy and allowing people with vision impairments to easily enlarge texts, children to be able to quickly search the definition of words and new migrants the ability to quickly copy and paste legislation into a translator, diversifying the voices that legislation can actively speak for because we have diversified the voices that can read it.

In speaking to the Legislation Bill, I am reminded that in this place, even though we may think we are speaking on something dry and somewhat ironic, such as speaking on legislation about legislation, everything we do is important. Everything we can do can have much wider positive implications or otherwise than we may initially realise. I look forward to the passage and implementation of this bill.

MR C.J. TALLENTIRE (Thornlie) [7.32 pm]: I am very pleased to rise to speak to the Legislation Bill 2021. I begin by commending the Attorney General for bringing it to this Parliament, as the previous bill unfortunately did not get through the last Parliament. It is really important legislation. I know that economists talk about the ingredients of the perfect market. They say that there have to be many buyers and sellers.

Mr R.S. Love: You're not going to spend the same quarter of a million dollars, are you?

Mr C.J. TALLENTIRE: We will see the validity of the member for Moore's interruption.

Mr Shane Love; Mr Simon Millman; Deputy Speaker; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman; Ms Jessica Shaw; Acting Speaker; Mr Donald Punch; Ms Meredith Hammat; Speaker; Ms E.J. Kelsbie; Ms Hannah Beazley; Mr Chris Tallentire; Ms Christine Tonkin; Mr John Quigley

The SPEAKER: Member for Moore, if you are going to continue to interject, you will only delay matters further, which will make your interjections rather irrelevant to the point you are making.

Mr C.J. TALLENTIRE: It was a pointless interjection; thank you, Speaker.

The perfect market depends on the free and perfect flow of information—the equal flow of information—and there being many buyers and sellers. I put it to the member for Moore that the perfect democracy needs the good free flow of legal information. People must have equal access to legal information, and that is what this bill will do. It will democratise access to legislation, and that is a very valuable thing.

I recall back in the early 1990s when I was getting into various forms of activism; in fact, one of my first episodes was at Curtin University, which wanted to impose a very hefty sum on students who were undertaking professional practice in the workforce. I was able to go to legislation and check on the validity of that and see whether it was legitimate, but I had to find hard copy legislation in the early 1990s, which involved a little bit of a carry-on. I had to get the guidance statement that came with subsidiary legislation. I think it was in the domain of the Administrative Appeals Tribunal. There was quite a rigmarole. During that time, legislation was just coming online; we were just entering into the phase of all legislation coming online, so it made the task much easier.

Mr R.S. Love: It's already online.

Mr C.J. TALLENTIRE: I am talking about in the 1990s and the evolution of things.

Mr R.S. Love: The legislation is already online now.

Mr C.J. TALLENTIRE: I am talking about the evolution of things. I am giving a little bit of context to this. I am not sure whether the member for Moore understands that.

The SPEAKER: The member for Thornlie is less than two minutes into his speech, so I think we will let the member for Thornlie continue and he can expand his argument.

Mr C.J. TALLENTIRE: Thank you, Speaker.

The point is that as we have enabled people to consult legislation online, we have democratised the whole process. Until quite recently, there was a bit of subtext or a watermark on the online legislation that stated that it was not to be quoted directly. Perhaps the Attorney General can elaborate on this point, but I think that is no longer the case because we are moving towards having the real piece of legislation online. That is how things have progressed.

Going back to my professional career prior to coming to this place, I often had yellow hard copy versions of various acts of Parliament on my desk—in my case, the one that particularly interested me was the Environmental Protection Act—and I would not be sure whether I was looking at the amended version, so I would have to check. It really has been a very important development that we have the latest versions of legislation online. It is a great help to us.

It has made a big difference to the community. I have been lobbied on this legislation by my constituents. One person who began lobbying me on this legislation back in early 2020 is no longer one of my constituents—that is how long things have taken. Because of the frustrations with the passage of legislation in the other place, my former constituent was really disappointed to see that the Legislation Bill 2018 was not passed. I will quote from my former constituent Kelly Underwood.

Mr R.S. Love interjected.

Mr C.J. TALLENTIRE: I think the member for Moore's interjections have proven unworthy so far, so I will ask for the Speaker's protection to no longer hear them, because they are not valid.

The SPEAKER: Member for Moore, the member for Thornlie has been on his feet for only four minutes. He has advised that he is not welcoming your interjections, so I ask you to desist from interjecting, please.

Mr C.J. TALLENTIRE: Thank you, Madam Speaker. If interjections are worthy, I will take them, but I will no longer take them from the member for Moore, I am afraid.

Kelly Underwood, my former constituent, made this point to me —

Hi Chris,

I don't know if you can get this going again, but it'd be lovely if you could—the *Legislation Bill 2018* has been languishing, unloved, in the Upper House since 31st October 2018.

Kelly Underwood is a professional law librarian. She is very well versed in this and very aware of the benefits that this legislation will bring to her professional life and to the people of Western Australia. Kelly went on to say —

Now, to most people it wouldn't mean much, but for a law librarian it's a rather important Bill, and we'd love it to be passed. Indeed, there are projects at work that I can't progress on until this Bill is passed and brought into force —

Mr Shane Love; Mr Simon Millman; Deputy Speaker; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman; Ms Jessica Shaw; Acting Speaker; Mr Donald Punch; Ms Meredith Hammat; Speaker; Ms E.J. Kelsbie; Ms Hannah Beazley; Mr Chris Tallentire; Ms Christine Tonkin; Mr John Quigley

This is really interesting —

I have (estimated) 870kg of paper, sitting, waiting for Parliament’s movement.

I think the point that Kelly is making is that that is the weight of the paper that will be saved on an annual basis. Just one or two arms of government will see that amount of paper saved. Kelly was concerned about this languishing bill, and she went on to say —

Maybe optics would help? I’m sure I could round up a mob of suitably cranky law librarians to march on Parliament; we’d probably have a few ring-ins from the wider legal fraternity too. Maybe we could get barristers in robes to attend?

Imagine that on the front steps of Parliament! She adds —

The odd Supreme Court Justice? The environmentalists would probably be on board too, considering that we’d be able to use quite a lot less paper.

Either way, if you could nudge the right person in the right direction, it would be a great help.

The perspective of a professional user of legislation who can see the benefits of the online system is a really valuable contribution to this debate, so I thank Kelly. As a passing note, we keep in touch via social media. I am not that fond of social media but, of course, as a parliamentarian, I have to use it. I am very appreciative of the fact that Kelly contacts me through the social media medium that I prefer the most—that is, Strava. It is the one on which people log their ride or run or other physical activity. I encourage my constituents to get in touch with me via Strava. I think it is a very worthy way for people to keep in touch with their local member and at the same time see whether their local member is looking after their physical wellbeing. It is a good way to go.

This legislation will be extremely valuable. I note that the Department of Justice website Western Australian legislation page and the State Law Publisher website mention the “Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International Licence”, which I believe is the licensing arrangement and part of the copyright procedure. Perhaps the Attorney General can clarify whether that means there is no problem with someone copying a chunk of electronic text and quoting it in a letter to a member of Parliament or to a government department to show that they have a point, they have looked at the relevant legislation and their thoughts are well grounded. The legal certification of the right to copy and use legislation under this legislation needs to be fully understood.

Legislation like this, which enables more people to readily access the laws of the land, is very welcome indeed. We want people to have confidence that they can consult legislation quickly. From time to time, we have all heard people on talkback radio saying things that we know straightaway are false and not researched. Often urban or rural myths are put about because people hear things but do not know that they can readily access the real information. Having legislation available online is already serving to dispel myths. Having the final black-letter law available online will help people to feel really confident that they are seeing the law of the land as it stands. It is something that we can promote. If people have doubts about legislation and want to check things, we can direct them to the law of the land as it stands online. That is a very positive development.

I commend this bill to the house and I look forward to it going through the other place this time. I note the comments by other members about the very slow passage of legislation in the last Parliament and the filibustering on other legislation that meant that worthy legislation such as this bill could not get through. Fortunately, I hope we will not see that level of filibustering ever again in the Western Australian Parliament.

Mr R.S. Love interjected.

Mr C.J. TALLENTIRE: Member for Moore, I will tempt fate and take your interjection.

Mr R.S. Love: We’ve had three hours of filibustering tonight.

Mr C.J. TALLENTIRE: The member’s side is incapable of contributing to the debate. If it was not for members on this side of the Parliament, there would be no discussion.

Mr R.S. Love interjected.

Mr C.J. TALLENTIRE: If the member is dismissing my contribution that included comments from my constituents, he is insulting the people of this state who want to hear about this legislation. I think that is disgraceful. The member is not giving due credit to people who are interested in the passage of this legislation and want to know that their local member of Parliament is engaged on the topic and supportive of it because they can see what the benefits will be.

I support this legislation. It is an excellent use of the Parliament’s time that we have debated it, but we saw a wasteful use of parliamentary time in the other place in the previous Parliament. This legislation has been properly discussed here and I look forward to hearing other members’ contributions, perhaps during the consideration in detail stage, which will further show our constituents that we are careful legislators and that we give legislation due

Mr Shane Love; Mr Simon Millman; Deputy Speaker; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman; Ms Jessica Shaw; Acting Speaker; Mr Donald Punch; Ms Meredith Hammat; Speaker; Ms E.J. Kelsbie; Ms Hannah Beazley; Mr Chris Tallentire; Ms Christine Tonkin; Mr John Quigley

consideration and do not just rubberstamp it through. We test legislation and pose what-if scenarios so that there is a proper vetting and checking of everything we pass through this place. I commend the bill to the house.

MS C.M. TONKIN (Churchlands) [7.45 pm]: In rising to support the Legislation Bill 2021, I am not going to perform any loaves-and-fishes miracles with the undoubted savings that will arise from the enactment of this legislation.

I first opened an email account in 1994 and had that same address until the internet service provider that provided it was closed in February of this year. I have been using internet banking since 1998. I was a very early adopter of this facility. In 2008, I successfully applied for mortgage finance online from the comfort of my office at a peacekeeping mission in El Fasher, Sudan. I have worked internationally as a consultant and have managed complex change management processes remotely with stakeholders in a Caribbean country 12 time zones away. My international career was enabled by the use of the online domain.

It is therefore with some surprise that in mid-2021 I speak here in support of a piece of legislation that in my estimation represents a very long overdue modernisation. It is a pity that this legislation did not pass in 2018. What is important about this legislation is its object—providing for Western Australian legislation to be publicly available. That is an incredibly important objective because it brings accessibility to our laws to everyone. The legislation will give official status to Western Australian legislation in both hard copy and electronic form, and confer power on the Parliamentary Counsel to make certain editorial changes so that Western Australian legislation can be kept up to date, modernised and simplified, and errors corrected without the need for Parliament to enact the changes. That is a marvellous efficiency measure. These changes will provide for the more effective communication of our law, for efficiency and for greater accessibility.

The opposition seemed somewhat hesitant in supporting the provisions of the bill that relate to authorising the Parliamentary Counsel to make editorial changes to WA legislation. However, there is a very clear overriding constraint on the exercise of this power—that it cannot change the effect of the law. All Australian jurisdictions, New Zealand and comparable jurisdictions such as the province of Ontario in Canada empower the exercise of editorial powers as part of updating versions of the law. I also note the dates of comparable legislation. The commonwealth Legislation Act dates from 2003, the Victorian Interpretation of Legislation Act dates from 1984 and the South Australian Legislation Revision and Publication Act dates from 2002. We are merely playing catch-up with legislation in comparable jurisdictions.

The ruling by Madam Speaker today to allow women members to breastfeed in this place also gave me goosebumps, as it did the member for Wanneroo. The bill before us provides for the use of gender-neutral language, such that the words “he” or “she” will be replaced with the relevant pronoun. Gender-neutral drafting is being adopted to overcome the male-centric approach to legislative expression. This provision of the bill is significant because it enhances the relevance of legislation to all Western Australians. Language matters. The use of inclusive language makes our laws more accessible and understandable. Although it may appear on the face of it that this legislation is as dry as the bottom of a cocky’s cage—as one of my colleagues so colourfully noted—it is actually timely, promotes efficiency and economy, and, most significantly, promotes inclusion and accessibility.

MR J.R. QUIGLEY (Butler — Attorney General) [7.51 pm] — in reply: I wish to thank all members for their contributions during the second reading debate on the Legislation Bill 2021 and the unanimous support for the bill in bringing the publication of legislation and subsidiary legislation into the twenty-first century, with its publication online having the same efficacy as it used to have with hard copy.

I am conscious of the hour and the time that members have given to this bill, and in particular I would like to address each of the concerns raised by the opposition through the advocacy of the member for Moore. The first matter raised by the member for Moore was the extent of the editorial powers proposed to be granted to Parliamentary Counsel by this bill. The editorial powers in part 3 of the bill are, in part, reproducing the editorial powers that currently exist in the Reprints Act 1984. Parliamentary Counsel consulted extensively on the additional editorial powers that we are seeking in order to provide up-to-date legislation that is consistent with current drafting practice. Parliamentary Counsel issued a public discussion paper in December 2016. This was made available online and responses could be made via an online survey, or via email or letter. Emails inviting submissions were sent to a large number of legal stakeholders and others considered to have an interest in the proposals. Twenty-one submissions were received, mostly from WA government agencies, and an overwhelming majority of submissions supported the proposed enhancements.

There was some feedback on the proposals, particularly the power to renumber legislation. Some government agencies pointed out that renumbering provisions would have implications for non-legislative material that refers to legislation and suggested that the Parliamentary Counsel’s Office consult with affected agencies about the proposal to renumber provisions. Some submissions also expressed concern that enhanced powers be exercised conservatively in order to ensure that they did not change the law. The Parliamentary Counsel’s Office appreciates these concerns and will take them into account in considering the appropriateness of the exercise of powers in each individual

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Tuesday, 1 June 2021]

p1022b-1050a

Mr Shane Love; Mr Simon Millman; Deputy Speaker; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman; Ms Jessica Shaw; Acting Speaker; Mr Donald Punch; Ms Meredith Hammat; Speaker; Ms E.J. Kelsbie; Ms Hannah Beazley; Mr Chris Tallentire; Ms Christine Tonkin; Mr John Quigley

case and the consultation that should be undertaken as part of that consideration. The Parliamentary Counsel's Office currently takes, as members will have noted, a very conservative approach to the exercise of the current reprint powers, and will continue to do so.

I now refer to the proposed editorial changes. The member for Moore queried, and justly so, whether these might have some negative or unforeseen consequence. In answer to that legitimate query, I would like to say, first and foremost, that the proposed additional editorial powers in part 3 of the bill cannot be exercised to change the law. That restriction is already in the current Reprints Act 1984. I refer the member for Moore to clause 23(3), which states —

Subsection (1) does not permit a change to the text of a law if the change would change the effect of the law.

Secondly, the ability to change grammar, spelling or punctuation errors currently exists in section 7 of the Reprints Act. The bill seeks to expand the ability to make changes, such as where it reflects current drafting practice rather than just errors or inconsistency. For example, drafting practice now reflects the spelling of “programme” as “program”. The Parliamentary Counsel's Office currently takes a very conservative approach to the exercise of the current reprint powers, and will continue to do so.

The member for Moore also raised a legitimate concern: how will one be able to track changes to legislation and how will it be laid out or available on the website? The answer to this is found at clause 41(1), which requires Parliamentary Counsel to ensure that editorial changes to a law are indicated in a suitable way. Clause 41(2) provides examples of ways this might be done. For example, the Parliamentary Counsel's Office might provide a comparison between versions of the enactment, or an indication of the change might be included in the current enactment. Similar requirements to identify the exercise of editorial powers are imposed by the relevant laws of the commonwealth, the Australian Capital Territory, Queensland, New Zealand and the province of Ontario in Canada. Clause 42 requires every annual report of the agency principally assisting in the administration of a bill to include a summary of the editorial changes to the law in the financial year covered by the report. The lead speaker for the opposition also asked to what extent will the amount of editing be subject to review. The answer to this is that editorial changes made do not get considered by Parliament and do not receive royal assent; however, an annual report submitted to Parliament will contain a summary of editorial changes made to the law in the financial year to which the law relates. That requirement is to be found in clause 42(2).

The lead speaker for the opposition also posed the question: what laws will be published on the WA legislation website? I think this was the last of the substantive questions the member asked in his contribution to the second reading debate. The following laws will be published on the WA legislation website: all acts as originally acted, all acts that are in operation with their amendments incorporated, subsidiary legislation as made by Parliament, subsidiary legislation as amended, imperial enactments that are part of WA's laws, proclamations that bring one or more provisions of an act into operation and, finally, instruments made under royal prerogative that apply in WA and have legislative effect. Clause 10 of the bill requires all acts originally enacted and all acts that are in operation with their amendments incorporated to be published on the WA legislation website. Clause 10 also provides for regulations to prescribe subsidiary legislation that must be published on the WA legislation website. Clause 10 also provides for regulations to prescribe other laws that must be published on the WA legislation website. An example of laws that might be prescribed are a collection of imperial enactments that are part of WA law. Parliamentary Counsel's Office does not currently have a comprehensive collection of this material because there is no definitive list of it. An example of an instrument made under royal prerogative that applies in Western Australia and has legislative effect are Letters Patent Relating to the Office of Governor of the State of Western Australia 1986.

Clause 10(2) provides that Parliamentary Counsel may publish on the WA legislation website other material that is prescribed or that Parliamentary Counsel considers appropriate for the website. An example of material that might be described under clause 10(2)(a) are versions of laws that are applied as laws of WA. This could include the Australian Consumer Law that is applied as a law of WA by the Fair Trading Act 2010 and the National Gas Law that is applied as a law of WA by the Natural Gas Access (WA) Act 2009. Both of those laws are currently shown in notes to those acts. The notes are updated as amendments to the laws applied in WA. Other jurisdictions such as New South Wales produce versions of the laws of these kinds and publish them on its legislation website as standalone documents. This makes them easier to find. If prescribed under clause 10(2)(a), under clause 10(3) the bill applies as if the reference to a law were a reference to the material. This means that versions of the material will have official status and where appropriate, the editorial powers can be exercised. Examples of the material that can be published under clause 10(2)(b) are public versions of Parliamentary Counsel's own drafting manual and style manual when these become available.

I hope that in my reply to the member's second reading contribution on behalf of the opposition I have addressed in detail the substantive questions to the bill raised by the opposition and I thank him for raising it and giving me the opportunity thereby to answer them in detail to Parliament this evening. I also want to thank all members who made a contribution this evening to this bill and, as I said, it is somewhat dry in its content. It is technical and it is

Mr Shane Love; Mr Simon Millman; Deputy Speaker; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman; Ms Jessica Shaw; Acting Speaker; Mr Donald Punch; Ms Meredith Hammat; Speaker; Ms E.J. Kelsbie; Ms Hannah Beazley; Mr Chris Tallentire; Ms Christine Tonkin; Mr John Quigley

very important legislation, as the member for Moore has identified. I commend the bill to the chamber and thank members for their contribution.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

[Leave denied to proceed forthwith to third reading.]

Consideration in Detail

Clauses 1 and 2 put and passed.

Clause 3: Object of this Act —

Mr R.S. LOVE: Clause 3 can change the objects of the act. Clause 3(2)(c) states —

conferring power on the Parliamentary Counsel to make editorial changes so that, in appropriate cases, Western Australian legislation can be kept up-to-date, modernised and simplified, and errors can be corrected, without the need for the changes to be enacted by Parliament.

Could the Attorney General or Parliamentary Counsel explain what process would be followed to identify what constitutes an error and who would be responsible for identifying that particular error?

Mr J.R. QUIGLEY: The errors are identified by a number of sources, including agencies. When we are doing legislation that refers to legislation with the wrong clause, the errors are often amended in the minor amendments bill that comes regularly before Parliament. It might be a numbering error or minor error and we bring these forward before Parliament from time to time, as the member would be aware, in the Statutes (Repeals and Minor Amendments) Bill.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 4 to 8 put and passed.

Clause 9: Purpose of WA legislation website —

Mr R.S. LOVE: Clause 9 outlines the purpose of the website to —

... provide, in a timely and efficient manner, free public access to accurate, up-to-date and reliable official versions of laws.

Clause 13 refers to what happens if there is an issue. I wonder whether there is an alternative record of the up-to-date law of the land or is it all contained just on some website? At the moment, we still have a lot of paper records. If we cast ourselves forward in 10 years and we are completely reliant upon some website, what happens if there is some sort of catastrophic cyber event and the website disappears? Is there an alternative repository of the law of the land other than the website that is mentioned in clause 9 and subsequently in clause 13?

Mr J.R. QUIGLEY: The original file is kept secure so that, in future years, from the secure repository, a reprint of the act can always be made. One can go to the website and ensure that what one is reading on the website is the consolidated enactment. Often people pull out an act and they do not have the up-to-date version. Now members of the public will be able to go to the website and see the up-to-date version. Within the repository, at all times in the file, the original version will be held.

Mr R.S. LOVE: Where is the original version kept? It is not on the website. The original version is the version that is published on paper in Parliament. Presumably, if we follow the intent of this act, there will be edits and changes will be made over time, which may or may not be through Parliament. Are those changes kept somewhere else as well or is it just the original versions on the website?

Mr J.R. QUIGLEY: Every version is made available on the website so people will be able to track the changes by going back.

Mr R.S. LOVE: If there is a cyber attack or some sort of event happens, I would hate to see all of Western Australia's legislative background disappear overnight. I wonder whether a backup—a seed bank of legislation—is kept somewhere.

Mr J.R. QUIGLEY: That is right. A copy of the legislation website, as built each night, is kept within the Parliamentary Counsel's Office on an internal server, backed up locally on the production server, as well as published on the live site. It is all backed up.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 10: What is published on WA legislation website —

Mr R.S. LOVE: Clause 10 refers to what is published on the website. I understand that the acts are published as originally passed and acts with their amendments incorporated. The Attorney General spoke about some of

Mr Shane Love; Mr Simon Millman; Deputy Speaker; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman; Ms Jessica Shaw; Acting Speaker; Mr Donald Punch; Ms Meredith Hammat; Speaker; Ms E.J. Kelsbie; Ms Hannah Beazley; Mr Chris Tallentire; Ms Christine Tonkin; Mr John Quigley

the older information that might be there, going back in time. I am not a lawyer, so I do not play around with these things, but clause 10(2) refers to what may be published on the WA legislation website including any other material that is prescribed or that the “Parliamentary Counsel considers appropriate for publication on the website.” Parliamentary Counsel determines what they consider appropriate for publication on the website. Could the Attorney General give some examples? Would it be local laws for the City of Subiaco about the control of dogs? Does it include local planning schemes? Is it fish management programs and plans under the Fisheries Act? What are we talking about being considered appropriate for publication on the website?

Mr J.R. QUIGLEY: It is not our local government by-laws. Clause 10 provides that Parliamentary Counsel may publish on the WA legislation website any other material that is prescribed or that Parliamentary Counsel considers appropriate for publication on the website. As I said, examples of material that might be prescribed under clause 10(2)(a) are versions of the laws that are applied as laws of Western Australia. These could include the Australian Consumer Law that is applied as a law of Western Australia by the Fair Trading Act 2010 and the natural gas law that is applied by the WA Natural Gas Access Act 2009. Both those laws are currently shown in notes to those acts. The notes are updated as amendments to the laws are applied in Western Australia. This is the same as in New South Wales and in other jurisdictions.

Mr R.S. LOVE: I refer to the explanatory memorandum. It refers to things that Parliamentary Counsel may publish that is not a law. The material may be prescribed by regulations or other material that Parliamentary Counsel considers appropriate for publication on the website. I am still not really sure exactly how it is determined what is appropriate to be published. What are some examples of things that are not a law? The Attorney General outlined laws in other jurisdictions, but what is an example of what might be published according to what the explanatory memorandum describes as not a law?

Mr J.R. QUIGLEY: Certainly. I cannot prescribe in the future things that might be hypothetical, but as I said in my second reading speech in reply, things that are not laws includes Parliamentary Counsel’s own drafting manual on how to draft a law and Parliamentary Counsel’s own style manual on how a bill will be set out in the style of the law. These are not laws but these are matters that Parliamentary Counsel considers appropriate that the public gets to see.

Mr R.S. LOVE: What is published on the WA legislation website is obviously different from what is currently published in the *Government Gazette*. In the *Government Gazette*, there are a lot of other matters such as local planning schemes and local government local laws. Another example at the moment is that the Department of Water and Environmental Regulation is looking at promulgation through regulation of the issue of environmentally sensitive areas under its act. Will the Parliamentary Counsel’s website eventually overtake the *Government Gazette* as the repository of all these matters or is it to be restricted to some other form of publication? I am still not sure exactly what determines what will go in the *Government Gazette* and what will go on the PCO’s website. I want a bit of guidance on what the boundaries will be between the two.

Mr J.R. QUIGLEY: It is the WA government legislation website so all subsidiary legislation must be published on it. I refer the member to clause 10(1). The explanatory memorandum states —

Subclause (1) also requires the publication of prescribed subsidiary legislation as originally made and with its amendments incorporated, and any other prescribed laws. Provision for prescribing the subsidiary legislation to be published on the website is because PCO proposes to take a staged approach to changing the way in which WA subsidiary legislation is published.

A large proportion of the subsidiary legislation that is currently published in the *Gazette* consists of material drafted by PCO. This includes regulations, rules for WA courts and tribunals, various orders, by-laws and most proclamations. Because this material is in a standard style and format, it can easily be published on the WA legislation website.

Mr R.S. LOVE: I think I read that in the explanatory memorandum. It explains the difference between the information that is drafted by Parliamentary Counsel’s Office and what is on the website. Is the Attorney General saying that only information, legislation or subsidiary legislation drafted by the PCO will be on the website?

Mr J.R. QUIGLEY: A significant amount of subsidiary legislation, such as local laws and other material that is currently required to be published in the *Government Gazette* is, as the member says, not drafted by Parliamentary Counsel’s Office. It is not in a standard style and format, and the publication of the WA legislation website would not necessarily be straightforward because it is not in the same format. Further, there may be alternatives to publication in the *Government Gazette*, other than publication on the WA legislation website, that would better suit the nature of the material provided or provide a better way of making it available to users, such as the publication on a departmental website, like on the Department of Water and Environmental Regulation website.

Clause put and passed.

Mr Shane Love; Mr Simon Millman; Deputy Speaker; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman; Ms Jessica Shaw; Acting Speaker; Mr Donald Punch; Ms Meredith Hammat; Speaker; Ms E.J. Kelsbie; Ms Hannah Beazley; Mr Chris Tallentire; Ms Christine Tonkin; Mr John Quigley

Clauses 11 to 21 put and passed.

Clause 22: Requirement or authority to publish or notify in *Gazette* —

Mr R.S. LOVE: This clause relates to the publication and notification of WA legislation on the website instead of in the *Government Gazette*. What is the eventual expectation for the *Government Gazette*? Will it fall away? Will it no longer be required in the future or is it going to continue in its current form? Will that, in a way, replicate two systems instead of one? How does that achieve a degree of efficiency and also make matters clearer and transparent for members of the public when they are looking for information?

Mr J.R. QUIGLEY: Legislation and subsidiary legislation will be published live on the WA government legislation website. The Department of the Premier and Cabinet is responsible for the WA *Government Gazette*, and other notices and information that do not form part of legislation or subsidiary legislation will still be published in the *Government Gazette*. The *Government Gazette* will still remain in print.

Mr R.S. LOVE: It says that if a written law or instrument is, or is to be, published in the *Government Gazette*, it is sufficient for the instrument to be published on the WA legislation website instead. How will the authority know where it is going to be published? Will a process be outlined so that government agencies or departments know where their instrument will be published?

Mr J.R. QUIGLEY: Subsidiary legislation does not come into effect until it is published in the *Government Gazette*. This clause means that once it is published on the website, it will have the same effect as it used to have when it was published in the *Government Gazette*. If someone wants to find out about a current regulation under any act, they will be able to go to the WA website and not have to go hunting through the *Government Gazette*.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 23: Parliamentary Counsel authorised to make editorial changes —

Mr R.S. LOVE: We are now at “Part 3 — Editorial changes to legislation”. Clause 23(1) states —

The Parliamentary Counsel may make an editorial change to a law in producing a version of a law.

Can the Attorney General explain exactly what this subclause means when it states “in producing a version of a law”? The law will be produced by Parliament and then Parliamentary Counsel will make an editorial change and produce a new version of the law. Exactly what does that mean?

Mr J.R. QUIGLEY: For example, when Parliament amends a law by changing some words in a clause, as we do from time to time in updating legislation, Parliamentary Counsel will be able to make an editorial change to what is on the screen to give effect to the new law that is published as a consolidated section. In doing so, if it requires renumbering, Parliamentary Counsel will be able to do that.

Mr R.S. LOVE: Clause 23(3) states —

Subsection (1) does not permit a change to the text of a law if the change would change the effect of the law.

That is important, but will that always be determined absolutely by Parliamentary Counsel? If a comma is taken out here or an “and” is put in there, or some other similar change is made, will I know that that will not change the effect of the law? Will there be some protection or some sort of instruction to the courts that a change to the ordinary language does not necessarily change the intent, as it has been ordinarily accepted, of the law? If I read a paragraph before an “and” or a comma or a full stop has been removed, or an apostrophe has been added, how do I know that that does not fundamentally change that law? What guarantee is there that the intent of subclause (3) will always be reflected in the outcome?

Mr J.R. QUIGLEY: Parliamentary Counsel takes a very conservative approach to this and has done since the passage of the Reprints Act 1984, section 7 of which gives Parliamentary Counsel some editorial power to do minor affectations to a law without changing the meaning of the law. Parliamentary Counsel, of course, drafts the bills for this Parliament, is well practiced in that and has more than 30 years’ experience in the exercise of the editorial power conferred by the Reprints Act to effect those that can be affected without changing the meaning of the law. It has been doing so for decades in a conservative manner.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 24 and 25 put and passed.

Clause 26: Things that have been changed or replaced —

Mr R.S. LOVE: We are talking here about things that have been changed or replaced. Clause 26(1) states —

A reference to a name or title of a body, office, person, place, locality or other thing that has been changed can be replaced with the name or title as changed.

Mr Shane Love; Mr Simon Millman; Deputy Speaker; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman; Ms Jessica Shaw; Acting Speaker; Mr Donald Punch; Ms Meredith Hammat; Speaker; Ms E.J. Kelsbie; Ms Hannah Beazley; Mr Chris Tallentire; Ms Christine Tonkin; Mr John Quigley

In relation to a developing trend of having dual place names such as Noongar or Yamatji, or whatever the language group is, with a European or previously accepted place name, will the PCO be able to reflect that change of name or place, or will it need to be put through some other process? I note that dual naming has become quite the trend of late in various areas. I am not expressing a view either way about that, but I wonder how that will unfold in future.

Mr J.R. QUIGLEY: The Swan River, for example, is commonly now called Derbarl Yerrigan, but in any legislation, Parliamentary Counsel would not change the name of Swan River to Derbarl Yerrigan. Parliamentary Counsel can effect a change in legislation only if some other statutory body changes its name for some reason, for example, if a committee, as part of the Legal Profession Act, changes the name of one of the statutory committees, or the Legal Practice Board changes its name. But as the member said, names like Derbarl Yerrigan are in common usage. Parliamentary Counsel will not be able to unilaterally go round changing legislation that refers to the Swan River by supplanting it with Derbarl Yerrigan. It can only reflect some other body changing its name.

Mr R.S. LOVE: If the Geographic Names Committee or some other authorised group changes the name of a location, will that be something PCO takes forward? If the committee that looks at the names of various locations, streets and formations in the state changes the name from Swan River to Derbarl Yerrigan, will that be something the PCO automatically picks up or will it need to be enacted through some other process?

Mr J.R. QUIGLEY: Some other process will need to be enacted to make it happen. If by some other means a name or designation of something had been legally changed through a local government authority or the State Planning Commission, Parliamentary Counsel can reflect that in the legislation so that no-one is confused. If they realise that the State Planning Commission has changed the name of something, it can be reflected in legislation.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 27 to 31 put and passed.

Clause 32: Conjunctives and disjunctives —

Mr R.S. LOVE: We are talking here about conjunctives and disjunctives being inserted, omitted or changed to be consistent with current drafting practice. Can the Attorney General explain for people such as me, not being a draftsman or a lawyer, who might look at this and know that if a paragraph contains “and” that means “and”, but if it appears at the end of a series of paragraphs, it appears to mean something different. Can the Attorney General explain what that example is about, because as a simple farmer, I am a bit lost to understand exactly what that means? I am sure that the Attorney General will explain to the chamber exactly how that will operate in practice.

Mr J.R. QUIGLEY: Most helpfully, the bill includes an example of what the member referred to. The main circumstance under which this sort of power is intended to be used is when a series of paragraphs include items, sub-items or similar provisions, but not all the paragraphs end with a conjunction. Previous drafting practice was to include a conjunction only after the second to last paragraph on the basis that the same conjunction was implied before each of the earlier paragraphs. However, current drafting practice is to include a conjunction after every paragraph for clarity so that no-one is going back and inferring the conjunctive in the earlier paragraphs or subparagraphs.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 33 put and passed.

Clause 34: Minor errors and inconsistencies —

Mr R.S. LOVE: This is about the correction of minor errors and inconsistencies. Clause 34(2) states —

A law can be changed so as to correct a minor error in the law.

Can the Attorney General explain to me what exactly is “a minor error in the law” and who would define it as a minor error in the law?

Mr J.R. QUIGLEY: Minor errors are actually defined in clause 34(1)(a) to (j). Subclause (2) will empower Parliamentary Counsel to correct any of those minor errors that can be seen in subclause (1). I will not read them all out, but they include a typographical error, a grammatical error, a spelling error, or, as in paragraph (h), an error in reference to a law or provision of the law where it refers to the wrong section of another law. Subclause (2) gives power to correct the minor errors described in subclause (1).

Mr R.S. LOVE: That is the answer I expected I would get, but I was asking more about who determines whether something is a punctuation error or an error that is borne out purely of a poor process as opposed to the actual intent of the law being changed. Is it possible that there might be a misunderstanding about the lawmaker’s intent, so Parliamentary Counsel will be tidying up some sort of minor error that changes the law when it was not intended or necessary to do so? Is there a reference to any group who might have oversight of whether something is a correction of a minor error? I am specifically referring to any parliamentary oversight of the changes to correct the law that have been undertaken by the PCO.

Mr Shane Love; Mr Simon Millman; Deputy Speaker; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman; Ms Jessica Shaw; Acting Speaker; Mr Donald Punch; Ms Meredith Hammat; Speaker; Ms E.J. Kelsbie; Ms Hannah Beazley; Mr Chris Tallentire; Ms Christine Tonkin; Mr John Quigley

Mr J.R. QUIGLEY: Firstly, there has been an editorial power for decades. Secondly, it is only ever used conservatively. Thirdly, there has to be an obvious error. Finally, the annual report of the Parliamentary Counsel's Office will report on editorial changes.

Mr R.S. LOVE: We have already passed the clause that relates to the report. The report, as such, would not be a disallowable instrument; it is just a report that someone could raise an issue with.

Mr J.R. Quigley: You could go back.

Mr R.S. LOVE: We could go back, but I do not think it is necessary. I would not have assumed that the report was in any way disallowable. It would be something that we could raise as a matter of interest. When the actual correction is made, is that reported to anybody at that time so that another body can determine whether it is a correction of a minor error or something more substantial?

Mr J.R. QUIGLEY: I take the member forward in the bill to clause 41, which states —

- (1) If an editorial change is made to a law, the Parliamentary Counsel must ensure that the change is indicated in a suitable way.
- (2) Without limiting subsection (1), an editorial change can be indicated as follows —
 - (a) by providing a comparison, or the facility to create a comparison, between versions of a law;
 - (b) by including, in the law in which the change is made, an indication of the change.

Mr R.S. LOVE: I was going to talk to clause 41. Without jumping forward, that is about understanding what changes have been made at the time and the recording of that change. Is there a group that will specifically have some sort of oversight of the corrections or the changes that the PCO will make under this legislation so it can know in the prescribed time, if you like, to take some action or to make some issue of it? Otherwise, the change could happen and the time to contest, review or question the necessity for such a change will have passed.

Mr J.R. QUIGLEY: That is the beauty and facility of this bill; it will happen in real time. Under clause 41, Parliamentary Counsel has to indicate that. At the moment, Parliamentary Counsel already has this editorial power, but people do not know about it until after it is in print. Now they will know about it in real time. If a member wants to raise it in this Parliament and ask a question on notice or without notice, they will be able to do so in real time because these editorial changes will be happening live at the end of each day, whereas at the moment, when they happen, they just get lost in paperwork for months and are not drawn to anyone's attention until the annual report comes out. Someone will be able to follow it live at the end of the day.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 35 to 40 put and passed.

Clause 41: Recording of editorial changes —

Mr R.S. LOVE: We have briefly touched on this already. When I look at clause 41, "Recording of editorial changes", it gives me some comfort to note that the comparisons and the changes will be known. If an editorial change is made by the PCO, will an explanation be given for the reason for the change or will it just be shown as a version change without any explanation?

Mr J.R. QUIGLEY: It will just be shown as a version. The only changes that can be made are the minor amendments to which we referred earlier. They will be obvious and they will be made and people will be able to see the changes that have been made at the end of each day if they want to go back and examine the legislation.

Mr R.S. LOVE: During the second reading debate, I mentioned the need to have some sort of key or indicator that a change has been made to a particular piece of legislation. I do not know how many acts are on the website, but if there are hundreds of acts that may or may not be changed, how would I know that the change has been made? Is there a requirement of this recording of changes other than the annual report, which I will find out after the fact? Will there be some explanation of what changes have been made recently in real time, even on a daily rundown, so that I do not have to trawl through an act just to see whether a change has been made to it? Will I be alerted when a change has been made to legislation that I have an interest in, which is published of itself, just to inform me of the change?

Mr J.R. QUIGLEY: No, there will not be a running sheet of what has happened in the office each day. The change will come up live on the legislation—what it was and what it has changed to. As the member quite rightly averred, section 42 will require a compendium of those changes to be published in the annual report.

Mr R.S. LOVE: Clause 41(1) states —

If an editorial change is made to a law, the Parliamentary Counsel must ensure that the change is indicated in a suitable way.

Mr Shane Love; Mr Simon Millman; Deputy Speaker; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman; Ms Jessica Shaw; Acting Speaker; Mr Donald Punch; Ms Meredith Hammat; Speaker; Ms E.J. Kelsbie; Ms Hannah Beazley; Mr Chris Tallentire; Ms Christine Tonkin; Mr John Quigley

The Attorney General is telling me that “a suitable way” means that it is just done within the legislation; it is not published on the website, indicating that a change has been made to the Dog Act 1976, for example. It will not alert me to the fact that a change has been made to that act. I would have to look at each act to ascertain whether a change had been made. That seems rather onerous to me. It does not fulfil what would look to be the plain reading of the intent of clause 41(1).

Mr J.R. QUIGLEY: There is no legislative requirement for an explanation of minor amendments to be given on a daily basis. We referred to those minor amendments earlier, in clause 22, I think. They will just appear in the legislation. If the member looks at the Dog Act, he will be looking at the latest version and he will see that there has been an editorial change. He will not be able to track every editorial change that is made during a working day, not that there will be that many. As I said, a compendium of the editorial changes made by the office will be published annually. That is happening already, but the member will not see it live; he will have to wait for the annual report.

Mr R.S. LOVE: If we wish to achieve an open and transparent system, why would those changes not be published on the website as they are made so that people could see that on a certain day, the PCO looked at the Dog Act and some changes were made? If I am a dog breeder, I would like to know what the changes are. I do not see a problem with recording in some way a running sheet of changes that have been made. I cannot imagine that every act of Parliament would be changed daily. It could not be that onerous to record it in the legislation as a blue note or whatever and also have a note on the website showing that on a certain day, a particular act was updated.

Mr J.R. QUIGLEY: The real effect of making a change is to clean up the actual act, so it is better to look at the act. If someone is looking at the medical act or whatever, they will see the change. At the end of the year, they will see a compendium of those changes. At the moment, there is no legislative requirement for all these changes to be listed in the annual report. They are already happening. This will not change anything. It will only make it live and transparent for people.

Mr R.S. LOVE: I note that the heading of this clause is “Recording of editorial changes”, so they could be recorded in the legislation as outlined in subclause (2). I go back to the fact that we are talking about a website. It costs nothing to publish. We are not cutting down trees to provide this information to the public. As the change is made, how difficult would it be to include it in a daily report of the workload of the Parliamentary Counsel’s Office? I would have thought it would not be difficult and that it could be provided under this clause. I will not die in a ditch over it, but I just raise it, and others might ask further questions about that in the other place.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 42: Annual report to include summary of editorial changes —

Mr R.S. LOVE: The annual report will include the summary of the editorial changes. When will the annual report be printed? I note that reference is made to the Financial Management Act. Can the Attorney General explain to me when it will have to be printed or reported?

Mr J.R. QUIGLEY: It is usually in August. Sometimes it is in September, but it is usually in August after the end of the financial year.

Mr R.S. LOVE: Will that be tabled in Parliament? How will that be provided?

Mr J.R. QUIGLEY: Yes.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 43 to 64 put and passed.

Title put and passed.

[Leave granted to proceed forthwith to third reading.]

Third Reading

MR J.R. QUIGLEY (Butler — Attorney General) [8.53 pm]: I move —

That the bill be now read a third time.

MR R.S. LOVE (Moore — Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [8.53 pm]: I thank the Attorney General and members for their contributions tonight, and I would like to thank the advisers for hanging out until the later hours of the evening to contribute to the discussion. I think the Attorney General has answered most of the queries I put to him in a fulsome way. Hopefully, the legislation will be interrogated in the other place, but I think it will ultimately lead to more open and transparent information about our legal system for the public. I commend the bill to the house.

Extract from *Hansard*

[ASSEMBLY — Tuesday, 1 June 2021]

p1022b-1050a

Mr Shane Love; Mr Simon Millman; Deputy Speaker; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman; Ms Jessica Shaw; Acting Speaker; Mr Donald Punch; Ms Meredith Hammat; Speaker; Ms E.J. Kelsbie; Ms Hannah Beazley; Mr Chris Tallentire; Ms Christine Tonkin; Mr John Quigley

MR J.R. QUIGLEY (Butler — Attorney General) [8.54 pm] — in reply: I thank all members for their contributions and the opposition for the efficient way in which we have dealt with the consideration in detail stage. I commend the bill to the house.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

House adjourned at 8.54 pm
