

NIB STADIUM DEVELOPMENT — HEADS OF AGREEMENT

Matter of Public Interest

THE SPEAKER (Mr G.A. Woodhams) outlined that he was in receipt within the prescribed time of a letter from the member for Victoria Park seeking to debate a matter of public interest.

[In compliance with standing orders, at least five members rose in their places.]

MR B.S. WYATT (Victoria Park) [2.53 pm]: I move —

That the house calls on the government to —

- (1) release all information on the renegotiation of the nib Stadium heads of agreement, including information held by the Minister for Sport and Recreation's and the Premier's offices and agencies;
- (2) explain the circumstances behind the renegotiation of the heads of agreement; and
- (3) explain the role of Liberal Party lobbyists in influencing the outcome.

This issue has a controversial history. The heads of agreement to which we refer was signed in February 2004 when the then state government was making a relatively smaller contribution of some \$6 million to the redevelopment and some \$4.5 million to the Town of Vincent. As a result of that, we ended up with Allia Holdings as the manager of nib Stadium under that heads of agreement. After the current minister became the Minister for Sport and Recreation, some media in May 2009 highlighted the fact that the stadium may even be moved to a new greenfields site. An article from 16 May 2009 in *The West Australian* noted —

The State Government fears the cost of the Members Equity —

As it was then called —

Stadium redevelopment could blow out to more than \$100 million and make building a stadium at East Perth with a grandstand on one side cost-effective and with better long-term development prospects.

The government is putting in nearly \$100 million of taxpayers' money. In fact, with the \$5 million payment to the Town of Vincent, this is a \$100 million commitment on behalf of the people of Western Australia. The problem is that it is clear that the best deal was not done by this government for the taxpayers of Western Australia. I want to go through some documents that have been provided to the opposition under freedom of information legislation. A Department of Sport and Recreation recommendation to the minister dated 21 June 2010 reads —

The State Negotiating Team ... has been very clear in their view that the State will be taking over a liability which will require capital investment, ongoing investment in maintenance and upkeep as well as the resolution of the existing contracts, the main exposure being the encumbrance of the management contract with ...

Allia —

which expires in 2024.

That briefing note ended with two recommendations to the Minister for Sport and Recreation —

- 1 Whether to submit a counter offer to the Town of Vincent (and if so under what terms and conditions)
- ...
- 2 The State acquires Perth Oval and Loton Park by compulsory acquisition.

The minister rejected both those recommendations, as is his right. Attached to that briefing note was a document titled "ME Bank Stadium — Principles for Business Planning". The third point reads —

The State will determine who manages the facility

Very early on, back when the commitment was only in the region of \$80 million, the Department of Sport and Recreation identified that the heads of agreement under which the manager was appointed needed to be addressed.

A number of emails from July 2010 outline the frustration of the director general, Mr Ron Alexander. Obviously, the mayor, as is his right, pressed the government to resolve this issue. In an email to Nick Catania, the then Mayor of the Town of Vincent, Mr Alexander makes the point —

Speaker; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Mick Murray; Mr Colin Barnett; Acting Speaker; Mr Terry Waldron; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr John McGrath

... the viability of the State investing in this locality may become an issue.

Early on the director general appreciated that if the government wanted to invest this sort of money, it needed to make sure there would be a return to the taxpayer. In an email to Tim Sharp and Ronnie Hurst, who are in the Department of Sport and Recreation, Mr Sloan, the policy adviser to the minister, and others, Mr Alexander writes —

Everyone is very happy to put their hand up for significant benefits while the state takes possession of an ongoing liability, to invest large capital sums and recurrent maintenance and operating costs.

At what stage is this a poor investment and we either purchase in a compulsory manner or go somewhere else?

The director general very early on identified some significant problems with the state investing \$90 million and not seeking or demanding changes to that heads of agreement.

We come now to 21 March 2011. Another DSR briefing note to the minister states that cabinet approved a number of things, including the allocation of \$5 million to the Town of Vincent and \$25 000 a year through VenuesWest. Cabinet also approved —

... subject to the resolution of the existing contract between the ToV and ...

Allia. The DSR briefing note reads “cabinet approved”. I will come back to that in a minute. That briefing note then went on to refer to what the government proposed to do —

Conversely the State who is investing all the capital for the stadium upgrade would receive little in the way of financial return, would be responsible for the ongoing capital investment in the stadium and meet any operational expenses associated with VW’s governance of the stadium. This will be the subject of a future report to EERC.

The briefing note went on to conclude —

The department believes the most appropriate solution for both the State and the sporting codes would be to negotiate a new more equitable agreement with ...

Allia —

which would be agreed to by all parties before there is a commitment to the redevelopment of nib Stadium.

The department recommended that the government sort this out before it committed to spending nearly \$100 million on nib Stadium. I turn to the bit at the back of the document where the minister has to say whether the recommendations are “approved” or “not approved”. The recommendation of the department is —

1. Given the considerable capital and ongoing investment by the State in the redevelopment of nib Stadium, the State pursues Option 3 (attachment 1) ...

I will go through that in a minute. Interestingly, the minister scratches out “approved” and handwrites —

Decision will be made pending further discussions with the Premier.

The department recommends a course of action to the minister. The minister says that he will not do a thing until he has spoken with the Premier. Option 3 is the lease between the Town of Vincent and the state and a new agreement with Allia. The heads of agreement would have needed to be renegotiated to include new key performance indicators. The document states the pros of that option. The department thought that was a good way to go because it gives the state the ability to access revenue sharing for stadium rights and to influence the ongoing subsidy. It states further that the benefit to sports is that it is likely to be welcomed by the sports as they can arbitrate stadium performance issues.

Ultimately, the Premier and the minister chose option 2 of this particular list of recommendations. The problem with option 2—that is, to simply adopt the heads of agreement as signed between the Town of Vincent and Allia Venue Management as part of their own liability—is the cons. Some of the cons, to quote from the department’s table, are as follows —

Some existing clauses unpalatable to State.

Unlikely to provide State with quiet enjoyment.

Sports are unhappy with current arrangements—high cost and inefficient.

We knew before this document was ultimately signed on 13 March this year that the state was unlikely to get quiet enjoyment, despite the fact that it is spending nearly \$100 million on a capital upgrade of this stadium. So

Speaker; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Mick Murray; Mr Colin Barnett; Acting Speaker; Mr Terry Waldron; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr John McGrath

here we have a situation in which Mr Alexander, the Director General of the Department of Sport and Recreation, is recommending a very clear course of action. The minister says, “I don’t approve that”, and handwrites in, “I want to speak to the Premier about this, and then I will make a decision”.

On 28 April 2011, a clearly frustrated director general, Mr Alexander, emailed Mr Nick Sloan, who I understand is the minister’s policy adviser, and said —

Nick

This has been a very invidious position for us. As you are aware ...

That part is exempted, but it is Allia —

have employed the Liberal Party lobbyists to work on Govt for them ... trying to ensure that we develop a strong negotiating position has been difficult with ...

Allia —

and Nick Catania dealing directly with The Premiers Office and our Ministers office at will. We never have been given the authority to get on and ensure the communities \$90m + is wisely spent.

Every time one of them doesn’t like something they run off to higher office and we have to deal remotely with third hand information, hearsay and rightly or wrongly the feeling of not being heard or supported on occasions.

The email goes on to say —

The State will still be subject to ...

Allia —

as manager and the ToV —

That is the Town of Vincent —

as landlord and will have additional ongoing expenditure towards lifecycle maintenance costs at nib stadium while receiving little of the revenue benefits from the development.

Why would the minister not accept that very clear, concerned advice from Mr Alexander, the director general? Why would he handwrite in, “I need to speak to the Premier”? It is because the Premier is dealing directly with Liberal Party lobbyists, who are promoting a very clear course of action.

Mr C.J. Barnett: Can you repeat that? I missed what you said about the Premier and the Premier’s department officers.

Mr B.S. WYATT: As the email from Mr Alexander to the minister’s office said, every single time that he and the department try to develop a strong negotiating position, Allia/lobbyists and Nick Catania deal directly with the Premier’s office, and it is the Premier’s office that gets in the way of Mr Alexander, the Director General of the Department of Sport and Recreation, in trying to develop a strong negotiating position on behalf of the people of Western Australia. That email was in response to an email sent to Mr Alexander from David Etherton, the chief executive officer of VenuesWest. Interestingly, this was an email of the same date, following on from a meeting that Mr Etherton had with the minister and a gentleman by the name of Graham Partridge. To quote from this email —

He —

Being the minister —

also advised us that the decision had been made to in essence go with a very similar HOA to the one that is currently in place, without any complicated negotiations about improving the States position etc.

Graham and I confirmed we would of course take on nib stadium in the format that the government determined and advised that these two decisions obviously meant that the state wouldn’t see much benefit directly from the redevelopment because the operational and management costs for complying with the current style of HOA and lease would be considerably higher than they otherwise might have been. The Minister advised that the decision had been made to just get on with it and not unduly delay things.

That is, “not unduly delay things” with such annoying issues as, to quote, “improving the state’s position”. So we now know that the director general is saying, “We need this course of action; we need to renegotiate the management contract.” We know now that, after the minister’s discussions with the Premier as a result of

Speaker; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Mick Murray; Mr Colin Barnett; Acting Speaker; Mr Terry Waldron; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr John McGrath

lobbying by Liberal Party lobbyists, as pointed out in the director general's email, the minister made a different decision.

Another briefing note from the Department of Sport and Recreation notes, "It is okay. On 28 April you made the decision that you will simply take over the heads of agreement from the Town of Vincent." But it goes on to warn the minister—this is, again, from the director general—that should the state decide to continue the existing HOA and licence conditions, the state has to accept a number of things. Those things include: under the existing HOA, the state has no way to derive any significant revenue from an \$88 million investment; the state has little power to guarantee priority access to the facility, as Allia has the right to determine priority of use; the existing HOA gives the sports little chance to negotiate better terms of use in their future agreements; and the state will be required to fund considerable ongoing operational capital costs, with Allia required to make only a minimal allocation to the facility. It goes on to note that the department believes that the most appropriate solution for both the state and the sporting codes would be to renegotiate and get a new and more equitable agreement.

So we have a situation in which the government is saying, "No, we want to go down our own path; we are not interested in spending time negotiating a better outcome for the state", and Mr Alexander, to his credit, is pushing back against the minister and the Premier in respect of that path. The emails go on to make the point that clearly Allia then itself starts to push back and tries to get a better outcome for itself.

Mr Alexander makes the point in an email of 17 August 2011 —

Did anyone mention to ...

That is either Allia or Mr Tana as the owner —

that he may be better off due to the fact that the State/community is investing \$100m + plus in his business and he's the major beneficiary!!!

Mr Sloan in the minister's office then sent back an email back saying, "I think that point may have been missed." Perhaps it was the role of the minister to make the point to Allia and the owner of Allia that the state is injecting such significant moneys into nib stadium that perhaps the state might want to achieve a better outcome for the people of Western Australia.

I have made the point that Mr Alexander has said that Liberal Party lobbyists are getting in the way of him, as the Director General of the Department of Sport and Recreation, putting themselves in a strong bargaining position, because ultimately the department has been told, "Transfer the heads of agreement as it currently is; do not try to negotiate a better outcome."

The final document I want to quote into *Hansard* is an email dated 19 August 2011, to Mr Sloan, and again from Mr Alexander —

Nick

It's worth you being across this. The delay is one thing or another. Usually an unreasonable request loaded in ...

Allia's —

favour and not just a straight transfer as directed by the Premier.

Ron.

I repeat that: "as directed by the Premier".

There are lots of questions —

Mr C.J. Barnett: What is your point?

Mr B.S. WYATT: Apparently the Premier has not been listening to a word that has been said. What is clear is that the Director General of the Department of Sport and Recreation is saying, "If you, minister and Premier, are going to inject \$100 million into nib Stadium, you need to sit down and negotiate a better outcome for the taxpayers", on a number of different issues that I have just gone through. The Premier was out of the chamber. That is not my problem. There are a number of problems. This is no longer a small investment by the state. This is a big investment. The Premier needs to negotiate a better outcome.

The minister says, "I don't agree with that; I need to speak to the Premier", and then Mr Etherton says, "I've just met with the minister, and he says we're going to hand it straight over; we're not going to bother with any undue delays by negotiating a better outcome for the people of Western Australia." Mr Alexander in frustration says, "We've not been able to get ourselves into a strong negotiating position because the Premier has said"—as directed by the Premier—"Just hand it straight over—a direct transfer. Don't spend time negotiating a better outcome for the state." The state did, before it signed it last week, have a very strong bargaining position,

Speaker; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Mick Murray; Mr Colin Barnett; Acting Speaker; Mr Terry Waldron; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr John McGrath

because it was going to give \$100 million. If you cannot get a better outcome, if you cannot renegotiate that contract when you have \$100 million to invest, then when can you do it? The state has missed a huge opportunity. Mr Alexander makes the point that that is as a result of Liberal Party lobbyists bypassing him and going straight into the Premier's office, and the Premier then saying to the minister, "Directly transfer it, minister. You get on and do it." The Minister for Transport says he does not believe those emails. This is an email from Mr Alexander, the Director General of the Department of Sport and Recreation.

I will conclude with one final email of frustration from the director general to Michael Cutler, which reads —

Michael

Perhaps you could forward to Richard M.

This is ridiculous. ...

Allia —

wants the money and control , just an annoying pest.

Maybe we could consider walking away and building at Belmont or Burswood ,this is going nowhere fast and the chances of a conflicted outcome are high Ron.

Madam Acting Speaker, the minister needs to get to his feet now as there are a lot of questions that he needs to address. Hopefully, the Premier may, on a rare occasion, get up and respond to this MPI.

MR M.P. MURRAY (Collie–Preston) [3.12 pm]: I find this extraordinary. The Premier has come into this house and said that he has a government that holds the highest standards, but to hear the previous speaker and to look at those emails certainly shows another side to this Premier. It really is extraordinary. At the same time that there is \$100 million at the Premier's discretion, he is not listening to the department. This is really extraordinary. At the same time that he is increasing prices and the cost of living, he is taking no caution at all about where he throws his money around. The footprints on all this point to here. The Premier has overridden his minister and the department. I would like to hear what the Premier has to say very shortly, because there is a certain arrogance that is coming out of this government that will cost him in the long term. When he came to government, he spoke about openness and accountability. He used those words on many occasions, yet we are seeing more and more often that that is not the case. It is, "Do as I say. Go and get it done, and I don't care at what cost." That is what has happened here. When other arrangements could have been made, as was recommended along the line by the department, these have not been followed. The Premier has just said, "Get it done." The Premier has gone to his minister and said, "I don't want to know about the finer details. I want to get it done. We need to. We have to show on the ground that we have done something." Most projects that are on fire around the state at the moment are Labor-instigated projects. That is why he is starting to panic. Here we are, 11 months out from an election, and the Premier is now getting very nervous about the lack of success of his own projects: "I am going to bully them through. I am not going to talk to the director general; I am going to talk to the lobbyists and follow their line, because I believe they are the people who will give me the right advice." That is the wrong way to go about this, Premier, and he knows that very well. He has said on lots of occasions that other people do it in the wrong way. I am telling the Premier now that he has this one wrong.

There are reasons why he has it wrong. He has deleted the council from the game. He has gone out without due respect to what the department has said on a contract worth \$100 million. Looking at that trail of emails that the member for Victoria Park has just gone through, the Premier has just disregarded that advice. He has overridden his minister, who in this very house this week was praising the stadium and saying how good it was, but he did not tell us how smelly the rest of the department was. He said, "Yes, we've got it done, but we've only half done it. We have an agreement; it is a great agreement." But when we look at that agreement, there are holes in there relating to how it was put out.

The Premier owes the state an explanation. When it is his turn to speak today, he needs to make it very clear how he went about his business. That is not the standard he tells other people that they should have.

MR C.J. BARNETT (Cottesloe — Premier) [3.15 pm]: It is a bit hard to respond to a matter of public interest when the first two speakers failed to actually make a statement as to what is the point of the motion. I do not know what I am accused of. What is the government accused of?

Mr B.S. Wyatt: Read the motion. Have you looked at the motion?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I have read the motion, but what is the point? What are we accused of? Here we have a motion by the opposition, but the opposition cannot actually say what is the point or purpose of the MPI.

Mr B.S. Wyatt: What the hell are you talking about? You must have walked out for longer than I thought. Were you listening to a word?

Speaker; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Mick Murray; Mr Colin Barnett; Acting Speaker; Mr Terry Waldron; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr John McGrath

Mr C.J. BARNETT: Yes.

Mr E.S. Ripper: You acted against the public interest.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: Oh—I acted against the public interest; I allegedly dealt with a lobbyist. Is there anything else?

Mr B.S. Wyatt: You undermined the state's position.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I undermined the state's position. Is there anything else? What is the point of this?

Mr B.S. Wyatt: Sit down and let the minister respond—if you're going to be like that.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Victoria Park!

Mr M. McGowan: You need to explain yourself —

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I do not need to explain myself.

Mr M. McGowan: — and the role of lobbyists in your office in influencing public policy.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: For the benefit of members, let me take members through the history of this project—a project that will start construction in July and will be fantastic. I think the relevant point, to start off, and the member for Victoria Park did start at this point —

Several members interjected.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: Charming.

In 2003, the then Town of Vincent entered into a heads of agreement for the management of nib Stadium. That heads of agreement with Allia—obviously, Allia is owned by Nick Tana, who would be known to most members of this house—was the mechanism by which the stadium was managed. It provided Allia with certain rights over a 20-year period—in other words, up to 2023. That was the starting position. The state government decided that we would take a different approach on stadium development and that we would redevelop the nib Stadium as the rectangular stadium. We made originally an \$82.5 million commitment. That ended up with some additions that were agreed upon. In August 2011, the final commitment was \$95 million—that being the revised scope of works for the stadium and work on the pitches, change rooms and all the rest.

In October 2011, the now City of Vincent approved a state lease over nib Stadium, because clearly we were not going to put \$95 million into a stadium if we did not have secure title over that stadium. It was agreed in an amicable agreement with the City of Vincent that the Western Australian government would lease the stadium for a 50-year period. That involved a \$5 million payment to the City of Vincent, which, I might add, allowed it to redevelop the Beatty Park swimming precinct. That was the agreement. We would provide \$5 million, and it would go ahead with the redevelopment of Beatty Park. It was a good outcome. In addition, the state negotiated that we would pay a \$25 000-a-year lease payment. I think that was a pretty good deal. If putting in nearly \$100 million, the state had to have security over the life of that asset.

One of the complications, obviously, was the heads of agreement and what happened to that? The simplest way of dealing with that was for the state to take on the obligation. Therefore, we took on the heads of agreement between the City of Vincent and Allia. We said that we would take that on, and then we would renegotiate. The City of Vincent was not going to be able to renegotiate it; it was not building the new stadium. It was logical that the purchaser would take on that obligation. That was agreed. It was a sensible arrangement. Indeed, only recently, the now Mayor of Vincent, Hon Alannah MacTiernan, has praised the whole project. It is a good project, because we are, as members accused us of, actually getting on with it.

That is where that is. The tender has since been let for construction. Construction will commence in July 2012, and the construction of the stand will be completed in February 2013. The Minister for Sport and Recreation will probably say more about this, but there will be a roofed east stadium; an unroofed south stadium; upgraded lighting; a new pitch with better drainage; replacement and extension of the ticketing booths; new pitch access; new concourses for the movement of cars and pedestrians; conservation works to the north west entry gates, which are quite famous; large video screens included; action playbacks; and upgrades to the public address system, security cameras, control room and so on. A pretty good deal, I would think; pretty popular, I would think, amongst both rugby and soccer fans, given that they will have covered seating and total capacity for the ground of about 21 000, through a very good state government investment. I do not know what the opposition would have against that. I would have thought that was a fantastic outcome for both rugby and soccer. I will go to the opening and we will invite members opposite along and hope they are gracious enough to come.

What the opposition seems to be getting excited about is the heads of agreement. I do not deny for a moment that it was a difficult situation to renegotiate.

Speaker; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Mick Murray; Mr Colin Barnett; Acting Speaker; Mr Terry Waldron; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr John McGrath

Mr B.S. Wyatt: Mr Alexander points that out.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: Yes, but the heads of agreement held by Allia, and Nick Tana in particular, still had to run through to 2023. This heads of agreement had a long way to go. I hope he does not mind me saying this, but when we started looking at the rectangular stadium, Nick Tana and I had a private conversation at a soccer game, I think, in which he made the point to me that he supported the redevelopment. He gave me a commitment that he would not interfere and he would not frustrate the development. Indeed, he said to me that if it was necessary, he would step aside to allow us to do it. But, having said that, he quite properly had a commercial interest and he is entitled to look after his commercial interest. I have no difficulty with that at all, because we were basically asking him whether he was prepared to walk away from a contract that ran through to 2023. He wanted to look after his staff, the commitments he had made and all of that. The state government said that we would not leave that to the City of Vincent; it was logical that it get out of it and get on with Beatty Park, leaving the state to get on with the redevelopment of the stadium and the renegotiation of the heads of agreement with Allia as the operator. I think that is a sensible way of dividing responsibilities.

There was a further division of responsibility between me and the minister. Because of some of the complexities of the heads of agreement, the agreement that we have within government is that the Minister for Sport and Recreation would get on with the sporting side—namely, the types of facilities, the development of the stand and the ownership of the facility through VenuesWest. The minister would get on with the physical project of developing the rectangular stadium. Meanwhile, the Department of the Premier and Cabinet and I took on responsibility for the renegotiation of the heads of agreement. I think that is a pretty sensible arrangement. Therefore, the sports minister got on with what he had to do—that is, redevelop the facility; I and the Department of the Premier and Cabinet took responsibility for the commercial renegotiation of the heads of agreement. That commercial renegotiation was complex and took some time, and there were many, many meetings over that. The final renegotiation, the conclusion of that, was negotiated personally by Peter Conran as the Director General of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet.

I want to make a few observations about that. The Director General of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet became fully involved in those negotiations from September 2011 to try to bring a successful conclusion. The parties to those negotiations included the City of Vincent, but to a lesser extent, Allia, the Department of Sport and Recreation and VenuesWest. The State Solicitor also provided advice to government and the state negotiating team throughout the process, so we were working on the State Solicitor's advice at all times. The outcome was an agreement between the state and Allia that assigned the original heads of agreement between the Town of Vincent and Allia to the state. That was the first major process. The proposed heads of agreement was considered by cabinet and agreed in February last.

The director general has informed me that to the best of his knowledge there was no involvement or role of any lobbyist in any negotiation in which he was involved.

Mr B.S. Wyatt: Fake email!

Mr C.J. BARNETT: No involvement. Listen to me: there was no involvement by a lobbyist through those negotiations.

Mr B.S. Wyatt: Ha ha!

Mr C.J. BARNETT: The member giggles away, but that is the truth.

Mr B.S. Wyatt: I am giggling away because I think you're misrepresenting the truth.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: There was no involvement.

Several members interjected.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: No involvement of lobbyists through the negotiations on the heads of agreement.

Mr M. McGowan: This is a privileges issue; you are misleading the house.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: Oh! The Director General of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet has advised me that he had not met or spoken to any lobbyist seeking to influence or comment on any one of the negotiations of the heads of agreement.

Several members interjected.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I will get to that. Neither I nor any member of my staff has been contacted by a lobbyist with respect to the heads of agreement. So, no negotiation, no involvement with me, my office staff or the director general in the negotiation of the heads of agreement, and the member's whole motion today is about the

Speaker; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Mick Murray; Mr Colin Barnett; Acting Speaker; Mr Terry Waldron; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr John McGrath

heads of agreement. That is why I asked the member: what is your point? The member did not answer. What is the member's point?

Mr B.S. Wyatt interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms A.R. Mitchell): Member for Victoria Park!

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I listened to the member in silence —

Mr B.S. Wyatt: No, you didn't!

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

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I understand that Nick Tana or Allia has a lobbyist employed, but that lobbyist is to advise on whatever else—there is nothing wrong with that, to seek advice—but there was no involvement of a lobbyist in any negotiation around the heads of agreement.

Mr B.S. Wyatt: So, what were you speaking to Allia about?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I am trying to answer, Madam Acting Speaker. Nick Tana had spoken to me about the project, when we were at the early stages—I said that—at the soccer. I made that very clear in my opening comment. There is nothing wrong with that all.

Mr B.S. Wyatt interjected.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: Madam Acting Speaker, I am trying to address the topic.

Mr B.S. Wyatt interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Victoria Park, I call you to order for the second time today and I ask you to remain in silence while the Premier responds.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: A lobbyist—I gather the member is talking about Mr Everingham —

Mr B.S. Wyatt: I never mentioned a name.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: No, but I imagine that is who the member is alluding to; I imagine the member is talking about Mr Everingham. Paul Everingham, as a registered lobbyist, made some telephone calls to my office. He did. Those telephone calls were prior to the negotiation of the heads of agreement, and they were of a generic nature, such as “What are you thinking about for the stadium? When's it going to happen?” They were of a generic nature long before —

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Albany, would you please keep quiet. There are no further conversations at the back of the room. I call you to order for the first time today.

Mr P.B. Watson interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Albany, I call you for the second time today—make that the third; I did not realise you had been called earlier in the day.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: Mr Everingham made contact with my office, and I understand that he had one meeting with a member of my staff, but that was at the early stage and they were generic discussions about the project and how we would go about it. I again repeat that there was no contact between me, my office or the director general and any lobbyist during the process of negotiating the heads of agreement, and that was the point raised. All those things are available.

What do we have at the end of the day? Yes, we have a government that made a decision to develop a rectangular stadium. Yes, we have a Minister for Sport and Recreation who has got on with it and negotiated with the codes about what facilities are required and done all the planning that is leading now to tenders, and construction is about to get underway. I did not want the work of the minister and his agency distracted by ongoing and potentially difficult negotiations over the heads of agreement. That relatively minor part of the project —

Several members interjected.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: It is minor! The heads of agreement is the minor component; the big dollars is for the construction of the stands. That is why we took the lease for 50 years. I took it that that would be negotiated —

Mr M.P. Murray interjected.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: What is the member saying?

Speaker; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Mick Murray; Mr Colin Barnett; Acting Speaker; Mr Terry Waldron; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr John McGrath

Mr M.P. Murray: You put him in the back pocket while he did the job.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: Yes, I took responsibility as Premier to see that those negotiations out of the heads of agreement were resolved in a timely way, and they have been. There are amendments to that heads of agreement; changes have been made. One of those relates to termination, because we had to make a choice: do we terminate that agreement now? I understand Mr Tana was amenable to that, but that meant that the state would have had to pay out that agreement. That would have cost the state a great deal of money. Therefore, we took a decision that Allia was providing a service. From my observation, it was providing a pretty good service, so we agreed to allow Allia to continue, but we also now have a clause that allows for termination. If the state becomes dissatisfied for whatever reason, we have the capacity to, if we like, buy out that contract. However, I do not want to buy out a contract when the person with the contract is providing a service. I would rather that he continue the service and be paid as the service is provided. To simply go out and buy out the contract for an unknown sum would be a waste of taxpayers' money. Let him continue his contract. Hopefully he will do it well and the ground will be well provided for. What is wrong with that? We inherited a decision with a contract until 2003. We have continued that contract. We have made some changes to the clauses to give protection to the state. We leased the whole facility off the Town of Vincent for 50 years. We gave it \$5 million so it could fix up Beatty Park. The Minister for Sport and Recreation and VenuesWest have negotiated all the improvements. Construction of a new eastern stand will commence very shortly. Then work will start on the open southern stand. At some time in the future I hope the whole ground is completed and we will have a purpose-built rectangular stadium. I ask members to tell me what the point is and tell me what is wrong with that. I cannot see anything wrong with that.

MR T.K. WALDRON (Wagin — Minister for Sport and Recreation) [3.31 pm]: I would like to quickly offer a bit of history and then I will refer to the heads of agreement and some of the points that have been raised today. The Premier covered some of the history, in particular, the early allocation of \$82.5 million. In August 2011 we made some changes, particularly to support the sports bodies—I will come back to that in a moment—and corporate areas to give them the ability to earn more money and to overcome some of the issues the member for Victoria Park spoke about. The state's lease over nib Stadium was approved in 2011. On 13 March we signed that lease agreement with the Town of Vincent. The heads of agreement was signed on 13 March this year. It was a long, very complex and, at times, frustrating process. However, we have come to the end of that process. I will talk about that heads of agreement in a moment.

I have a bit of time so I will talk about the redevelopment itself. When I explain what we have done and the changes we have made within the heads of agreement, members will be able to see that this facility actually delivers for the state and it will deliver for sport in the state and assist the sports.

The member for Collie–Preston referred to the comments I made in the house. The eastern stand is a temporary stand. It has been there for a long time. It is getting to the stage at which it is dangerous for the public. I have seen people out there on hot and wet days. It is terrible for the sporting public. People in Western Australia like their rectangular sports. We are doing something about the stand. We are replacing that temporary scaffold seating on the eastern side. It will be a modern grandstand that will include new toilet areas, food and beverage outlets and a corporate section, which I will come back to. We are also looking at a barbeque terrace, which I think will be a great innovation. It is important to recognise what is included in this whole project because this is what will benefit the sports. The member for Victoria Park talked about the benefits to the sports. This is what it is about. The project will also include new sports lighting; a new pitch; maintenance work to the heritage gates; a new entry to gate 4, which the Premier spoke about; a new PA system and closed-circuit television; two new video screens; and upgrades to the south east entrance. The Department of Sport and Recreation has a great record of providing facilities on time and under budget, such as the rugby facilities.

Mr B.S. Wyatt: They're not bad at providing advice either.

Mr T.K. WALDRON: I will come back to that. I get lots of advice. That is fine. At the moment we are investigating whether we can do some work on the southern stand; that is, do more within the budget allocation, if possible. We cannot finalise that yet but if that is possible, we will do that. We have put plans in place should that be possible. We might be able to do something to further improve some of the seating at the northern end. I flagged that some time ago, saying that if it was possible, we would look at that. One thing I have learnt from the stadium trip and since I have become the sports minister is that at times we think about everything else but we forget about the fans. The Premier and I talked about this. The Premier made a strong point when he said that we want to look after the fans. When I looked at that ground and attended games, that was my focus—to deliver for the fans. We received advice and there was a push to start at the other side and work on the Fred Book Stand. We made the decision about the stand on the east. We probably did not take that advice either because we made the decision to put the fans first and work on the eastern stand.

Speaker; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Mick Murray; Mr Colin Barnett; Acting Speaker; Mr Terry Waldron; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr John McGrath

There has been quite a bit of talk about the capacity of the stadium. Its current capacity is 21 254. When it is completed, it will come down a little and its capacity will be around 21 000. The difference will be that fans will be able to sit in comfort in good stands with shelter and good amenities; they will not be sitting out in the boiling sun or the pouring rain. During construction, the capacity of the stadium will be reduced to around 10 000. Other figures have been floating around that are incorrect. That has always been known and it has been discussed with the sports bodies.

Mr B.S. Wyatt: Will there be any compensation payable as a result of that?

Mr T.K. WALDRON: There may be.

Mr B.S. Wyatt: How much?

Mr T.K. WALDRON: I do not know at this stage. It depends when we do it. That is something that we will discuss at that stage. We will not have to worry about that with the new stadium. There are issues with nib Stadium, just as there are when improvements are done to Subiaco Oval. We will lose some of the capacity while we are doing the job. The same occurs when we build a new road; we have to close a couple of lanes. It is inconvenient for a while but the long-term benefits are much better.

In relation to the heads of agreement, I think the member for Victoria Park mentioned the figure of 204. It does not matter, but it was 203. That is the mechanism under which the stadium is managed on a day-to-day basis. The Premier said that Allia Venue Management has certain rights over a 20-year period. I will not go through all of that because I think the Premier covered most of that. I want to talk a little about dealing with Allia et cetera. I think Allia does a really good job. Yes, there are issues at times with the sports bodies; the sports have issues with management at times. We need to remember that there is a heads of agreement and there are also licence agreements between Allia and the sports, which the sports sign up to —

Mr B.S. Wyatt: Did they end up showing you those?

Mr T.K. WALDRON: We are aware of those agreements. I am not sure of the full particulars of them.

Mr B.S. Wyatt: So you didn't take that advice from Ron Alexander either.

Mr T.K. WALDRON: I ask the member to listen for a little while. I listened to the member; I did not interrupt him once. When I visit stadiums in the eastern states, overseas and here in Perth, wherever I go there are issues between the stadium management and the sports. The sports always want to get it as cheaply as they can, and rightly so. As minister I always try to assist sports wherever I can. We subsidise sports—basketball is a good example of that—and we assist sports. The people who are managing have to ensure they survive as well. Last year I visited the rectangular stadium in Melbourne. I went through it twice to ensure that we were aware of the benefits of that stadium and that we got advice. They have the same problems. They have issues with the sports about the management. There are two lots of management there. That is something that happens all the time. Looking at what happens in some of those big stadiums in America, I think we are very, very lucky. I think Allia does a very good job, but it is not perfect.

Mr B.S. Wyatt: That's not the topic of debate.

Mr T.K. WALDRON: I will come back to the topic that the member wants to talk about. The member says that we have just taken over the heads of agreement. We have made changes to the heads of agreement.

Mr B.S. Wyatt: Why did you say in the upper house there were no changes?

Mr T.K. WALDRON: I ask the member to just hang on. We have made changes to the heads of agreement. Other amendments were required to achieve the agreement, including, but not limited to: clauses relating to the right to terminate, which the Premier mentioned; any future stadium redevelopment; naming rights, which we have made changes to; catering and fit-out; and the stadium reserve fund. They are parts of the agreement. We are trying to ensure that we get the best deal we can.

There are benefits for Allia and benefits for the state in this heads of agreement. As the Premier said, the state solicitors have been involved throughout the process.

Mr B.S. Wyatt interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Victoria Park!

Mr T.K. WALDRON: I do not have much time left and I want to answer a couple of questions that the member asked. I am trying to give him answers. The member raised the question about the director general. He kept making the point about the director general giving advice early on. I want to come back to that point.

Speaker; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Mick Murray; Mr Colin Barnett; Acting Speaker; Mr Terry Waldron; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr John McGrath

The director general and the department make lots of recommendations and give me lots of advice. I accept a lot of that advice, which I act on and go with. I do not go with everything that they tell me, otherwise I would be standing up here and the member for Victoria Park would be saying, “You never make a decision. You are a weak minister. You just let the department run you.” I have had that before as well.

Mr M. McGowan: It is about the influence.

Mr T.K. WALDRON: I will talk about the influence as well.

Mr M. McGowan: He said there’s no such thing as Liberal Party lobbyists.

Mr T.K. WALDRON: There are lobbyists out there. There is a lobbyists’ register. I will come back to that in a minute, but I want to answer the member for Victoria Park first. I think the director general will tell the member that we have a good relationship. We get on well. We do not always agree. We have had some disagreements on things and I have not always followed his advice or the advice of the department. Sometimes there are different thoughts within the department. We are human beings and we are trying to get the best result. He gives me advice and I take that advice on board but I do not always act on it. In this case, I have to tell members, his advice came early on. It was his opinion and his advice. Since then, given the process and negotiations that we have gone through, I think that advice has proved to be incorrect in light of the subsequent discussions we have had and the resulting heads of agreement. Changes have occurred. As I said, Allia Venue Management does a good job.

Let us talk about some of the benefits that will go to sport.

Mr B.S. Wyatt: You’ve been through that already.

Mr T.K. WALDRON: No, I have not. The member for Victoria Park can tell me what I said, then.

Mr B.S. Wyatt interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms A.R. Mitchell): Member for Victoria Park, the minister would like to respond to the questions you raised during your speech, so I ask you to remain quiet please.

Mr T.K. WALDRON: The member has to realise that we have included things such as video screens, which the organisers have to hire for every game. That is of value to all the sports that use the stadium because they do not have to pay the fee for hiring video screens every time they want to use the stadium. I mentioned the sound system. They have to hire the sound system because there is no sound system. It is a modern sporting arena. We are talking about the Western Force and Perth Glory teams, who will be playing at the nib Stadium in a final this weekend. Ticketing is also an issue, plus the ability for the sports to earn money. I mentioned advice received early on how the lack of corporate suites can affect the ability for the sports to earn money. I took that advice and I discussed it with the Premier—he will tell members this—because I thought we needed to make some changes there. I went back to the Premier and back to cabinet and we agreed to make the changes for the benefit of the sports. I think they were good changes because we will have corporate suites on both sides and that will give the sports much more capacity to earn. It is a good decision for the state; it provides the capacity to earn. Not only that, a lot of the members of Western Force and Perth Glory clubs utilise those seats in that stand, and now the clubs will have something to sell. With its success—let us hope Western Force will have a little more success—it will have a lot more opportunities to fill those seats and make more money.

Mr B.S. Wyatt: Will that be revenue to the state?

Mr T.K. WALDRON: Yes; of course it will be. The benefit to the state is through the benefit for our sports in this state. We are a government that is about promoting sport. Look at what this government has done. Members opposite did a good job with the athletic stadium and started the basketball arena. I acknowledge former sports minister John Kobelke all the time. He did a good job with that. We have completed the athletic stadium and the basketball stadium, and finished the rugby facility. Right now we are improving the Barbagallo race track and building the netball stadium that the Labor Party promised and never delivered. We have started planning for the WAIS facility. We are out there doing it and we are improving the nib Stadium because the sports benefit, the people in the state benefit and we as a government benefit.

For goodness sake, it is the role of government to help sport in this state. We talk about benefits, and our program Sport for All—this is outside this argument—reflects our philosophy of supporting sport. I have listened for years to governments on both sides and, as I say all the time because it is true, it is easy to talk about the benefits of sport, but as far as putting our hands in our pockets as a government and making the hard calls, this government has done that.

Speaker; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Mick Murray; Mr Colin Barnett; Acting Speaker; Mr Terry Waldron; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr John McGrath

On the lobbyists situation, I want to let members know that Nick Sloan from my office has on one occasion met the lobbyist, Everingham, about alcohol in sport. Nick advised me that during the meeting about alcohol in sport they asked about the progress of the redevelopment, and that was discussed. That is what has happened.

Mr B.S. Wyatt: When was that?

Mr T.K. WALDRON: I am not sure; it was before January 2011, I think. I can check that and advise the member.

I think this is a great project. The benefits are there. We do not always do exactly as our departments want but we do what is in the best interests of the state now and in the long term.

MS R. SAFFIOTI (West Swan) [3.43 pm]: Some key issues were not addressed by either the Premier or the minister. The key issue is what is in a briefing note of 2 May from the director general to the minister, which reads —

Under the existing HOA the state has no way to derive any significant revenue from ... investment.

That is the key point. Under the existing HOA the state has no way to derive any benefit. The other key point reads —

The State will be required to fund considerable ongoing operational and capital costs with Allia only required to put a minimal allocation into the facility;

We are talking about \$100 million of taxpayers' money. We all love supporting sport but here is a key issue: \$100 million of taxpayers' money. The minister's department advised the minister that the deal was bad for WA—bad for the taxpayers.

Mr C.J. Barnett: This deal is bad for WA is it?

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Thank you members.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The director general, the person appointed to head the department, said that this deal would not deliver benefits to Western Australian taxpayers.

Mr T.K. Waldron: Where does it say that?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: It says in this briefing note —

Under the existing HOA the state has no way to derive any —

Mr T.K. Waldron: But the agreement has changed.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Yes, but in those changes the minister never outlined any additional revenue or receipts.

Mr T.K. Waldron: Yes, I did.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: No, he did not; not to the state.

Mr T.K. Waldron: Yes, there is.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: He did not.

Mr T.K. Waldron: I'm sorry if you can't see it.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: He did not. He never ever addressed some of the key issues. I refer to the issue of Allia, who it was meeting and what it was discussing. Allia is party to the heads of agreement. When they meet people from the offices of the Premier and the minister, what would they be discussing? The heads of agreement.

Mr C.J. Barnett: That's right.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The Premier just said that Allia did not discuss the heads of agreement. He said that Allia talked about general nib —

Mr C.J. Barnett: No-one said that. Who do you think we negotiated with? We negotiated with Allia. Negotiations were with Allia, not the lobbyists.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The minister said that the lobbyists came in and talked about general issues.

Mr T.K. Waldron: Get it right. I said that Nick Sloan —

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: No, no, no. You said that the lobbyists representing Allia —

Mr T.K. Waldron: Who's "you"—the Premier or me?

Speaker; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Mick Murray; Mr Colin Barnett; Acting Speaker; Mr Terry Waldron; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr John McGrath

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: — came in to discuss general issues. The issue is that Allia was party to the heads of agreement. The only thing they would be discussing would be the heads of agreement.

Mr C.J. Barnett: That's right. The negotiation was with Allia—dozens of meetings I would think.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: So Allia was paying a lobbyist.

Point of Order

Mr M. McGOWAN: Madam Acting Speaker, you have regularly called members of the opposition to order during interjections from this side. I hear the Premier and the minister regularly interjecting on the member for West Swan, as they, particularly the Premier, always do. I am wondering what actions will be taken to ensure the member for West Swan can make her speech in silence as standing orders require.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Thank you Leader of the Opposition. At this stage I will make those decisions. While I was sorting out who said what, I did not think there was a reason to call, but I will keep my eye on it, and I can assure you that I will do my job.

Debate Resumed

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The proposition from the other side is that Allia came in and talked about the heads of agreement, but the lobbyist, whom they pay, talked about something else. That sounds ridiculous. The lobbyist would be talking about the issue Allia wanted raised, which was the heads of agreement.

Mr C.J. Barnett: No they didn't; it didn't happen.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: It did.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Thank you, Premier.

Mr C.J. Barnett: Prove it. Evidence?

Mr B.S. Wyatt: Ron Alexander's email.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Premier, I formally call you for the first time.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The Director General of the Department of Sport and Recreation's words indicated that Liberal Party lobbyists are getting in the way and that they are going over the top of the proper process of his department's activities. They are going straight to the Premier's office and straight to the minister's office. They reflect his words about Liberal Party lobbyists. Everyone knows there are Liberal Party lobbyists. The whole state government knows there are Liberal Party lobbyists and, obviously, directors general know there are Liberal Party lobbyists. The idea there are no Liberal Party lobbyists is again a mistruth to this Parliament.

The other key point that was never addressed is: why did they change from option 3 to option 2 in that key period in 2011? We all knew there had to be a transfer of the heads of agreement from the Town of Vincent to the state government. No-one is arguing about that. It is the nature of the agreement. Should more have been done to ensure there was some return to the state and taxpayers of Western Australia? That is the key point. The department recommended a course of action. The director general said that this course of action is being ignored. The course of action to protect taxpayers, to ensure the state gets a good deal and to ensure that this deal is in the public interest is being ignored because Liberal Party lobbyists have been going to the relevant minister's office and to the Premier's office. That is one of the worst accusations I have ever heard a director general make. Here it is in writing—a director general saying that proper process is not being followed but is being ignored because Liberal Party lobbyists are going straight to the Premier's office and to the minister's office. The allegation has been made by the Director General of Sport and Recreation. As I said, I have not seen an accusation like this in writing before. This is one of the worst things I have seen in terms of how far this senior public servant went to make a point. The government ignored the public interest and, as a result of lobbyists going straight to the Premier's office and the minister's office, it did not get the best deal for the state.

MR M. McGOWAN (Rockingham — Leader of the Opposition) [3.50 pm]: What we have heard from the minister and the government is a whitewash of the whole issue. The real issue is the involvement of Liberal Party lobbyists in influencing government decisions to the detriment of the public.

Mr C.J. Barnett: Evidence?

Mr M. McGOWAN: We need no further evidence than the email—written evidence—of the Director General of Sport and Recreation, a long-term public servant of some standing, in which he puts in writing the fact that Liberal Party lobbyists are undermining what is in the best interests of the state. That is extremely serious. For the Premier to come in here and whitewash and pretend it did not happen —

Speaker; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Mick Murray; Mr Colin Barnett; Acting Speaker; Mr Terry Waldron; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr John McGrath

Mr C.J. Barnett: It didn't happen.

Mr M. McGOWAN: It did happen, because it is here in writing. Perhaps the Premier should have been better briefed. This email is suggesting that Liberal Party lobbyists go into the Premier's office and undermine what is in the best interests of taxpayers in terms of receiving a proper return on a taxpayer investment. When that happens—when the public interest is undermined by the behaviour of lobbyists—it deserves further inquiry. What we saw historically, and the Premier refers to it regularly, was that some ministers paid the ultimate price for such matters, including one who is now a member of the government—the member for Kalgoorlie, in case the Minister for Police does not realise. The member for Kalgoorlie paid the ultimate price for his dealings with lobbyists. Here we have similar occurrences taking place with lobbyists going to ministers' offices and the Premier's office and undermining proper process. It is here in black and white. The Premier should address the real issue here. It deals with a significant issue of probity. The other day we saw the Minister for Planning making decisions on issues that directly affect properties owned by him. The government whitewashed that. We now see evidence of public money being spent against the advice of the department. I accept that ministers can make decisions against the advice of their departments, but when there is evidence that it is because of the influence of Liberal Party lobbyists, then that deserves further inquiry. The Premier should investigate this matter properly and not whitewash over it in the manner that he has.

MR J.E. McGRATH (South Perth — Parliamentary Secretary) [3.53 pm]: What we have today is the opposition complaining about what will be a very good outcome for the people of Western Australia. The opposition is working on an email from the Director General of Sport and Recreation. He was obviously clearly frustrated about what was happening in what the Premier has pointed out has been a very difficult deal to change over the management of nib Stadium and for the state to take over the lease. I do not think any evidence has been demonstrated today that lobbyists did meet with the Premier. In fact, the Premier has said that he did not meet with lobbyists. Of course, Allia is going to meet with the government; it has to, because they are signing a new heads of agreement. It is a 20-year deal. From my knowledge of the deal, it was a very difficult one to get through. The Minister for Sport and Recreation has also supported that. Getting back to this facility, it has been welcomed by the people of Perth. If members opposite try to tell the people of Perth that there has been any impropriety in this, I am sure they will say that there has not been. This was a deal into which the government had to put \$100 million. It is a facility for the future. At the same time, the government had to negotiate to take over the lease of the facility from the Town of Vincent. All that was happening. It was a difficult one for the government to manage. The director general of the department obviously became frustrated. He sent an email. I do not deny that members opposite have an email.

Mr M. McGowan: A number of emails.

Mr J.E. McGRATH: The email referred to Liberal Party lobbyists. Members opposite have not provided any evidence today that Liberal Party —

Several members interjected.

Mr J.E. McGRATH: No; members opposite have an email from the director general. They have not provided any evidence today that Liberal Party lobbyists actually attended meetings with the Premier. The Premier did have to take over this deal. It was a deal at the highest level. I think the outcome that we are going to see with this stadium will be welcomed by the people of Western Australia. Members opposite should be supporting it rather than trying to dig up some dirt about a facility —

Mr B.S. Wyatt: Dig up dirt? It is an email!

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms A.R. Mitchell): Member for Victoria Park, I call you to order for the third time today.

Mr J.E. McGRATH: Thank you, Madam Acting Speaker. Rather than —

Several members interjected.

Mr T.G. Stephens: What you have done is confirm that there is dirt to dig up!

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for West Swan I call you for the first time, and also the member for Pilbara. I ask the member to finish.

Mr J.E. McGRATH: What I say to members of the opposition is that if they have some evidence of lobbyists attending meetings with the Premier and sitting in while the Premier negotiated with Allia a very complicated deal that is still being worked on, they should bring it into the Parliament.

Extract from *Hansard*
[ASSEMBLY — Thursday, 29 March 2012]
p1638b-1651a

Speaker; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr Mick Murray; Mr Colin Barnett; Acting Speaker; Mr Terry Waldron; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr John McGrath

Question put and a division taken with the following result —

Ayes (23)

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

Mr F.M. Logan
Mrs C.A. Martin
Mr M. McGowan
Mr M.P. Murray
Mr P. Papalia
Mr J.R. Quigley

Ms M.M. Quirk
Mr E.S. Ripper
Mrs M.H. Roberts
Mr T.G. Stephens
Mr C.J. Tallentire
Mr P.C. Tinley

Mr A.J. Waddell
Mr P.B. Watson
Mr M.P. Whitely
Mr B.S. Wyatt
Ms R. Saffioti (*Teller*)

Noes (25)

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

Mr V.A. Catania
Dr E. Constable
Mr M.J. Cowper
Mr J.M. Francis
Mr B.J. Grylls
Mrs L.M. Harvey
Mr A.P. Jacob

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

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

Pairs

Mr A.P. O’Gorman
Ms J.M. Freeman
Mr J.C. Kobelke
Mr D.A. Templeman

Mr J.H.D. Day
Mr C.C. Porter
Dr K.D. Hames
Mr W.R. Marmion

Question thus negatived.