

## JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE ON END-OF-LIFE CHOICES

### *Motion to Concur*

Resumed from an earlier stage of the sitting.

**HON MARTIN PRITCHARD (North Metropolitan)** [5.18 pm]: During my last contribution, I encouraged all members to make a contribution to this debate even though I realise that the debate is about setting up a Joint Select Committee on End-of-Life Choices. It is probably appropriate at this time to say that I will support the motion to set up the committee. I have concerns but hopefully they will be addressed during the 12 months of the committee inquiry. As a starting point, I will go back to the fact that the committee will be required to make a recommendation, and that recommendation will come back to the two houses. I believe this house has a unique opportunity to hold that committee accountable, to make sure that it has done its job diligently and that it represents community expectations through the fact that a very interesting vote will be conducted in 12 months or so.

In putting my position in supporting the motion to set up the committee, I also encourage people to talk a little about themselves. Having such large constituencies, it is probably less likely that members interact with the whole of their constituency. I think it is worthwhile for members' constituents to know a little about members so that they can judge in some way how we will approach the next 12 months. I mentioned before that if anybody in this house thinks people will not be reading *Hansard*, will not be looking into our history and will not be looking at the faiths we hold, I would again suggest they are kidding themselves. We will be under intense scrutiny and not only the committee members but also each individual member here will be the subject of lobbying, on the basis that we will get a vote on any final legislation that comes through.

On that basis I will talk very briefly and not to any great extent about my faith. I suggest anybody who knows my history might endeavour to pigeonhole me in one camp or another, and I wanted to break out of that mould, to be perfectly honest. With regard to my faith, I am an adherent to the Salvation Army. I do not, unfortunately, visit the corps as often as I should. My parents brought me up as Church of England. They had a Salvation Army background. I talked about a lot of my history in my inaugural speech. For whatever reason, when we arrived in Australia, practising our faith was not seen as a priority and lapsed quite dramatically. Subsequently, when I had children I believed that having faith was a worthwhile thing to do, and so I picked up again at the Salvation Army. They since have, I would suggest, not held that faith, and my mine has waned.

With regard to my beliefs, I believe we all have a soul. I think that distinguishes us from being smart animals. I cherish the fact that we have a soul. I do not believe that we are the sum of multiple coincidences over the centuries, and I also do not hold God—or whatever name we like to put on our deity—to blame for all the ills in the world. I think, basically, as humans we know in our hearts right from wrong, but, unfortunately, we do not always listen to our inner soul. That often is through drug dependence and many other things—pride; many, many other things—but ultimately I think most humans know what is right or wrong, even if they do not listen to that.

I hate to call it community standards, because I do not think those are the right words. I often wish I was as eloquent as Hon Simon O'Brien in choosing my words, but I do not think that community standards are the right words. We evolve, and things seen as appropriate may not have been 1 000 years ago, 100 years ago or 50 years ago. Things do change. One issue that during my lifetime I have probably gained more insight into is gay marriage. I am not sure that my view now would be the same as it was when I was younger. That probably has a lot to do with the fact that the dearest thing to me is my family. My eldest daughter is gay. Her partner, Lucy, is expecting a child, although she is only at 12 weeks, so I am still crossing my fingers. I could not imagine not supporting gay marriage, knowing my daughter and her partner as I do. I look forward to the day my daughter and her partner are given the opportunity to marry. They have been together for 12 years. It is an extremely loving relationship. However, not every relationship, gay or straight, is that way. I do not think it depends on whether a relationship is gay or straight. It has to do with the make-up of the person.

I do not want to digress because I know members are keen to move ahead with this motion. It is important to put on the record our position on euthanasia. I do not want people to put on the record that they support euthanasia and all the things that go with it, or they are absolutely opposed to euthanasia, and that is the position they will have in 12 months or whenever legislation may come before the house. Even if that is what we think, that is a very negative thing to put on the record. It is more positive to put on the record a bit about who we are. In my inaugural speech, I spoke a lot about me and my history so that people will understand who I am. It is amazing how many people read our inaugural speech prior to meeting us. Our constituents and people who lobby us read it to get a sense of who we are. The electorates of country members are massive compared with those of metropolitan members. It is impossible for country members of this chamber—perhaps less so for those in the other chamber—to have an intimate knowledge of their constituency. Our constituency has a right to know about us, because we have put ourselves forward for public service.

Hon Martin Pritchard; Hon Laurie Graham; Hon Sue Ellery; Hon Nick Goiran; Hon Robin Chapple; Hon Colin Holt; Hon Dr Sally Talbot

---

That is one of the reasons I want to talk about my faith. My faith is not such that I would automatically vote against euthanasia or end-of-life choices. I have some fundamental concerns about euthanasia. I do not know how I will vote when any legislation comes before us. That has probably put me out there and I will be the subject of more intense lobbying, but rightly so. I have an open mind on this, and if I am lobbied and receive 10 000 emails, so be it. That is what I am here to do, and I will have to deal with that. As I have said, standards change.

I am disappointed about how the gay marriage debate is going at the federal level. I am even more disappointed that the members of the federal Liberal and National Parties will not be given a free vote. It is important that on some issues we have the right to be open to persuasion and to vote on the basis of either how we were persuaded or our conscience. I am frightened about the effect of the gay marriage debate on my children, particularly my eldest child. I understand the frustration of the federal Labor Party at the position of the Liberal and National Parties on gay marriage. It is disappointing that as a result of that frustration, the federal Labor Party will now not give its members a free or conscience vote on gay marriage.

**The PRESIDENT:** Member, I want to bring you back in. I have been listening to the debate. The motion in front of us deals explicitly with the terms of reference that have been agreed to in the other place and requests members of this chamber to agree to that resolution. I would encourage you to focus your discussion around those terms of reference. You have talked about a range of broadbrush issues that are probably more appropriate in a second reading speech on a bill sometime in the future.

**Hon MARTIN PRITCHARD:** Thank you for your advice, Madam President. I will take your advice on that and move on.

We have before us a motion on the terms of reference in setting up a committee. I indicated that I will support the motion to set up the committee, but that is not without reservation. I have some particular concerns with the terms of reference and I go back to one of the statements that Hon Michael Mischin made in his contribution about where we draw the line. With all these issues, that is the concern.

I recently lost my mother and father, both at St John of God in Midland, and the care that they received in their last days gave me great confidence that doctors, through whatever process they have, already deal with those concerns of end-of-life choices in consultation with families. Nine years ago, my father was admitted to hospital and I travelled back from Phuket because the understanding was that he would pass away then. I went through all the discussions about palliative care. The doctors at that time were absolutely convinced that he would pass away within days. He rallied and lived quite an independent and productive life for another eight or so years. Unfortunately, he was unable to rally in the most recent situation and passed away very peacefully in his sleep. I thank the doctors who dealt with it, I thought, very appropriately.

The only issue I have ever known when a doctor has been called to point—there are probably many more and I will not go into any detail or rake it up—was when a doctor in Geraldton raised the issue that she had taken steps beyond what she believed the law allowed her to do, in an empathetic way, that resulted in a death. I agree with Hon Alanna Clohesy that other than that, doctors deal with it compassionately now. My concern with these terms of reference is that if the eventual legislation that comes before us broadens it, the line in the sand will sort of get a bit further and then people and doctors might cross that.

The other term of reference that I have a particular concern with is paragraph (2)(d), which refers to the examination of advance health directives, enduring power of attorney and enduring power of guardianship laws. Having gone through that recently, I find it almost amazing how relationships affect the choices that our aged parents and others make. I am certain that my father made some choices not necessarily for his own benefit, but to ease the pain of those caring for him, including his children. I have some concerns about where those lines are drawn. The way to deal with this and to get to a point at which I may know more and be able to make an informed choice is to allow this committee to do its investigations, and that is the reason that I support the motion. As I said, it is appropriate that we make these determinations. That does not mean that we are infallible and that the legislation will necessarily not achieve everything that it purports to achieve when it comes before us. But it is our job to look at this issue and to make determinations. People may say that once an egg has been scrambled, it cannot be put back together again, but I do not hold the same view for legislation. If legislation is introduced and it is good, it can be reversed and amended. Legislation is amended all the time. Irrespective of the determination that we make after the committee has done its work, we will be able to deal with those outcomes. If we deal with them badly, of course, the electorate will have its say at the appropriate time.

I will not go on for much longer, but I want to make one small point, which is a bit whimsical. I have listened to a lot of the debate and I have encouraged everyone to make a contribution. I do not think a delay of a day or two will make a lot of difference to a 12-month inquiry or the committee's work, which I think is important. Talking about community standards reminds me of a film from many years ago, the name of which I had to look up and

Hon Martin Pritchard; Hon Laurie Graham; Hon Sue Ellery; Hon Nick Goiran; Hon Robin Chapple; Hon Colin Holt; Hon Dr Sally Talbot

---

which I am not sure anyone knows about. The film is *Wild in the Streets*, and it is a little bit like *Logan's Run*, in that people, when they are 30 years old, are sent off to camps and get into LSD. The people in the leadership group are about 18 or 19 years of age. In the very last scene of that film, two 12-year-olds are talking and they say, "Everybody over 16, they should be off to camps." Things change—not always for the better, but things do change. As I said, this motion has made me think about that film for some reason.

I will support the establishment of the committee. I hope that I have not held people up for too long. I appreciate being given the opportunity to put my thoughts on the record. I look forward to many discussions with my constituents, lobbyists and such like about their thoughts and maybe having some input into the committee. I thank members for their time.

**HON LAURIE GRAHAM (Agricultural)** [5.37 pm]: As a new member, I think it is important to put a few words on the record about my position on the motion to establish the Joint Select Committee on End-of-Life Choices. I very much support the committee's structure; it is the way to go forward. This issue is a bit like the gay marriage issue, in that it has taken a long time for the community to get here and it has taken governments a long time to catch up. I have had a number of discussions within my community, and it broadly supports legislation being dealt with by the Parliament. The community believes that this matter is a bit like the gay marriage issue—that unless Parliament discusses the issue and all the facts and possible legislation become known, we will find it very difficult to go forward. However, when we get to the detail of the legislation, that community support may change. When I have discussed this matter with people, it has been interesting to hear their support become negative when they think there will be a particular outcome. I will be making a determination on my position on this matter once the committee report has been received and Parliament has considered the matter.

It is important to touch on some past experiences. I have been present on a number of occasions when people were coming to the end of their lives. On some occasions it was a wonderful experience and on other occasions it was awful because the person was in pain. Those situations could have been better had appropriate legislation been in place.

Country WA is very different from the metropolitan area. A number of members have spoken about situations in the metro area, but I would like to raise a couple of examples from the country. My wife has been a nurse since she was 16 years old—for some 50 years. For 20-odd years, she was an intensive care nurse working either in emergency or with end-of-life patients. I think working in emergency got her blood going. It really impacted on me that the hardest thing for her to manage was working alone at night nursing patients who were at the end of their lives. Although those patients wanted to move on, the right decisions had not been made. Nothing was in place and nurses were left to deal with distressed relatives. It was a very traumatic experience.

Life would have been much less stressful in those days had legislation been in place and had doctors not been as reluctant as they were. Doctors are probably more liberal these days but, in the past, they were very reluctant to risk their licence et cetera by giving medications. When a patient gets to the end of their life, the unfortunate thing is that we can give them all the medications we like, but invariably, if they are really in pain, they will live through it. I think it will be great to finally resolve this matter. I hope it is resolved in a way that the outcome can be accepted by the community.

Comments are often made that we provide better for our pets than we do for humans. That is something we should consider with this legislation. We have no trouble taking our pets to the vet to deal with them humanely, but we cannot make a decision to choose to end our life in an appropriate way. As a government and a Parliament, it is our obligation to try to facilitate the appropriate arrangements. Having said that, I am a practising Catholic and I will find this pretty difficult. I will perhaps find it impossible to vote for it; yet I recognise that, like gay marriage and other items, we have all moved on. I can accept that now. Thank you very much for the opportunity to say a few words.

**HON SUE ELLERY (South Metropolitan — Leader of the House)** [5.41 pm] — in reply: I thank members for their contributions and I thank the house for the decision that was made earlier today. I have already put some of my comments on the record and I want to finish by referring to a document that I found helpful. It is called "A background paper: How should Australia regulate voluntary euthanasia and assisted suicide?" and was published in November 2012 by Australia21: Shaping the Future and Queensland University of Technology. It canvasses both sides of the argument and it canvasses the most minimalist to the most regulated legislative responses. I found it a useful document. Questions arise whether voluntary euthanasia should be deemed a criminal act. If that is the case, what are the appropriate penalties? If we take the view that it should not be a criminal act, which is my point of view, questions arise about how we permit and regulate it. This paper sets that out in some detail. These are the things that I would anticipate the committee needs to investigate. The paper states —

Possible elements of any reform model include: ensuring decision-making is competent and voluntary; ascertaining a person's eligibility to utilise the regime, for example, whether it depends on him or her

Hon Martin Pritchard; Hon Laurie Graham; Hon Sue Ellery; Hon Nick Goiran; Hon Robin Chapple; Hon Colin Holt; Hon Dr Sally Talbot

---

having a terminal illness or experiencing pain and suffering; and setting out processes for how any decision must be made and evidenced. Options to bring about decriminalisation include challenging the validity of laws that make VE and AS unlawful, recognising a defence to criminal prosecution, or creating a statutory framework to regulate the practice.

Regarding the last point, the report canvasses factors for looking at a regulatory regime; this is what I would like the committee to canvass. The factors include competence, a voluntary and informed choice, a person's condition, the decision-making process, and the oversight of decisions.

This is an important debate. I thank the house for its forbearance in listening as people set out why, for them, this is an important decision. I look forward to the outcome of the vote we are about to take. Just by way of explanation, once the house has made its decision, if I assume that the house is going to agree with the motion, I then have another motion that lists the four members of the Joint Select Committee on End-of-Life Choices that have, I hope, been agreed upon by way of conversation behind the Chair.

Question put and passed.

*Appointment of Members — Motion*

**HON SUE ELLERY (South Metropolitan — Leader of the House)** [5.45 pm] — without notice: I move —

- (a) that the following Legislative Council members are appointed to the Joint Select Committee on End-of-Life Choices: Hon Robin Chapple, Hon Nick Goiran, Hon Colin Holt and Hon Dr Sally Talbot; and
- (b) that the Legislative Assembly be acquainted accordingly.

**HON NICK GOIRAN (South Metropolitan)** [5.45 pm]: I look forward in due course to getting a copy of the motion moved without notice by the Leader of the House. As I understand it, it simply seeks to appoint members to the Joint Select Committee on End-of-Life Choices and to inform the Legislative Assembly of the appointment of those members. If I heard correctly, I think I am proposed to be one of the members. Indeed, I now have a copy of the motion in front of me and I am pleased to indicate my support for not only the motion, but also, of course, my own participation in the committee.

As a number of members have already expressed over the last couple of days, this is a very important committee and I expressed during my remarks yesterday that I look forward to participating in the committee because the issue of end-of-life choices is an important one in the community. It remains my considered view that it is very important for every Western Australian, when accessing health services at the end of life, to have available to them the very best health care accessible in Western Australia and, at the same time, that they provide consent to any medical treatment that they are given. I consequently look forward to the committee looking into those issues.

It is my intention, as I participate on the committee and as I advise the house now, to ensure that the committee fulfils its task to look into each of the terms of reference that the house has provided. I am grateful for the various expressions by members over the past two days that indicated that it would be appropriate for the committee to look into the risks of voluntary euthanasia, including the impact on suicide prevention. I was grateful that many members said that my concern about that issue ought not be a concern and that there seemed to be a view—a consensus by members—that it would be appropriate for the committee to look into that, and that it effectively went without saying that that should happen.

I remain concerned that it will be possible for members on the committee to argue that it is not appropriate for the committee to do that. Of course, as a member of the committee at that time—I am not a member of the committee until such time as this motion is passed—I will not be able to reveal any of the deliberations of the committee. I express now my ongoing hope that those members who have expressed a genuine enthusiasm for the committee to look into the risks of voluntary euthanasia, including the impact on suicide prevention, will facilitate that when the committee commences, and that that intent that has been expressed by members across the chamber is not frustrated by the committee process. Should it become frustrated—I will remain an optimist and hope that it is not the case.

The committee of which I will be a member in the event that this motion is passed will have to look at all the various terms of reference. It was interesting to hear members' remarks on what has happened in other jurisdictions in the debate that has transpired over the past two days. I was particularly interested in members' comments on other jurisdictions, but generally speaking they overlooked that Australia was the very first jurisdiction to experiment in this area. We already have a very good test case in our own experience and in our own backyard in the Northern Territory. There seems to be a mixture of views in the chamber from those who have had the opportunity to look at this issue in significant detail and have a fairly solid position to others who have indicated that they have not had the opportunity to look at the matter in detail and remain open to listen to the debate. I encourage any member who is yet to have a firm view on this issue to look carefully in the forthcoming period

Hon Martin Pritchard; Hon Laurie Graham; Hon Sue Ellery; Hon Nick Goiran; Hon Robin Chapple; Hon Colin Holt; Hon Dr Sally Talbot

---

at what happened in the Northern Territory. In fact, there is a wonderful article entitled “Seven deaths in Darwin”. As a member of the committee—if this motion is passed—I will encourage the committee to fulfil its terms of reference and look at other jurisdictions. There is a specific term of reference for the committee to look at other legislation. If I remember correctly from the debate that has transpired over the last couple of days, term of reference (2)(b) states that it is a requirement for members of the committee to —

review the current framework of legislation, proposed legislation and other relevant reports and materials in other Australian states and territories and overseas jurisdictions;

I read into that requirement that, as a prospective member of the committee, it will be my responsibility to ensure that the committee looks at the legislation passed in the Northern Territory, which, of course, is no longer in place. I think that legislation is a very useful test case. In the Northern Territory, frankly, that legislation was a disaster. Hence, a number of eminent doctors co-authored an academic research document entitled “Seven deaths in Darwin”. I think it would be worthwhile for the committee to look at that article, and that is certainly my intention if I am indeed to be a member of the committee.

As a prospective member of the committee it will be my responsibility to ensure that the committee looks into other overseas jurisdictions. Of course, the Oregon model is one jurisdiction that was mentioned by a few members and would comply with term of reference (2)(b) as an overseas jurisdiction. I would like to ensure that members of this place are under no illusion that if they want to support me to be a member of the committee, they understand that I will give full consideration to term of reference (2)(b) and I will include Oregon, which has been mentioned by a number of members, as an overseas jurisdiction to be examined. I think the debate over the last couple of days has been helpful to me as a prospective member, because it gives me an idea about the types of issues that members want teased out by the committee. Although the debate has been perhaps longer than I anticipated, I think it has been useful. I will certainly encourage the committee to look closely at the Oregon model because, notwithstanding what has been suggested, there are a number of concerns about the Oregon model. It is not exactly what people suggest it is. I hope that members will still be satisfied to have me as a member of the committee, noting that it will be my intention to ensure that all of the aspects, particularly the risks, of models like the Oregon model are properly considered.

It will be a unique opportunity. I have served on joint committees previously in the Parliament, and hopefully that is one of the reasons that members thought it was appropriate to nominate me. In the last Parliament I was, of course, the Chair of the Joint Standing Committee on the Corruption and Crime Commission and that was also the case in the thirty-eighth Parliament. I also served in the thirty-eighth Parliament as a member of the Joint Standing Committee on the Commissioner for Children and Young People. With the benefit of that experience as a member of joint committees over the last two Parliaments, it has been my experience that members from both houses work in a very collaborative and, importantly, non-partisan way. I have found it a thoroughly rewarding aspect of working on a joint committee that members have been prepared to leave their partisan politics, which we all inherently bring to this job, at the door of the committee meeting for the benefit of the work of the committee. Once again, it would be my intention as a prospective member of the committee, if you like, to leave my Liberal hat at the door of the committee and fulfil my task as a member of the Legislative Council on the Joint Select Committee on End-of-Life Choices.

**The PRESIDENT:** Member, I am just going to say to you that this motion in front of us is very specific. It is about appointing four members of this chamber to this joint select committee. It is not necessarily an opportunity to espouse your great virtues to assist you to get on to this committee. You are already named as a potential candidate. I think you have been canvassing a number of issues that could have and should have been canvassed, if they have not already been, in an earlier debate. I encourage you to perhaps tighten the scope of your discussion around this particular motion.

**Hon NICK GOIRAN:** Thank you, Madam President. I continue to indicate my support for the motion moved by the Leader of the House. I would be happy to support both limbs of the motion. As I have indicated, I am grateful that it has been proposed that I be a member of the committee. I want to make it clear that if members are to support the committee, they should be under no illusion about the approach I will be taking as a prospective member. I understand that if that should cause any concern from members, they would be quite entitled to move an amendment to this motion by the Leader of the House, particularly to paragraph (a), and seek the deletion of my name and the insertion of that of another person. I understand that is the process and I hope it does not come to that, but I want people to be under no illusion about the approach I will be taking as a prospective member of the Joint Select Committee on End-of-Life Choices. I think the approach I have outlined this evening is consistent with the remarks made yesterday by Hon Robin Chapple, who I note is also a prospective member of the committee. The honourable member indicated a desire for us to work in a collegiate and collaborative fashion. As I indicated yesterday, that has certainly been my experience in working with the honourable member. I will indicate now, if it is not already clear, my wholehearted support for his membership on the Joint Select Committee on End-of-Life Choices. Two other names have been suggested as members of the committee and I am also pleased

Hon Martin Pritchard; Hon Laurie Graham; Hon Sue Ellery; Hon Nick Goiran; Hon Robin Chapple; Hon Colin Holt; Hon Dr Sally Talbot

---

to note their experience. At the moment, I have the benefit of being Deputy Chairman of the Standing Committee on Legislation, the chair of which is Hon Dr Sally Talbot. Although it is the first time that her and I have had the opportunity to work together, I have no reason whatsoever not to suggest that she is an entirely appropriate person to be serving on the committee. I indicate my support for her membership of the committee.

**Hon Dr Sally Talbot:** Thank you, Hon Nick Goiran; it is going well so far.

**Hon NICK GOIRAN:** It is early days, member, but so far so good!

As well as the other experienced members of the committee, I note that it is proposed that Hon Colin Holt will be a member. He is also an experienced member of Parliament, having entered into the thirty-eighth Parliament at the same time as me. I have found him also to be a very professional member who looks at all the issues in a very conscientious fashion. I indicate my support for him as well. Whether by design or otherwise, it is interesting that the membership of the committee should happen to consist of four members who participated in the consideration of the private member's bill introduced by Hon Robin Chapple in 2010. It is a matter of public record that those four members of this committee were present for that debate after which two of them voted in support of the second reading and two of them voted against it. Although, in a sense, the views that those four members had on that legislation do not directly impact upon the capacity of the members to do the work of the committee, it is helpful for the debate and for the work of the committee that there is a cross-section of views.

Members who have voted previously for or against this type of legislation did so for a variety of different reasons. As we have heard over the last couple of days, it is not always the case that someone votes for proposed euthanasia legislation for the same reasons as another member. I was very interested yesterday when the Leader of the House, in her introductory remarks, explained to the house the difficulty that she had with that particular legislation and how she was ultimately convinced to vote for it because of some conversations with Marshall Perron. That is quite a different approach from the one that would have been taken by, for instance, Hon Robin Chapple or other members of the chamber. Indeed, I anticipate that Hon Colin Holt and I might have had similar yet differing views in 2010. The composition of the committee is helpful because each member not only has experience but also comes from a different political party. Although it is my view that the members should, as I have indicated, leave their partisan politics at the door of the committee room, for the sake of the perception of the committee, it is beneficial to have a member from the Labor Party, the Liberal Party, the Greens and also the National Party. It is regrettable that by nature of the committee consisting of four members of this place and four members of the other place, other parties are not able to be represented on the committee. I very much regret that. Obviously, I did my best yesterday to try to ensure that they would be able to participate, but that will not be the case. I want to say on the public record that I regret that for those members who are not able to participate. I am happy to make myself available to hear from any members if they think that particular matters should be teased out by the committee. Of course, any members of this chamber will be welcome to put in a submission to the Joint Select Committee on End-of-Life Choices setting out their views on the various terms of reference, and I encourage them to do so. They will still be able to participate; albeit not in the same fashion. I am pleased to support the motion moved by the Leader of the House and I encourage all members to do likewise.

**HON ROBIN CHAPPLE (Mining and Pastoral)** [6.05 pm]: I rise to support the motion put forward by the Leader of the House. I express my thanks for having been nominated for the committee. I accept that nomination and I make it very clear that I am going into this committee to learn. We hope that the evidence that will be provided to the committee will inform us all in great detail.

**HON COLIN HOLT (South West)** [6.06 pm]: I have resisted contributing to the substantive motion we have discussed for the last two days because I did not want to go into my views on end-of-life choices because, if this motion passes, I do not see it as my role as a committee member representing this house. I think it goes without saying, although I am probably going to have to say it, that the members of this joint committee are appointed by the Council to carry out the Council's job. It is not to be a personal crusade. It is to inform the Council as best we can under the terms of reference and to come back to the Council with what has been defined as a potential way forward. The substantive debate will occur after that point with the presentation of a committee report and/or any potential legislation that comes out. That will be the time for debate about end-of-life choices. My commitment to the chamber, if it passes this motion, is that my approach to this committee will be to ensure that it is represented well and that we address the terms of reference on its behalf.

**HON Dr SALLY TALBOT (South West)** [6.07 pm]: I support the motion and am glad to have been nominated to the committee. I will work hard to make sure that we comply with all the terms of reference. I am a little surprised that Hon Nick Goiran felt it necessary to speak at such length about his approach to the committee. I think we all made the position we were taking clear in our comments on the substantive motion.

**Hon Nick Goiran:** I'm not sure that I did, member. That's why I did it now. I was busy moving an amendment.

**Extract from *Hansard***

[COUNCIL — Wednesday, 23 August 2017]

p3158a-3163a

Hon Martin Pritchard; Hon Laurie Graham; Hon Sue Ellery; Hon Nick Goiran; Hon Robin Chapple; Hon Colin Holt; Hon Dr Sally Talbot

---

**Hon Dr SALLY TALBOT:** I think the honourable member did a fine job.

I am confident that we can come back with a proposition for the Parliament that will at least convey the views of the Western Australian community and some very careful deliberation about the way that those views might be translated into statutory form.

Question put and passed.