

SELECT COMMITTEE ON ROYAL SOCIETY FOR THE PREVENTION OF CRUELTY TO ANIMALS

Motion

Resumed from 22 April on the following motion moved by Hon Rick Mazza —

That —

- (1) The Council establishes a select committee to inquire into the operations of the Western Australian Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, including an examination of —
 - (a) its funding from the government;
 - (b) its objectives; and
 - (c) the use of its powers.
- (2) The membership of the select committee is to be five members, and to include the member from the Shooters and Fishers Party.
- (3) The member from the Shooters and Fishers Party shall be the chair.
- (4) The select committee is to report to the Council by no later than Thursday, 3 December 2015.

HON RICK MAZZA (Agricultural) [1.20 pm]: In my opening remarks I described the outrageous notion of animal rights extremism. In my mind, the evangelistic approach that these people take is really out of step with what I think animal welfare is all about. Ironically enough, Peter Singer, who I mentioned in my opening remarks and who has been described as the father of animal rights in Australia, was on an episode of *Q&A* last week. Part of what he talked about was that we should not have guide dogs; money spent on training guide dogs should be used in Third World countries because it is better to prevent blindness than to actually look after people with sight impediments. I do not know how members can possibly feel that that is the right thing. In fact, why can we not do both? Why can we not have guide dogs for the blind in Australia and also do what we can in Third World countries to assist people with eyesight issues? He went on about legal rights for chimpanzees—the same rights as humans.

Hon Darren West: Isn't this about the RSPCA?

Hon RICK MAZZA: Just be patient, Hon Darren West. He is pretty keen on this, and I am sure he will make a good contribution in time.

I describe animal rights extremism for the reason that I want members to understand how bizarre it is and the fact that we do not want animal rights extremism permeating our very respected institution of the RSPCA. I was asked by members what proof I had that animal rights ideology is starting to permeate the RSPCA. The thing is, what proof do we have that it is not? That is why we need to have an inquiry like this.

Several members interjected.

Hon RICK MAZZA: Members, look. I am simply responding to concerns that are raised every other week in the media. In fact, there is something called “RSPCA Insights”—I know it is from the UK—that talks about how to provide a vegetarian diet for one's dog. It is not just me, these are expressions from the community and from industry having concerns about these particular issues. In an article in *The Advocate* in 2013, the then president of the Pastoralists and Graziers Association, Rob Gillam, said that as recently as the previous Christmas, the RSPCA had been urging the public to send a card to their MP demanding that the government end the export of live animals because it was cruel and inhumane. He said that this was hardly the activity of a mainstream animal welfare group that does not object to animals being grazed for food and fibre. He said that if the RSPCA truly wanted to distance itself from the animal liberation activists that had permeated its ranks and were using the organisation as a platform to end all livestock production, it would need to acknowledge that the live export trade was not cruel and inhumane, and work within the industry to improve animal welfare standards.

I now refer to another article. Admittedly, this appeared in *Australian Shooter*, but these people also have concerns. It was pointed out in the article that evidence showing an ideological shift towards alarming extremist views had increased over the years and that the RSPCA was increasingly steering away from its traditional animal welfare responsibilities of providing food, shelter and codes of practice for animal owners.

During the last Victorian state election, the Victorian Farmers Federation responded to an advertisement by Animals Australia and other animal rights groups, along with the RSPCA, by saying that the partnership signalled a new era in animal activism. The VFF believed that it was part of a bigger strategy to wear the animal industry down. The VFF animal welfare spokesman and Egg Group president, Brian Ahmed, said that RSPCA

chief executive officer, Liz Walker, was joining forces with these groups and saying that it was the best way forward for animal welfare groups, if they were to really make a difference.

I touched on this issue last time I spoke; there is a group being formed out in Narrogin called the Coalition Against Animal Rights Activists and Regulations. It is headed by a couple by the name of Thompson who own a feedlot out there. They stated in an article that —

“Agriculture ends up looking like the bad guy.”

As for the RSPCA, Ms Thompson branded the organisation as disingenuous.

She said any farmer or people related through family, business or otherwise who donated to the RSPCA was supporting the enemy.

“Its (RSPCA) scientific officer says it is not against live exports but then that statement is followed up by much talk about ending live exports,” she said.

It is also on the RSPCA website that it wants live exports ended. The article continues —

Ms Thompson said individuals were scared to stand up for themselves and speak out for agriculture, which is why it was important to have an organisation such as the proposed coalition to stand up and speak on their behalf.

I am not just making things up; this is a response to community concerns, and as MPs we have an obligation to respond to community concerns that have been raised. In fact, there was an article only last week in *Farm Weekly* about this motion. The RSPCA state president was quoted as saying —

“We (RSPCA) are not trying to put farmers out of business, we are actually trying to help them understand what the new world order is.

“The RSPCA is a good barometer of where public opinion is at.

I would like to know what the “new world order” is that the RSPCA is trying to help farmers understand. It is of great concern to me. We have all heard of RSPCA-approved chicken, which is now being sold through Coles and Woolworths. Recently there have also been moves to sell RSPCA-approved milk, which the dairy industry is vigorously opposing. It is worth remembering that, if we have RSPCA-approved chicken and we have a move towards RSPCA-approved milk, it could follow on to RSPCA-approved beef, pork, lamb and eggs. What concerns me most is that all of these producers would then be subject to the requirements of the RSPCA and what it decides is the animal welfare standard that should be observed. Those producers will be subject to that, particularly if the major supermarkets decide that the only producers they will buy from are RSPCA-approved producers. If those standards are raised to a level that is beyond what is reasonable, obviously it will also push up food prices. The big argument here is accountability and oversight. Who is overseeing the RSPCA?

Hon Ken Travers: Its members.

Hon RICK MAZZA: I am sorry, Hon Ken Travers, but I cannot accept that. The basis of our democratic system is that everything is oversights and accountable. Every department is accountable. Even our esteemed President of the Legislative Council fronts up at estimates hearings to take questions on the Legislative Council, how it is run and how it has performed for the year.

Hon Adele Farina interjected.

Hon RICK MAZZA: That may be a motion that Hon Adele Farina can raise at some other point.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! There is quite a bit of time to go on this debate, and Hon Rick Mazza as mover of the motion is the first speaker, so there will be opportunities later for others, but you cannot override what he is trying to say.

Hon RICK MAZZA: Thank you, Mr President. I am running short of time to cover quite a lot of areas, so I will have to condense it somewhat.

What this is about is oversight. We have an organisation that is acting as a quasi-government department, and I am sure there are some very, very dedicated people within the RSPCA who are experienced and do the right thing at a grassroots level. I would suggest that they are probably in the vast majority. But we also have very dedicated and capable people in our police force and our Department of Fisheries, but those departments are oversights by the Parliament and are required to produce annual reports, attend estimates hearings, and maybe receive questions without notice from this place, so that we always make sure that those departments are on point and are serving the community correctly. What we have here is a quasi-government department that has the power to lay serious criminal charges but does not have that oversight. That is the whole point of this particular motion.

I have often heard the RSPCA claim that it represents the mainstream community view. I have wondered where it gets the research to show that it represents the mainstream community view. I came across a blog from Queensland that states —

Lynne Bradshaw, National President of the RSPCA, spoke at the LiveExchange conference in Townsville last Friday. The talk was in the form of an interview by Landline presenter, Pip Courtney.

These are some of the things that Lynne said ... and the questions I would have asked, if public questions had been permitted.

“The RSPCA reflects public opinion”

“Represents mainstream Australia”

“has 98% brand recognition in the community”

“The public at the moment are really barely tolerating live exports.”

Any objective, independent research behind the assertion re “reflecting mainstream Australia”, and ‘the public’ ... ‘barely tolerating live exports’? Any actual figures? Or are we supposed to just swallow these assertions because it’s the RSPCA saying so?

I think that is a very good point. It is very easy to say that it represents the mainstream, but we do not have any oversight to make sure that that is the case.

Last week there were advertisements in *The West Australian* and *The Sunday Times* lobbying against recreational hunting. There was some suggestion that there was a connection between this motion and recreational hunting, but there is not. This motion has been on the notice paper for some two years, so there is no connection. An inquiry to *The West Australian* suggested that the card rate for a full page ad was \$18 000 and that charities could get discounts of up to 40 per cent, so, after a quick calculation, it would cost around \$11 000. There was an article in August last year about an RSPCA budget crisis. It stated that the RSPCA had to lay off staff, there was a real problem trying to fund some of the shelters and it was looking at a restructure because it lost \$1 million last year. If an organisation, whose core business should be looking after animal shelters, spends money on advertising for political gain—I am told that it is going to put more in, so that could be 20, 30, 40 or 50 grand—it seems like an extraordinary waste of a precious resource for an organisation that should be engaged in its core business, which is dealing with animal welfare and looking after shelters and mistreated animals.

The RSPCA has been quite active in trying to argue against an inquiry, but I would have thought that in the face of a lot of criticism in the media and from some past employees, from whom I have had emails, it would welcome an inquiry. I would have thought it would welcome an inquiry if it is confident that its governance is in place, it has community support, it will clear the air and set the record straight, and it has nothing to fear. In my mind, accountability is critical in maintaining credibility.

I look forward to contributions from other members in this place. I commend this motion to the house.

HON KEN BASTON (Mining and Pastoral — Minister for Agriculture and Food) [1.33 pm]: I want to say a few words on this motion. As many members are aware, the Department of Agriculture and Food is responsible for administering the Animal Welfare Act and, as the minister, that department is my responsibility. Let me be very clear that this does not mean that I am the minister for the RSPCA. In fact, I have little ability to tell a not-for-profit, non-government body how to operate. However, the RSPCA does have an agreement with DAFWA; it receives some \$500 000 a year as a grant in return for undertaking certain obligations. These include having inspectors undergo appropriate training to undertake duties as general inspectors and undertaking compliance and enforcement activities in relation to companion animals.

I am aware that concerns have been raised about the efficacy of the RSPCA in administering its responsibilities. I have received feedback from members and the public that appear to indicate that there have been some issues around the RSPCA’s prosecution of its powers. It could be argued that when a not-for-profit animal welfare group is given prosecution powers, tensions such as these will arise. I believe that these tensions have been highlighted by the RSPCA’s stance on certain issues, one of which is the live export trade. In a sense, it has behaved like a political lobby group over that and some other issues. It has taken a philosophical and political position, which, I might add, is at odds with both the state and federal governments. It is my opinion that when a body has such an important role to play, and specifically when it is appointed as an inspector to dispense duties around compliance and enforcement, it should be guided by science and firm policy, not ideological leanings; and when the government funds a body to undertake these responsibilities, there must be careful scrutiny—there must be checks and balances. I am not convinced that we have enough checks and balances in place, and the absence of these checks and balances does not ensure that the best outcomes will be achieved for either the state or the RSPCA. To make myself clear, I believe that the RSPCA has achieved some great outcomes over the

years and has a very important role to play in companion animal welfare. However, it is not unreasonable to question whether we can indeed improve the framework within which it is working, because, at the end of the day, it is about obtaining the best and most fair results possible for animal welfare and the public interest.

The house will be aware that I have instigated a review into animal welfare investment and administration. I have appointed a panel to undertake a review. It consists of Mr Brian Easton, the current chair of the Conservation Commission of Western Australia and the chair of the Western Australian Zoological Parks Authority; Mr Eric Ball, an animal welfare expert; Ms Lynsey Warbey, a senior solicitor at the State Solicitor's Office; and Mr Bruno Mezzatesta, the executive director of regional services for the Department of Fisheries. I inform members that planning is well underway and I expect to be able to update the house on the review's findings in August. It is set to take three months and has already started, so that will take us to August. The process will include a public submission opportunity. This review will provide the government with advice on whether the current delivery model and expenditure of the state's money represent best value. It will also look at whether there is a consistent and appropriate approach to the administration and enforcement of the Animal Welfare Act and, if not, how this can be achieved. In summary, I believe it is vital to question whether we are spending taxpayers' money in the most appropriate manner and whether we are achieving the best outcomes possible.

I would like to reiterate that I believe that animal welfare bodies such as the RSPCA do indeed perform an important role. Animal cruelty is in no way acceptable, and that is something that both the government and wider society hold to be true.

I will pause here a bit to think of the way I ran my business in the pastoral rangelands for some 30-odd years. It just came to me that I sacked a number of staff whom I had caught being cruel to animals. They did things such as lifting lambs above their heads and throwing them on the ground as hard as they could. I did everything to contain myself not to land a punch—maybe I was not a good boxer. There are other things that really used to get my goat. When there was hot weather and the shearers had to struggle with a sheep, some of them would turn their hand piece over and whack the sheep on the head. For those who are not familiar with a hand piece, it has a tensioner on the top, which is very hard, and when it is turned over, it becomes a tool. The animal does not die straightaway; it takes about an hour before it drops dead after it has gone outside, obviously with a severe head injury. Also, shearers cutting tendons on sheep when they are angry with an animal means it cannot walk again with its shanks cut. If ever the worst was brought out in me, it was when I saw somebody doing that and I caught them.

Hon Helen Morton: You do need to say that very few shearers would do that.

Hon KEN BASTON: Very few shearers did that, but when there was even one, others would probably report it.

Australians have a strong affinity for their pets and have one of the highest rates of pet ownership in the world. That is a little bit of information that I dug up. Almost two-thirds of all Australian households have a pet. This equates to some 33 million pets in Australia, including 3.41 million dogs and 2.35 million cats. In Western Australia alone we have 3.14 million pets, with 16 dogs for every 100 people. I think that is an interesting statistic. Although we all like to think that everyone will do the right thing by their companion animals, unfortunately we know that on occasion it is certainly not the case. For this reason we need an organisation that will educate the public about pet ownership and where necessary, ensures compliance.

The RSPCA in Western Australia investigated 6 113 cruelty complaints in 2014, involving some 11 100 animals. The Malaga shelter looked after 292 sick and injured animals every day of the year. That represents a 21 per cent increase on 2013. Although theirs is an important role, it is also one the public and the government expect to be undertaken with extreme care. Given the serious nature of the RSPCA's role, the government's investment in the organisation, and the expectations of the public, it is not unreasonable to question whether the best outcomes are being achieved, and how we might continue to strive for improvements. In Broome last year a case of animal cruelty was reported. The Department of Agriculture and Food sent four inspectors up to Broome and eventually provided funding of \$75 000 over three years to Nirrumbuk Aboriginal Corporation, an Aboriginal education group, to educate people up there. This was, in particular, for Aboriginal support, to get them to learn how to look after animals. Some of the pictures that I saw from that were fairly horrible. However, I think education is one of those roles that needs further advancement right throughout the state, particularly the regional areas of the state.

I therefore support the intent of this motion, however, I would like to ensure that the review already underway is given time to submit its findings before further examination of this matter is commenced. I note in the motion that an inquiry would not be due to report until 3 December 2015. The review we are doing through DAFWA under the Animal Welfare Act is due to report by August this year. There is a large gap between August and December. In that, I support the motion.

The PRESIDENT: I give the call to Hon Lynn MacLaren at this stage. I understand the Leader of the Opposition wanted to make a contribution. The Leader of the Opposition has just come back into the chamber, so I will give the call to the Leader of the Opposition.

HON SUE ELLERY (South Metropolitan — Leader of the Opposition) [1.44 pm]: The President is very kind and I thank the chamber for its indulgence. Anyway, let us move on and try to retain our dignity.

I rise to speak on this and to indicate that the opposition will not be supporting this motion. I listened carefully to the contribution made by Hon Rick Mazza, in particular, and the case has just not been made. Hon Rick Mazza has probably made a case for us to do an inquiry into animal rights extremism. He may have made a case that we have an inquiry into Peter Singer's views; he may even have made a case that we have an inquiry into what he described as "evangelism" in animal rights, but he did not make a case that we need to have an inquiry into one of Western Australia's most respected community organisations, the RSPCA. This inquiry would look into the objectives of the RSPCA; that is what the motion tells us. The inquiry would look into the funding from government and the RSPCA's objectives and the use of its powers. Frankly, if it were limited to just its funding from government, one could mount a case that that would be appropriate for the Parliament to look into. Given we have just heard from the Minister for Agriculture and Food about the review that his department is undertaking into animal welfare more broadly and into the use of taxpayers' money in respect of animal welfare, that review panel that the minister has established must look at the taxpayers' money that is provided to the RSPCA to the value of about \$500 000 to undertake certain enforcement and training procedures. If the terms of the proposition before us were narrowed so that the funding the RSPCA receives from the government is examined, I would probably still argue against it because I would say that we are repeating and pre-empting the work of the panel that the minister has just created.

Hon Rick Mazza made some points about extremism from some parts of the animal rights movement that I think nobody would really disagree with. However, that is not what the inquiry is into; the inquiry is into the RSPCA. Members have a right to ask, but I would find it objectionable that the Parliament conduct an inquiry into whether a not-for-profit community-based organisation has got the right objectives. That is for the organisation to determine. It is not for the Parliament to determine what that organisation's objectives should be. It is for Parliament to determine whether taxpayers' money is being spent appropriately. I take no issue with that and we heard from the minister that that is exactly what he is doing. He is looking at how taxpayers' money is being spent in respect of animal welfare.

I want to turn to some of the propositions that I think have caused some concern about the prosecutorial role played by the RSPCA. In 2013–14, statistics collected by the RSPCA show that some 6 113 investigations were carried out; in 2014–15 to date, there were 4 150. Successful prosecutions conducted in 2013 were 22; successful prosecutions to date in 2014–15 are 23. That tells us which prosecutions it undertook were successful. It does not give us the full picture. It might be the case, if we are to believe some of the propositions put in the debate so far by Hon Rick Mazza, that there are prosecutions undertaken by the RSPCA that are inappropriate, that are misplaced —

Hon Ken Travers: Vexatious.

Hon SUE ELLERY: Indeed. Vexatious was the next word I was coming to, thank you very much, Hon Ken Travers. The real question to look at is: if those were the successful prosecutions, how many prosecutions did the RSPCA undertake that were not successful? The answer to that question will tell members whether or not it is indeed literally biting off more than it can chew, or whether it is indeed going beyond the role that it undertakes to carry out with respect to enforcement on behalf of the state. The answer to that question will tell members that, so it is important to look at unsuccessful prosecutions. The number of unsuccessful prosecutions by the RSPCA in 2013–14 was zero. The number of unsuccessful prosecutions in 2014–15 to date is zero. It is not the case that the RSPCA is undertaking vexatious prosecutions. It is not, because the court has found in each of those prosecutions that the case put by the RSPCA —

Hon Jim Chown interjected.

Hon SUE ELLERY: I look forward Hon Jim Chown's contribution. I know he is going to speak.

The PRESIDENT: Order. I took note of members who stood to indicate they wish to speak. I noticed Hon Jim Chown—you are on the list somewhere, but you might just slip down the list if you want to try to make a speech by interjections in the meantime.

Hon SUE ELLERY: I do not think the evidence that the RSPCA takes its role in prosecutions lightly stacks up. The evidence is just not there. The bulk of the RSPCA's work, for which it is highly respected, highly regarded and in fact beloved by many, is in response to complaints and allegations of the mistreatment of companion animals—of our pets; primarily of our cats and our dogs. The way that the RSPCA conducts that work and in the most part the way those issues are resolved is by way of negotiation between the RSPCA and the animal owner to put in place an agreed plan or program to manage the situation.

When I understood that I would have the opportunity to talk about the RSPCA, it struck one member of my household—the four-legged member of my household, Ernie—that this might be another opportunity for Ernie to get his name into *Hansard*. He likes it when he is mentioned in *Hansard*.

Hon Robyn McSweeney: You know what happened to me when I got my dog mentioned in *Hansard*.

Hon SUE ELLERY: Well, I am not going to mention my dog in the way that the member mentioned her dog, and that was an entirely different context. There you go, Ernie; you are in *Hansard* again. If he is awake when I get home later this evening —

Hon Simon O'Brien: You'll be very popular when you get home!

Hon Ken Travers: It's only the husband that needs prevention from cruelty in her household.

Hon SUE ELLERY: That is so unkind.

Hon Simon O'Brien: If one of us had said that!

Hon SUE ELLERY: It is a tired and well-worn line from Hon Ken Travers. My Pete knows exactly where he stands.

Several members interjected.

Hon SUE ELLERY: I am being frivolous, but I should not be because this is a very serious issue. It is because of the affection and high regard that I and many other people have for our companion animals that the RSPCA is held in such high regard. It is interesting that the organisation that this inquiry seeks to look into is held in such high regard that its current patron in chief is Her Excellency Hon Kerry Sanderson, AO, Governor of Western Australia. Its patrons are Hon Colin Barnett, MLA, Premier; Hon Mark McGowan, MLA, Leader of the Opposition; and Hon Wayne Martin, AC, Chief Justice of Western Australia. Some of those in the highest public positions in Western Australia are quite happy to have their names associated with and to themselves be associated with this organisation. That is not because it is an organisation characterised by animal rights extremism. It is not because it is an organisation characterised by the Peter Singers of this world, and it is not because it is an organisation associated with evangelicalism—that is not the word I am thinking of. The word that Hon Rick Mazza used.

Hon Nick Goiran: Evangelism, maybe.

Hon SUE ELLERY: That is the one, sorry, the member is quite right.

The PRESIDENT: *Hansard* will get it right.

Hon SUE ELLERY: *Hansard* always makes me look a lot more articulate than I actually am.

In market research conducted in 2012, the RSPCA had 96 per cent brand awareness. The overall community perception of the RSPCA was overwhelmingly positive, and less than three per cent of people had a negative impression of the organisation. Ninety-seven per cent of those surveyed had a positive impression of the RSPCA. Do we really want to have an inquiry into an organisation that is so highly regarded by the Western Australian population?

I think the real issue, and what concerns people such as Hon Rick Mazza—I hope he does not think that I am putting words into his mouth, and will stand corrected if he thinks that I have got it wrong—is the RSPCA's advocacy role. I think the minister even referred to concerns that the RSPCA might be behaving like a political lobby group. If that is what is really behind this motion, let us call it that, and the member should say that that is what he wants to have an inquiry into. If that is the proposition of this motion—that we ought to have an inquiry because we do not believe that the RSPCA should conduct itself as a political advocate or in the role of political lobbyist—we really have to question what kind of democracy it is that we are in. Is it our role to say that because we do not like the particular brand of politics that an organisation is pursuing, we should externally change the objectives of that organisation?

Sometimes Parliament has taken the view that some forms of political extremism are not acceptable to the community. The Western Australian Parliament—it was the government at the time, but it was the Parliament really—took the view that the actions of people such as Jack van Tongeren with respect to racism were really unacceptable in Western Australia and expressed its point of view and the government of the day took action on that. There are some standards and laws put around those standards about what that is. There are debates from time to time about racial vilification and those sorts of things. Is the proposition before us that the RSPCA is breaking some already established laws about the kind of points of view that we will accept in our democracy? That proposition has not been put and it cannot be put, because the RSPCA is not—if members are of the view that they do not like the RSPCA's advocacy or lobbying—advocating or lobbying for anything that breaches any of our laws or any of the standards that we have set about on the edges of our democracy. Nothing the RSPCA

has done or said breaches any of that, but we have before us a motion that states that we need to spend our time and taxpayers' money to conduct an inquiry into the objectives of a highly regarded not-for-profit community organisation. I think it is absolutely extraordinary that we think we have the right to do that. As I have said before—I want it to be absolutely clear—I take no issue with this Parliament giving the highest possible scrutiny to how taxpayers' money is spent. If members really think that that \$500 000 a year is not being spent appropriately, I take no issue with looking into that, except I would say right now that it would be putting the cart before the horse because the minister has already told us that his department is conducting a review into that. I might be wrong—correct me if I am wrong—but the minister said he anticipated something around August. The minister is indicating by nodding that that is the case.

Hon Ken Travers: Has he announced who's doing it?

Hon SUE ELLERY: Yes. He has announced the names of the members of the panel.

If the minister is reviewing how taxpayers' money is being spent on animal welfare, why are we effectively trying to do the same thing—except, of course, we are not; we are trying to do something much broader than that. The case has not been put. I think it is embarrassing that the case has not been put to support this motion. It is embarrassing that the government, which is conducting its own inquiry into how taxpayers' money is being spent, supports a motion such as this. I will be interested to hear how the government intends to respond to what I think will happen when ordinary Western Australians find out that this inquiry into the objectives of a community organisation that they hold in such high regard is proceeding. I think it is embarrassing. Certainly, the Labor Party does not want to support that notion. The RSPCA is an organisation the bulk of whose work is around complaints of abuse, neglect or mistreatment of companion animals. The bulk of the way it resolves those issues is through negotiated outcomes with those people.

The minister and Hon Rick Mazza raised the issue of accountability, and that is entirely appropriate. However, if they are concerned that taxpayers' money is being spent in such a fashion as to lack accountability, perhaps they should direct their inquiry to the agency responsible for that accountability. If it is their view that Western Australians do not get the information they want out of the annual reports provided by the RSPCA on how that money is acquitted, perhaps they need to ask the department to write the acquittal arrangements into the contract in a different way. If they think the department is not adequately setting targets and goals and measuring achievement against how that \$500 000 is spent, perhaps they should direct their inquiry to the department, and ultimately to the minister, about what the department and the minister could do differently to give them the satisfaction they want on how that \$500 000 is acquitted. But nothing before us says that that \$500 000 is not being accounted for or is not being acquitted in exactly the terms of the grant arrangements between the government and the RSPCA. There is nothing.

The notion was also put to us that there is “no evidence that extremism has not permeated the RSPCA and that is why we need an inquiry like this”. I wrote those words down and I hope I got them accurately, but Hansard will demonstrate whether I did. It is absolutely extraordinary that we will devote the resources of Parliament into an inquiry on the basis that there is no evidence that extremism has not permeated the RSPCA. Seriously? That is embarrassing.

Hon Ken Travers: We could be busy with lots of inquiries into what is not happening.

Hon SUE ELLERY: Yes. There are 1 000 things that need to be fixed in Western Australia—1 000 things that could be inquired into by a parliamentary committee. The fact that there is no evidence that extremism has not permeated the RSPCA is not an argument for why we should have an inquiry into the RSPCA. That is absolutely embarrassing. It is appalling that we would hold an inquiry on that basis. The mover of the motion said that we need an inquiry like this because “I cannot find any evidence that extremism has not permeated”. Really? Is that what we have come to? We should not be seeking to inquire into an organisation that is very highly regarded by Western Australians. If there is an issue with the expenditure of taxpayers' money, we should look into that. Indeed, the minister has just told us that that is exactly what he is doing and that he will report back to Parliament on it sometime around August. If at that time he says, “I've found out that it's shocking; that \$500 000 is not being acquitted properly and here's what I'm going to do to fix it, and I want the support of the Parliament to do that”, let us act on that. If we are not satisfied that the government's review has indicated that that \$500 000 has been properly acquitted, that is the time for the Parliament to consider whether it needs to do more than what the minister has done in that review—not now. It should not be now when we have no evidence that the RSPCA is not acquitting the money properly; not now when we know how it reports back every year; and not now when we know that the minister will undertake an inquiry. It is extraordinary.

That makes me ask: Why is the honourable member seeking the inquiry if all the facts say that there is no need to have one; if all the facts say that this is a community organisation that has the right to set its own objectives? If we know that the government is conducting an inquiry into how taxpayers' money is being spent, why do we want to do this? I do not think it is the extremist political agenda of the RSPCA; I think it is another extremist

political agenda, and that is one that does not like the advocacy role carried out by the RSPCA. Whoever has that view can have it. I think Hon Rick Mazza has an extreme view about this. He can have that point of view.

Hon Rick Mazza interjected.

Hon SUE ELLERY: He can have that point of view. I respect his right to have that point of view, but I am trying to call this for what it is. It is not appropriate in a democracy like ours to say that we will look into the objectives of a community-based organisation. It is appropriate for us to look at how taxpayers' money is being spent. I would support that, and I support the minister's move to conduct an inquiry, but I do not support the Parliament doing exactly the same thing at exactly the same time. That would be a waste of resources. But I am looking forward to what the minister has to tell us about the way that that \$500 000 is being acquitted and, indeed, every other use of taxpayers' money on animal welfare. As the minister indicated, the review panel that he has constituted is looking not only at the RSPCA, but also at how taxpayers' dollars are spent on animal welfare. That is the right thing to do, and I support that.

The case has not been made in the Parliament for this inquiry to proceed. Frankly, I think it is insulting to an organisation that is so highly regarded and does such important work in the community. It is insulting that we would treat the RSPCA and its members and supporters in the way we are in the terms of this motion, and we will not support it.

HON BRIAN ELLIS (Agricultural) [2.08 pm]: I am sure that everyone here will agree that there is a great need for an organisation such as the RSPCA to protect animals against genuine cruelty. I think a credible, highly regarded organisation, to which, as the Leader of the Opposition has said, some high-profile people are connected in the role of patrons as such, would welcome an inquiry to show that it is open and accountable to those who provide funds to it. However, some concerns have been expressed to me and, I know, to other members of Parliament in a letter and a personal report regarding the activities of the current chief executive officer of the RSPCA. It is my view that an inquiry should focus on a broader role of the organisation. A parliamentary committee would be the suitable avenue through which to conduct that inquiry, given that it could look into the RSPCA as a whole. Importantly, a parliamentary inquiry can raise issues concerning the conduct of RSPCA officers and would allow for natural justice, give people a voice and allow their responses to be recorded.

The motion before the house provides an opportunity to look at new issues that have arisen since Hon Rick Mazza moved a similar motion in 2013, one of which includes the aforementioned personal letter and report that I and various members of Parliament have received from a person with a long association with the RSPCA, formerly at a high level. This person has serious concerns about the operation of the organisation in recent years. According to that person's report, a formal complaint was lodged with the Department of Commerce alleging deceptive practices by the current chief executive officer regarding the RSPCA's fundraising promotions. This person says that the department responded on 21 June 2014, advising that they had contacted the CEO to notify him of the concerns and had reminded him of the RSPCA's obligations with respect to the Australian consumer law. According to this person, the department went on to advise that at this time no further action would be taken. The author of the report also queries what he believed to be a lack of detailed disclosure in the RSPCA's annual report of the use of government grants and Lotterywest grants. Lotterywest grants totalling \$413 128 in 2013 and \$324 837 in 2011 were granted for defined purposes. However, the listed purposes are generalised—such as, information technology, buildings, vehicles and equipment. I believe there should be more detailed follow-up, accountability and an individual costing for the purchased items and services. I also believe that the expenditure of half a million dollars of government money each year should be accounted for, given that there is an increasing move by the RSPCA to be involved in campaigns that oppose such things as the live animal trade industry. In a letter to the *Countryman* on 16 May 2013, the former president of RSPCA Australia, Lynne Bradshaw, now RSPCA WA president, wrote —

RSPCA Australia is calling on the Australian Government to make a firm commitment to a transition away from live exports to a meat-only trade for the sake of Australian animals and Australian farmers.

Frankly, I am not comfortable with the RSPCA using government money to campaign against an industry that the granting government supports. By the way, I did not feel any better when my office checked out the RSPCA's world of animal welfare education website for teachers on 11 March 2015 and found that it states —

In 2001, the State Government honoured its promise to introduce new animal welfare legislation and to provide a recurring grant to the Society for the next four years. This \$250 000 per year provides, for the first time, an element of financial certainty towards approximately 10 per cent of our annual operating costs.

Despite that website being upgraded on 20 May 2014, the RSPCA website went on to state —

Unfortunately, the State Government elected in 2008 did not continue this grant, causing us to depend solely upon the generosity of the public to provide essential services.

It appears that for the last six years the RSPCA has effectively been telling teachers, who pass on that misinformation, in a ripple effect, to children in classrooms and their parents at home, that the Barnett government and Lotterywest do not care about the RSPCA. That is despite the fact that the Barnett government has doubled the grant and has been giving the RSPCA half a million dollars a year since it was elected. On top of that, the Barnett government has doubled the number of animal welfare inspectors from six to 12.

In a parliamentary question to the former Minister for Agriculture and Food, Terry Redman, on 19 June 2012, Lisa Baker, MLA, referred to the additional funding of \$250 000 to the RSPCA and asked questions about outcomes, performance indicators, outputs and other deliverables and the completion dates. In response, Minister Redman said —

There are no specific key performance indicators, but the RSPCA is required to report annually on achievement of outcomes, stakeholder engagement activities and expenditure related to the grant;

Having acknowledged the extra funding and having questioned how accountable the RSPCA was for spending the money, on 20 August 2013, Lisa Baker, MLA, issued a media statement claiming that the “Barnett government continues to erode the protections afforded to animals”. I find that type of thinking difficult to understand when the government supports animal welfare more than any government before it.

The Barnett government has also doubled the annual funding for animal welfare to \$1.6 million. Added to that, and after providing various funding amounts for over three decades, Lotterywest has provided the RSPCA close to \$1 million in the last three years alone. That is hardly a sign that the RSPCA depends solely on public generosity, as claimed in its educational website.

Minister Redman’s parliamentary answer on the RSPCA grant accountability was made when the Animal Welfare Act was under the auspices of local government. There is now a new agreement between the RSPCA and the Department of Agriculture and Food, which is the agency currently responsible for that act. Perhaps the department could either request or require more detailed reporting on the expenditure of the government’s grant money to ensure that whilst it may be used for educational purposes it is not used for propaganda. This is particularly important, given my understanding that the role of the RSPCA treasurer, which used to rest with the RSPCA board, is now vested in the CEO. Moreover, according to that personal report I mentioned earlier, the provision to appoint the chief executive of the state government department that manages the Animal Welfare Act was removed and there is now no such representation on the RSPCA board. This becomes even more critical given that on 31 August 2014 *The Sunday Times* published an article titled “RSPCA budget crisis”, in which it was reported that RSPCA WA had made a desperate plea for donations after running up a loss of more than \$1 million last year. The article went on to state that the RSPCA shed the equivalent of 4.5 full-time positions the previous month as part of a restructure prompted by financial constraints. However, the CEO told *The Sunday Times* that two new staff were also hired as part of the small restructure. It does not appear to be as simple as that.

The person who provided that personal report to me, as well as to other members, included a list allegedly provided to him by former employees detailing 26 employee departures, either voluntary or involuntary, since the appointment of the current CEO. These allegedly included: two chief inspectors; a senior inspector; three inspectors; one inspectorate staff; a chief prosecutor; a contract solicitor; two veterinarians; the executive manager marketing, who had also been the acting CEO; the executive manager business services; the manager people and safety; the finance manager; finance accounts; manager education; a fundraising officer; customer service persons; and, most interestingly, the policy manager after just four weeks. The personal report claims that another 11 employees’ positions were terminated in June 2014. It alleges that they were required to sign confidentiality agreements. I understand that they included the policy and planning manager and two education officers. Since then, apparently, the public relations officer has also parted company with the RSPCA. When I look at these departures, I cannot help wondering whether these staff changes were part of a policy direction change being driven within the RSPCA. It appears that way, as I will explain shortly.

The RSPCA WA president, Lynne Bradshaw, said in the society’s August 2012 newsletter that the board had recently set down its new strategic plan and the new CEO’s appointment would help position RSPCA WA to drive change across a range of welfare issues. Only a few months later, in November 2012, *The West Australian* ran an article titled, “RSPCA turns into political animal”. When the RSPCA launched its political animal campaign during an open day at its Malaga headquarters, after nearly 40 staff terminations around that time, I am wondering whether anyone who did not agree with the new direction of the RSPCA either got the chop or left. We only have to read the RSPCA’s summer 2014–15 magazine, *Great & Small*, to see the list of political campaigns that seems to be ever expanding, including a campaign against the live meat trade; a campaign called “set a sister free”, to stop caged egg production; a campaign against culling sharks; and a campaign against

recreational hunting. This is no better illustrated than the full-page advertisements that have appeared in *The West Australian* over the past few weeks. I was told that these ads cost around \$15 000.

Hon Peter Collier: No, \$18 000.

Hon BRIAN ELLIS: I have a lower figure. Given the resources involved in promoting and attending these campaigns, I can only presume that that takes a toll on the staff available to do what I and other people see as the traditional role of the RSPCA—that is, respond to cruelty and neglect alerts, rescue and re-home animals and educate the public and offenders about proper animal care. I did a quick calculation based on the figure of \$15 000 for the ads in *The West Australian*. If it is wrong, I am out by a few days but that money could pay for more than two years' worth of animal shelters. That is taken from the RSPCA's home website that says it costs about \$20 a day to shelter an animal. We can see where the funds have gone; the RSPCA has moved away from protecting animals.

According to *The Sunday Times* article titled "RSPCA budget crisis", the RSPCA re-homed just 600 animals in 2013 compared with more than 5 000 animals re-homed by grassroots animal rescue groups in WA. It may be worse than that. After the seizure of 130 animals on 2 February 2014, *The Sunday Times* ran an article with the headline "Did pets have to die?" The opening paragraph states —

The WA Government has raised fears the RSPCA is destroying pets that could be kept alive.

PerthNow carried a similar report the same day, stating that a briefing note to the head of the Department of Agriculture and Food, Rob Delane, dated May 2013, the same year that the RSPCA re-homed 600 animals, states —

"It is unclear whether the RSPCA had sufficient grounds to destroy these animals ...

It warned that the RSPCA's processes were inadequate. According to the PerthNow report, the briefing note came after Mr Delane wrote to the RSPCA inspector involved in the case in April to warn that the RSPCA could be charged. Just what is going on in this organisation? It certainly made me shake my head when I read *The Sunday Times* article from September 2012 stating that the RSPCA's newly-appointed senior inspector, who had been in Perth for only three weeks after moving from Britain, said it was like landing on Mars when she arrived in Perth and discovered cats and dogs still being sold in shopping centres. The article quotes her as saying that she planned to introduce a code of practice for pet owners. This was only a few months after *The West Australian* reported that the RSPCA believed dog owners may need to be licensed by completing training programs with their pets.

Farm Weekly quoted former Pastoralists and Graziers Association of Western Australia president, Rob Gillam, saying that the RSPCA had gone from being a credible animal welfare organisation to morphing itself into becoming an animal liberation organisation. The same article quoted the WAFarmers president, Mike Norton, calling into question the state government's decision to increase funding to the RSPCA, saying that the RSPCA had gone away from its original charter and had been infiltrated by animal activist-type organisations. In fact, the personal report that I mentioned earlier in my speech claims that animal liberation took control of the RSPCA for a period of time. If that is the case, it would appear that its influence is still alive and well.

Thankfully, we live in a democracy. Whatever my personal views about the RSPCA's campaigns, if the organisation's charter permits these political activities, perhaps it is a matter for the RSPCA's members to take up with their board if they feel it is undermining their capacity to meet their traditional core purpose. Nevertheless, I believe that a parliamentary inquiry might clear the decks with regard to other concerns that have been raised about the internal workings of the RSPCA in recent years and the percentage of its funding that is spent on political campaigns. The government of the day and ensuing governments will then be able to choose whether to continue to support this organisation.

HON DARREN WEST (Agricultural) [2.31 pm]: I rise to make a contribution on what I find a bizarre motion and one that Hon Sue Ellery has spoken very eloquently about. The Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals is a community-based organisation that receives funding from the government of \$500 000 a year. In this motion, we are realistically being asked as a Parliament to put resources into establishing a select committee to inquire into the operations of the Western Australian Royal—for all those monarchists over there; all those Prince Philip people and royal baby people—Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. It is an extraordinary state of affairs when we are realistically being asked as a Parliament to consider putting resources into this. Sadly, the Liberals have the numbers in this place, and I am quite sure that the National Party members will, once again, support the Liberals, as they do on everything that comes into the house. I have never seen them once vote against anything that the Liberals have put up in this house. Of course, Hon Rick Mazza is —

Several members interjected.

The ACTING PRESIDENT (Hon Amber-Jade Sanderson): Order, members! Hon Darren West has the call.

Hon DARREN WEST: The point I am making, Madam Acting President, is that the members of the National Party are a subservient lot, and I expect that the Liberals will count on their support to get this motion through and we will have to go through this crazy process where a select committee will have to come up with some findings and take up an enormous amount of the time of the members on this committee on a matter that really is quite wacko and bizarre, I think is a good way of putting it.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING PRESIDENT: Order, members! I note that none of the members of the National Party has stood to seek the call, and I invite them to do so at the appropriate time to make a contribution. Hon Darren West has the call.

Hon DARREN WEST: Thank you, Madam Acting President. I certainly look forward to contributions from members of the National Party. I am sure they will be enlightening, as normal. I am sure they will be intelligent, as normal. We look forward to them.

Let us have a bit of a look at what we are talking about here. We are talking about the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. What I am hearing is that the RSPCA is being charged for doing what it can to prevent cruelty to animals. That is as wacko as the rest of the motion. The charter of the RSPCA is to prevent cruelty to animals. Members of this house are suggesting that something is wrong with that. What is even more bizarre is that members of the government are suggesting that Hon Rick Mazza is right in moving this motion. The Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals is being charged for preventing cruelty to animals. What an odd set of circumstances that is!

Hon Jim Chown: Nobody has said that. We are asking for an inquiry. That is all.

The ACTING PRESIDENT: Order, Hon Jim Chown! Hon Jim Chown will have the opportunity to make his contribution.

Hon DARREN WEST: The Parliament is being asked to do an inquiry into a community-based organisation, the patron of which is none less than the Governor of Western Australia. The chief patron of the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals is none less than the Governor of the state of Western Australia. What does that say of the opinion of members opposite of the Governor of Western Australia? It gets worse.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING PRESIDENT: Order, members! This has been a debate that has been conducted well so far. Let us not let it deteriorate.

Hon DARREN WEST: It gets worse. Her Excellency the Governor, Hon Kerry Sanderson, AO, is the chief patron of the RSPCA, the organisation that members opposite are calling into disrepute and want to do some sort of parliamentary committee witch-hunt on.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING PRESIDENT: Order! How do members expect Hansard to record proceedings with their continued yelling over each other?

Hon Paul Brown interjected.

The ACTING PRESIDENT: Order, Hon Paul Brown! Hon Darren West has the call.

Hon DARREN WEST: As I was saying, Hon Kerry Sanderson, AO, the Governor of Western Australia, is the chief patron of the RSPCA, the organisation that members are calling into disrepute in this motion and that they want to do some sort of political witch-hunt on. Members opposite may be interested to know who the other patrons of this organisation—the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, which is widely supported by the Western Australian public—are. The first is Hon Colin Barnett, MLA, Premier of Western Australia—their leader. The Premier of Western Australia is a patron of the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. The other patrons of the RSPCA are Hon Mark McGowan, MLA, Leader of the Opposition and next Premier of Western Australia, and Hon Wayne Martin, AC, Chief Justice of Western Australia. These are the patrons of the organisation that members opposite are seeking to tear down and take apart. That is what they are doing. This is a political witch-hunt. It is no more and no less. Let us call it for what it is.

I will go further about the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals and its good work. It is a community-based organisation, and it has—this has not been mentioned anywhere in all of this debate—an elected board of governance. I want to tell members opposite about the calibre of the people who oversee the organisation that is the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals and who members opposite are seeking to attack in this witch-hunt inquiry. I will go through them in order.

The president of the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals is, as members would know, Lynne Bradshaw. She was elected to the board of the RSPCA in 1997, so she has been on the board of the RSPCA for a very long time. I will read from the RSPCA website and tell members something about Lynne Bradshaw —

Lynne Bradshaw held the office of President since 2004, after being elected to RSPCA WA Council in 1997 and previously serving as Vice-President. She was also the National President of RSPCA Australia between 2006 and late 2013. Lynne is Director of Marketing for an ASX listed healthcare group. She has a 25-year record in senior management and Director positions in the healthcare industry, both locally and overseas. Having established, grown and eventually sold her own businesses, she has high level experience in business strategy, marketing, financial management and business development.

Is it not a shame that she is not a member of the Liberal government? I reckon they could do much better with that level of expertise among their ranks. It continues —

Before moving to Australia in 1985, Lynne was a committed member of RSPCA UK.

That also stands for the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. It continues —

Lynne has also been an active member in the Fauna Rehabilitation Foundation (now Native Animal Rescue). Lynne is also a sitting member of the Telethon Institute Animal Ethics Committee and is the RSPCA WA representative on the WA Animal Welfare Advisory.

That is the calibre of person that members opposite are seeking to take down with their witch-hunt political inquiry.

Several members interjected.

Hon DARREN WEST: They are. Let us call it for what it is.

Hon Rick Mazza interjected.

Hon DARREN WEST: I will get to that in a while.

The next member of the board of the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to animals is a gentleman called Ian Cowie. Ian Cowie was appointed to the RSPCA in 2000. So, again, he is a person on the board who has a lot of experience. He was first elected in 2007. The website states —

Ian Cowie is the Chief Executive Officer at the City of Gosnells, a position he holds since 2009. Previously, he was the Director of Governance and Strategy at the City of Joondalup for three years and a Director at the Department of Local Government for over 10 years, where he represented Western Australia on the Commonwealth Government's National Consultative Committee on Animal Welfare and participated in the development of Australia's first National Animal Welfare Strategy. Ian was also responsible for the development and implementation of the current Animal Welfare Act 2002.

Several members interjected.

Hon DARREN WEST: I know it is not easy listening up there, but these are the sorts of people the government is taking out. The web page continues —

Ian holds a Bachelor of Arts Degree with first class honours from the University of Western Australia and a Masters Degree in Economics from the London School of Economics. In June 2014 Ian received the Public Service Medal in the Queen's Birthday Honours, for his outstanding public service, particularly to the City of Gosnells.

There is another board member in the sights, so to speak, of Hon Rick Mazza. The web page continues —

DARE Megan – first elected 2009

Megan Dare has a Bachelor of Tourism and History from Murdoch University and is currently studying at Curtin University. Megan has traveled extensively throughout Europe and the United States, and is currently a Procurement Manager in the Department of Corrective Services. Through her role, she has built an understanding of strategic policies and planning, risk-management practices, contractual obligations, and data analysis.

Megan has been a volunteer at RSPCA since 2005, fostering numerous cats and kittens. In 2005, Megan established a non-profit dog club with over 50 members, which assists in dog socialisation, dog rescues and rehoming. Megan is also President of the RSPCA Perth Auxiliary.

In 2008, Megan was successful in persuading companies, including Bunnings —

So now Bunnings is on the RSPCA's side —

to donate more than \$70,000 of products for project at the Malaga shelter. She was also responsible for the donation of a washing machine to the Admissions Building. With her husband Aaron, they are the proud parents of two dogs and two cats, all of whom are rescue animals.

There is another board member under the gun from the Liberal–National government. The next member is someone I know personally —

De LANDGRAFFT Jeanette – first elected 2009

Many members will be familiar with the outstanding work done in the Agricultural Region by Jeanette De Landgrafft. The website states —

Jeanette De Landgrafft farms and is a Lake Grace Shire Councillor, as well as a member of the Country High School Hostels Authority, —

There is actually a farmer on the board of the RSPCA. Unlike the situation in the Liberal–National government, there is actually a farmer on the RSPCA board. She lives on and operates a farm, unlike anybody in the Liberal–National government —

which ensures an understanding of the importance of good governance and financial responsibility of organisations such as the RSPCA WA. She has a teaching degree and was the President of the Isolated Children’s Parents’ Association of Western Australia for 3 years and on the State Council for 10 years, giving her a sound appreciation of the necessity to promote and finance a voluntary organisation.

As a primary producer involving livestock, Jeanette takes a keen interest in animal welfare on the family farm and is well aware of the benefits of good animal husbandry as the key for sustainability. Jeanette is committed to contributing towards policies that ensure highest animal welfare standards are developed and adhered to.

I would like members opposite take notice of the words “highest animal welfare standards”, which we all benefit from. The next member of the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals board is Michelle Mackenzie, who was elected in 2010. The website states —

Michelle Mackenzie has had a lifelong interest in animal welfare with a particular focus on intensive farming practices. Michelle is currently an Executive Director at the Department of Regional Development. Prior to this role, Michelle worked in community relations at Rio Tinto Iron Ore and at the WA Local Government Association (WALGA) where key positions included the Community Policy Manager and the Executive Manager Infrastructure.

Before moving to Perth in 2003, Michelle lived in the Pilbara, working for local government, and on remote Aboriginal communities in the Kimberley. Michelle has received a number of National and State awards for her work in Local Government, regional development and reconciliation. Michelle has a Master of Arts in Public Policy, a Bachelor of Music/Arts with Honours from the University of Melbourne, and graduated in 2010 with an Order of Merit from the Australian Institute of Company Directors’ course. Michelle is a Fellow of Leadership WA.

The next board member is Heidi Shields, first elected in 2007. The website states —

Heidi Shields grew up on sheep and cattle properties before graduating from the National Centre for Petroleum Geology and Geophysics with Honours in 2000. Heidi is a Senior Geophysicist working for a multinational service company specialising in data acquisition and processing.

On moving to Perth, Heidi began volunteering at the Malaga shelter and held the position of Secretary of the Perth Auxiliary between 2004 and 2009. Heidi was elected to the RSPCA WA Board in 2007, appointed Chair of the Audit and Risk Management Committee in 2009 —

Hon Brian Ellis may be interested in that —

and re-elected for a second term in 2011. In 2010, she represented WA at the RSPCA National Forum.

Heidi was Secretary of the Western Australia Dragon Boat Association for 10 years ...

That certainly would have given her some insight into volunteer organisations. The next board member, recently appointed, is Graeme Boden. The website states —

Graeme Boden has an economics degree from Monash University and had 25 years’ experience in the finance and administration/planning and evaluation functions of large resources companies before forming his own corporate services business in 1998.

Graeme’s employers in the resources sector included BHP Melbourne, CRA Ltd, the Gwalia Group and two of the largest US companies. Graeme’s past memberships include: Fellow of CPA Australia,

Fellow of the Taxation Institute of Australia and Associate Fellow of the Australian Institute of Management. He has been a Fellow of the Australian Institute of Company Directors since 1996.

Several members interjected.

Hon DARREN WEST: For members opposite, in case they were not listening, this is the board of the organisation into which the government wants to hold a political inquiry. I am trying to point out to members —

Several members interjected.

The ACTING PRESIDENT (Hon Amber-Jade Sanderson): Order! I invite Hon Darren West to continue his remarks through the Chair.

Hon DARREN WEST: Thank you, Madam Acting President. I am trying to point out to members opposite that I have not struck anyone yet on the RSPCA board who would not stack up well against the curricula vitae of any member on the other side making this decision to go on a political witch-hunt after this organisation. I am talking about Graeme Boden, a board member of the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. The website continues —

His current clients include a range of unlisted and ASX Listed companies, initially mostly biotechnology/healthcare and, more recently, mostly resources. Graeme and his employees handle corporate matters such as mergers, IPOs, routine governance, accounting and administration services.

Graeme's involvement in the not for profit sector has principally been in education, including seven years on the governing body of a leading independent school, initially as Chair of the Finance Committee and subsequently Deputy Chair. He was founding Treasurer of the Learning & Attentional Disorders Society of WA and has served 20 years in that role.

The next board member—there are not many more—is Peter Rosseidscher, appointed recently. According to the website —

Peter is a professional Director and advisor, with a long career in innovative growth businesses, domestically and internationally. He has developed extensive commercial experience over 25 years leading global technology, marketing and services companies.

Peter is Chairman of a resource industry consulting group. His voluntary Board Director roles are Chairman of Trails WA (the trails sector state peak body) and Austmine (the national peak body for Australian METS). Prior roles include Chairman of a consulting group in Sweden, CEO of a business intelligence provider, Partner of a venture firm and Managing Director of a Fortune 100 company.

Peter is a Fellow of the Australian Institute of Company Directors. His education includes a Masters Degree in Marketing and Bachelors in Computer Science. Peter and his wife have two children and two small dogs named Lucky and Brave.

Lucky and Brave are now also mentioned in *Hansard*, Hon Sue Ellery! The next board director of the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals is Giselle di San Marzano. The website states —

Giselle di San Marzano is a senior lawyer at the State Solicitor's Office.

Several members interjected.

Hon DARREN WEST: I can hear members opposite muttering amongst themselves, and I am sure they are saying to each other that they are not nearly as qualified as any of these people.

The ACTING PRESIDENT: Order! Hon Darren West has the call. Try not to be distracted by members in the chamber.

Hon DARREN WEST: Thank you, Madam Acting President; I will take your advice.

Several members interjected.

Hon DARREN WEST: As I have said, I am sure members opposite are sitting there saying, "Gee, I'm not as qualified as any of these people; I don't know quite why we would be launching an inquiry into them." But I will progress. I might have to start that one again —

Giselle di San Marzano is a senior lawyer at the State Solicitor's Office. She has a law degree from UWA and nearly 30 years' experience of varied legal practice in the Government sector, both Commonwealth and State. Giselle currently specialises in the equal opportunity and discrimination jurisdiction, undertaking work for a variety of Government departments and agencies.

Giselle has a lifelong love of animals and a particular interest in animal welfare. She is a member of the RSPCA Perth Auxiliary and a volunteer dog walker at the Malaga shelter. She is also on the Cat Haven

Board and volunteers at their shelter, in addition to helping out at fundraising events. Giselle has three rescue cats and is in the process of adopting a dog.

Pamela Hass was recently appointed. The web page states —

Pamela worked in a variety of legal positions before joining Curtin University as General Counsel, where she established the university's first in-house legal service. Advice was provided in administrative law, governance, intellectual property, dispute resolution, contract/commercial law and property law. She then moved to Sydney for 8 months, where she worked as General Counsel at Macquarie University, and returned to Perth in 2008 as University Secretary, Director of Governance and Special Legal Counsel at UWA.

In 2010 Pamela moved from the university sector to the Department of State Development as Principal Legal Counsel, Legal and Commercial Strategy, where she heads a small in-house legal team working on the State's major resources projects.

Pamela holds a Bachelor's degree in Law (with honours), a Master's degree in Law and an Arts degree. She is a member of the Australian Institute of Company Directors and was an elected member of the Council of the Law Society of WA and a Board member of the Perth Institute of Contemporary Art. She was also the first national president of the Australian Corporate Lawyers Association.

The final board member who was recently appointed is Alwyn Vorster. The web page states —

Alwyn has held senior management roles with a number of leading mining companies. His current role is General Manager for an ASX listed mining resource company, where he is responsible for projects in the Pilbara and South Africa.

Hon Ken Travers: These extremists are everywhere!

Hon DARREN WEST: That is exactly right. Hon Ken Travers is on to it; he knows where it is going. It continues —

Alwyn spent the first 33-years of his life in South Africa. He completed two years military service and was deployed to northern Namibia. Following that, he qualified as a geologist and then obtained post-graduate degrees in mineral economics and management. He moved with his family to Australia in 1996 and has since been involved in the marketing, shipping and sales of iron ore to China, Japan, Korea and Taiwan. He also spent some years working in Singapore.

Alwyn's wife is a part-time high school science teacher and part-time medical assistant. They have a daughter who is studying for a nursing degree and a Labrador called Archie.

Who is also now in *Hansard* in perpetuity —

They are volunteer dog walkers at the Dogs Refuge Home in Shenton Park.

Alwyn's other interests include many forms of physical activities—he has completed two Avon Descent canoe marathons, two Ironman triathlons and 15 standard marathons.

Is that not a list of extreme animal activists if ever I have heard one? This group of people are far more qualified than any member opposite. I think they would be disbelieving that a rabble such as the current state Liberal government is suggesting that there should be an inquiry into them. These people are far more qualified, far smarter and far better organised than any member opposite, yet they want to hold an inquiry into these people. There are no animal extremists in this group, and saying that the RSPCA has been infiltrated by animal extremists is the view of someone who has not even done the simple act of looking at the board of the RSPCA. That is all it took. If members read the information about the board members of the RSPCA, they would then think to themselves that this organisation is fairly well governed by some high-quality people with some great qualifications —

Hon Liz Behjat: How do you know that? If you don't look into it, you don't know what the governance is.

Hon DARREN WEST: Hon Liz Behjat, I have just read —

Several members interjected.

The ACTING PRESIDENT: Order, members! Hon Darren West has the call.

Hon DARREN WEST: I have just read to members opposite the qualifications of the board members of the RSPCA.

Hon Liz Behjat: How does that demonstrate how the governance works?

Hon DARREN WEST: The allegation from Hon Rick Mazza is that the RSPCA has been infiltrated by extreme animal activists. I have just pointed out that that is not the case. This is the board of governance. On top of that, it has a patron.

Several members interjected.

Hon DARREN WEST: They are eminently more qualified than Hon Paul Brown to run an organisation such as the RSPCA, so let us just leave it at that.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING PRESIDENT (Hon Amber-Jade Sanderson): Order, members! I have previously invited Hon Paul Brown to make a contribution at the appropriate time, and I invite him to do so then.

Hon DARREN WEST: This is not an organisation that has been infiltrated by animal extremists. That is not the case. I think that we can end that silly line of debate here and now. Someone opposite might have suggested that we do not know whether they are animal extremists. I think that all those people would be highly offended by that view. I encourage whoever holds that view to make an appointment with the board members of the RSPCA and tell them that they think they are extreme animal activists. I encourage members opposite to show a bit of front and not just yell comments across the chamber and disparage and denigrate these people. Why do they not tell these people themselves? I will bet that not one member would point the finger at the board members of the RSPCA and say that they are extreme animal activists. I think we can end that one here and now.

The RSPCA does not hold the views of Peter Singer. If members were listening, they would have heard that Peter Singer is not on the board of governance of the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. I did not read out his name; I did not read out anything about him. He is not on the governing council of the RSPCA.

Evangelism is something that members opposite know more about than we do. I do not think there are any evangelistic-type people on the board, although members may want to take that up with them. I think “evangelism” is a bit of a silly word. I do not think the RSPCA preaches evangelism. I will leave it to members opposite to discuss who preaches evangelism.

I think the minister’s motion is a much better idea. Let us look at whether we are getting good value for our \$500 000. Let us not discredit and denigrate the organisation or the people who give up their time voluntarily to serve in their capacity as board members. I think that is all very silly.

I asked myself right from the start why do we have to go through this, why are we being put through this debate and why will we be asked by the Liberal–National government when the time comes to vote to support putting a whole lot of parliamentarians’ time into such a committee when there are so many other things that we could inquire into. The state’s finances are trashed, our economy is going to be downgraded again, we have big problems in remote Aboriginal communities, we have problems in the eastern agricultural region in the state, there is a big problem with crisis housing and homelessness, and we are cutting education. Surely all these issues are more important for the Parliament to spend its time on than whether Hon Rick Mazza thinks the board of the RSPCA has been infiltrated by extreme animal activists. Surely there are more important things that this Parliament could put its time into than a witch-hunt into the RSPCA. I welcome the minister’s review. I think it is a good thing for Parliament to always be diligent about how taxpayers’ money is spent. It does not seem to bother the government too much about having a review when it wants to build an apartment tower in Karratha. I make the point that the donation given by the Western Australian government to the RSPCA is less than the cost of one of those empty apartments in the Pelago tower in Karratha. I think that puts things into a small amount of perspective.

When I asked myself why we are being subjected to this and why we are wasting Parliament’s time on what is not really a big issue facing the people of Western Australia, I started to do a little research into why Hon Rick Mazza might put up such a motion and try to get some publicity around the future of the RSPCA. I have not been in this place long, but I took a couple of lines of inquiry into why that might be. I searched through the results of the last state election and I looked at the Agricultural Region, which is my region. I found that, at the last election, the Shooters and Fishers Party gained the favour of 2 618 voters, which is 0.23 of a quota. It came in well behind the Greens, who got 3 149 votes, or 0.28 of a quota. So that everybody knows, the political party that is promoting the RSPCA as an extreme animal activist got 0.23 of a quota, but the Greens got more than that, with 3 149 votes, and Hon Rick Mazza was elected. Coincidentally, WA Labor, which, I have to admit, had a poor showing at the last election but also had one member from the Agricultural Region elected to the Legislative Council, got 13 998 votes. That is around 12 000 more votes. I also note that a former National Party leader, who went to the election with a couple of quite large knives protruding from his back and blood running all over the floor, got 4 219 votes, which is almost double the number of votes received by the Shooters and Fishers Party. Two thousand, six hundred and eighteen votes is less than three per cent of the votes

and mirrors the number of people, 97 per cent, who think that the RSPCA is a favourable organisation. I think the weight of public opinion is quite strongly against what Hon Rick Mazza is proposing. Ninety-seven per cent of people in the Agricultural Region favour the RSPCA as an organisation while about three per cent favour Hon Rick Mazza's political party as an organisation.

Hon Rick Mazza interjected.

Hon DARREN WEST: Okay. I am putting things into a bit of perspective for members opposite. Even Max Trenorden, a former National Party leader, got a knife before the brutal pre-selection. I do not think that would happen in any other political party—knifed at preselection! He even got more votes than the Shooters and Fishers Party. So I am thinking perhaps this is a way —

Several members interjected.

The ACTING PRESIDENT (Hon Amber-Jade Sanderson): Order, members! Hon Darren West has the call.

Hon DARREN WEST: People are calling this a political issue. I think I know what the real political agenda is; that is, to lift the profile of Hon Rick Mazza so that perhaps he will be elected again and maybe more people will go along with this. Let us see what it is. That was one line of inquiry that I took when looking at why we might be debating this motion. Perhaps it is a political issue after all, but it is not the political issue that has been put in front of us because, as I said, we have a very sound board and community-based organisation that has the favour of the public. It does an outstanding job in its charter, which is the prevention of cruelty to animals. Hon Ken Travers and I recently took the opportunity—I do not know whether members opposite have done this, but it would do them good if they have not—to visit the RSPCA headquarters in Malaga. Has any other member been to the RSPCA in Malaga? We were given a tour of the facility. It is an outstanding place. There were animals there in varying states of wellness. Some animals who had been recently seized were quite distressed and in very poor shape. Other animals that had been there for some time were being cared for. The dogs there were much happier with the world and the cats were in good order as well. We also saw animals that had been there for—I think I am right in saying this—more than two years while cases were going through the courts. The RSPCA also has the job of being a holding place for animals while legal disputes between humans are resolved, which is a bit strange. Hon Sue Ellery has touched on the courts in her remarks—she clearly did research in the same area as I did—but to reiterate, in the 2013–14 financial year, 6 113 investigations were carried out resulting in 22 successful prosecutions. Last year, there were 6 000 investigations and 20 000 calls to the cruelty line. Last year in the state of Western Australia, 6 000 investigations were carried out and there were 22 successful prosecutions. As Hon Sue Ellery pointed out, there were zero, none—none at all—unsuccessful prosecutions. In other words, to point it out and make it simple for members on the other side of the chamber who are not as qualified as these people, the RSPCA was successful in its pursuit of every individual or organisation that it took to court. That is, the court decided that the organisation or individual in question had been cruel to an animal or animals. We cannot say that the RSPCA is an extreme animal activist organisation that is vexatious and out to get farmers and pastoralists and anyone who has cats and dogs, because every person or organisation that the RSPCA prosecuted was found guilty. Similarly, in the 2014–15 year, which we have almost finished, there were 12 000 calls to the cruelty line and 4 150 investigations. There were 23 successful prosecutions and zero—same again, two years in a row; zero comes before one—unsuccessful prosecutions. No-one can say that the RSPCA is vexatious and that it is trying to rip people off to court or dish out improvement or infringement notices for no reason, because the evidence does not show that, just like we cannot say that the organisation has been infiltrated by extreme animal activists. The facts suggest otherwise.

I heard a couple of silly things said in members' contributions today, but I am not sure which members made these comments. One member suggested that the RSPCA wants to stop the use of guide dogs. That is not the RSPCA's view—it never has been and never will be. That is just clouding the waters for some other agenda and rationalising an action that, like I said, is whacko and bizarre.

I will talk a little about live export, because that industry is important to me. As I have told members in the house previously, only one member of the Western Australian Parliament lives on and operates a farm, and that member is me! I am the only person who lives on and operates his farming property.

Hon Simon O'Brien: Do you export sheep?

Hon DARREN WEST: Yes, absolutely.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING PRESIDENT: Order, Hon Darren West has the call.

Hon DARREN WEST: We export sheep from time to time and contrary to the myth that has been created by those sitting on the other side of the house, I have never once been charged by the RSPCA, I have never once been given an improvement notice by the RSPCA and never once have I been reported to the RSPCA because

we are not cruel to the animals on my farm. If people on farms want to avoid the RSPCA, they should not be cruel to animals; they have to look after their animals. The minister has given some examples of some of the things that can happen in a farming situation. We have all seen people get angry with stock and some of the injuries caused by that. We need to stamp that out and send a clear message that it has to be stamped out and that message must come from the highest level of government right the way down to every person in society. Just as we all instinctively slow down when we see a police car, by knowing that there is a well-resourced and sound and ethical organisation with an excellent board of governance that has not been infiltrated by animal activists, we are well on the way toward preventing cruelty to animals, because that is what this is all about.

We are trying to achieve an ethical and sustainable way to look after animals. This is important not only for the animals but also for a major reason that I do not think members on that side of the house have thought about; and if they have not, I do not know why they have not thought about it. I refer to live export. As I have said, I am involved in live export and we have had no problem live exporting. We all saw the *Four Corners* program and are aware of what can happen when people do not do the right thing when exporting animals overseas. As a result, the Exports Supply Chain Assurance System was put in place whereby animals are monitored right the way from farm to their final destination. The public is now much more comfortable with the live export industry because it has such a system. From there being a war between those who are anti-live export and those who are pro-live export, live export is now much more widely accepted in the community. Of course, there will be those who want to stop the trade and we in the industry understand that in the long term it would be nice to transition to a situation in which we export everything in boxes, because that would create employment and remove some of the risks to our industry when things do not go right. That industry is now accepted by the public and it is better for it as a result; it is a stronger, more durable industry and, consequently, livestock prices have not been higher because of the extra competition from other countries that accept that we have the strongest assurance scheme anywhere in the world. That is a good thing. Without the RSPCA and other organisations highlighting cruelty to animals, we would not have the scheme and we would still be in a situation in which our lambs would be worth \$120 one day and \$60 the following week if not for a boat that was caught floating around the gulf with nowhere to offload its sheep and no assurance scheme. The story was all over the media for months and farmers suffered as a result. The scheme is a good thing; it came out of an adverse situation. This is the reason we need organisations such as the RSPCA and we need them to be governed by people of this calibre. We do not need to drag these people through parliamentary inquiries. Some of these people might think: "Look, I do not deserve this. I do not want this, and I will move on and do something else." We should encourage good people onto boards such as the RSPCA board. We should resource the organisation and we should appreciate the RSPCA's work. As the only farmer in the chamber, I have nothing to fear—

Hon Paul Brown interjected.

Hon DARREN WEST: Someone has rattled that pig bucket again.

As the farmer in the house, I have nothing to fear from the RSPCA. I am not lying awake at 3.00 am wondering whether the RSPCA will come and close me down. Of course I do not worry about that, because there is nothing to worry about.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING PRESIDENT (Hon Amber-Jade Sanderson): Order, members!

Hon DARREN WEST: Hon Rick Mazza touched on a point that I think is very, very pertinent that actually makes the case against having this inquiry. He made the point that one day supermarkets will insist on RSPCA-badged meat. I think that is a good program that currently runs on chicken. I would like to see it expanded. I would like to work with industry and supermarkets to have an approved accredited badge that the RSPCA could put on all meat produced ethically and sustainably to RSPCA guidelines. If members go on the RSPCA website, they will find a lot of information about the work the RSPCA does on this. That will create greater community acceptance of the meat that we produce. As I said earlier, 97 per cent of the people surveyed see the RSPCA as a positive and good organisation.

If supermarkets are going to insist on food with an RSPCA accreditation, members have to ask why they might insist on that. Anyone who has been in business—I know the current Liberal government does not do business and books and figures very well—knows that these things are driven by the consumer. If that is what the consumer wants, that is what we will deliver or the consumer will not buy our products. I put to Hon Rick Mazza that supermarkets will insist on having an RSPCA accreditation on their food, because their consumers will pay a premium for that product. The future of agriculture in Western Australia is to get a premium on our products. Our production will always be hampered by climate change.

Hon Jim Chown: What does the RSPCA endorsement on food mean?

Hon DARREN WEST: Can Hon Jim Chown use a computer? On the RSPCA website there is a good explanation —

The ACTING PRESIDENT: Order, members! Hon Darren West has a couple of minutes left, and I encourage him to continue his remarks through the Chair.

Hon DARREN WEST: Thank you, Madam Acting President; I will do so.

This is a good endorsement because it is what consumers want.

Hon Jim Chown: But why?

Hon DARREN WEST: Hon Jim Chown will have to go and stand outside a supermarket and ask people. He can ask people two questions while he is there: Would they be prepared to pay a premium for a product that has the RSPCA badge of approval? Would they pay a premium for a product that is not genetically modified? If Hon Jim Chown were to go and stand in front of a supermarket and ask people those questions, I can tell him the answers he will get. My industry, the agricultural industry, has its future in premium markets, not discount markets. We cannot compete with Asia with our cost structures, but we can compete with quality products. Members may know that the RSPCA is worldwide; it is not just in Western Australia. If a product is RSPCA-approved here, it will also be RSPCA-approved in the country where it is sold. That may be the lamb sold in the United Kingdom or beef sold in Asia. This is a real opportunity for us. We should embrace this and use it like the exporter supply chain assurance system to command a premium for our products. That is our future.

Several members interjected.

Hon DARREN WEST: I do not think that either of those two members will produce much premium product—that is okay—but I intend to produce premium products. If I can get a dollar or 20c more a kilo for a side of lamb with that badge, I am all for it. I already meet the criteria; we do not have cruelty to animals on our farm. We have a low rate of prosecution for that in Western Australia, so, generally speaking, no-one else has much to fear from the RSPCA either.

I think government members are going about this completely the wrong way. They will have a fight with the RSPCA, which is an organisation that the public likes. They are offending the RSPCA board members, which includes a farmer, with this inquiry. It is unbelievable that government members are even contemplating doing this, let alone supporting it. There will be a committee—I can tell members that now. I am sure that members on the opposition side of the chamber have good arguments on this issue. I know that we have good arguments on this issue, but the government has the numbers. I will take the numbers any day and I am sure that the members opposite will as well.

The good commonsense argument is that we should leave the RSPCA alone to do its work. It is an independent community-based organisation. Yes, the Department of Agriculture and Food contributes \$500 000 a year and we should ensure that there are sufficient checks and balances and probity. If there are questions about the way that that money is administered by the chief executive officer or treasurer, by all means, investigate it. Do a review and ensure that all the ducks are in a row. It is not something that we do very often, but it is something we should do here. Other than that, I think we should do what Liberal members often say that we should do and create less red tape—this is a red-tape fest—get out of the way, because none of us are qualified to work in this area and certainly not as qualified as these people to run an organisation such as the RSPCA, and let the RSPCA get on with its job. It has good public support, which it has earned over a number of years. The RSPCA was formed in 1980—it has been around for a long time. Just because some people want to embark on activities that may not always be uncruel to animals is no reason to get rid of the RSPCA. No reason at all! I know that this inquiry will be a witch-hunt and that the committee will be weighted in favour of taking down the RSPCA. It is fairly obvious to anyone who has read the motion and understands the politics behind this issue. The RSPCA is a very important organisation.

Sadly, there will always be cruelty to animals. It is a sad fact of our Western world that there will always be cruelty to animals, but we have the RSPCA—the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals—as the cop on that beat. To do its good work, in conjunction with departments such as the Department of Agriculture and Food and other hardworking government agencies, it is diligent and always alert for issues of cruelty to animals. It may issue improvement notices and go through the processes and work with the community to help educate people to stamp out cruelty to animals. We should get out of the way and let the RSPCA get on with its job. It is an important and necessary job and in 2015 the public expects us to do that. Let us just leave the RSPCA be.

HON NIGEL HALLETT (South West) [3.18 pm]: We have only a couple of minutes left of this debate —

Hon Peter Collier: Only two minutes, but again next week.

Hon NIGEL HALLETT: I thank Hon Peter Collier.

I think a very common thread of the debate so far is that the structure of the RSPCA is the issue. What the RSPCA does as its job is well acknowledged. I think what we can take away from this inquiry—if this inquiry happens—is that we will finish up with a far better RSPCA.

Hon Ken Travers: How will you be able to change the RSPCA?

Hon NIGEL HALLETT: The leadership can be changed.

Hon Ken Travers: Is that what this is about; is it about the leadership?

The ACTING PRESIDENT: Order, members!

Hon NIGEL HALLETT: I am giving Hon Ken Travers my opinion.

Hon Ken Travers: It is a private organisation; you can't change it.

Hon NIGEL HALLETT: It has public money put into it and when an organisation has public money, it is no different from our returns as politicians—they are open to scrutiny. If the RSPCA takes public money, it is open to scrutiny. No-one can doubt or challenge that. Does the member agree?

Hon Ken Travers: No —

The ACTING PRESIDENT: Order, members! Order, Hon Ken Travers! Hon Nigel Hallett has the call and I encourage him to direct his remarks through the Chair.

Hon NIGEL HALLETT: Thank you, Madam Acting President.

In recent years—this is an issue I raised before in this chamber—as credible an organisation as the RSPCA is, it has lost direction at different times.

Debate adjourned, pursuant to temporary orders.