

**GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS — HUAWEI —
PROCEDURE AND PRIVILEGES COMMITTEE REFERRAL**

Standing Orders Suspension — Motion

DR M.D. NAHAN (Riverton — Leader of the Opposition) [3.08 pm]: — without notice: I move —

That so much of standing orders be suspended as is necessary to enable the following motion to be moved forthwith —

Ms J.J. Shaw: Shame on you! You're a disgrace!

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

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members!

Dr M.D. NAHAN: I will read this again —

That so much of standing orders be suspended as is necessary to enable the following motion to be moved forthwith —

- (1) That this house refers the Premier to the Procedure and Privileges Committee for investigation and report as to whether he intentionally misled the house when having been asked in the house on 14 August 2018 and 15 August 2018 the Premier stated he had no knowledge of the impact of the Huawei contract on the automatic train control system; and
- (2) The Procedure and Privileges Committee report to the house by 16 May 2019.

Mr D.J. Kelly interjected.

The SPEAKER: Minister for Water.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: This is an extremely serious issue. It goes to the heart of accountability in our system; that is, the Premier stands up and tells the truth —

Mr P. Papalia: Take your hands out of your pockets.

Withdrawal of Remark

The SPEAKER: Minister for Tourism, you will withdraw that remark.

Mr P. PAPALIA: Which remark?

The SPEAKER: “Take your hands out of your pockets”. Do you want me to repeat it for you? I heard it. It is unparliamentary and I call you to order for the first time.

Debate Resumed

Dr M.D. NAHAN: The Premier of this state must be open and honest with the Parliament of Western Australia. The evidence we have is that he has not been.

Several members interjected.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: He thinks this is a laughing matter. It also goes to the heart of security —

The SPEAKER: Excuse me, Leader of the Opposition. Members, this is very serious. A very important thing has been raised. You might not think so, but under the standing orders of Parliament it is. If anyone on the government side interjects, I will call them to order.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: It goes to the heart of the openness and transparency of our system. It also addresses serious issues around the government's decision-making, about security, communications security, the viability of contracts and also highlights a system of cover-up led by the Premier and the Minister for Transport.

We repeatedly raised this last year, but after Parliament rose at the end of 2018 we received extensive freedom of information material, the provision of which was for a long time resisted by the government. We received it after Parliament rose in November, and it shows and proves that the Premier was briefed on issues that he repeatedly claimed no knowledge of. He was thoroughly briefed over months prior to that. His own department had serious problems with the radio replacement contract. Also, there are eerie issues around the Public Transport Authority because it recommended to its minister that the contract, because of its sensitive nature related to security, be taken to cabinet for discussion, but the minister and Premier chose not to do it. They also did what could be described as “See no evil, do no evil”; they took their hands off this project and tried to —

Point of Order

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr David Templeman; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Mark McGowan; Ms Rita Saffioti

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: The member appears to be arguing the merits of the case, rather than the reason that standing orders should be suspended.

The SPEAKER: I think there is an agreement coming on, so —

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: I think if he sat down, we could do other things.

Standing Orders Suspension — Amendment to Motion

MR D.A. TEMPLEMAN (Mandurah — Leader of the House) [3.11 pm]: I move to add to the motion —

To insert after “forthwith” —

, subject to the debate being limited to 15 minutes for government members and 15 minutes for non-government members

In doing so, I highlight the highly improper method that the opposition is attempting to use with regard to the procedures of the house.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: I want to comment

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: No, you cannot. Sit down.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Yes, no; he can talk to the amendment. Leader of the Opposition.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: There is nothing improper about this issue at all; that is why the government is agreeing to do it. It was done last year, and it has been done in the past. This is our first chance to address a very important issue, the additional information having been provided.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members, I will not put up with this. The motion that has been put to the house is very important. Some members on the government side probably do not even know what it is about, but they are screaming out. I just want members to stop and listen, and to think how serious this issue is.

Mr P. Papalia interjected.

The SPEAKER: Minister for Tourism, I call you to order for the second time. Your voice carries a lot further than you think.

Amendment put and passed.

Standing Orders Suspension — Motion, as Amended

The SPEAKER: Members, as this is a motion without notice to suspend standing orders it will need an absolute majority to succeed. If I hear a dissentient voice, I will be required to divide the Assembly.

Question put and passed with an absolute majority.

Motion

DR M.D. NAHAN (Riverton — Leader of the Opposition) [3.14 pm]: I move the motion.

I indicated earlier today that this is a very serious and urgent issue. This is the first time we have been able to find out whether the Premier told the truth in Parliament. That is because we had to obtain freedom of information material about briefings he had received before he made the comments in this house about whether the rail replacement contract would have an impact on the automatic train control system. A whole raft of other information shows that the government, led by the Premier, and the transport minister attempted a systematic cover-up of this contract. It is a serious issue.

On 2 July 2018, the Premier received a briefing note memo from his department that states that the PTA had entered into a negotiation with Huawei to implement a rail systems replacement contract. The Department of the Premier and Cabinet had become concerned. I will read the briefing note to members. The DPC’s concern was that the technology provided by the Huawei contract —

... may not be able to support a level of security required to support potential future uses of the network, particularly automatic train control ... and public safety mobile broadband.

In other words, it was known at the time the Premier was told—it had always been planned—that the rail upgrade system would be the basis or backbone of an upgrade to the automatic train control system and a wider public sector mobile broadband. The briefing note to the Premier goes on —

It is expected that the PTA's 4G network —

A radio systems replacement project —

will be upgraded in the future to incorporate the ATC in the support of delivering METRONET.

In other words, the Premier was briefed that there would be a relationship between contract for the radio systems replacement and the ATC, which he has today and before denied knowing anything about. He was repeatedly briefed on it at least a month and a half before he was asked questions on it in this house.

I will again quote from the briefing note to the Premier on 2 July 2018 —

- The consequences of interference with ATC could be severe and the protective security of the network would need to be reconsidered to ensure these risks are appropriately managed.
- Preference is that nothing is included in the current procurement process —

That is, the contract for the radio systems replacement —

that would prevent the security of the network being upgraded —

From where it is now —

to CLASSIFIED level ... (e.g. PROTECTED or SECRET).

That means that nothing be done to compromise the further expansion of the system as planned for the PTA and the wider public sector by this radio system replacement contract. The issuance of the contract to Huawei jeopardised that. The Premier had been informed about the relationship between the radio systems replacement project and the ATC; he denied knowing anything about the relationship. He is trying to pretend they were separate; they were not. There is a building plot: radio systems, then ATC, then the wider public sector network. He knew it, and misled Parliament. Seriously.

There is also a briefing note on the PTA radio systems. First of all, the Premier made some statement about this being very widely held—that is, Huawei is involved in a lot of other similar projects. Another briefing note said they were not aware of any established or planned 4G networks, or LTE, which is the software that would be implemented in the radio system control project, in Australia that is comprised entirely of Chinese technology. None! He is out there saying that Huawei is everywhere, or similar. That is the Premier's own briefing note, contrary to what he said. He also says that New South Wales has similar technology in its radio control system. It does have a contract with Huawei, but it is not 4G; it is an older system. He also said that other states are considering other systems. They are, but Victoria excluded Huawei and went to Vodafone and Nokia. The briefing note also refers to broader risks, reiterating the relationship with the radio system control and the automatic train control. The document states that it is expected that the Public Transport Authority's radio network will be upgraded in the future to include the automatic train control. It is understood that this feature is necessary for the delivery of Metronet, which is the government's major investment project. The automatic train control is necessary for Metronet, and the radio control system will go to ATC. The document states that the consequences of interference with ATC could be severe, and the protective security of the network would need to be reconsidered after the Huawei contract to ensure that these risks are mitigated. It also goes on to say that there are significant financial risks, because the government has been told that if it signs Huawei up to that radio control system, it will be prevented from going to ATC in the public sector security system. As a result, it will have to be ring-fenced, limited, and duplicated at a cost. This has all been conveyed in detail to the government.

The Minister for Transport made clear in a statement on 4 May to an industry body that the radio system that is critical to train operations will also provide a platform for future improved train control systems. She admits that it is the building block for an expansion of the system. The government is trying to pretend that it is and will always be a standalone system and would not have any relationship with an upgrade. That is false, and the government was told that repeatedly in briefing notes before.

Point of Order

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to standing order 92, which states —

Imputations of improper motives and personal reflections on the Sovereign, the Governor, a judicial officer or members of the Assembly or the Council are disorderly other than by substantive motion.

I have read the member's motion, and it does not make any assertion of any of those issues by any member of this house. Therefore, the member, in making his contribution, is not able to make that assertion in Parliament, because he is not doing it in the motion itself. I ask you, Mr Speaker, to ensure that the member's contribution is done in accordance with the standing orders, and not outside the standing orders.

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr David Templeman; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Mark McGowan; Ms Rita Saffioti

The SPEAKER: It is not a point of order. The opposition is trying to present a case and it can do this in trying to present the case, even if it is not in the original motion.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: The Premier misled Parliament in our view —

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: Nothing in this motion says that the Premier misled Parliament.

The SPEAKER: Are you challenging the ruling?

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: No, I am not; I am challenging the member for Riverton.

The SPEAKER: Just wait a minute. I have made a decision.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: If you could hear my point of order, Mr Speaker. The member for Riverton said —

The SPEAKER: No.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: It is ridiculous, I am just asking —

The SPEAKER: You do not run the chamber. I know that you think you do, but you do not. All right? Enough.

Debate Resumed

Dr M.D. NAHAN: There is an issue about what he told Parliament about the future position of that project. He also said that he got advice from Canberra, and he did, but we have no evidence that he actually got it from the Australian Security Intelligence Organisation. That is why we asked him earlier on to table that advice.

The most interesting piece of information is that the PTA advised the government that this could be done in two ways in handling the communication of this issue. It could go “too hot to handle” or “nothing to hide”. The government has systematically gone about saying that it is too hot to handle. The minister did not make a press release or go to a press conference or put the issue to cabinet for scrutiny. It has been a debacle and an exercise in cover-up from the start. I will finish and then hand over to the member for Scarborough. First, I will mention the indictment by the US government. A US Department of Justice document states, in part —

As charged in the indictment, Huawei and its subsidiaries, with the direct and personal involvement of their executives, engaged in serious fraudulent conduct, including conspiracy, bank fraud, wire fraud, sanctions violations, money laundering and the orchestrated obstruction of justice ...

That is the type of firm that the government is bringing into this state, not only to start the radio systems, but beyond. This should have been brought to cabinet for scrutiny. I am sure that it would have been thrown out by the wiser heads in the government if it had been.

MRS L.M. HARVEY (Scarborough — Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [3.26 pm]: I rise to add my support to the motion before the house. This issue was first raised by the member for North West Central in May last year, when he put a question to the minister about the status of the tender process, and received the usual rebuff that we get from the Minister for Transport. It was curious that in May 2017 the minister was very happy to announce that the tender was down to the final selection of companies being considered to provide this radio network and other things. At the time the press reported —

Ms Minister Saffioti told an industry magazine that the digital radio system to be built by the telecommunications giant would be used as a “platform for a future improved train control system”.

...

“This project will help facilitate automatic train control in the future, in line with Metronet objectives.”

When we raised these issues and asked questions of the Premier and the minister in this house, the minister and the Premier consistently downplayed the scope of this contract with Huawei and its intended purpose for the future. When we finally received responses to the freedom of information requests that had been put in by the opposition months ago, we ended up getting some really interesting information, including a briefing note for the Minister for Transport from the Public Transport Authority giving an update on the spectrum and radio services. It states —

The PTA’s current analog system can only support voice communications. The new LTE-based system will be capable of voice and data to serve a range of potential railway uses including:

- Short Message System — the same as SMS messages on mobile phones;
- On-board CCTV — the ability to look live into a train from a central monitoring room;
- ATC — a system of automatically controlling train movements;
- ...
- Data capability for security personnel — includes live CCTV feeds, status of building alarms and offender records;

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr David Templeman; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Mark McGowan; Ms Rita Saffioti

We were curious when we received this. We have raised this today as a suspension of standing orders because this is the first opportunity that the opposition has had to grill the government after the summer break. We note that the release of these documents was delayed until after Parliament had risen. Repeatedly we hear the Premier say that there is nothing to see here. His answers to our questions in this house ridicule us and downplay the potential scope of this contract and what his own minister has actually said in a public forum.

What sparked our curiosity, and the reason the government is in the pickle it is in, is that the minister is happy to go out and do media for a \$500 000 upgrade to Yarloop train station and for \$7.8 million to build a new bus station, but she wants neither hide nor hair of it for a \$206 million contract and is nowhere to be seen. In fact, the advice we have uncovered in this process from the Public Transport Authority shows that it wanted the minister to take this to cabinet. We believe the minister has not taken it to cabinet, so she can try to wash her hands of what is a very controversial contract.

Ms R. Saffioti: Where is that advice?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: There is freedom of information advice.

Ms R. Saffioti interjected.

The SPEAKER: Minister for Transport!

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Our view is that if the minister cannot go out in front of the cameras and say that she has awarded a \$206 million contract to this Chinese company to provide these services for these reasons and this is why it is a good way to spend taxpayers' money, then it is the wrong decision.

Ms R. Saffioti interjected.

The SPEAKER: Minister for Transport! You will have a chance to speak, Minister for Transport.

Ms R. Saffioti interjected.

The SPEAKER: Minister for Transport, I call you to order for the first time.

Mr W.R. Marmion interjected.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: The member for Nedlands said to table the Australian Security Intelligence Organisation advice.

Ms R. Saffioti interjected.

The SPEAKER: Minister for Transport, I will not warn you again.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I suggest that the minister table the ASIO advice. It can just look like this.

Ms R. Saffioti interjected.

The SPEAKER: Minister for Transport, I call you to order for the second time.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: It can look like the usual briefing notes the government gives us—everything redacted.

Ms R. Saffioti interjected.

The SPEAKER: Minister for Transport!

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: All we want from the government is the advice that has the ASIO letterhead on it and the words “Huawei” and “no security concern here.” That is what the Premier says he has. Everything else can be redacted, but table that advice from ASIO and the other intelligence agencies that says the word “Huawei” in the briefing note and “no security issue here”, “nothing to see here”, “there is no problem with this contract”, because I do not believe that the government has advice from that agency that says there is no security issue with Huawei, and that is what our documents are showing.

MR M. McGOWAN (Rockingham — Premier) [3.31 pm]: Ordinarily, there is a daily program and, ordinarily, the first piece of business for the first day of Parliament is the Premier's Statement. It has been that way for 15 years or so—since the Premier's Statement came in. It is an opportunity for all members of the house to raise issues and respond to the government's agenda for the year. During the eight and a half years of the last government, the Premier's Statement took priority on the first day of Parliament. What we are seeing with this opposition is that it rips up every convention and disrespects the Parliament. It has come in here and suspended standing orders before the Premier's Statement, which has never happened before. The opposition will have every opportunity to raise whatever issues it might wish after the Premier's Statement, and every opportunity tomorrow to move a matter of public interest motion or something of that nature. The opposition has absolutely no respect for this place or the conventions of this place. When I was elected to this place, when Richard Court was Premier of the state, this would never, ever have happened. I find it very sad that an opposition would be so disrespectful to the conventions of the Parliament and so pathetic, frankly, that it would misuse the standing orders in this way.

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr David Templeman; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Mark McGowan; Ms Rita Saffioti

I want to take the opposition through this issue again. A tender process was launched by the last government for the radio system replacement project. Originally, it had automatic train control as part of it, but they were separated and automatic train control was taken out. Radio system replacement has to occur, because the spectrum provided by the telcos is being wound up. The government launched an expressions-of-interest process at the beginning of last year. The winning tenderer was Huawei. It is a Chinese-owned company. Other Chinese companies were also very prominent in the tender process. The government went to the federal government and asked, "Is there a problem here?" The advice that we got, in person, was that there was no problem with Huawei winning that contract. The opposition seems to think that we should overturn the tender process and ignore the advice of the federal government. That seems to be the opposition's position on this matter.

Now the opposition selectively misquotes documents it received under freedom of information laws. I note one document the opposition received is a briefing note from an officer in the Department of the Premier and Cabinet. The opposition deliberately did not release all of the advice. I want to read all of the advice from Mr Justin Court in the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, so that people actually know what advice the opposition received and which bits it is redacting and not releasing. I quote —

- In May 2018, following publicised concern over the procurement process, the Minister for Transport requested that DPC write to the Commonwealth Department of Home Affairs, inviting it to raise any residual concerns it may have.
- In its response the Department of Home Affairs advised that it had not identified any issues that would prevent the Project from proceeding.

Another briefing note by Mr Justin Court states —

... Home Affairs advised that it had not identified any issues that would prevent the Project from proceeding.

The opposition did not release that. The opposition ran to the media with its briefing note, but it did not release this information even though it was attached to the briefing note. The opposition redacted it. It does not fit the opposition's argument, so it redacted it. That is the advice. That is the tenor of all the advice we have received in relation to this matter.

It is a 4G network. I am not a technological expert. It is a closed system to provide communications between train drivers and their headquarters. That is all it is. Automatic train control is another matter. It has not been committed to and it is not being implemented; it is a whole other project. The advice we received is that there was no problem with the radio system replacement project that Huawei won in an open tender process. As I indicated in question time, the Prime Minister's office and the Minister for Home Affairs' office have not raised any concerns. They have been briefed. They have requested advice from Rear Admiral John Lord on this matter. Huawei has a joint venture partnership with UGL, which has offices here and employs Australians. Huawei provided phones and modems to ministers in the former government. If a person goes into any telecommunications shop in Australia, they will find Huawei phones and modems. As I understand it, we can find Huawei equipment in any equipment provided by Optus and the like. If a person goes into factories in China, they will find Apple phones manufactured in proximity to Huawei phones. That is the nature of telecommunications these days in this world.

We acted with all the best advice and we have had no reason to doubt the advice that we received. The idea that somehow this opposition thinks that security advice and the like would be tabled in Parliament is, frankly, ludicrous. It is ludicrous that the opposition would suggest something of that nature. I also want to draw the attention of the house to the fact that this is the same Liberal Party that signed the contract with John Holland that this government now has to deal with. It is the same Liberal Party that signed the contract with Capella. Remember that? It was the car park with no cars at the Perth Children's Hospital. It is the same Liberal Party that signed the Serco contract at Fiona Stanley Hospital for a hospital with no patients. Treasury and the Langouland report condemned the Liberal Party for its management of that contract. For the opposition to come in here, particularly when the Leader of the Opposition is a foreign citizen with a tax bill to a foreign government—true statement —

Point of Order

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: Standing order 97 refers to irrelevant debate. The Premier is clearly bringing in completely irrelevant points to the actual motion —

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members, I will hear it in silence.

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: — which is a serious motion that should be debated seriously.

The SPEAKER: It is not a point of order.

Debate Resumed

Mr M. McGOWAN: The opposition is carrying on about national security when its leader is a foreign citizen with a tax bill to a foreign government, and he kept it secret. Members opposite should not come into this chamber with claims on all these issues. I am an ex-naval officer representing this country. The Minister for Tourism served the country in Iraq and Afghanistan. The Minister for Housing has served this country as well. Don't come in here with your foreign citizen with a foreign tax bill to a foreign government carrying on about national security!

MS R. SAFFIOTI (West Swan — Minister for Transport) [3.39 pm]: Clutching at straws—that is the best way to describe this motion today. It is absolutely disrespecting the Parliament and the position of the Premier of the day. This is the second time that this has happened under the Liberal opposition. It also did it last year. It is tradition that the Premier stands to outline the government of the day's agenda. This is desperate politics by “Mr 13 per cent”. If the Leader of the Opposition took a vote from his backbench, I think it would be less than 13 per cent!

We want to go through national security and the opposition wants to send people to the Procedure and Privileges Committee. Let us send the Leader of the Opposition to the Procedure and Privileges Committee. He misled this place about a staffer taking photos from the confidential security briefing. Let us go through that. We wanted to keep it so secret that we briefed the opposition! That is the ridiculous claim being made by the opposition. If we wanted to keep this issue so secret, why did we brief the opposition? Why did we invite staffers—basically everybody that the opposition wanted to bring in? The member for Scarborough was not there. I understand that included the Leader of the Opposition, although in hindsight a foreign citizen getting access to confidential information probably was not a wise move from our position. If we wanted to keep it secret, why did we brief the opposition? We briefed the opposition because we knew there was some sensitivity. We wanted to ensure the opposition was across all the issues. As the Premier outlined, the opposition selectively quoted freedom of information documents. The Premier outlined that that did not include key parts.

Mrs L.M. Harvey interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Scarborough!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The opposition signed a contract with John Holland and we are still going through the implications. I notice the opposition did not talk about that today. How many thousand variations have we now seen, Treasurer?

Mr B.S. Wyatt: Twenty thousand.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: There were 20 000 variations to a contract. I notice the opposition did not ask a question about that today.

Let us go through what the Leader of the Opposition did. If the opposition wants to suspend standing orders to refer people to the Procedure and Privileges Committee every day, we can do it with all of them. We can do it today. In respect of the security documents, the Premier asked —

Did one of the Leader of the Opposition's staff photograph this in a private briefing?

The Leader of the Opposition replied, “No.” The member for Scarborough said “rubbish” when it was said that a staff member actually photographed the documents. She said no; that it was rubbish. What happened? The Deputy Leader of the Opposition then admitted that they did do it. Shall we send the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to the Procedure and Privileges Committee? Shall we send her to the Procedure and Privileges Committee for all the misleading claims she made today?

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The opposition sat there and received a briefing. We cleared the security issues with the federal government. The opposition knows we did.

In relation to the contract, two weeks ago the US Department of Justice applied indictments against the company. We did not see that coming. Maybe as a US citizen the Leader of the Opposition did, but we did not see that coming. As a result, we have asked it to clarify the deliverability of the project. That is the right thing to do.

Let us go through the history so members are aware of the whole history of the project. In 2010, the opposition—the then government—was informed by the Australian Communications and Media Authority that it would no longer be able to use the 400-megahertz band for non-emergencies. Basically, the Public Transport Authority would have to be moved off so that emergency services and police could use that. In 2012, the authority issued an instruction to reduce rail access to what was known as the harmonised government spectrum. The previous

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr David Templeman; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Mark McGowan; Ms Rita Saffioti

government began the process—the radio replacement program—in 2013. At that time the PTA renewed licences for this new spectrum, and it paid \$8 million to do so. That was in 2013. Nothing really happened because under the previous government, nothing much happened. The years went on and on. They got an extension for 2020. As a result, when we won government, we had to ensure that we could deliver this program because, basically, post-2020 the non-essentials will be kicked off this spectrum. That is the situation.

In 2013–14 the former government separated the automatic train control project from the radio replacement project. It could not get funding for ATC or the radio replacement project until the 2015 budget. In May 2015, the former government secured \$119 million in funding for this project. We have gone through all the proper processes, including procurement processes. We received advice along the way. Two weeks ago, when there was new —

Mr S.K. L'Estrange: What about the cabinet process?

Mr B.S. Wyatt: You didn't have one!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Read the Langouland report about your cabinet process!

Two weeks ago, information was made public about the US Department of Justice. We did the right and proper thing. We sought clarity about the deliverability of the project and we are working through that right now. Along the way we have always sought expert advice. Of course, we have not sought the advice of Hon Jim Chown, who now seems to be the IT expert—and an expert on international relations and all things, as I understand—but we have sought advice from professionals along the whole way. That is what we have done.

The member for Dawesville welcomed the arrival of Huawei in relation to this project. As the opposition knows, Huawei componentry is in a lot of infrastructure in this state. If the opposition was so concerned, how did it let two cabinet ministers walk around with Huawei phones? How was that possible? How did that happen if it were so concerned?

If we are going to contracts, let us go into the contract with John Holland and the NorthLink WA project. What happened to John Holland's owner in relation to World Bank construction projects? What were a lot of companies that the previous government entered into contracts with alleged to have done or found to have done in other countries? A lot. I could go through them but I am going to run out of time. Another time, I will go through some of the contracts that the previous government entered into and what those companies were alleged to have done around the world, particularly the owner of John Holland.

Division

Question put and a division taken with the following result —

Ayes (16)

Mr I.C. Blayney	Dr D.J. Honey	Mr S.K. L'Estrange	Dr M.D. Nahan
Mr V.A. Catania	Mr P. Katsambanis	Mr R.S. Love	Mr D.C. Nalder
Ms M.J. Davies	Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup	Mr W.R. Marmion	Mr P.J. Rundle
Mrs L.M. Harvey	Mr A. Krsticevic	Mr J.E. McGrath	Ms L. Mettam (<i>Teller</i>)

Noes (37)

Ms L.L. Baker	Mr M. Hughes	Mr P. Papalia	Mr C.J. Tallentire
Dr A.D. Buti	Mr W.J. Johnston	Mr S.J. Price	Mr D.A. Templeman
Mr J.N. Carey	Mr D.J. Kelly	Mr D.T. Punch	Mr P.C. Tinley
Mrs R.M.J. Clarke	Mr F.M. Logan	Mr J.R. Quigley	Mr R.R. Whitby
Mr R.H. Cook	Mr M. McGowan	Mrs M.H. Roberts	Ms S.E. Winton
Ms J. Farrer	Ms S.F. McGurk	Ms C.M. Rowe	Mr B.S. Wyatt
Mr M.J. Folkard	Mr S.A. Millman	Ms R. Saffioti	Mr D.R. Michael (<i>Teller</i>)
Ms J.M. Freeman	Mr Y. Mubarakai	Ms A. Sanderson	
Ms E. Hamilton	Mr M.P. Murray	Ms J.J. Shaw	
Mr T.J. Healy	Mrs L.M. O'Malley	Mrs J.M.C. Stojkovski	

Pairs

Mr K. O'Donnell	Ms M.M. Quirk
Mrs A.K. Hayden	Mr K.J.J. Michel

Question thus negatived.