

**JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE ON END OF LIFE CHOICES — MEETING MINUTES**

*Motion*

Resumed from 7 November on the following motion moved by Hon Nick Goiran —

- (1) That the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly cause to be tabled in both the Legislative Council and the Legislative Assembly, within three sitting days of both houses having so ordered, all minutes of meetings of the Joint Select Committee on End of Life Choices, redacted only to maintain as private the details of any private evidence or personal information; and
- (2) that the Legislative Assembly be invited to pass a resolution in similar terms.

**HON NICK GOIRAN (South Metropolitan)** [1.12 pm]: The reason this motion is necessary is that the Joint Select Committee on End of Life Choices no longer exists. That committee was dissolved and ceased to exist at the time that it tabled its report on 23 August this year. Three months after that date, which will shortly arrive in two days' time, the government is required under the standing orders to provide a response to that committee's report. However, the point is that the committee does not exist. It is not possible to communicate with and obtain information from the committee and, it follows, it is not possible to seek to have the committee table the minutes of its year-long inquiry. The only way that can be done, in accordance with the advice that I have received, is to have the houses request the Speaker to do so, hence the motion before us.

I have sought to move this motion because in this instance the stakes are very high. I put it to members that there would be few committee inquiries in which the stakes are any higher than this one. It is now a matter of public record, because the government announced a few days ago, or perhaps it was indeed last week, that it had established an expert panel to look into the provisions of legislation that will be brought to the Parliament at some stage next year. At that time, it will be important that members have the maximum amount of information available to them. It will be unhelpful and a hindrance if members were somehow hamstrung in the provision of information and have less information than what is otherwise available. Indeed, it would be unfortunate and unfair if some members of Parliament had additional information that other members of Parliament did not have. There were four members from this place on that committee; I was one of the four members. It would be unfortunate if I was in an advantageous position compared with other members because I had information at my disposal that others did not have. The stakes are very high here, Madam President.

In my view, the committee has recommended one of the least safe regimes for assisted suicide in the world, and it will for the first time create a lawful category of killing. It is a matter of public record that I am opposed to that, because I know, having studied what has happened in each of the other jurisdictions—it is detailed in my minority report—that it will guarantee casualties; there will be wrongful deaths. This is not a matter of theory; it is a matter of the lived experience in the other jurisdictions. But other members may disagree with me on that point and they are welcome to have that debate, and no doubt we will have that debate in the fullness of time. The point here is that the 35 voting members of this place, when they cast their votes next year, ought to have before them the maximum amount of information and not a selective provision of information. That is why I have moved the motion before us.

Quite separate from my motivation for moving the motion before us, as I outlined on the previous occasion that this motion was before us on Wednesday, 7 November, is that if members are passionate about transparency, I seek their support for the motion before us. I gave an example for that on the last occasion, on 7 November. When I chaired the Select Committee into Elder Abuse, which was running concurrently with the Joint Select Committee on End of Life Choices, that committee, which I served on with Hon Alison Xamon, Hon Matthew Swinbourn and Hon Tjorn Sibma, tabled all its minutes from the 12-month inquiry on elder abuse. That is now a matter of public record and members can access those minutes should they wish to do so. If they are passionate about the issue of elder abuse and they want to have available to them the maximum information, those minutes are available. Unfortunately, we do not have that in the case of the Joint Select Committee on End of Life Choices and, as I have outlined earlier, it is not possible—it is not a case of being impracticable; it is actually impossible—to communicate with that committee because it no longer exists. Therefore, if members are passionate about transparency, they will support this motion.

I draw to the attention of members opposite that it was indeed their government that promised a gold standard in transparency during this term of Parliament. I have to say that I am disappointed to hear that the government has already decided two things: first, that it will not support this motion; and, secondly, that it will not allow its members a conscience vote on this issue. I am disappointed about that because it makes all of today's activities, and our debates here, frankly, a fruitless and pointless exercise. Even if this chamber were to agree to the motion before us, it will of course be comprehensively defeated in the other place, making the whole thing a fruitless exercise. I am disappointed to hear that the government that promised the gold standard in transparency will not

**Extract from Hansard**

[COUNCIL — Wednesday, 21 November 2018]

p8313d-8324a

Hon Nick Goiran; Hon Colin Holt; Hon Rick Mazza; Hon Dr Sally Talbot; Hon Sue Ellery; Hon Michael Mischin; Hon Martin Pritchard; Hon Peter Collier

---

be supporting the motion, but even more so, putting that to one side, given that the stakes are high, I am disappointed to hear that members opposite will not be granted a conscience vote on this issue. But that is the way things are and those things are outside my control.

I also seek support for this motion from members who are passionate about consistency. It is the case that this house agreed to a message from the other place to form the Joint Select Committee on End of Life Choices, and part of that agreement with the other place ensured that the committee would be run under the auspices of the Legislative Assembly. It is the ordinary custom and practice of committees run under the auspices of the Legislative Assembly to table their minutes. This is not something irregular or strange; it is actually the ordinary custom and practice. The last time we were considering this motion on 7 November 2018, I had only eight minutes at my disposal to set out a brief introductory argument for the motion. As I have a little more time this afternoon, I want to take members through the occasions in each of the last three Parliaments—the thirty-seventh Parliament, the thirty-eighth Parliament and the thirty-ninth Parliament—on which Legislative Assembly committees tabled their minutes. I will start with the most recent Parliament, the thirty-ninth Parliament, and the Community Development and Justice Standing Committee.

In the last Parliament, the Community Development and Justice Standing Committee tabled its minutes on two occasions—if you like, in two parts. Part 1 was done on 13 October 2015 and part 2 was done on 17 November 2016. If members want to seek those tabled papers, they are tabled papers 3490 and 4879. They provide the minutes from 15 May 2013 all the way through to 9 November 2016. Why did it stop at 9 November 2016? Well, of course, there was a state election in March 2017 and once the other place is dissolved, the committees are dissolved and there are no opportunities for those committees to meet and, therefore, no further minutes are available. The point is that on two occasions in the last Parliament, that committee tabled all its minutes, as is the normal custom and practice. In the case of the Community Development and Justice Standing Committee, this was not a strange isolated incident in the thirty-ninth Parliament—no, no! Indeed, it did this in the thirty-seventh Parliament and the thirty-eighth Parliament. For members' interest, in the thirty-eighth Parliament, they can look up tabled paper 1872, which was tabled on 24 February 2010; tabled paper 3205, which was tabled on 22 March 2011; tabled paper 4532, which was tabled on 28 February 2012; and tabled paper 5613, which was tabled on 14 December 2012. In the thirty-eighth Parliament, to the extent that there was a difference between how that committee tabled its minutes in the thirty-eighth and thirty-ninth Parliaments, in the thirty-eighth Parliament, it did it on four occasions—if you like, in four parts—but in the thirty-ninth Parliament, it did it on two occasions, in two parts, all of which is to say that in total, it tabled all its minutes in the thirty-eighth Parliament and the thirty-ninth Parliament. Let us go to the thirty-seventh Parliament for that committee. It tabled its minutes by way of tabled paper 2535 on 27 March 2007 and tabled paper 3723 on 1 April 2008. That is the situation with the Community Development and Justice Standing Committee, a committee run under the auspices of the other place, in the thirty-seventh Parliament, the thirty-eighth Parliament and the thirty-ninth Parliament.

Should there be a misunderstanding by any member who thinks that that is just an isolated incident that is attributable to the Community Development and Justice Standing Committee and that it is somehow a custom and practice of only that standing committee, I draw to members' attention that indeed the Economics and Industry Standing Committee, which is also run by the other place, abided by precisely the same custom and practice. In the thirty-ninth Parliament, it tabled its minutes in tabled paper 4880 on 17 November 2016. It tabled all its minutes in one hit, if you like, in one bulk amount on one day, 17 November 2016. If we go back to the thirty-eighth Parliament, the Economics and Industry Standing Committee did it on two occasions. It tabled paper 1909 on 16 March 2010 and tabled paper 5590 on 15 November 2012. If we go back to the thirty-seventh Parliament, the minutes were tabled by way of tabled paper 2536 on 27 March 2007 and tabled paper 3693 on 18 March 2008. I encourage members who are interested to look at those tabled papers to see how the Economics and Industry Standing Committee in the thirty-seventh Parliament, the thirty-eighth Parliament and the thirty-ninth Parliament tabled all its minutes, as is the custom and practice of committees run under the auspices of other place.

That is the second committee, but perhaps I will give members a third example. The Education and Health Standing Committee is also run by the other place. What did it do in the thirty-ninth Parliament? On 17 November 2016, it tabled all its minutes from the thirty-ninth Parliament in tabled paper 4881. Of course, that is no different from what it did in the thirty-eighth Parliament, other than the fact that in the thirty-eighth Parliament it did so in four parts—tabled paper 1873 on 24 February 2010, tabled paper 3159 on 15 March 2011, tabled paper 4534 on 28 February 2012 and tabled paper 5600 on 20 November 2012. What did it do in the thirty-seventh Parliament? It tabled on two occasions; on 27 March 2007, it tabled paper 2537, and on 3 April 2008, it tabled paper 3762. Those are three examples of standing committees run by the other place that in each of the last three Parliaments—the thirty-seventh Parliament, the thirty-eighth Parliament and the thirty-ninth Parliament—tabled all their minutes, as is the ordinary custom and practice of committees run by the other place.

**Extract from Hansard**

[COUNCIL — Wednesday, 21 November 2018]

p8313d-8324a

Hon Nick Goiran; Hon Colin Holt; Hon Rick Mazza; Hon Dr Sally Talbot; Hon Sue Ellery; Hon Michael Mischin; Hon Martin Pritchard; Hon Peter Collier

---

Because time is limited, I will limit my examples to four committees. I will give members the details for the Public Accounts Committee. On 17 November 2006, the Public Accounts Committee tabled paper 4888, which contained all its minutes from the thirty-ninth Parliament. What did it do in the thirty-eighth Parliament? There was tabled paper 1878 on 25 February 2010, tabled paper 3174 on 15 March 2011 and tabled paper 4662 on 29 March 2012. In the thirty-seventh Parliament, there was tabled paper 2461 on 20 March 2007 and tabled paper 3700 on 18 March 2008.

Members who are passionate about consistency should support this motion because it is plain and clear that it is the ordinary custom and practice of committees run under the auspices of the other place to table their minutes, as has been done in the thirty-seventh Parliament, the thirty-eighth Parliament and the thirty-ninth Parliament. The only difference here is that we are in the fortieth Parliament and in the fortieth Parliament, we have a government that said that it would lead the charge on the gold standard of transparency. Members opposite may well say that they might be the first government in the history of Western Australia to lead the charge in the gold standard of transparency. Perhaps it is a debatable point as to whether it is the first, but the point is that it was passionate about that. Members opposite mentioned that many times in the lead-up to the election and we, the opposition, have been equally passionate about holding the government to account to the standard it said it would bring. That is in the fortieth Parliament, yet in the thirty-ninth, thirty-eighth and thirty-seventh Parliament it was routinely the case that minutes were tabled by committees that were run under the auspices of the other place.

Because there may or may not be time for me to reply to any other contributions that will be made, depending on how long the debate goes for, I indicate that I will try to, if you like, predict some of the questions on the mechanics of the motion before us that might be asked by members. Some might ask, “Why is this directed to the Speaker?” That is simply because, firstly, that is the advice I received and, secondly, the minutes are in the custody of the Clerk of the other place and so on the advice that I have received, it is appropriate that the directive from the two houses goes to the Speaker.

Members might also be interested to know why it is necessary to have a joint resolution. Of course, it is not for this place to simply issue an edict. It was a joint select committee that was established, and being a joint select committee, it requires the resolution of both places to do something. As I said, if the committee were still in existence, it would be possible for any member of the public or Parliament, any person whatsoever, to communicate with that committee. That is no longer possible as the committee has been dissolved, and the only mechanism by which this can be achieved is by resolution of both places.

Members might also ask, “Why does the motion specifically talk about it being tabled within three sitting days?” That is simply to provide a time period. I am entirely relaxed about that. If some members feel that three sitting days is insufficient or too generous, I will be very happy to accept any amendments along those lines. It was merely a starting point. It seems to me that three sitting days is not an unreasonable time for the Speaker to provide the minutes. But of course, that is just my view and I am happy to discuss that with members as they deem fit. Perhaps the other place has another view about the three sitting days and I would be open to it to also make such amendments as it would deem fit, should it ever reach that place. As I said, unfortunately, I am reliably informed that the government has already predetermined that it will not be supporting the motion, so of course it would not get through to the other place in any event.

Last but not least, the motion also outlines the information to be redacted. I draw to members’ attention that the words in the first limb of the motion specifically state that the minutes be redacted only to maintain as private the details of any private or personal information. I have included that in the motion because members may be concerned that some of the workings of the committee might have involved closed hearings. Without having the full committee report in front of me, I cannot recall off the top of my head whether the committee report discloses whether closed hearings took place. Irrespective of whether it does disclose that, theoretically, members would be aware that it is possible for committees to take closed evidence and to have closed hearings, so it would be quite understandable if any member was concerned that publication of the minutes would reveal information from a closed hearing or persons who appeared at closed hearings, hence why the motion specifically outlines such information being redacted, which is entirely reasonable and I have no issue with that whatsoever. In fact, I fully support the importance of keeping such information private to respect the confidentiality of closed evidence and the process.

All of that is to say that I seek members’ support for the motion. If they are passionate about transparency, if they appreciate and value the importance of consistency, and if they share my concern that the stakes are very high in this debate that we will be having next year, and the stakes are high, it is in our best interests as lawmakers in Western Australia to have the maximum provision of information at our disposal, and not have some members having extra information and others not. That will put some members at a disadvantage and others at an advantage. This motion would eliminate that because the only information that members might not have at their disposal, understandably, is any closed evidence, and there is nothing that can really be done about that. That is simply

**Extract from Hansard**

[COUNCIL — Wednesday, 21 November 2018]

p8313d-8324a

Hon Nick Goiran; Hon Colin Holt; Hon Rick Mazza; Hon Dr Sally Talbot; Hon Sue Ellery; Hon Michael Mischin; Hon Martin Pritchard; Hon Peter Collier

---

a necessary mechanism, but it is entirely unnecessary for anything that would otherwise be made public, in accordance with the ordinary custom and practice of the Legislative Assembly, not to be made available to members so that they can properly make decisions in the fullness of time. I seek members' support for the motion if they are passionate about transparency, appreciate the importance and value of consistency, and if they share my view that the stakes are high in this matter.

**HON COLIN HOLT (South West)** [1.35 pm]: I thank the mover of the motion. I understand very clearly the motivation to move such a motion, but I will not be supporting the motion in this instance. I will tell members why I have come to that conclusion. We have a very long and revered process in this house about support for our committee process. I have been on quite a few committees. I have been on joint select committees, select committees and standing committees, and they do a lot of very important work on behalf of the house. There is a longstanding understanding and tradition about how committees operate. I have to say in my experience that they have almost exclusively, on almost every issue, operated in a bipartisan sense. I have been on the Standing Committee on Environment and Public Affairs a couple of times, and members can imagine the wide-ranging issues that are referred to that committee through petitions, often very political petitions, as well as some self-instigated reviews and inquiries. My experience has always been that a strong approach is taken by all members to tackle the issue in a non-political sense. Sometimes it creeps over, but, generally, 99 per cent of the time, it is treated in a non-political sense to get to the nut of the issue to try to respond to the concerns of the community. I would say that most of my committee work has been in the same sense. Maybe new members, who have been on a committee for only a year and a half since we were appointed to committees, have a different view, but I find that committees are a really valuable tool for this Parliament, this house and the community at large.

One of the strengths of committees is that members come together from different parts of the political divide and there is a full and frank discussion in those committee proceedings of the issues. To a degree, with a degree of freedom around us, we know that it is a part of parliamentary privilege, it is a committee environment and there is an expectation that those discussions and deliberations will be kept within the committee room. It is a really valuable position and process to have because sometimes it means members can thrash out some of the finer points, their personal experiences or even political views, and move on to more of a general outcome. That does not always work, because we often have committee reports and minority reports. Obviously, there was not agreement in the committee on that particular issue. At the same time—I have been on committees that have had minority reports—the committee process treated everything in all those deliberations in a completely respectful way to ensure that the issue was fully investigated, and gave everyone an opportunity to have their say, but, in the end, even if we could not agree, we still could do a minority report. The committee process itself delivered that ability to have a committee report and a minority report, if that was the way it went. That was based on good discussion, good evidence gathering and good deliberation. I have thought about some of the committee reports that we have had here. In my view, the committee report is a strong reflection of the evidence gathering and the deliberations of the committee. I know we have had a lot of controversial committee reports on some issues. I remember back in my first term here that a committee looked into the need for stop-and-search laws. Some members here were on that committee at that time. If I remember rightly, Hon Dr Sally Talbot was on that committee. It was a controversial subject and the committee came out with a majority report and a minority report. The house respected both reports and came to a conclusion based on thorough investigation by the committee, which put in many hours and held many hearings. Did the house ask for extra information in that sense? No, it did not. The committee made the decision and delivered those two reports. I think that is an important consideration.

Perhaps the mover of the motion can clarify something for me that he has made reference to. He can do it by interjection, if he likes, or in his reply. He said that the Select Committee into Elder Abuse had released all its minutes. I have looked at them and I want some clarification because I do not want to jump to conclusions. I refer to the minutes of the meeting on 27 August 2018, which I assume is the last meeting of that committee. Item 3 is “Any other matters” and refers to the minutes being made public and uploaded on the webpage. It states —

The Committee considered 18 sets of minutes from 14 September 2017 through to 20 August 2018 inclusive and made redactions. Staff noted the redactions on hard copies.

I do not think that is the whole set of minutes. I know that there would be minutes from before 14 September, which are not tabled here that I can see, and it refers to the adoption of minutes from a previous meeting in August. The committee did not release all the minutes. It seemed to be the pinnacle of the arguments of the mover of the motion that —

**Hon Nick Goiran:** You said you would take an interjection. You, who were not on the committee and is not aware of how many minutes there were, are saying that the committee has not released all its minutes.

**Hon COLIN HOLT:** No, I am asking the member for clarification. Has the Select Committee into Elder Abuse released all its minutes?

**Extract from Hansard**

[COUNCIL — Wednesday, 21 November 2018]

p8313d-8324a

Hon Nick Goiran; Hon Colin Holt; Hon Rick Mazza; Hon Dr Sally Talbot; Hon Sue Ellery; Hon Michael Mischin; Hon Martin Pritchard; Hon Peter Collier

---

**Hon Nick Goiran:** Yes.

**Hon COLIN HOLT:** I retract that then, if that is the case. Was the first meeting of the committee on 14 September?

**Hon Nick Goiran:** The first meeting would have been in September 2017 and the last meeting would have been a year later.

**Hon COLIN HOLT:** Have the minutes of 14 September been released?

**Hon Nick Goiran:** That is without me having the exact dates in front of me.

**Hon COLIN HOLT:** Because the only one that I can see released up until the last one was 30 October.

**Hon Nick Goiran:** Do you have only one set of minutes?

**Hon COLIN HOLT:** No.

**Hon Nick Goiran:** Do you have the whole lot?

**Hon COLIN HOLT:** As far as I know. It is okay, but the point I am trying to make is that committees make the decision whether they want to release minutes. Thanks for the interjections. I know that at the last meeting of the committee, the members said, “Let us release the minutes” and they all agreed to that. I was curious to see whether they had discussed that possibility on the very first meeting date, because I think in that process that would help the committee decide how members deliberate and how minutes are recorded. But I do not know whether the committee discussed it in the very first meeting and said, “We are going to go through this process. When we get to the end, why don’t we release the minutes?” I am sure that would have helped committee members think about how they would have interacted or how the committee would have recorded its minutes. I do not know whether that happened. I cannot see it in the released minutes but maybe my research has gone astray. If it is not in the released minutes and the minutes of a meeting have not been released, as the honourable member pointed out, we cannot reconvene a select committee to ask it to release those minutes or even have that discussion if it has not discussed it in the very first meeting that it had.

I raise that issue because when committees come together, they do it in the full knowledge that it is with frank and full parliamentary privilege. If a committee is going to decide to release the minutes, it is a great idea to have that conversation in the very first meeting so that every committee member knows that the minutes will be released at the end, and the minutes can reflect whatever the committee wants them to reflect. In this case, we do not know whether that conversation about releasing the minutes of the Joint Select Committee on End of Life Choices occurred because they are not being released. Just as I accept the decision of the Select Committee into Elder Abuse, which was appointed by this house, to release its minutes, as is its wont—it is its decision on behalf of the house—I accept the decision by the Joint Select Committee on End of Life Choices not to release its minutes. Even though I am on that committee and it makes it a bit awkward to talk about it, I respect the decision that the committee made not to release the minutes, just as I respect the committee report and the minority report for what it is and what it should reflect in terms of the committee work.

From my viewpoint, to be selective about which committees should release minutes is not appropriate. It should be a decision made by each committee and my viewpoint is that we continue to uphold that tradition, if you like, to ensure that we give the power to committees. If they want to release the minutes, they should go right ahead. If they do not, that decision should be accepted by the house as well. That is why I cannot support this motion moved by the member. With that, I will be keen to hear other members’ viewpoints on this. Again, it is an important tradition and process we hold in this place in our committee work and the committee in this instance and most instances should be respected in how it deals with its own minutes.

**HON RICK MAZZA (Agricultural)** [1.48 pm]: I rise to make a brief contribution to Hon Nick Goiran’s motion to table the minutes of the Joint Select Committee on End of Life Choices and to say that I will not be supporting the motion. Although I respect Hon Nick Goiran’s position, I think that committee work is very important for Parliament and most of us go into committee work and deliberate on the basis that we know that the minutes and deliberations are confidential and it enables us to speak freely. If the terms of reference at the beginning of the select committee had included that the minutes would be tabled, I could accept that. If there had been a resolution by the select committee while it was formed, I could accept that too. The select committee has now been dissolved, so there is no possibility that the committee could reform and agree to table those minutes. My objection is that the committee members were on a very contentious committee. I respect the fact that committee members went into that committee thinking that everything would be confidential. They spoke freely and their deliberations were made freely. To now table those minutes without the committee having a say in doing so would really break with the convention of the Parliament. I do not think that doing so would add that much to the debate that is coming next year. A very substantial report has been tabled and there is a significant minority report for members to take into consideration when they are thinking about this issue. Based on those points, I will not support the motion.

**Extract from Hansard**

[COUNCIL — Wednesday, 21 November 2018]

p8313d-8324a

Hon Nick Goiran; Hon Colin Holt; Hon Rick Mazza; Hon Dr Sally Talbot; Hon Sue Ellery; Hon Michael Mischin; Hon Martin Pritchard; Hon Peter Collier

---

**HON DR SALLY TALBOT (South West)** [1.50 pm]: I rise to oppose the motion and to put on the record a couple of my observations about why members who were not on the committee might consider rejecting the motion put by Hon Nick Goiran. I invite members to consider the possible assumptions or grounds on which they might reject this motion. I suppose the prime question for me, which was raised by both Hon Colin Holt and Hon Rick Mazza, is whether this is legitimately a decision to be made by the committee. If we were being confronted with evidence that whether to make their minutes public is not a decision properly made committees, we would have a different motion in front of us and we may very well arrive at a different conclusion. I invite members to consider first of all whether it is a legitimate question.

The second question is to consider whether, when that decision was made, it was properly made. I do not hear any allegation or insinuation from Hon Nick Goiran that the decision was made improperly. I heartily endorse the comments made during the tabling of this lengthy and comprehensive report. All of us in this place referred to the fact that, given that matters are highly emotional and contentious, we had operated in a very collegiate fashion, respectful of views even when they deeply diverged from each other. I would like to continue in that spirit now. I certainly do not intend to be the one who breaks that. I ask honourable members to consider whether there is anything they have come across to suggest that the committee operated under a veil of secrecy. I cannot see it. If members are contemplating that question and they are not sure what the answer is, I invite them to consider the fact that the committee looked at 730 submissions and supplementary submissions, held 81 public hearings, heard from just over 130 witnesses and received 64 pieces of additional information, either by way of answers to questions on notice that witnesses took away or as supplementary information that was provided. The vast bulk of that material is public; it is all available for everybody to see. I would say quite clearly that the committee did operate in a fashion that was as transparent as we could possibly make it.

I also ask members to speculate, in their ruminations about whether to support this motion, on why a committee might make the decision not to make its minutes public. Without talking in any kind of detail about the work of this joint select committee, I suggest that members think about what might happen when we are considering an issue as emotional and contentious as voluntary assisted dying. I would suggest to members that the two possible reasons—I am not speculating that these were the reasons, but I invite members to contemplate the possibility—for the decision not to make the minutes public might be made on the basis of protecting witnesses and it might be made on the basis of keeping the committee's deliberations undisclosed. Both Hon Colin Holt and Hon Rick Mazza referred to the absolute importance of protecting the capacity of committee members to speak freely in meetings. I think that is something we ought to guard absolutely to the final instance. The right to speak freely in committee should be one that we regard as a primary, fundamental right as members of Parliament. I would suggest that members contemplate whether those may be two reasons that a committee might make the decision not to make its minutes public.

I ask members to further contemplate why it is important, when we are dealing with an issue like voluntary assisted dying, to ensure that privacy is protected, particularly the privacy of witnesses. We live in a state that is often referred to as a village. Often, when we are in another country, we meet people from Western Australia. We have half the population in the entire state of cities in the eastern states. This is a small place. We invited people to come in, and all the evidence members have seen on the public record shows how willingly and how fulsomely people talked about their experiences of this issue, whether they were arguing for change or against change. I think we have to contemplate the possibility that when a committee makes a decision to keep its minutes private, an element of that is to do with protecting the privacy of witnesses.

I want to draw my remarks to a close by simply reminding honourable members that Hon Nick Goiran was a member of the committee and, as a member of the committee and as a member of Parliament, Hon Nick Goiran has one of the most powerful elements of free speech and free inquiry accorded to him—that is, the matter of parliamentary privilege. I want to ask the mover of the motion to seriously contemplate whether, if he fails to get this motion through the house, it will in some sense seriously cramp his style in the arguments he can mount. I say this in an absolutely genuine spirit of respect for the capacity of the honourable member, his understanding of the issue and his commitment to the values that he espouses. I want to suggest to honourable members that this debate around this contentious and emotional issue will not be adversely affected one iota if those committee minutes are not made public.

**HON SUE ELLERY (South Metropolitan — Leader of the House)** [1.57 pm]: I want to make a few comments about this motion. I had to think about this a lot because it is not a debate I have contemplated in the 17 years I have been a member of Parliament. Of course, we are being asked to consider something in which we do not know, and quite legitimately should not or cannot know, some of the things that are behind it. In getting to a position in which I could intellectually come to grips with how the decision was made, I relied on the following. Operating under the standing orders of the Legislative Assembly, is there a power for a joint select committee to make a decision to release or not release its minutes? Yes, there is, under the standing orders. The committee had

**Extract from Hansard**

[COUNCIL — Wednesday, 21 November 2018]

p8313d-8324a

Hon Nick Goiran; Hon Colin Holt; Hon Rick Mazza; Hon Dr Sally Talbot; Hon Sue Ellery; Hon Michael Mischin; Hon Martin Pritchard; Hon Peter Collier

---

the legal authority to make a decision to do either one of those things. Clearly, it chose to do one of them. I then thought: what if there was something that the Parliament needed to know about this particular issue but it was being precluded from knowing it because the committee had made the decision not to make public its minutes? I looked at the report—the majority report and the minority report. Although I do not agree with the conclusions of the minority report—that would not be a secret to anybody; my position on this matter is generally well known—it is certainly a solid piece of work. There is no question about that. It canvasses the issues that I would have anticipated it to canvass. I reached the conclusion that if anything needed to be in the report, it would have been in either the majority report or the minority report, because they diverged so widely on certain points that I feel that the report that I read canvassed all the critical issues. I do not know whether something else was not canvassed, but knowing the diligence of Hon Nick Goiran, I cannot imagine that, if there was an issue that he wanted to ventilate in his minority report, he was not able to ventilate that issue in that report. In thinking it through, maybe there was something in the minutes that constrained him from referring to—I do not know—the particular personal circumstances of somebody. That is all I could think of. But even then, in my thinking to get me to the point that I am at, he would still have had the opportunity, in an intellectual sense, to canvass the issue.

In any event, I know that other members want to speak. In all the circumstances, I have reached the conclusion that we will not support the motion. The committee had the power, the authority, under the standing orders it was operating under, to make the decision. There is no proposition before us that anyone has acted improperly or in breach of the standing orders; and, in the absence of that, we will respect the decision made by the committee not to release the minutes.

**HON MICHAEL MISCHIN (North Metropolitan — Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** [2.01 pm]: I was not going to get involved in this debate to start with. I had no particular interest in the outcome, but I have listened with considerable interest to some of the comments that have been made and, frankly, I am astonished. The Joint Select Committee on End of Life Choices was set up at the instigation of a member of the government to explore a certain policy position. I have no doubt that the members of the committee—four of them from this chamber and four from the other place—did their job diligently and faithfully and with good intent. We received a substantial report that canvassed quite a number of issues, but Hon Nick Goiran raised one particular aspect when debate commenced on the establishment of the committee. My sense of it is that the majority report did not look into that in any great depth, if at all. He delivered a comprehensive minority report that canvassed quite a number of issues that were not touched upon in the majority report. So be it. That is part of what happens in the work of committees. I accept and entirely support the importance of committee work and that there needs to be confidentiality surrounding the deliberations of parliamentary committees so that they can deal fearlessly with the issues at hand, debate them fearlessly and robustly and come up with a final recommendation.

There are a number of points about this committee that are unusual, at least from the perspective of this house. One of them is that it was a joint select committee with equal numbers of members from both places. The other is that it was governed not by the standing orders and customs of this place, but by the standing orders, customs and practices of the Legislative Assembly. We have been informed by Hon Nick Goiran—I have heard no-one disagree with it—that the custom and practice of committees in the other place is to disclose their minutes. We have also heard that the custom and practice of the other place is that there is a chair's report, in effect, that others contribute to along the way. These are not the sorts of mechanisms that are adopted and customary in this place, whereby the crafting and drafting of a committee's report involves the collaboration of all members.

There are a number of peculiar features—peculiar to this place at any rate—about the way that this committee went about its exercise. I can entirely accept it if there were a conscious decision of that committee at any stage during its proceedings to say, “The practice of the Assembly is to reveal the minutes in due course, but we resolve, for a variety of reasons, that the minutes of our proceedings will remain confidential”, and I stress that it is just the minutes—the record of the proceedings—not the detail of deliberations. I have no evidence that that was the case, or that it was even considered, notwithstanding that four members of that committee were well aware of that practice in the other place. What we have heard, however, is an invitation for us to speculate that there may have been such a decision by the committee; and, if there was such a decision by the committee, it may have been for a variety of very worthy purposes. We are being asked to speculate upon speculation about something that would ordinarily have been apparent if this committee had been set up by the place whose standing orders governed its proceedings. I find that astonishing. Hon Dr Sally Talbot told us that it could have been for this worthy purpose, if there had been a decision at all, but she cannot tell us. We are being asked to speculate that the matter was even brought to the mind of the committee and thought about and that a resolution was made. That will be revealed by the minutes. There may have been a number of unworthy reasons for it, too. We do not know, but we are being asked to speculate that there was a decision and it was done for the best of reasons. Thank you very much! That is valueless.

**Extract from Hansard**

[COUNCIL — Wednesday, 21 November 2018]

p8313d-8324a

Hon Nick Goiran; Hon Colin Holt; Hon Rick Mazza; Hon Dr Sally Talbot; Hon Sue Ellery; Hon Michael Mischin; Hon Martin Pritchard; Hon Peter Collier

---

I accept the importance of committee work. I accept all the things that have been said about the importance of keeping deliberations confidential. I accept that members have approached this properly, but this is one of the most important issues facing this Parliament and the government announced a particular policy objective and it set up a committee for a particular policy objective. We do not know whether the minutes may reveal something that is material to the ultimate deliberation. We are being asked to say, “Two reports have been delivered; I think that they are pretty good and they have covered everything, so it will not make a difference to anyone’s debate on the subject.” Again, I do not know that. Something may be revealed by the minutes—a policy decision, an approach or a dismissal of certain evidence because it was thought to be irrelevant. There may have been some resolution that may mould one’s impression of the material that is provided and argued about in this place. We do not know. We are being asked to speculate that there is nothing. We are even being asked to speculate that the committee turned its mind to it. That is a hopeless approach. The only way that we will know is if the minutes are made available.

Hon Dr Sally Talbot told us that people had volunteered evidence and information. That is not a problem. The terms of the motion are —

That the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly —

It is the Speaker who has taken that responsibility ultimately —

cause to be tabled in both the Legislative Council and the Legislative Assembly, within three sitting days of both houses having so ordered, all minutes of meetings of the Joint Select Committee on End of Life Choices, redacted only to maintain as private the details of any private evidence or personal information ...

No confidentiality in that respect will be revealed, assuming that the minutes contain anything to that effect. If there is something else that members of the committee feel, after due consideration, needs to be addressed in order to preserve something that may be embarrassing—I am not suggesting embarrassing in terms of the integrity of the committee, but embarrassing in terms of revealing information that might compromise other people—we have the opportunity to amend the motion and deal with it on that basis. However, we have heard nothing about that.

The other odd thing about it is that, the committee having been established at the initiative of the government, the government has taken the approach that it will oppose this motion. I can only wonder why that is. Is it because the government is concerned as a block that something will be revealed that may compromise the integrity of its policy position? Again, I do not know, but let us speculate about it. After all, we are being asked to speculate that there is nothing that is awry in this. We may as well speculate on the worst possible case scenarios too. We are asked to pile speculation upon speculation in order to oppose this motion and to do something that would have been a matter of course in the other place, the place whose standing orders govern the proceedings of this committee. I do not even know whether there was a decision. We will never know whether there was a decision unless those minutes are published. I am prepared to entertain any halfway house with this matter, if members of the committee wish to turn their mind to it in order to satisfy the needs of disclosure or transparency that the government on yet another occasion has decided for some reason ought not to be met as a standard. I am prepared to entertain amendments to refine this motion, even if it is a release of the minutes that reflect the decision to start with to show that members have actually turned their mind to it in that committee in order to achieve these ends. However, I have heard no convincing argument so far based on anything other than speculation that would militate against the idea of the usual course, custom and practice that has been adopted in the other place and whose standing orders this committee was bound by, was operating under and was well aware of when it commenced deliberations. I confess that my inclination is to support this motion in the absence of any good reason not to, and I have not heard one yet. I have heard a number of reasons based on speculation that we are invited to accept as fact that would turn me towards supporting finding out what it is that the committee is concerned about revealing—not in a way that will embarrass those who gave evidence or who debated the issues within that committee, but simply to know that they have turned their mind to the question. I support the motion in the absence of any good reason not to.

**HON MARTIN PRITCHARD (North Metropolitan)** [2.13 pm]: I was not going to speak on this motion but I think there is a view across the chamber that the backbenchers do not often put arguments, so I am happy to put an argument for my non-support of this motion. With regard to the substantive issue of the report, I think my position is fairly well known: I have not made up my mind. I am looking forward to the debate and to testing the legislation that comes forward. However, on the matter before us today, I have confidence in the committee process. I have participated in committees in the past three years. I enjoy that they are apolitical in many ways and that people participate in a very cooperative way. I have absolutely no idea what the Joint Select Committee on End of Life Choices determined or whether it made a decision, a conscious decision or no decision whatsoever. If we start passing motions in this place that put at risk the committee process and how people participate in that

**Extract from Hansard**

[COUNCIL — Wednesday, 21 November 2018]

p8313d-8324a

Hon Nick Goiran; Hon Colin Holt; Hon Rick Mazza; Hon Dr Sally Talbot; Hon Sue Ellery; Hon Michael Mischin; Hon Martin Pritchard; Hon Peter Collier

---

process, that is a negative. Irrespective of the fact that we are talking about only one issue here, it is something that people need to look at and consider whether it sets a precedence in the future for all committees. My view is this: the committee made a determination. I accept that we nominated people to be on that committee. I accept that they did a good job and that, as it stands at the moment, they made a determination not to release the minutes. I am content with that. I will have enough information. I will listen to the debate on the substantive issue. However, we are talking here about interference in a very negative way in the committee process. We should accept the committee determination.

**HON PETER COLLIER (North Metropolitan — Leader of the Opposition)** [2.15 pm]: I was not going to make any comments on this, but it is important that I do, from a personal perspective. I have grown more attached to the motion as I have listened to the debate. I do not diminish anyone's comments on this matter; I think they are all valid. Without a doubt this is one of the most highly contentious and emotive issues that any member of this chamber will ever have to deal with in their entire parliamentary career. In life, information is power, and it is absolutely vital that we are empowered when we make our decisions on this issue. It is vital. Apparently, according to *The West Australian*, we have all made up our minds anyway, but *The West* has another think coming. I am pretty sure where I have landed already; however, I can assure members that I have not completely made up my mind. This is a very emotional issue. I commend the committee wholeheartedly, and I embrace the report and the minority report. I thank the members of the committee most sincerely personally and on behalf of the community for spending so much time on this vexed and emotive issue.

Having said that, two issues need to be identified that I see as arising from the debate that has emanated from today; first, the precedent and whether it is appropriate. Yes, there is precedent and it is appropriate. As Hon Nick Goiran already expressed, there is enormous precedent for committees under the standing orders of the Legislative Assembly to table the minutes of reports. For example, over the past three Parliaments, the Community Development and Justice Standing Committee has tabled the minutes of eight committee hearings; the Economics and Industry Standing Committee has tabled the minutes of five hearings; the Education and Health Standing Committee has tabled the minutes of seven hearings; and the Public Accounts Committee has tabled the minutes of six hearings. I am highlighting there that there is precedent for the tabling of minutes. I assure members that those hearings were on issues that were not as contentious as the one we are dealing with now.

I do not see it as infringing upon the responsibilities of the committee to ask for the minutes to be tabled. I have absolutely no idea whether it was discussed at the committee level; none of us will, apart from those on the committee. However, this is not a normal committee report. This is an extremely emotive, highly inflammatory in some instances, but very personally excruciating issue that we and the community have to deal with. I am sure that members have been inundated with emails from constituents. I certainly have. People have made value judgements about me based on an article in *The West Australian*. They hate me because apparently I am going to vote no. I promise members, they do. They have made that value judgement on where I stand as an individual even though they have never had a conversation with me. Somehow I am diminished as an individual and they will never vote for me again as an individual because apparently I am going to vote no—that terrible thing that I am going to vote no. That is what we are going to have to endure, guys, for the next 12 to 18 months. We all have to get used to it, particularly those who apparently are going to vote no.

In order to be prepared for that onslaught—it is coming; the tsunami has already started—we need to be best prepared. As I said, information is power. We have our own personal issues. Some of us have our own religious beliefs and some of us have our own personal beliefs. Some of us have our own personal angst that we have to deal with as a result of the circumstances surrounding this issue. I certainly have, and I will have more to say on that when we deal with the debate. Do not think for one second that those who apparently are voting no are heartless, because we are not, but we deserve to have as much information as anyone. We in this chamber deserve to have as much information as anyone. If those minutes provide us with more learned information, so be it. As I said, information is power, and it is vital. As the Premier himself has said, and I stated this in debate in this chamber last week, the public interest must come first, transparency must come first and openness must come first. They are the words of the Premier of Western Australia. I agree with him wholeheartedly. The public interest must come first, transparency must come first and openness must come first. Rather than being labelled as heartless or out of touch et cetera, I would like to think that I can be empowered with as much information as I can possibly have when I am dealing with this issue. As I said, the reports are comprehensive, and I am absolutely in awe of the amount of work and effort that went into both the committee report and the minority report. If the minutes add value, so be it. What are we afraid of? Surely, there can be nothing more personally debilitating, in a lot of instances, and emotionally heart-wrenching than this issue. Every single piece of information that we can have, whether we agree or disagree with it, is valid. There is no one person on this earth whose views are more significant than anyone else's with regard to issue. We all have our views and it is absolutely vital, as I said, that we are empowered. Personally, I would like to think that will occur. Over the next 12 months, I will most definitely be taking the time to go through this issue at a personal level. Yes, I am

**Extract from Hansard**

[COUNCIL — Wednesday, 21 November 2018]

p8313d-8324a

Hon Nick Goiran; Hon Colin Holt; Hon Rick Mazza; Hon Dr Sally Talbot; Hon Sue Ellery; Hon Michael Mischin; Hon Martin Pritchard; Hon Peter Collier

---

Peter Collier the man; I am also Hon Peter Collier, member for North Metropolitan Region. Yes, I will take into account the views of my constituents, but I will also take into account the views of the report and the minority report, and the views of my friends, my family, my colleagues and all Western Australians when I come to my conclusion. I would like to think I can do this in a much more empowered situation than I am in at the moment. This might just value-add.

Do not be afraid of transparency, do not be afraid of openness and do not be afraid of the public good. As the Premier said, embrace it for all that it is and say that every piece of information that we can garner from this report is going to add value to our final decisions. For that reason, if these minutes are going to add value, and I would like to think that they will, I really encourage members to support this motion. I have not heard one valid reason that we should not support it. There is precedent for it. There are no problems there whatsoever. This is not intruding whatsoever. If there were private hearings, this motion will not intrude on anyone's views from that perspective, but it is saying that we are really taking this issue seriously. All 36 of us who will be moving to one side of the chamber in 12 months or 18 months are going to have as much information as we possibly can and we will know that we have made our decision for the right reasons, regardless of whether it is yea or nay. That is because we are all powerful. For that reason, I will most certainly be supporting the motion.

**HON NICK GOIRAN (South Metropolitan)** [2.23 pm] — in reply: If there are no further contributions, I will respond to members who have contributed to debate on the motion, and I thank them for doing so. I also thank members for the courteous way in which the debate has been conducted. As Hon Peter Collier, the Leader of the Opposition, has indicated, at the heart of this matter is a very sensitive topic that people have very strong views on. In those circumstances it is appropriate that things are done in the most respectful and sensitive fashion.

I will respond to the various contributions that have been made. I do so in the full expectation that, to use the words of Hon Sally Talbot, it will make not one iota of difference. I do not think responding will make any difference. I do not profess that my powers of persuasion will be so magnificent in this very short time to respond that members will suddenly change the views they have already expressed, but I think they deserve at least the courtesy of hearing my response to what they have said.

My good friend Hon Colin Holt made some observations about his previous experience on committees and that they ordinarily operate in a non-political sense, which is the phrase he used. I take no issue with what he said there. He said that the committee was about ensuring that things were fully investigated and that was based on good evidence gathering. That is perhaps where Hon Colin Holt and I differ. It is a matter of public record that I say that the committee did not fully investigate the matter. It was asked to do certain things. For example, in the terms of reference that we as a house agreed to in the message from the other place, the committee was asked to look into the intersection with federal laws. Can a member of this place, finally, after nearly three months of the committee's report having been tabled, point me to the paragraph in the report where even a word is invested to deal with that term of reference? It does not exist, but I am happy for members to show me the paragraph in the committee's report. Could it be that the minutes might shed some light on that particular issue and why the committee has not devoted one single paragraph, one single sentence, one single word in its report on an element it was asked to investigate? Could the minutes do that? Why would we not want to know that one way or the other? As Hon Peter Collier said, what are we afraid of? Do not be afraid of transparency. Where I have a divergence of view with my good friend Hon Colin Holt is that I maintain that the committee did not fully investigate matters, and to the extent that it did certain things, they were not based on good evidence gathering. Clearly, seven other members of the committee hold a different view on that, and that is fine. They are quite entitled to that and they have put their view in that committee report. But while I continue to prosecute the argument and try to convince members not to give too much weight to the committee report because things were not fully investigated and the report was not based on good evidence gathering, why would I be prohibited from having the benefit of the minutes to help prosecute my argument? What are we afraid of? I can tell members that I am not afraid of one word in the minutes. I know what is in the minutes because I was a member of the committee. I am not afraid; I am not embarrassed by one single word in the minutes. I am happy for them to be revealed at the earliest opportunity. That is why I have moved the motion and I support it.

Hon Colin Holt then asked a series of questions, and there was a useful interchange between us about the minutes of the meetings of the Select Committee into Elder Abuse. I obviously have been involved in that debate. He raised an interesting question, which in effect is: have all the elder abuse committee minutes been released? I believe they have, but because he has raised the issue, and out of respect for what he has raised, I will double-check. The point I make to the honourable member is that if they have not been released, it is wrong, because they should be, and if that has not happened, it can only be an administrative error. If the member is concerned, I encourage him to talk to the Clerk of this place and I am sure the matter will be remedied at the first available opportunity. To the best of my knowledge and belief, all the elder abuse committee minutes have been published. If that is incorrect, it is an easy fix. Even if there were still a problem, I would say to the honourable member that he could move a motion in

**Extract from *Hansard***

[COUNCIL — Wednesday, 21 November 2018]

p8313d-8324a

Hon Nick Goiran; Hon Colin Holt; Hon Rick Mazza; Hon Dr Sally Talbot; Hon Sue Ellery; Hon Michael Mischin; Hon Martin Pritchard; Hon Peter Collier

---

this place and he would have my full support to have the minutes of the Select Committee into Elder Abuse fully revealed, because, again, I have nothing to hide. I am not afraid of anything that happened in the Select Committee into Elder Abuse, nor am I with regard to the Joint Select Committee on End of Life Choices, and I am not afraid of the transparency.

Quickly, I move on to the contribution of my good friend Hon Rick Mazza. He indicated that he will not support the motion. I respect his view. He said that he does not think it will add much. All I can say in response to that is that it is impossible—it is not impracticable—for a member who was not on the committee to come to a conclusion about whether something is going to add much because he has not seen the information. I move on because I think that if it does not add much, then, going back to what Hon Peter Collier said, what are we afraid of? If the minutes are not going to add anything, let us get this done and move on. If it is going to add something, we will all be better off. There is no scenario in which anyone is worse off, unless they are embarrassed by what is in the minutes. I am not.

My friend Hon Dr Sally Talbot, with whom I work on the Standing Committee on Legislation, has put to members: is there anything going on here that would suggest a veil of secrecy? I would say to the honourable member, yes—opposition to this motion is indeed that. Opposition to this motion is precisely suggesting a veil of secrecy, and I am trying to pierce that veil with this motion. Hon Dr Sally Talbot also indicated that it was important to respect the privacy of witnesses. On this point I stand shoulder to shoulder with my friend Hon Dr Sally Talbot. I agree entirely that it is important to respect the privacy of witnesses, and I point out to members that the precise wording of this motion does exactly that. It ensures that the privacy of witnesses is protected by the redactions that would be made by Mr Speaker.

Hon Dr Sally Talbot indicated that in her view the debate on this issue would not be impacted one iota without the minutes. I remind members that when we had the debate about the formation of the committee, I moved an amendment to the terms of reference, which the chamber did not agree with, the purpose of which was to enshrine in the terms of reference a requirement for the committee to look into the risks of voluntary euthanasia and assisted suicide. Clearly, I thought that was a very important thing for a committee of this sort to be doing—to look at the risks. If members look to the *Hansard* of that debate, it was my friend Hon Dr Sally Talbot who said that we have nothing to fear here because the existing terms of reference will allow that to happen. That was a point on which I agreed with her and, again, that is why I wanted it enshrined in the terms of reference—to make sure that it would definitely happen. Guess what, members? It did not happen—hence, why there is a 248-page minority report—because the thing that we all said it is very important that we do never happened.

**Hon Michael Mischin:** Should we speculate that that is the reason why she is opposed to revealing the minutes?

**Hon NICK GOIRAN:** All I am asking members to do is to not be afraid of transparency and to have the minutes released.

Hon Sue Ellery indicated that she could not think of anything that would not be in the committee report or in the minority report, and that that was the reason she would not support the motion. There are two things I say to that: again, if that is the case, what harm would be done in having the minutes released? If it is not going to add anything, if nothing new is going to be added, let us release the minutes and move on. But, of course, could there be something in there? Could we be in a situation next year, when we have this debate, in which one honourable member on the committee responds to a concern? Let us play out this scenario. Let us assume that my good friend Hon Donna Faragher, who will probably have words with me later for using her as an example, raises a concern about a particular element of the bill next year. Then let us assume that her good friend Hon Dr Sally Talbot rises to her feet and says, “Look, Hon Donna Faragher, with all due respect to you, you were not on the committee, and I can tell you that we’ve looked into that issue and that concern is not valid.” Would it not be terrific if a person like me was then able to say, “Actually, I know what really happened on the committee”, and draw members’ attention to paragraph such and such of the minutes that shows that the concern Hon Donna Faragher has is indeed valid and what Hon Dr Sally Talbot has said is not true? That would be a terrific addition to the debate and we would be better off for it if that scenario were to take place.

**Hon Michael Mischin:** Hon Dr Sally Talbot wouldn’t be able to say that, would she, because she wouldn’t be able to reveal the deliberations of the committee unless she had access to the minutes?

**Hon NICK GOIRAN:** If that were indeed the interpretation of things, we would be hamstrung in the debate. We would not be able to have the full and frank debate that everyone assures us we should be able to have.

In the few minutes left, I thank Hon Michael Mischin for his contribution and for indicating his support for the motion. I tell members that the opposition has not had detailed discussions about this whatsoever. When Hon Michael Mischin rose to his feet and when afterwards Hon Peter Collier rose to his feet and contributed off the cuff to this debate, it was all authentic. I had no idea that those members were going to speak, and I thank

**Extract from *Hansard***

[COUNCIL — Wednesday, 21 November 2018]

p8313d-8324a

Hon Nick Goiran; Hon Colin Holt; Hon Rick Mazza; Hon Dr Sally Talbot; Hon Sue Ellery; Hon Michael Mischin; Hon Martin Pritchard; Hon Peter Collier

---

them for their genuine comments. I apologise to Hon Martin Pritchard. I will go back to the *Hansard* to look at his precise comments, but I was involved in another urgent matter at the time he was speaking, and I thank him for his contribution and I acknowledge that he indicated that he will oppose the motion.

But I just say in conclusion that what Hon Peter Collier has said is quite right. What are we afraid of here? Why are we so afraid of transparency when it comes to the Joint Select Committee on End of Life Choices? Why are we as the Legislative Council unwilling to send a message to the other place to ask its members to agree to have the Speaker release the minutes of this committee, which was run under the auspices of the Legislative Assembly, when it is the ordinary custom and practice of such committees to release their minutes? What are we afraid of? No member has been able to indicate to me that there is anything to be afraid of. All we have effectively been told is, “Look, it’s not going to add much; we’re not going to be that much better off.” Then why would they oppose the motion? What would be the reason to be so concerned?

I end where I started my reply, by acknowledging the respectful way in which the debate has taken place. I thank members who have contributed. I acknowledge that my brief however long it was—20 minutes—reply is incredibly unlikely, barring some miracle, to convince those who have indicated that they will oppose the motion to suddenly support it. I respect that. I just indicate my disappointment. At the end of the day, wherever members sit on this issue, I indicate my disappointment with the government, because even if the motion were to pass through this place by some miracle in the next few minutes, it will be blocked by the government of Western Australia in the other place, which has determined that under no circumstances will these minutes be revealed. That is in the circumstances of a government that said it wanted to aspire to gold standard transparency and in circumstances in which no member is able to indicate what we need to be afraid of in having redacted minutes published when it is the ordinary custom and practice of the other place for that to happen routinely. Publication of minutes happened in the thirty-seventh, thirty-eighth and thirty-ninth Parliaments. We have got to the fortieth Parliament and there are new rules. It is not silver transparency or bronze; it is the worst.

*Division*

Question put and a division taken, the Acting President (Hon Adele Farina) casting her vote with the noes, with the following result —

Ayes (13)

|                    |                     |                      |                                  |
|--------------------|---------------------|----------------------|----------------------------------|
| Hon Tim Clifford   | Hon Michael Mischin | Hon Aaron Stonehouse | Hon Ken Baston ( <i>Teller</i> ) |
| Hon Peter Collier  | Hon Simon O’Brien   | Hon Dr Steve Thomas  |                                  |
| Hon Donna Faragher | Hon Tjorn Sibma     | Hon Colin Tincknell  |                                  |
| Hon Nick Goiran    | Hon Charles Smith   | Hon Alison Xamon     |                                  |

Noes (19)

|                     |                   |                        |                                   |
|---------------------|-------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Hon Martin Aldridge | Hon Sue Ellery    | Hon Alannah MacTiernan | Hon Matthew Swinbourn             |
| Hon Jacqui Boydell  | Hon Diane Evers   | Hon Rick Mazza         | Hon Dr Sally Talbot               |
| Hon Robin Chapple   | Hon Adele Farina  | Hon Kyle McGinn        | Hon Darren West                   |
| Hon Stephen Dawson  | Hon Laurie Graham | Hon Martin Pritchard   | Hon Pierre Yang ( <i>Teller</i> ) |
| Hon Colin de Grussa | Hon Colin Holt    | Hon Samantha Rowe      |                                   |

---

Pair

|               |                    |
|---------------|--------------------|
| Hon Jim Chown | Hon Alanna Clohesy |
|---------------|--------------------|

Question thus negatived.