

NORTHERN GOLDFIELDS — CHILDREN’S HEALTH AND WELFARE

Motion

HON HELEN BULLOCK (Mining and Pastoral) [10.11 am] — without notice: I move —

That this house expresses its lack of confidence in the Minister for Regional Development, the Minister for Indigenous Affairs and the Minister for Child Protection for their incompetence, inaction and lack of accountability in addressing the serious issues raised by the Goldfields–Esperance Development Commission project officer reports into the health and welfare of children in the northern Goldfields.

Guess what? It turns out that Mr Robert Johnson, the Minister for Police, is not the only government minister who is incompetent and irresponsible, has a lack of accountability and is a self-loving narcissist. There is a bunch of them sitting on the front bench on the other side of this chamber! Shall we go through them, one by one?

Let us start with the Minister for Indigenous Affairs. The Department of Indigenous Affairs is very well known in the state’s remote communities. Everybody knows about DIA, but the thing is that nobody knows what DIA does; I myself actually wondered at one stage what it does.

Hon Robyn McSweeney interjected.

Hon HELEN BULLOCK: The minister’s time will come; she should just wait patiently.

Let us try an exercise. I will go through a few of the issues raised in these reports and see whether we can somehow get DIA involved. The reports refer to a lack of dental services in the Tjuntjuntjara community for both adults and children—not DIA’s responsibility? An unhealthy living environment in the Tjuntjuntjara community—nothing to do with DIA? Housing issues in remote Indigenous communities—no? Lack of public transport between those remote communities—no? A pregnant 12-year-old girl—nothing to do with the Minister for Indigenous Affairs.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order, members!

Hon HELEN BULLOCK: Abused and neglected children—not DIA’s responsibility? An unreported paedophile running around in these remote communities?

Hon Peter Collier interjected.

Hon HELEN BULLOCK: Okay, right. Let us make things easier. When his time comes to speak, perhaps the Minister for Indigenous Affairs can go through a few of his achievements so that we can all hear them. I just hope that the minister will not deny himself the pleasure of going through a few of his rare achievements.

Hon Peter Collier: What’s the role of DIA? Do you know?

Hon Adele Farina: Let her finish. You’ll get your chance.

Hon HELEN BULLOCK: I thank Hon Adele Farina.

Whenever issues such as those mentioned in the GEDC’s reports are brought to his attention, the Minister for Indigenous Affairs often says, “I don’t know how to solve the crisis,” or “I don’t have a solution”. It is my understanding that the minister actually asked for this portfolio, so I would have thought that even before he took it on, he must have had some idea of how to do a few things and fix some issues, though not all of them; we do not expect him to do that.

Hon Peter Collier: When did I say that?

The PRESIDENT: Order! Minister, please do not interject. You know that there are provisions in the standing orders. If you want to do something about it, do it that way, not by interjection.

Hon HELEN BULLOCK: As we all know, the issues raised in those reports are not new, so I ask the minister to please do something about them—anything, whether conventional or not, or whether politically correct or not; I do not mind. Otherwise, he should let one of his capable colleagues have a go.

Point of Order

Hon PETER COLLIER: The honourable member made reference to a quote of mine. I want to know whether that was a direct quote of mine that she was referring to; and, if so, where the quote came from. I would like her to identify that quote.

Hon Helen Bullock; Hon Peter Collier; President; Hon Robyn McSweeney; Hon Col Holt; Hon Dr Sally Talbot;
Deputy President; Hon Sue Ellery

The PRESIDENT: You are asking for her to identify the document she has quoted from, rather than taking a point of order.

Hon HELEN BULLOCK: Which quote is the minister looking for?

Hon PETER COLLIER: The one that the member just referred to.

Hon HELEN BULLOCK: Is the minister referring to “I don’t know how to solve this crisis”?

Hon PETER COLLIER: Yes.

Hon HELEN BULLOCK: That was quoted in *The Weekend West* on 11 June 2011.

Hon PETER COLLIER: I did not say that. Not at all.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I think that is an example of the house working, because the minister has sought confirmation of where the quote came from, and the member on her feet has provided that confirmation. Let us move on.

Hon PETER COLLIER: She misquoted me.

Hon HELEN BULLOCK: I will pass the quote to the minister after I have finished.

The PRESIDENT: Let us move on.

Hon PETER COLLIER: You are actually wrong.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Debate Resumed

Hon HELEN BULLOCK: The Minister for Indigenous Affairs also made repeated comments in relation to some of the programs that are running in those remote communities, and I agree with him on those comments.

Hon Peter Collier interjected.

Hon HELEN BULLOCK: Let me finish. That is one of the things I have realised after visiting those remote communities. The minister was quoted in the *Weekend West* of 11 June 2011 as saying —

... an enormous amount of duplication (and) a massive amount of wastage of resources which are not necessarily directed at the right areas,”

Another quote by the minister, which appeared in the *Weekend West* of 2 July 2011, reads —

“There are dozens of programs, hundreds of thousands here, millions there, tens of thousands here

...

“There is a massive amount of duplication. There is an enormous amount of wastage.”

We get the minister’s message, and I agree with him. Now we are waiting to see what he is going to do about that wastage and duplication of services in those remote communities.

I will now move on to the Minister for Child Protection, but I ask the Minister for Indigenous Affairs to tell us, when he gets the chance, a few of the things he has done in his DIA portfolio for those remote communities.

The Minister for Child Protection appears to me to be a caring and no-nonsense person, but her action—or rather, inaction—in dealing with the issues raised in these reports paints a different image.

Hon Robyn McSweeney interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Minister, you have interjected three times on the member on her feet. Let her have her full 20 minutes of contribution and then it may be that you get an opportunity to respond.

Hon HELEN BULLOCK: In relation to the GEDC’s Laverton abandoned children report, instead of investigating the claims contained in the report and looking at internal reports, files, emails and any other form of correspondence sent to the Department for Child Protection’s office in Laverton from the Laverton police, school and hospital, the Minister for Child Protection and the head of her department chose to have a go at the messenger by questioning the credibility of these reports and the officer who wrote them. This action itself shows how substandard both of them are.

The senior officer was employed by the Goldfields–Esperance Development Commission. To question the credibility of the person who wrote the report, the Minister for Child Protection is actually questioning the credibility of the GEDC’s competence in terms of its work ethic and ability to hire the right person to do a proper job. I am actually surprised that the Minister for Regional Development had to put up with these accusations

Hon Helen Bullock; Hon Peter Collier; President; Hon Robyn McSweeney; Hon Col Holt; Hon Dr Sally Talbot;
Deputy President; Hon Sue Ellery

from the Department for Child Protection. I am also surprised that the Minister for Regional Development did not stand up to defend his department and his employee. There is another phrase for it—it is called a man without a backbone.

Members are probably wondering why the project officer did not stand up to defend herself. That is because she was told not to speak to anybody. She was not the only one told not to speak to anybody. Lots of employees from those government departments were told not to speak to anybody.

Hon Robyn McSweeney: Not from my department. If they have anything to say, they can say it.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Minister, did you not hear me a minute ago? You will get a chance to respond; do not respond by interjection. The same rules apply to all members, remember that.

Hon HELEN BULLOCK: I must say, watching the Minister for Child Protection perform like that from the outside, I held my breath for her. I said to myself, “Surely she can do better than that.” But no, it got worse. The minister then travelled to Laverton one afternoon and spent some time in the community patrol van. She had a meeting or two with a few people who were carefully selected by her advisers. She came back and said to us, “Look, I went there. I did not see any abandoned children anywhere. You cannot substantiate the claim; you cannot prove that they were abandoned; and you cannot give me concrete evidence. What are their names? What are their parents’ names? Where do they live? Where do they come from? You cannot substantiate all these claims.” She also told us that country kids—like her when she was young—like to treasure hunt in rubbish tips. To show how generous the Minister for Child Protection is with royalties for regions money, she said her department would provide royalties for region money to fund three more full-time positions in Laverton.

In terms of other briefs that surfaced in July through the freedom of information process, the record clearly shows that the minister received those reports on 2 June 2011. But the second round of these kinds of “explosions” clearly was too much for the Minister for Child Protection. She could not handle it any more. This is what I imagine happened: she sat in her office, buried her head in her hands and cried out to her spokesman, who was waiting for instruction as to what to say to waiting media outside, “I did not receive any reports—did you? Can you go out there and tell them that? I could not possibly make comments on the issues raised in those reports because I did not see them! What—a 12-year-old girl pregnant! I wish you hadn’t told me that. Are you sure she is 12 and not 22? Whereabouts is the paedophile? How do I know; how does that involve me? Oh, no more of this. Can you check with Peter and get him to take some responsibilities? And also go out and tell the media to please go away. I have given them some money from the royalties for regions fund. There is nothing left. Also, could you please go out to check with Brendon to see if he has more money to spend? Just go away, leave me alone.”

Point of Order

Hon HELEN MORTON: I am not 100 per cent certain, but —

The PRESIDENT: Order! It is not a speech. Are you standing to make a point of order?

Hon HELEN MORTON: I make a point of order about some words that were used. I am looking for the President’s direction in this. I understood the speaker called the Minister for Indigenous Affairs by his Christian name, Peter. I understood that she also referred to the Minister for Regional Development by his Christian name, Brendon. If, by some chance, the member is referring to those two ministers, I think there needs to be a level of appropriateness in the way that is used.

The PRESIDENT: The member was relaying a hypothetical story. If there is an official addressing of a minister, the member knows they have to be addressed in the correct terms.

Debate Resumed

Hon HELEN BULLOCK: Thanks, Mr President. I can assure you I understand all that.

One more thing before I leave the Minister for Child Protection, as I understand this is too much for her: the Minister for Child Protection used the words “culturally inappropriate” when the Laverton community asked whether the existing youth hostel facility could be converted to a shelter for neglected children. For someone who portrays herself as a passionate advocate for the welfare of children in this state, I realise that she is just another gutless, disingenuous hypocrite.

Hon Robyn McSweeney: At least I am not Joe Bullock’s wife!

Hon HELEN BULLOCK: How pathetic; how cheap is that!

Hon Robyn McSweeney: So are you!

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon Helen Bullock; Hon Peter Collier; President; Hon Robyn McSweeney; Hon Col Holt; Hon Dr Sally Talbot;
Deputy President; Hon Sue Ellery

Hon HELEN BULLOCK: What you just said, the words you just used, really wiped off all the admiration that I had for you!

Hon Robyn McSweeney: Wow!

Hon Ljiljana Ravlich: That wasn't much!

Hon Robyn McSweeney: I didn't have any for you!

Hon HELEN BULLOCK: We move on now; it is not your turn. It is not all about you! Now it is about the Minister for Regional Development. The Minister for Regional Development is a very lucky man in many aspects, one of which is to have a very diligent, competent and responsible project officer—which is in stark contrast to him—working for him in one of his regional development commissions; namely the GEDC. As a responsible person, the officer writes a report, or brief, after each visit by raising issues and providing recommendations. These reports are not confidential reports as such. They are merely the project officer's effort to try to bring the government's attention to the tragic reality of remote communities. These reports or briefs are simply working notes. My understanding is that they are very well circulated amongst remote communities. The reason for their wide circulation is that the project officer hopes that some government agencies will take some action through the circulation of the reports. But what? Nothing has been done. Looking at the date of these reports, the earliest date on the report is June 2010 and the latest is January 2011. All these reports were lying on the Minister for Regional Development's desk, sleeping soundly for months and months, just like the minister himself, until one day he was woken by the media! Even then, the Minister for Regional Development did not want to know and did not want to do anything about it. As reported in *The Weekend West* on 11 June 2011, he kept saying —

“I don't know what the answer is mate. If you're there, I'm hoping you can come up with it.”

He also said that he would not have acted differently if he had received those reports six months earlier, because he did not have a solution. He also thinks the issues and problems raised in the report are not something new or unique, as he knew them all too well. In the end, the Minister for Regional Development was very frustrated and had a go at the messenger. He told the Goldfields-Esperance Development Commission that if there were briefing notes attached to the report, he would have known about those reports earlier. I thought he just said that it would not have made any difference to have known about those reports six months earlier. What a confused soul! The Minister for Regional Development also told the GEDC not just to inform him of the problem, but also to fix it with his money because there was plenty of it.

I think I had better quote what he said, as it is very good. *The West Australian* reported him on 18 August 2011 as saying —

“In a quiet moment with the development commission, I suggested to them that rather than just informing me of the problem, maybe some of the policy suggestions could come from them — because we put them (there) to have a degree of autonomy and we've given them great access to Royalties for Regions — instead of just sending me a report saying ‘This is all s...’” ...

Members can let their imaginations run wild!

Hon Adele Farina: It's a direct quote!

Hon HELEN BULLOCK: Yes, that is in a quote.

Hon Norman Moore: Did he say “s, dot, dot, dot”?

Hon HELEN BULLOCK: It did say “dot, dot, dot”.

Hon Col Holt: Tell us more about royalties for regions; I like that.

Hon HELEN BULLOCK: I will come to that.

I would like to point out that every one of these reports has recommendations. I got you, Hon Norman Moore!

Hon Norman Moore: What?

Hon HELEN BULLOCK: Every one of these reports has recommendations at the back of the report. Do members think anyone reads those recommendations before they open their big mouth? Apparently not.

Hon Simon O'Brien: You didn't consider your speech before you opened your big mouth!

Hon HELEN BULLOCK: Is Hon Simon O'Brien being nasty again, like he always is? I did not hear what he said.

Hon Helen Bullock; Hon Peter Collier; President; Hon Robyn McSweeney; Hon Col Holt; Hon Dr Sally Talbot;
Deputy President; Hon Sue Ellery

Even the Minister for Regional Development himself did not read the report. His chief of staff simply forwarded those reports to the chief of staff of the Minister for Child Protection, but not to the chief of staff of the Minister for Indigenous Affairs. Of course, that had nothing to do with the Department of Indigenous Affairs.

The difference between DRD, DCP and DIA is that DRD has the money—that department just has to ask for it. In the end, the Minister for Regional Development must have said, “Look, here you go, here’s \$28 million to fix those irresponsible parents and something we can talk about in case the opposition asks any more questions.” But the thing is, this \$28 million is a potential headache for the Minister for Indigenous Affairs. He needs to decide whether this \$28 million will provide positive outcomes for Aboriginal communities, how useful it will be and how much will be duplicated through these existing programs. Mr President, I am running out of time.

These were the actions taken by these ministers in this chamber. Are they doing better than the Minister for Police? No!

HON ROBYN McSWEENEY (South West — Minister for Child Protection) [10.34 am]: I certainly will not be agreeing to this motion. What an odd little speech that was! What an outrageous motion! It is totally untrue and one that has absolutely no substance at all. What a mob of buffoons members opposite are!

When opposition members come into this place and throw stones, it would be very wise of them to check their own party’s record on child protection, because they certainly do have a record on child protection. They have a record that is akin to a criminal record on child protection, and there are many reports to prove that. There is one report that I will not dwell on. I want to tell the house about the actions I took on the briefing notes that I received from the Goldfields-Esperance Development Commission. These briefing notes were not written by my department. They were not written by trained child protection workers who work in their communities at a grassroots level. What is not well publicised is the dates on those briefing notes. By the time I received those briefing notes on 2 June, they were well over 12 months old. We have four staff members who work in that area, on the ground, working day in, day out. They know what is going on. In fact, Mr Damian McLean, President of the Shire of Ngaanyatjarraku, described those briefing notes as shallow, derivative and useless in terms of providing constructive ideas, and there was no factual basis provided within the reports for any of the claims made; rather, they were a collection of anecdotes, impressions and previous documentation of already very well understood problems.

Hon Michael Mischin: Sounds like an opposition speech!

Hon ROBYN McSWEENEY: It does indeed.

The report that I focused on was one written in January 2011, and it was about Laverton. Given that I received the briefing notes on 2 June, at the first opportunity on 7 June, some five days later, I flew into Laverton with the director of country services of the Department for Child Protection, Mr Hancock. On the way there I was briefed about all matters pertaining to that area around the Goldfields, including the lands. That is action—something the Labor Party knows nothing about. I met with my departmental staff, I met with police, I met with the Aboriginal patrol and I met with local government. I stayed the night. I went out on that patrol with the Aboriginal women who run that patrol and they do an absolutely fantastic job. That is action—more action! Do members know what? They were extremely offended to think that people were saying that Aboriginal children were living on the tip. They told me that it was not true. At an interagency meeting on 13 June, nobody could say or provide any data to support those allegations. At that meeting, officers from the WA Police, the Department of Indigenous Affairs, GEDC, the Shire of Ngaanyatjarraku and the Department for Child Protection were present. More action! A parenting support program is to be set up in Laverton—that is action—with two positions. We are advertising for workers now. Oh, look, there is more action here! Since my visit, a team leader is now living in Laverton because of something that this government does: it builds houses in remote areas. We now have a house for our team leader who is living in Laverton.

More action! Oh my goodness! More action! I wrote to Jenny Macklin asking her whether we could implement —

Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich interjected.

Hon ROBYN McSWEENEY: Actually she is one of the Labor ministers in the federal government that I actually do respect; she gets on and does things. I therefore wrote to her asking her whether we could have income management in the Goldfields area. Oh, look; more action. I received a letter from the Shire of Laverton expressing its appreciation to me for visiting Laverton so promptly and for saying that I would help fund a youth officer. They thanked me for that action. Does the member want some more action? I suggest to Hon Helen Bullock that this motion is now null and void. She should be extremely embarrassed for bringing it in. When I was in Laverton, people asked me who Hon Helen Bullock was. However, I give her full marks for going to

Hon Helen Bullock; Hon Peter Collier; President; Hon Robyn McSweeney; Hon Col Holt; Hon Dr Sally Talbot;
Deputy President; Hon Sue Ellery

Laverton. At least she went there. Hon Sue Ellery, when she was Minister for Child Protection, never got off her backside to go to Laverton. At least Hon Helen Bullock did.

Hon Kate Doust: She may come in here and defend herself if you keep on belittling her.

Hon ROBYN McSWEENEY: I am absolutely trembling! I am trembling in my boots!

The PRESIDENT: Order! Look, I have got to say that I do not like the tone of the debate that seems to have crept into statements, motions and general debates in the chamber in the last few weeks. Members know that you reap what you sow. If you make accusations in this place, the member who feels aggrieved is entitled to respond. Unfortunately, those accusations and responses are becoming very personal. It is a tone of debate that is not constructive and not conducive to good outcomes, which is what this house should be all about. I ask members to temper their comments a little so that we address the issues rather than making personal, derogatory comments.

Hon ROBYN McSWEENEY: Thank you, Mr President. I am sure Labor Party members have listened to that. I have alerted Jenny Macklin to a proposal —

Hon Ken Travers: Let's see if you have.

Hon ROBYN McSWEENEY: No, I have just said that I absolutely respect Jenny Macklin, the federal minister. I have alerted Jenny Macklin about a proposal in Laverton. The Laverton shire wants to provide managed short-stay accommodation and temporary sorry facilities, which I support. More action! I have arranged to visit the lands in October. It was an arrangement that I made back in June to travel to the lands and have a look. That is what a good minister does. A good minister takes action when there are flare-ups. In child protection there inevitably will be flare-ups. At times, a minister has to go into a community and see what is happening. I do that. There is no inaction on my part. As I said, I hope Hon Helen Bullock is very embarrassed with the motion she brought forward. My colleague Hon Peter Collier works very hard in Indigenous affairs and Hon Brendan Grylls is doing an enormous amount of work out in the regions with state government royalties for regions money to help Indigenous people. I do not care what colour a child is; if they need help, I will try to help them. That is what I am doing. I know child protection is challenging. I actually asked the Premier three years ago if I could have child protection, because we needed to turn it around. We needed to turn around the fear and intimidation that was the culture in that department under Labor. We needed to turn around what was happening to children in care. While I would love to take every child home with me who I see being neglected, I cannot. I put on the record that I care. I am a minister who is very strong in the area of child protection, and I take a great deal of action when it is needed.

Government members: Hear, hear!

HON COL HOLT (South West) [10.43 am]: I rise briefly to say that the National Party cannot support this motion. It is a little misguided and, in fact, is completely wrong. We have a great deal of confidence in those ministers. It is useful to again put on the record some of the positive things that are being done to address some of those issues. We always welcome opposition members putting motions on the notice paper so that we can talk about all the very good things that are happening. They are doing a very good job in opposition in that respect; they should probably stay there a bit longer. There are certain issues. This government, especially through the Department of Regional Development and Lands and the Minister for Regional Development, has been working towards addressing some of those issues.

I will go through some things that are specific to Laverton but also talk about the Goldfields region and other regions, which I know members will be interested in. At the time of this issue, investment was already underway in Laverton. Ten homes were under construction in Laverton as part of the Government Regional Officers' Housing program. That program had stalled, but the injection of royalties for regions funds put it back on track. Out of those 10 homes, five were allocated to the Department of Education, four to WA Police and one to the Department for Child Protection. I understand that DCP is looking for more housing for further positions. I think the Minister for Child Protection just talked about that. One thing that this government recognised early in providing services to communities in those regions was the level of housing that was available. Often people move a long way from essential services or a long way from their families to take up these positions. One thing that can be provided to them is a level of housing that they can appreciate and so that they can feel like it is their home. That has been a very positive program that has been funded by the royalties for regions program.

Funds have also been put into the responsible parenting program. I know that 13 additional full-time equivalents have been provided in the Goldfields to expand that program. It is a \$38 million program over five years, which is a significant injection of funds. Money is not everything—it is also about how these things are implemented and the people who work out there—but funds and infrastructure are certainly needed to support the work that they do. In 2011–12, \$6.4 million will be provided to expand the program, including its home visiting services and its support and advice services to at-risk families with both older children and young babies. Before royalties

Hon Helen Bullock; Hon Peter Collier; President; Hon Robyn McSweeney; Hon Col Holt; Hon Dr Sally Talbot;
Deputy President; Hon Sue Ellery

for regions came along and enabled the expansion of this program, this service was available only in the metropolitan area, the Peel region and the Kimberley. We are now looking to expand it further into the regions because of the need. We know there is a need out there and we are trying to expand into that.

There has also been an injection of funds into the country local government fund for the Shires of Ngaanyatjarraku and Laverton. Some of their projects include working on the design and building of accommodation villages for Aboriginal people to provide various types of accommodation in a safe and healthy environment. I believe that about \$2.1 million of their country local government funding has been invested in those projects. An Indigenous visitors' hostel is going up in Kalgoorlie and the Department of Housing is providing \$13 million over three years to establish transient visitor housing. There will be 30 beds in Kalgoorlie and 50 beds in Broome.

Hon Adele Farina: How does that help the Broome community that I identified in the report?

Hon Mia Davies: You were talking about the other report and we are talking about the statewide impact of royalties for regions and the considerable effort that the Department of Regional Development and Lands is putting into Indigenous disadvantage.

Hon Adele Farina interjected.

Hon Peter Collier: That is not what she spoke about.

Hon COL HOLT: We are talking about all of it. We are talking about how we are supporting these communities and Indigenous people in the regions.

Hon Mia Davies: You can't have it both ways.

Hon Sally Talbot: You can sit down now, Hon Colin Holt, because Hon Mia Davies is doing all the talking.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Look, every member has the right to stand in this place and make a speech, so every member should respect that right.

Hon COL HOLT: Thank you, Mr President. I will keep going through the things we are doing. An amount of \$10 million has been budgeted towards the Aboriginal community emergency response fund, which is an initiative that will enable an immediate response to emerging crises in critical infrastructure needs for Aboriginal communities. In the past, and having worked with some communities like this, I know that when a crisis has come along—it could be for a whole variety of reasons, such as a major industry has shut down or something has happened in the community—the community has had nowhere to turn and no pot of money to access to provide an immediate response to address some of those concerns. The only example I can think of at this time is the mine closure at Hopetoun, which obviously caused a lot of angst in the community. There was no real avenue through which the people there could get people to help them solve some of the issues. That fund has been established to address some of those sorts of events. It is a really good initiative so that if there is a real crisis in communities, there is somewhere to turn to for immediate funding assistance. Also, \$12 million has been allocated to upgrade existing water infrastructure so that quality water is delivered to the remote communities in the Goldfields, Esperance, the Kimberley and the Pilbara. Also, nearly \$20 million over four years has been invested in north west drug and alcohol support services. We know there is a real challenge in a lot of communities with the level of alcohol abuse. An injection of funds in that area is strongly welcomed.

The Kimberley and Pilbara youth justice services have been expanded. This is about tackling some of the core issues and helping young offenders before they get on the hamster wheel of recidivism. The amount of \$22 million is allocated over four years to six remote Indigenous health clinics, the design of which is based on the Warmun clinic model. The WA Country Health Service will determine which sites those clinics will go to.

One of the very positive and well received projects is the additional Clontarf colleges, which have achieved some outstanding results. This government has invested in the establishment of eight additional Clontarf colleges throughout the regions, at Carnarvon, Newman, Northam, Wyndham, Katanning, Derby, Roebourne, Karratha and Fitzroy Crossing. This is about action at the level at which it is needed so that people can get engaged in the sorts of programs they run, for their own benefit and the benefit of their families and communities. The amount of \$15 million has been allocated to Aboriginal housing in the Kimberley. Housing in the Roebourne area has been instigated, and \$20 million has been allocated for Indigenous participation in the Pilbara Cities initiative.

Finally, I come to the Ord–East Kimberley expansion program, which is one of the first projects started under royalties for regions. A fair commitment was made also from the federal government. While royalties for regions provides a lot of funding for infrastructure for the Ord growing area expansion, the federal government came in with a package with the aim of supporting the community, including the Indigenous community, and making the

Hon Helen Bullock; Hon Peter Collier; President; Hon Robyn McSweeney; Hon Col Holt; Hon Dr Sally Talbot;
Deputy President; Hon Sue Ellery

most of those opportunities. This project is an excellent example of a partnership between the state and federal governments in making sure we get an extra bang for our dollar and good outcomes for the projects we instigate. I would like to see more of the state and federal governments partnering to deliver greater outcomes for people in regional Western Australia and Western Australia generally. With those words, I will take a seat.

HON SALLY TALBOT (South West) [10.53 am]: With the greatest respect to Hon Col Holt—it is interesting that he stood and basically read from the royalties for regions glossy pamphlet—that is not what is under discussion today; we are not talking about lists of expenditure. We are talking about a motion of no confidence in three government ministers, the Minister for Regional Development, the Minister for Indigenous Affairs and the Minister for Child Protection, for their incompetence, inaction and lack of accountability —

Hon Col Holt: I was pointing out some action, that's all, and my confidence.

Hon SALLY TALBOT: I am getting to the point, Hon Col Holt, of addressing the serious issues raised by the Goldfields–Esperance Development Commission project officer reports into the health and welfare of children in the northern Goldfields. That is what we are talking about this morning. The government, particularly the Liberal Party ministers, clearly do not want to have this debate aired, as we saw from their reaction to the excellent speech by Hon Helen Bullock. I think that every member, at least on this side of this house, who takes these issues seriously, will want to join me in paying tribute to the work she has done to get this issue onto the front pages of the press and to draw it to the attention of the media in this state. What was revealed in these four reports—I notice Hon Robyn McSweeney acknowledges only one—told the tragic story about what is happening to people in this state in 2011. If we had read these stories 200 years ago about Third World countries, we would have been appalled. Anybody with the slightest passing interest in political history, even if it extends only to watching movies such as the great film *Amazing Grace*, will have read stories about the abolition of slavery and the kinds of abject poverty and dreadful social consequences of people living lives of such deprivation. These reports show that people in this state in 2011 are living in just such appalling conditions.

These four reports give accounts of abandoned children, children begging for food, children living on rubbish tips and children and women subject to levels of domestic violence that would have had a state of emergency declared had they been happening in the suburbs of the metropolitan area. The four reports tell stories about water supplies in communities contaminated with human faeces, schools with no teachers, clinics with no nurses and fully equipped community facilities for old people and children that are simply standing with padlocks on their doors, locked up and unavailable to the communities to use.

These four reports show that the Aboriginal people in those communities have been using every resource within their power to bring change to their communities. The reports show that they have received not one level of effective assistance from the Liberal–National state government. I think the core of this problem goes to the question of what the issue is here. Clearly I, and Hon Helen Bullock in moving the motion, and other members on this side of the house, identify the issue as being the issue of reports about abandoned children and the unused facilities I have just listed. That is obviously not the case as far as the government is concerned. I draw members' attention to documents that are now, thanks to Labor's freedom of information request, on the public record. I particularly draw members' attention to a briefing note dated 21 June to Hon Brendon Grylls from Robert Hicks, the CEO of the GEDC. At the end of section 2 is the heading "Issues". We do not have to speculate about how the government identified the issues of concern here. We do not have to wonder whether the government agreed with us and whether the issue was about people living in the most appallingly deprived circumstances of squalor and poverty because they have been set out for us in this document. There are three issues as follows —

- i The Laverton brief/report has been leaked to the media and details about child neglect, violence and child prostitution published and aired.
- ii The Freedom of Information requests from two Opposition members of Parliament may lead to questioning in Parliament of Ministers and their agencies.
- iii This may create further media interest.

Mr President, did you hear any reference in there to the issues being flagged as the absolute imperative to deal with the problems identified in those four reports? Not once is it mentioned. Not once have we heard in the responses made to Hon Helen Bullock's motion so far any effective plans for dealing with these issues that have been raised. The first official government response we got stated, according to my notes —

This is not an official or formal report.

This is the government's response to the Laverton report. It continued —

It is a briefing note from a field officer. ... there has been no formal consultation between the field officer and the DCP.

Hon Helen Bullock; Hon Peter Collier; President; Hon Robyn McSweeney; Hon Col Holt; Hon Dr Sally Talbot;
Deputy President; Hon Sue Ellery

The second reaction was, “We’ve been investigating this for as far back as”—wait for it—“2010”. Oh, my goodness! The government has been investigating it since the end of last year. I have seen all these documents and I can tell members that emails were circulated amongst senior government officials, ministers and government advisers with attachments labelled “Laverton Abandoned Children—Domestic Violence Report, January 2011.” What possible excuse could the government have for doing nothing?

I want to move specifically to the role of Hon Peter Collier in all of this because he is one of the ministers named in the motion. Hon Peter Collier got off to quite a good start when he took on the Indigenous affairs portfolio by announcing to this house that he saw his role as Indigenous affairs minister, the role of his office and, indeed, the role of his department as being that of a coordinator. A number of people in this house, including me, thought at last we have a Minister for Indigenous Affairs who is prepared to take action to move behind the silo-ed thinking that has beset this portfolio and a number of others for years. On 21 June he spoke about wanting to “ensure coordination within government”. On 16 March he said that the role of his office, the role of the department and his role as Minister for Indigenous Affairs is to act as the coordinating department. The minister initially took this role on quite willingly. Since then it has all been downhill. We have seen no response to the stolen wages report, despite the fact that the minister well knows that his predecessor made specific commitments about the extent of the embarrassment that this was causing the Barnett government. We have seen no response to the Kimberley Aboriginal Law and Culture Centre about the Kimberley alcohol plan. We have had no active involvement in the federal government processes in which DIA is identified as the lead agency.

I can only agree 100 per cent with Hon Helen Bullock because at every meeting that I walk into as the shadow Minister for Indigenous Affairs, people say to me, “What on earth is DIA doing because we see no evidence of their action on the ground?” We have seen an appalling set of bungles and mismanagement when it comes to the Oombulgurri community, culminating yesterday in the minister’s advice to me that when he went to Wyndham he did not speak to anyone who told him they wanted to go home to Oombulgurri. I do not know who the minister talked to; he probably sat in the chairman’s lounge at the airport and did not venture out. The government has a set of recommendations in front of it in the shape of the Sanderson report. It needs to act on them and it needs to act now.

HON PETER COLLIER (North Metropolitan — Minister for Energy) [11.04 am]: I will have to try to temper my comments after that rubbish. Obviously, I will not be supporting the motion. First, I want to clarify a couple of things. As far as Hon Helen Bullock’s motion is concerned, as a result of the original report, Hon Helen Bullock has probably received advice that perhaps the report is not as accurate as may have been first thought and a number of the claims made in that report have been unsubstantiated, so therefore she went ahead and talked in a more generic sense about Indigenous affairs. I want to make a few comments about that and also pick up on a couple of things that Hon Sally Talbot said. I am so glad that she reiterated the points that I have made on a number of occasions with regard to the role that I have as Indigenous affairs minister and the role of the Department of Indigenous Affairs.

People think I have this notion that the Department of Indigenous Affairs is the panacea for resolving all the issues within Indigenous affairs. I wish to say—I stick by this—that the role of the Department of Indigenous Affairs is to act as a coordinating body. It is doing that. For the very first time in Indigenous affairs we are working on a mapping exercise throughout government. After I took office I asked the previous director if I could see every program that exists that delivers outcomes for Indigenous people in Western Australia. He said that was almost impossible. I said, “Tough, we’re going to do it.” I wanted to see federal and state programs. I got pages and pages from this mapping exercise. It just reinforced my view, and I stick by it, a point raised by Hon Helen Bullock, that there is an enormous amount of duplication in the delivery of services to Aboriginal people. That is what the Department of Indigenous Affairs is doing. I will bring my remarks back to Laverton in a minute but the comments from Hon Helen Bullock were very generic and very broad-based across the state. I stick by my role as Indigenous affairs minister. The department is a coordinating body. We are working with departments to ensure that we have positive outcomes for Aboriginal people.

I am very, very familiar with the situation in the Goldfields. I am a Kalgoorlie boy born and bred and proud of it. I grew up with the Wongi people. I know the Wongi people as well as anyone in this chamber. I used to go to Laverton for the gymkhanas at least one Sunday a month. I had my beautiful golden palomino and we used to go to the gymkhanas. I used to interact constantly with the Wongi people. The Wongi people used to come to our shop and my father would constantly give them dry bread in the back lanes. I am very aware of the Wongi people and I am very, very aware of the problems associated with that tribe.

In relation to the issues in Laverton, to suggest that I am sitting on my hands or the government is sitting on its hands with regard to Aboriginal people, particularly in the northern Goldfields, is without foundation. For example, earlier this year the Department of Indigenous Affairs, through the Aboriginal Affairs Coordinating Committee, which is a coordinating committee of all government officers, appointed a new chief operating

Hon Helen Bullock; Hon Peter Collier; President; Hon Robyn McSweeney; Hon Col Holt; Hon Dr Sally Talbot;
Deputy President; Hon Sue Ellery

officer, which has been very, very well received, to ensure that we provide much more coordination throughout the northern Goldfields region. The new office of the new chief operating officer will work in partnership with the Department of Families, Housing, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs and my Department of Indigenous Affairs to ensure that there are closer linked strategies for that region. The DIA and the Department of the Premier and Cabinet are leading a high level, whole-of-government initiative within the Goldfields and working with local government and the Department of Families, Housing, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs for reform within the Ngaanyatjarra lands and Spinifex country communities. The high-level task force met as recently as last month. It will be meeting again out on-country in October 2011.

The DIA also commenced a visitors mapping project in early 2011 to ascertain the numbers, the purpose, the duration of visits and the impact on the regional centres of Kalgoorlie for Aboriginal people in the area. Again, it is very proactive on the part of DIA. The visitors mapping project includes Laverton, and the data will inform all levels of government and provide evidence to plan for targeted investment and long-term solutions. The Laverton mapping has been completed and a report and recommendations are currently being prepared. In addition, specific to the northern Goldfields region, in 2011 DIA awarded the Laverton Leonora Cross Cultural Association another contract from January to continue patrol services. Those Aboriginal patrol services are doing magnificent things. I have been out with those patrols; I know what they are doing. They are having a very, very positive impact in assisting Aboriginal people improve their quality of life. For the member to suggest that we are doing nothing is without foundation.

We have also established the Laverton interagency meeting, which brought together the relevant heads of government to discuss local issues, again, because they are local issues. The issues of Aboriginal people throughout Western Australia are profound, but they are quite diverse when we compare the problems that exist in perhaps Gosnells, Northbridge, Laverton, Meekatharra, Halls Creek or wherever it might be. That is why we need cross-government approach through the Department of Indigenous Affairs. I say to Hon Sally Talbot that I wear what the department is doing as a badge of honour. It is a very, very long process. As I said earlier, there is duplication and a waste of resources. That is why I have said to the department that I wanted a mapping exercise—I am digressing for a moment; I could talk about this all day. I told my department that I am not going to advocate on its behalf at the cabinet Economic and Expenditure Reform Committee or to the Treasurer and ask for more cheques to be written on more programs that perhaps are already being delivered and possibly inefficiently. I am not going to do it.

Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich interjected

Hon PETER COLLIER: Don't you start! I am not ready for you today, I can tell you!

Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich interjected.

Hon PETER COLLIER: I am not taking the member's interjections; it is as simple as that.

Point of Order

Hon KATE DOUST: Mr Deputy President, I am querying the standing orders relating to the management of this debate. My understanding is that the mover of the motion gets 20 minutes, the minister responding on behalf of the government gets 15 minutes and all other speakers get 10 minutes apiece, and hopefully the mover gets five minutes in reply.

I note that we have already had one minister get to her feet and speak for that time. Hon Peter Collier is now the second minister, and he has been allocated 15 minutes. My question is: should he actually get 10 minutes because he is speaking as a member and not on behalf of the government. We have had other debates of a similar nature in this place in the past and a minister has spoken on behalf of the government and has received 15 minutes, and any other minister or member who gets up has received 10 minutes. I would like your clarification on the manner in which this is being debated.

Hon Peter Collier: I thought I had 10 minutes.

Ruling by Deputy President

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon Matt Benson-Lidholm): The Deputy Leader of the Opposition has raised a very significant and interesting point, one perhaps that in reviewing the standing orders the Standing Committee on Procedure and Privileges had not given due consideration to. I think it is necessary for that committee to give serious consideration to the issue, simply because at this point in time the motion does make mention of three ministers, one of whom, of course, is not in this house and the parliamentary secretary representing that minister is away on urgent parliamentary business, which has left us with two ministers. The first minister to address the motion today spoke for 15 minutes. I thought it might have been preferable, given that ministers were mentioned and no particular minister would seem to have primary carriage, if you like, of the government's position here, and appropriate that perhaps the two ministers concerned received 15 minutes. However, listening to the

Hon Helen Bullock; Hon Peter Collier; President; Hon Robyn McSweeney; Hon Col Holt; Hon Dr Sally Talbot;
Deputy President; Hon Sue Ellery

Minister for Energy, he has indicated that he is quite content to use the 10 minutes that would normally be allocated to a subsequent speaker. If I am mistaken, I will get the minister to make a comment in a minute or two. If that is the case, then I suggest that the 10 minutes is utilised and the Standing Committee on Procedure and Privileges may well take into account the issue that has been presented to us today. If the minister is in agreement at this point to utilise the 10 minutes that would normally be allocated, the house would adopt that particular procedure as appropriate right here and now.

Hon KATE DOUST: Mr Deputy President, I know what you have to say, but I ask that perhaps we seek a ruling from the President on this. It is going to be quite some time before the Standing Committee on Procedure and Privileges presents to this chamber the outcomes of its deliberations on our standing orders, and I dare say from time to time there will be other motions that may bring a range of ministers into the motion. And as I said earlier, in the past it has been one minister speaking on behalf of the government; the second and any others who elect to get to their feet have been allocated 10 minutes. I would like a formal ruling from the President on how this matter should be dealt with and how we proceed with this in the future.

Hon ADELE FARINA: I would like to speak in support of the comments made by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. The standing orders on this matter are very clear; that is, the lead speaker for the government gets 15 minutes and every other speaker who speaks to the motion gets 10 minutes. If you are to put an interpretation on that that allows ministers to have 15 minutes to speak to a motion, that is going to eat into opposition time to contribute to the motion, which was not the intention when the standing orders were agreed. It is very clear. If we have a motion that condemns the government does that then give the right to every single minister on the government benches to speak for 15 minutes? If the Standing Committee on Procedure and Privileges is going to entertain that idea, then we would need to entertain lengthening the period that we have to debate on motions. I think that standing orders are very clear on this matter: 15 minutes for the lead speaker for the government and 10 minutes for every other speaker on the motion. There is no need to refer the matter to the Standing Committee on Procedure and Privileges and no need to place any interpretation on the standing orders which, by their very express words, are very clear.

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: Mr Deputy President, I think your approach is most commendable. You are just trying to find a way ahead in an unusual circumstance. The fact of the matter is this is an unusual motion.

Several members interjected.

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: May I address you, Mr Deputy President?

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Yes.

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: The wording of the motion is not a condemnation of government—we see plenty of those, in which case we do have a lead speaker for the government. This motion expresses a lack of confidence in several ministers, so there is no lead speaker. A motion expressing lack of confidence is a serious matter, and if in that circumstance a minister or any other member having a motion of lack of confidence expressed in them has to sit down and listen to the sort of diatribe we have heard today, then they should have the capacity to respond. It is not a question of lead speakers for the government. It is a personalised motion directed to a specific minister—or ministers in this case, given the construction of the motion. In the event I believe that Hon Robyn McSweeney, as Minister for Child Protection, spoke for only eight minutes anyway, and the Minister for Energy has indicated he is going to speak for only 10 minutes, so the question is not really a matter of great moment for today. Perhaps the opposition should accept your middle-ground ruling and stop trying to be precious about it.

Hon SUE ELLERY: Mr Deputy President, you have been asked to provide a ruling and I would reiterate I think that needs to happen. In the negotiations for this particular set of arrangements it was clear that this was non-government business. The expectation of everybody sitting around the table who negotiated this was that there would be a lead speaker on the particular motion who would get 20 minutes, a lead on behalf of the government who got 15 minutes, and then everybody else got 10 minutes. I was in the negotiations and the honourable member may well shake his head at me, but I was part of the negotiations. If there is to be a different interpretation, then that needs to be a considered interpretation, and that is why you need to take on board the request for a ruling. In the event, the clock is still ticking. I appreciate what the Deputy Leader of the House has said about what has happened today, in practice, but I do not want to walk away from today with us setting some other form of convention about how non-government business time is to be allocated, so we need to clarify that. I am happy if that ruling occurs subsequent to today's proceedings, but we cannot let it go and accept that we have some new interpretation of what is an important part of how the business of the house is managed.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon Matt Benson-Lidholm): Members, I made a ruling and I will stick to that ruling. I understand the urgency of the timing. I alert members to the current temporary orders, which mentions under non-government business motions that the responsible minister or parliamentary secretary has 15 minutes.

Hon Helen Bullock; Hon Peter Collier; President; Hon Robyn McSweeney; Hon Col Holt; Hon Dr Sally Talbot;
Deputy President; Hon Sue Ellery

I put to you that my interpretation is based on that. This particular non-government business motion mentions a number of ministers. As a way forward, I simply put to you that the Standing Committee on Procedure and Privileges can meet on this issue. I take on board what the Leader of the Opposition has said. Subsequent to today's ruling, we certainly need to sit down and give some serious consideration to the situation that has presented itself. My suggestion would be, though, that the Minister for Energy has already indicated, in a spirit of cooperation, that he is quite prepared to speak for only 10 minutes. The issue, as far as I am concerned, needs to be addressed. I have suggested that the procedure and privileges committee can deal with this as a matter of some urgency and a decision would be made prior to the next sitting of the house. As far as I can see, if the non-government business motion temporary order states "responsible minister" and we have a non-government business motion such as this, which mentions the Minister for Regional Development, the Minister for Indigenous Affairs and the Minister for Child Protection, I would have thought that in the spirit that particular motion is put that perhaps those three ministers—if they were in this particular chamber, or their parliamentary secretaries—may deem it appropriate to have spoken for that 15 minutes. However having said that, I note the Minister for Energy's comments. Therefore, what I am saying is that there is an impasse and I believe that the best thing this house can do is to refer that impasse to the procedure and privileges committee for some determination, given that we are now going down the track of reviewing our standing orders. I believe that is quite possible to be done within the next week and a half or so prior to the next sitting.

Hon SUE ELLERY: I want to put this on the record because it is an important deviation from the way that arrangements for this bit of business have been dealt with to date. The first point I want to make is that the Standing Committee on Procedure and Privileges has completed its review of standing orders and is waiting for a draft report. Therefore, we are not going back to revisit standing orders. If we are to have a conversation and some negotiations about whether we need to reinterpret how this business is arranged—which is what I think has happened this morning—I think that needs to happen between the leaders of the parties, not through the procedure and privileges committee. The second point I want to get on the record is that the interpretation of the lead speaker in reply—that is, the lead speaker on behalf of the government—was the person on behalf of the government who had responsibility for the carriage of the motion, not whether it went to portfolio A, portfolio B and portfolio C. If we follow the logical conclusion of a notion that anything that applies to a particular minister will give that minister the opportunity to make a 15-minute contribution to the debate, we could have the nonsensical position whereby we put a point of view in a motion about the government and every single minister can stand. That is not what was intended. To the extent that there might be some confusion, with the greatest respect, Mr Deputy President, in your mind this morning, I think we need to resolve this by getting on with the seven minutes that are now left, but undertake to have discussions between the leaders of the parties subsequently. Referring this matter to the procedure and privileges committee when we have already finished our consideration of the standing orders is not the appropriate way to deal with it.

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Members, I believe that the way forward then would be that the resolution of this situation will be undertaken behind the chair. I do not think there is any point in us continuing any further at this particular point. With only six minutes remaining, I believe that to be the correct ruling. Therefore, I ask the Minister for Energy to continue.

Debate Resumed

Hon PETER COLLIER: How long have I got? About two minutes.

I was talking about the specific areas and programs that we have rolled out in the north Goldfields region, particularly Laverton, and I went through a number of those programs. A Laverton elders group was established in July 2011, of which the Goldfields Department of Indigenous Affairs office is a key stakeholder. Therefore, the Department of Indigenous Affairs has implemented a good half a dozen programs to ensure more positive outcomes for Aboriginal people in the north Goldfields region, and I have mentioned just a couple. In addition, Hon Col Holt outlined that around \$58 million of additional money for Aboriginal programs is in this year's budget. This is a government that is committed to more positive outcomes for Aboriginal people.

In my other role as Minister for Training and Workforce Development, my top priority is to provide more positive outcomes for Aboriginal people through training and employment opportunities. Again, that works in the eastern Goldfields. We now have five dedicated Aboriginal workforce development centres—in Murray Street, Broome, Geraldton, Bunbury and in Kalgoorlie, which I opened about three months ago. The Kalgoorlie Aboriginal workforce development centre is in a magnificent building on Macdonald Street. It will work hand-in-hand with industry throughout the Goldfields and Esperance regions, with Aboriginal people and with the community at large to ensure that we open doors for Aboriginal people and remove any barriers to employment. It will also provide mentoring services for Aboriginal people, assist with job applications and curricula vitae, and

Hon Helen Bullock; Hon Peter Collier; President; Hon Robyn McSweeney; Hon Col Holt; Hon Dr Sally Talbot;
Deputy President; Hon Sue Ellery

work with industry to see where job opportunities arise and what training opportunities exist for Aboriginal people to assist Aboriginal people into the workforce. Aboriginal workforce development centres throughout the state have been directly responsible for a significant increase in Aboriginal participation in the workforce just in the past 12 months. What we as a government have done for Aboriginal people, as I said, is exceptional. There is a long way to go—of course, there is. There are significant issues, particularly in service delivery in regional and remote areas of the state, which is exactly why I was extremely proactive from day one. I told the department that I want a mapping exercise because I wanted to know what service delivery we already had so that we could identify the deficiencies that exist and fill in the gaps, not the other way around. I will not continue to reinvent the wheel; we will identify the gaps that exist and fill those gaps to ensure that the barriers that exist for Aboriginal people are removed the best we possibly can. That is what DIA is doing; it has done the mapping exercise. I have seen the draft of that mapping exercise; suffice to say, I am excited about the prospect for what we will continue to do to provide positive outcomes for Aboriginal people throughout Western Australia.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Hon Helen Bullock.

Hon Adele Farina: There's only two minutes left.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: There are only two minutes left, so I give the call to the mover of the motion.

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: I take notice of Hon Philip Gardiner acknowledging that.

HON HELEN BULLOCK (Mining and Pastoral) [11.28 am] — in reply: I will leave you a few seconds for it!

I was not going to have a go at the Minister for Regional Development again because he is not in the chamber, but somebody from the National Party side stood and said something about my motion and I was not happy with what the member said.

Members have probably heard the expression “money can't buy everything”. It seems that everybody knows this expression except National Party members. Every time they stand they say how much money they spend here, there and everywhere throughout the regions in Western Australia. I have to say, it is a good thing—be positive. But the question is: how effective is that money that has been spent? As the Minister for Indigenous Affairs will probably tell us, a lot of this money is spent on duplicated services and does not deliver any effective results. I just want to say this again: this motion is not about money; I did not have time earlier to say that. Members opposite have not heard me ask for funding for anything. This motion is not about asking for more moneys for those remote communities. I was quite disgusted by the National Party members who stood to tell us again about those ad hoc programs—again and again and again; I will hear no more of those things. Not only does it disgust me, it is also a burden on the Minister for Indigenous Affairs, because he is the one who has to sort out all the wastage in those duplicated programs.

I move on now to the Minister for Child Protection. I must say, I give points to the minister; at least she visited those communities.

Motion lapsed, pursuant to temporary orders.