

**COMMISSIONER OF POLICE — SELECTION PROCESS — MINISTER FOR POLICE**

*Standing Orders Suspension — Motion*

**MRS L.M. HARVEY (Scarborough — Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** [2.51 pm] — without notice: I move —

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

- (1) That this house refers the Minister for Police to the Procedure and Privileges Standing Committee for report back to the house by 30 November 2017 for misleading the house regarding the employment of former Road Safety Commissioner Kim Papalia.
- (2) Calls on the Premier to suspend the Minister for Police from cabinet pending the outcome of an investigation by the Procedure and Privileges Committee.

The opposition is moving this motion at this time, and I note —

Several members interjected.

**The SPEAKER:** Order, members! This is an important motion; please everyone listen.

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. We think it is of the utmost importance. It is important that we suspend standing orders to debate this motion. I note that the manager of opposition business is now discussing this matter with the Leader of the House.

The opposition has moved this suspension of standing orders today because of the chaos and dysfunction we see under the stewardship of the Minister for Police; Road Safety. Everyone saw the front page of the newspaper today. None of us on this side of the house disagrees with the appointment of Mr Chris Dawson as Commissioner of Police. However, we disagree with the political interference in the process and the destabilising effect that has had on the police force in Western Australia and on community confidence with respect to the appointment of the Commissioner of Police. The commissioner's appointment should be beyond reproach. There should never be any question whatsoever as to the validity of such an appointment.

In addition, the opposition has learnt that the Minister for Police has deliberately misled this house regarding the appointment of former Road Safety Commissioner Mr Kim Papalia. The opposition has obtained documents under the freedom of information process from the Minister for Police, a document, I might add, that reflects incredibly badly on the Premier's office because we have had to appeal to the Freedom of Information Commissioner to have the Premier release documents subject to the FOI act.

Several members interjected.

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** Listen to the rabble over there. This is important. This is about gold-standard transparency that members opposite promised.

**The SPEAKER:** Members on this side, the debate on the motion is to be held in silence. Member for Scarborough, talk to the motion, please.

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. We know that the Minister for Road Safety knew as early as 8 June and supported the removal of the Road Safety Commissioner well in advance of 27 June. The minister came into this place and said on 26 and 27 June that she had no knowledge of the Road Safety Commissioner moving on and that he was doing that of his own volition. We know from information we have received from the Public Sector Commissioner that on 8 June, the minister was well aware of the Road Safety Commissioner being moved on with her support.

The minister has misled the house. She has failed since 27 June to go back over her own records and at the first available opportunity come to this place and correct the record and apologise to the house for misleading the house and the community of Western Australia in such an abhorrent way about the removal of such a high-profile person from that position. She has refused to do that. There is chaos and dysfunction in the police portfolio. Look at the police officers. For the first time in years, they are taking industrial action as a result of a broken 1.5 per cent pay rise promise by the minister. It was okay before the election but after the election, no, all bets are off. Members opposite will say anything to get elected, but promises are not worth anything if one is a police officer in this state.

Then we have the minister's failure to secure vital funding for the purchase of stab-proof vests for police officers—absolute failure—and there is a range of other issues.

I have just been informed that the government has agreed to a suspension of standing orders with a time-limited debate, so I will sit down and make further comment on this suspension and the substantive motion after the manager of opposition business has stood.

**Mr D.A. Templeman:** I'm not the manager of opposition business.

**Extract from Hansard**

[ASSEMBLY — Wednesday, 18 October 2017]

p4878c-4885a

Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr David Templeman; Mr Peter Katsambanis; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Sean L'Estrange

---

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** Leader of the House, sorry.

*Standing Orders Suspension — Amendment to Motion*

**MR D.A. TEMPLEMAN (Mandurah — Leader of the House)** [2.57 pm]: I move to add to the motion, after “forthwith” —

subject to the debate being limited to 20 minutes for government members and 20 minutes for non-government members

In moving that amendment, I need to remind the opposition that the normal convention is to give some notice of a suspension. That was the case when we sat on that side.

An opposition member interjected.

**Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN:** The member was never in here so he would not know. The former Leader of the House in the previous government was always given notice—at least 10 minutes, if not more—that there was an intention to suspend standing orders. I hope that that will be the agreed practice between the government and the opposition in the future, so I formally add that to the motion.

Amendment put and passed.

*Standing Orders Suspension — Motion, as Amended*

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

Question put and passed with an absolute majority.

*Motion*

**MR P.A. KATSAMBANIS (Hillarys)** [2.58 pm]: I formally move the motion.

This motion is not something that the opposition has moved lightly. However, we have sat back and watched complete and utter dysfunction and chaos in the Minister for Police’s office and in her handling of a critical portfolio such as police in Western Australia at a very important time. We have seen confidence in this minister erode. Unfortunately, when public confidence in the minister erodes, it reflects on the very police force that we, as a community, need to support, and whose support we need back in return to keep us safe. We have seen the dysfunction unfold, but we now have evidence that on top of the dysfunction, this minister has directly misled the house in an attempt to deny the Parliament and the public of Western Australia proper scrutiny around the dismissal of Kim Papalia from the position of Road Safety Commissioner. On 27 June 2017 in this place, the minister said —

I say earnestly that I had anticipated that Mr Papalia would continue in that role, and continue to be Road Safety Commissioner, and that we would continue to have a Road Safety Commission.

She further said —

No pressure has been put on Mr Papalia. My belief was that we were working well together and that he would continue in the role.

On 27 June, the minister wanted us to believe that she walked into the office that morning and found out—around 26 or 27 June—from Mr Papalia that he no longer wanted to be Road Safety Commissioner. That is what the minister told this house. However, the opposition looked into this, as members in opposition do. We thought, “Let’s check to see if we can take this minister at her word.” It has been difficult with this minister. There has been so much dysfunction and chaos in her portfolio, sometimes we do not know where to start. We had a look and it transpired that on 8 June 2017, the Public Sector Commissioner, Mr Wauchope, wrote to the Minister for Police; Road Safety in a letter headed “Transfer of CEO and Interim Acting Arrangements”. The Public Sector Commissioner wrote to the minister —

... it is my intention to transfer Mr Kim Papalia, Commissioner of Road Safety, Road Safety Commission to the performance of other functions in the Senior Executive Service for the remainder of his term of appointment, which expires on 27 October 2020.

Then Mr Wauchope further said to the minister in this correspondence —

Based on our previous discussions, I understand that you support this arrangement.

On 8 June, Mr Wauchope confirms in his letter that he and the Minister for Police; Road Safety had had discussions about the position of Mr Papalia.

**Mr T.J. Healy:** Pap-ah-lia.

**Mr P.A. KATSAMBANIS:** Pap-ah-lia, okay—to-mah-to, to-may-to. When we talk about mispronunciation and names, I am the expert in this place. I have heard many pronunciations of my name, but do not deflect from the real substance of the issue here. Prior to 28 June, this minister not only knew there was a transfer in place, but also supported the arrangements to remove the Road Safety Commissioner from his position and send him to Coventry to do other duties; it is quite clear. On 27 June, the minister said in here, “What a surprise to me. I was working well with the commissioner. I thought we could continue, carry on, and work really, really well”, when in the background, the minister had been having meetings with the Public Sector Commissioner to work out how to remove the Road Safety Commissioner and where to place him, and not only that, there had been correspondence and discussions. It goes to show that this minister treats the Parliament of Western Australia with utter contempt. If this is not an issue for the Standing Committee on Procedure and Privileges, I do not know what is. It is here in black and white; there is no argument. If this minister had performed her duties fantastically well in the rest of her portfolio, we would have said, “It was a slip. It was an excuse.” But look at the dysfunction in her portfolio and the way in which the appointment of the Commissioner of Police was handled. The opposition has full and utter confidence in the new police commissioner and in our police force, which is doing a great job in difficult times with no support from this minister. However, we have no confidence in this minister because we know now that in the appointment process of the police commissioner not only was the police minister of the McGowan Labor government involved in the process, but also the de facto police minister of the McGowan Labor government, the police minister in waiting, the member for Burns Beach, was interfering. We know that the selection process went from having a short list to having a long list after a chat between the member for Burns Beach and the police minister.

**Mrs M.H. Roberts** interjected.

**Mr P.A. KATSAMBANIS:** That is exactly what happened. The Western Australian police force has been denied the pay increase that this government promised before the election. When asked to give our police proper support in providing them with stab-proof vests, the minister baulked and had to be dragged kicking and scheming to a process that still has not delivered those vests. Given the record of this minister, we do not know if those vests will ever be delivered. This minister has issues with ministerial advisers having to be counselled, as the Premier said, on mixing their work under term-of-government appointments in government and campaigning for public office. I welcome people running for public office, but when there is a clear conflict between their duty and their running for public office, it has to be managed. Counselling after the event is just not good enough. There are many other issues to discuss. I am going to run out of time in this time-limited debate, but it is quite clear that this minister has misled this house. This is an issue for the Procedure and Privileges Committee, and whilst it is being investigated this Premier has to stand up, show some leadership and appoint a police minister who will do the right thing by the portfolio.

**MRS L.M. HARVEY (Scarborough — Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** [3.07 pm]: I rise to reiterate some of the points made by the member for Hillarys. Through the freedom of information process, we have a letter written by the Public Sector Commissioner dated 8 June to Hon Michelle Roberts, Minister for Police; Road Safety. This letter clearly states —

... it is my intention to transfer Mr Kim Papalia, Commissioner of Road Safety, Road Safety Commission to the performance of other functions in the Senior Executive Service for the remainder of his term of appointment, which expires on 27 October 2020.

Based on our previous discussions, I understand that you support this arrangement.

The minister was on 6PR on 26 June and said —

“I had expected Kim Papalia would continue in his role as Road Safety Commissioner, but much to my surprise, he advised the Public Sector Commissioner he didn’t wish to continue in the role under the new structure.”

Once again in this house on 27 June, the minister misled the house and stated —

No pressure has been put on Mr Papalia. My belief was that we were working well together and that he would continue in the role.

That is the role of Road Safety Commissioner. The letter dated 8 June to the minister clearly shows that she knew well before 26 and 27 June that Mr Papalia was being moved on, and, in fact, she supported him being moved out of that role.

That is very clearly misleading the house. The performance of this minister has caused dysfunction and chaos. Whenever this minister is criticised, her immediate response is to go on the attack. She attacked Mr Papalia and tried to besmirch his reputation. She implied that he was acting outside his remit as Road Safety Commissioner by not providing information that was cabinet-in-confidence to the Langoulant inquiry. She attacked him and said that he should have provided the information and that he should not have acted in the way he did. She knew that

he was being moved on, because she supported that, but she told this house she was surprised he was being moved on and criticised him for his actions around protecting the long-held convention in this place of releasing cabinet-in-confidence documents.

I refer to the commissioner appointment process. We have talked about this matter many times in this Parliament and the former Commissioner of Police, Dr Karl O'Callaghan, who is very highly respected and regarded in the community, has offered his views on this. I quote from what he said on ABC News. His view was that the process had been corrupted and that there was inappropriate political interference in the appointment of the Commissioner of Police. As a result, it was unfortunate for a man as highly regarded as Mr Chris Dawson to be constantly operating under the premise that there was a dubious appointment process. Chris Dawson, quite frankly, deserves better than that. He deserves better than having to operate in the environment created by the Minister for Police in response to a phone call from the member for Burns Beach saying, "My mate didn't get an interview. Can you get him an interview?" Then we found out —

**Mrs M.H. Roberts:** When was the phone call? What phone call?

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Minister for Police, I call you to order.

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** The member for Burns Beach is on the record saying that is exactly what happened. He bragged about it to the media. For goodness sake! He has bragged about it to the media and he takes full responsibility for the appointment process being interfered with. We know that process was interfered with because it went from a short list of applicants being interviewed to everyone being interviewed all of a sudden, including the member for Burns Beach's mate, who is highly credentialed, apparently, but did not get the job. What did the government do? This comes down to the Premier's leadership, too. Dr Karl O'Callaghan is highly regarded. He had 13 years of distinguished service as Commissioner of Police. He served the community in some way, shape or form in WA Police for more than 40 years. What did the Premier do? He attacked the former commissioner. He said to tell him that he has relevance deprivation disorder. For goodness sake! The commissioner is quite rightly pointing out completely inappropriate interference in what should have been an independent process. Instead of the Premier saying that the commissioner probably has a point but we have a good candidate notwithstanding that, he came out and attacked Karl O'Callaghan. He accused him of having relevance deprivation disorder and undermining Mr Dawson.

Mr O'Callaghan has been very clear in his radio interviews this morning that this is nothing to do with Mr Dawson. It has to do with an inappropriate political interference in the selection process, which puts Mr Dawson on the backfoot from the first day of his appointment. He deserves better. If this government had any regard for standards and transparency, it would not have occurred. The Minister for Police should have told the member for Burns Beach that that was an inappropriate conversation and an inappropriate request and that it was being handled independently through the Public Sector Commissioner. The minister should have told the member that he needed to tell his friend, "Sorry, try next time when the commissioner's job is up for appointment again." That would have been the appropriate response, not to change the process and the committee that was put together to vet applicants. That is not the right process. Ministers are supposed to be strong and stand up to people interfering in a process and say, "No, there is a standard here and I am not going to drop below that standard because I want to find some mates for my faction." That is not how ministers should behave, and that is what we have seen with this process.

Then we look at police. For the first time in many, many years—we certainly did not see it over the eight and a half years of the Barnett Liberal government—we see police taking to the streets and striking. We did not see police take industrial action and now we are seeing that because the government has failed to deliver the 1.5 per cent pay rise that it promised. It said, "Too bad, police." The minister has failed to secure funding for stab-proof vests that police officers say they require. We have a debacle over the purchase of new police uniforms. How can we have confidence that this decision was made by Commissioner Chris Dawson and not the result of interference of the Minister for Police in police operations? We cannot have confidence in that. We do not know whether this was Mr Dawson's decision because we know this minister likes to interfere in decisions and the independence of these kinds of processes.

Then we look at the road safety issue on Indian Ocean Drive. Instead of decisive action and the Minister of Police speaking to the Minister for Transport to get the Main Roads engineers to look at that road and take some action to improve the safety of it, what did we get? The Minister for Police decided to set up a committee and get drivers to take photos and tell the government what they think we should do. Motorists might have some information, but engineers design roads and make the appropriate changes to improve the safety of those roads. Where would they try to source those funds? They would source it from the road trauma trust fund, except we know that that account has now been raided for non-road safety projects, such as overhead costs for the Department of Transport employees—the lighting bill, the increased electricity bills, the rental bills and for cups of tea and coffee for the people working in the Department of Transport. Overhead employment costs for the Department of Transport are now being raided from the road trauma trust account, thereby relinquishing the ability of a road safety initiative

Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr David Templeman; Mr Peter Katsambanis; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Sean L'Estrange

---

being put in place on Indian Ocean Drive where, tragically, we have seen the loss of life like never before over the past six or so months.

**Ms M.M. Quirk** interjected.

**The SPEAKER:** Order, member for Girrawheen!

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** It has been a terrible tragedy and that needs fixing. It does not need a committee. It needs a solution, and that is what ministers are put in place to provide. A solution would be provided by engineers, not by people driving along in their cars taking photographs on their mobile phones. That will not solve the problem.

Then in question time the minister completely failed to articulate how she is managing conflicts of interest in her office. When elected members of local government are acting as policy advisers in her office, there will be conflicts of interest. The minister failed to articulate how she will manage those, whether she is managing those or whether any of those conflicts have been declared. Good grief! What is she thinking? What can we expect in the future if this minister is not brought before the Procedure and Privileges Committee and made to explain her case and apologise to this house for misleading it and once again treating this Parliament with contempt, which is what we have seen from this government from day one? It treats Parliament, the community and its processes with contempt.

Now I come to the Premier. The reason the motion calls on the Premier to take some leadership and have the Minister for Police stand down is that we have had to take the extraordinary step of requesting a review by the Information Commissioner because the Premier's office is failing to release documents that we have requested under FOI. We know they exist. The Premier's office is failing to release documents subject to the FOI act, which is in direct contravention of his promise of gold-standard transparency. The Premier said that he would set a new level of gold-standard transparency. The Premier has set a low bar. His poor decision-making —

**Mr M. McGowan:** Are you retiring?

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** I am not retiring. I am living the dream. I am here to hold the Premier to account because the Premier and the Minister for Police are the gifts that keep on giving.

**MRS M.H. ROBERTS (Midland — Minister for Police)** [3.19 pm]: One problem I have noted in this place over many years is that a lot of people—people like the member for Scarborough—judge others by their own standards, and the member for Scarborough's standards are very, very, very low. Members may recall that she misled Parliament over the detective shortages back in 2016. She was found by a committee to have misled the house. She basically came into this house and said that the WA Police Union had not raised the matter of detective shortages with her. The only problem was that Mr Brandon Shortland said that she had in front of the whole union committee and that they actually had a tape-recording of their raising that issue with her. They are the member for Scarborough's standards.

**Mrs L.M. Harvey** interjected.

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Scarborough, you were heard in silence; can we have the same now.

**Mrs M.H. ROBERTS:** The member for Scarborough came in here with a grab bag of issues, and again has misled the Parliament. She does it over and over again. Today she introduced a new element into the Commissioner of Police's appointment, and is now alleging that I received a phone call from the member for Burns Beach.

**Mrs L.M. Harvey** interjected.

**Mrs M.H. ROBERTS:** Can you tell me where he said that? Can you tell me that? Have you got a reference for him saying that?

**Mrs L.M. Harvey** interjected.

**Mrs M.H. ROBERTS:** Have you got a reference?

**Mrs L.M. Harvey** interjected.

**Mrs M.H. ROBERTS:** No, you do not, because you made it up. There was no phone call. You will not be able to find a reference of him saying that he did that because he simply did not do it. It is an absolute nonsense.

Today, the opposition has also added the issue of stab-proof vests. Let us have a little go on that one. I have said in this house and on the public record—the current and former commissioners of police have said this—that money is not the problem; it is not the issue. The issue is getting something practical, wearable and agreed to. Deputy Commissioner Brown has special responsibility for dealing with the police union on this matter. I understand they are working together well on this matter and that money is not and never has been at issue. What is at issue is what is appropriate, wearable, serviceable, and provides for the occupational health and safety of our police officers, and that matter is properly in the domain of the Commissioner of Police. Today, the member for Scarborough had a go at the uniform issues. I understand that Mr Dawson has made a presentation about the uniform matter as part of the estimates hearing in the Legislative Council. I also understand that he answered questions from the media at

Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr David Templeman; Mr Peter Katsambanis; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Sean L'Estrange

---

a press conference. I understand that most of the elements of the uniform that were pictured in *The West Australian* will come into service. What the Commissioner of Police has taken issue with is the black polo shirt, and whether it is appropriate as a predominant uniform for WA Police. Again, the opposition has made a false allegation at me. The member for Scarborough said that maybe I interfered in this matter; maybe it is my idea and not the commissioner's idea. That is another false allegation from the member for Scarborough. Commissioner Dawson raised the issue with me and said that he was going to review the matter. It was his initiative and his decision. That has been just another kind of weird own goal, misleading fallacy from the member for Scarborough.

Opposition members have also managed to drag Indian Ocean Drive into it. It is pretty sad that they are trying to make political capital out of that. A significant number of deaths have occurred on that road so far this year, and the fact is that that is the state the former minister left the road in. What did the member for Scarborough do to improve safety on Indian Ocean Drive when she was Minister for Police; Road Safety? I will tell her what I have done. I have put in place a high-level working party of directors general to look objectively and scientifically at what will be the best things to do. In addition, I have had discussions with the Minister for Transport, who is working with her agency. They have brought forward the expenditure of \$7 million for four overtaking lanes. I have raised the issue of policing on that road with senior police. I have been on patrol on Indian Ocean Drive. I have personally driven that road a number of times. I went on patrol a couple of months ago with some traffic enforcement group officers and spoke with them about what they routinely see there. I received an assurance from the Western Australian police force that it has significantly upped the patrolling of that road. Maybe the former government should have asked some questions about police presence on that road. Police presence on country roads has been a significant issue for years. Under the watch of the former government, road deaths went up, and Western Australia now is one of the worst states in Australia for road fatalities and serious injuries.

The former government should not be proud of that record, and nor should it be proud of its record in the level of crime in our community. It rolled out a so-called new model of policing that saw consistent double-digit increases in crime. That is not a record the member for Scarborough or the former government can be proud of. It is nothing short of complete nonsense for them to come in here and talk about chaos and dysfunction. In my view, the Road Safety Commission and the Western Australian police force are operating extremely well. Both the new acting commissioner for the Road Safety Commission and the Commissioner of Police are doing excellent jobs in their respective commissions.

The opposition has decided to enter the domain of local government elections and cast aspersions on members of my staff. I am not sure what the opposition is getting at when it comes to Mayor Gangell from Bassendean. Maybe it thinks that people in local government should not be able to work in state or federal government in case there is a conflict. If the opposition's issue is whether those conflicts are being managed appropriately or declared, it is my understanding that Mr Gangell made the appropriate declarations about being Mayor of Bassendean, and I understand that Ms Clarke informed her manager and the Department of the Premier and Cabinet that she intended to be a candidate at the City of Bayswater elections. I think that the real issue seems to be that another Bayswater councillor happens to be the research officer of the member for Hillarys. Some people have suggested to me that the member for Hillarys' research officer, Mr Fleeton, aspires to be a candidate for the position of the Mayor of Bayswater.

Several members interjected.

**Mrs M.H. ROBERTS:** It may be that the member for Hillarys marina's electorate officer —

Several members interjected.

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Hillarys.

**Mrs M.H. ROBERTS:** — has a real interest in who gets elected in that ward of the City of Bayswater. The opposition is clouding the issue.

Several members interjected.

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Hillarys, do you want to go home early?

**Mrs M.H. ROBERTS:** Members of this house might be interested to know that the CEO of Bayswater has actually lodged a complaint about Mr Fleeton for using the council letterhead for electoral material—and that that complaint has been lodged with the Local Government Standards Panel. Apparently Mr Fleeton could be in breach of the city's code of conduct for elected members. Mr Fleeton, who works for the member for Hillarys marina, is well known in Liberal Party circles.

*Withdrawal of Remark*

**Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE:** The minister is incorrectly referring to the name of a member of this place.

**The SPEAKER:** Minister, could you refrain from using that phrase, and withdraw it.

**Mrs M.H. ROBERTS:** I withdraw.

*Debate Resumed*

**Mr P.A. Katsambanis** interjected.

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Hillarys, I have given you a lot of licence. I call you to order for the second time.

**Mrs M.H. ROBERTS:** I am sure the member enjoys his view over Hillarys Boat Harbour as, no doubt, does Mr Fleeton, the Bayswater councillor. I am told he was a very active Young Liberal at Murdoch University and previously a member of the Australian Liberal Students' Federation. A Liberal political operator is in the member for Hillarys' office and is also a councillor in the City of Bayswater.

**Mr P.A. Katsambanis:** It is not in my electorate. It is nowhere near my electorate.

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Hillarys, I call you to order for the third time. Members from both sides, just listen to the minister.

**Mrs M.H. ROBERTS:** Some kind of politics is playing out in the City of Bayswater and, no doubt, in a lot of councils throughout Western Australia. We have provided answers about how conflicts of interest are being managed. I have advised the house that Ms Clarke informed her manager and the department of her intention to run for office. At that time, discussions occurred regarding strategies to ensure the mitigation of any potential, perceived or actual conflicts of interest. In answer to parliamentary questions, I have also pointed out that Ms Clarke has not sought any information specific to the City of Bayswater. It seems that members opposite are trying to make some capital out of the fact that Ms Clarke is interested in CCTV grants. The grants that are available are crime prevention grants that have been around since I introduced them in 2004. They are hardly top-secret information.

I will move on to the matter of Mr Papalia. Some unfortunate imputations have been made in my direction about me allegedly wanting to get rid of him or having had a hand in it. The fact of the matter is that I had no agenda to get rid of Mr Papalia. Various comments have been read out today. I stand by all those comments—those I made on 6PR and those I made in this house. Mr Papalia enjoyed my support and, from my perspective, we were working well together. Mr Papalia raised no concerns with me. I want to make it very clear on the record that I did not seek meetings with Mr Wauchope to undermine Mr Papalia in any way, nor did I ever request that Mr Wauchope move on Mr Papalia and so forth. Mr Wauchope met with me and advised me that Mr Papalia did not want to continue. When Mr Wauchope advised me of that, I was surprised. I added, though, that I did not have any issue with it because Mr Wauchope explained that Mr Papalia did not want to continue in the role or go back to WA Police. If anyone here is unaware, Mr Papalia was formerly a WA Police officer. For reasons that are best known to himself and that I am not aware of him making public, he did not want to go back to that agency. That was his call. He did not want to go back to WA Police. He raised that, but did not raise it with me. He raised it, appropriately, with the Public Sector Commissioner, who had a discussion with him. The Public Sector Commissioner advised me that that was Mr Papalia's choice and what he wanted to do. I said words to the effect of, "If that's what he wants to do, that's his call. We'll find someone else to take on that role who is happy to be the Road Safety Commissioner." I cannot unequivocally tell members all the exact reasons Mr Papalia took the actions he did. They are best known, presumably, to himself. He did not explain those reasons to me. He may have had more detailed discussions with the Public Sector Commissioner, but my recollection of the advice that the Public Sector Commissioner gave to me was that he did not want to go back to WA Police. He enjoyed being a CEO. I think he would have liked to have continued on as a CEO. Obviously, our government had made the decision to go from 40 CEOs down to 22 CEOs, which was something that we needed to do to streamline our public service and to try to claw back some of the enormous debt that the former government had put us into.

I listened to the bits and pieces that were read out by the member for Hillarys and the member for Scarborough. They have basically put one and one together and come up with about 300. The fact remains that as a result of those changes in departments—40 going down to 22—Mr Papalia had the appropriate discussions with the Public Sector Commissioner about his future. I made it clear to the Public Sector Commissioner that I was more than happy for Mr Papalia to continue as the Road Safety Commissioner, but that position would be located within WA Police. That was the direction that we were going in. I suppose I can only say it so many times, but he made the call. My recollection is that Mr Wauchope advised me of that verbally and in writing. Initially, I was very surprised because my perception from the outside was that Mr Papalia really enjoyed the position of Road Safety Commissioner. We had had some good conversations and good meetings, so it surprised me. On one level, it also surprised me that Mr Papalia chose not to have a conversation directly with me about his concerns. He made a response to the reorganisation on 6PR. That is why I publicly said on 6PR that if Mr Papalia wanted to, he could continue in that role. I also clarified that our government intended to continue to have a Road Safety Commissioner. That was his call. I was informed of his call by the Public Sector Commissioner and I said words to the effect of, "If that's what he wants to do, that's fine by me. We'll find someone else to do that role." There was never any suggestion that I sought for the Public Sector Commissioner to initiate some course of action against

Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr David Templeman; Mr Peter Katsambanis; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Sean L'Estrange

---

Mr Papalia. That is simply not correct. He was going about his job and initiating the changes that were required as a result of the reduction of CEOs across government.

This has been a grab bag of issues. To me, the opposition looks desperate and grubby. It is not focused on the real agendas, the provision of government services or creating jobs in our community. It is clearly not focused on reducing the massive debt burden it left the state with. Its rejection of the gold tax is evidence of that. Instead, it comes in here day after day with a series of very nasty, very grubby tactics. If members opposite think that will get them anywhere in opposition, it will not. It will just make them more irrelevant than the member for Scarborough already knows she is.

*Division*

Question put and a division taken with the following result —

Ayes (16)

Mr C.J. Barnett	Mrs L.M. Harvey	Mr W.R. Marmion	Mr K. O'Donnell
Mr I.C. Blayney	Mr P. Katsambanis	Mr J.E. McGrath	Mr D.T. Redman
Mr V.A. Catania	Mr A. Krsticevic	Dr M.D. Nahan	Mr P.J. Rundle
Ms M.J. Davies	Mr S.K. L'Estrange	Mr D.C. Nalder	Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup ( <i>Teller</i> )

Noes (36)

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

---

Pair

Ms L. Mettam

Mr B.S. Wyatt

Question thus negatived.