

McGOWAN GOVERNMENT — TRANSPARENCY

Motion

HON MICHAEL MISCHIN (North Metropolitan — Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [9.18 am] — without notice: I move —

That this house condemns the McGowan Labor government for its continuing lack of transparency and its persistent refusal to give full, frank, timely and correct information to members, this Parliament and the people of Western Australia.

It gives me no pleasure to move this motion and to once again bring this matter to the attention of the house. One would have hoped that after two years of settling into government, the McGowan Labor government would realise its responsibilities as a government rather than as a political party. It should have got out of campaigning mode, with all the stretches of the truth that may be involved in campaigning, and shown some regard for its responsibilities to not only the public, but also this place to provide full, frank, timely and comprehensive advice and information. We have noticed over the last two and a half years this misinformation, if I can put it that way, as well as a failure to provide full and frank information in a variety of forms: public announcements, second reading speeches, information allegedly provided during Committee of the Whole, correspondence to members from ministers, answers to questions in this place and in other forms from low-level officers of this government. Perhaps that is a good place to start. It is said that dead fish rot from the head. Maybe the fact that those at the tail end are exhibiting the sort of behaviour that I am complaining about is indicative of the lack of guidance or perhaps is indicative of the standard being set by those at the top. One of those examples is, of course—I suspect other members may have experienced this too; certainly Liberal members have and perhaps we are favoured by this—the advice about ministerial visits to electorates. It has been a convention for a long, long time that when a minister on official duties or a parliamentary secretary as proxy for a minister goes to a member’s electorate, they do the courtesy of telling the member where they are going and roughly what time and give some idea of what it is about. The ones we have received are classic. This comes from the top, from the Premier’s office, and I quote —

Good afternoon

I picked this one at random; there are dozens of them —

Please be aware that the Hon Mark McGowan MLA, Premier, will be in your Electorate on Saturday 12 May 2018.

This was sent on Friday, 11 May 2018 at 5.12 pm. It goes on —

Should you require more information, do not hesitate to contact our Strategic Adviser Mark Reed via mark.reed@dpc.wa.gov.au (also copied into this email).

Kind regards

It was from the appointments secretary.

Invariably, my office sends a request for further information such as where, what is the purpose and what time. Invariably, Mr Mark Reed—I presume he does exist, although one has one’s doubts—never responds. I think I have probably received one email from him in the last two and a bit years. That is the standard of a McGowan government. Either this strategic adviser is being deliberately offensive and discourteous to elected members and denying the information invited to be provided, presumably in good faith by the appointments secretary, or is incompetent. Maybe it is in his job description to ignore members of Parliament—just to pretend but not to respond. Perhaps one of the ministers or perhaps the Leader of the House, who regrettably seems to be absent once again on urgent parliamentary business, might be able to assist on behalf of the Premier with what is going on in that office. However, there have been repeated refusals and failures to provide what is promised by these sorts of emails. I suspect that has also happened in other cases. The example is set. The only way someone of that position in the Premier’s office could get away with it for so long is if it is endorsed by the Premier, a Premier whose mentor, amongst others, included one Brian Burke. We know how transparent his government was as long as it lasted. I see Hon Alannah MacTiernan is most distressed by that and is shaking her head ruefully given the history of that government.

Hon Alannah MacTiernan: That’s pixie land.

Hon MICHAEL MISCHIN: I will go on to a few other public announcements. That goes through to public announcements more generally. I am sure each member will be able to tell a tale of their experiences. Here is a beauty because it is so blatant. It is about Perth Stadium, now Optus Stadium, which was derided by the Labor opposition as a vanity project and a terrible waste of money. “If a stadium was to be built, it ought be squeezed into some small space in Subiaco somewhere. That would be the best way of doing it—a terrible idea.” Now that the

Hon Michael Mischin; Hon Peter Collier; Hon Colin De Grussa; Hon Robin Scott; Hon Colin Tincknell; Hon Alannah MacTiernan; Hon Nick Goiran

stadium has been opened, the Labor Party wants to own it. Success has many fathers, they say, so it is with the Labor government. It wants to have a piece of it. The Labor government was only too anxious to get out there. Mark McGowan himself, as Premier, was only too anxious to stick his name to the project, unlike Hon Alannah MacTiernan's project, Perth Arena, which went three times over budget and took about three times as long to build. I am sure that she will remember that.

Several members interjected.

Hon MICHAEL MISCHIN: When that was opened, Premier Barnett —

Hon Peter Collier interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Leader of the Opposition, you are not helping the member on their feet because they cannot be heard.

Hon MICHAEL MISCHIN: Thank you for your protection, Madam President —

The PRESIDENT: I am just protecting you from your own.

Hon MICHAEL MISCHIN: — from all these unruly interjections from the other side of the chamber too.

Hon Alannah MacTiernan: You need to do a bit more research.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Minister, I look forward to your response soon, but we will listen quietly to what the member is saying.

Hon MICHAEL MISCHIN: Thank you. I am glad to hear Hon Alannah MacTiernan's interjection about research. When that arena was opened, Hon Colin Barnett —

Hon Alannah MacTiernan: I was involved in it?

Hon MICHAEL MISCHIN: It is like an illness with the minister, is it not? She just cannot stop.

Hon Alannah MacTiernan: I hate seeing you fall into error. I hate seeing you wrong. I am embarrassed for you.

Hon MICHAEL MISCHIN: Madam President, my time is being used up.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Member, I would say to you that perhaps if you did not encourage interjection, you would not have these interruptions. Maybe, perhaps if you direct your comments to me.

Hon MICHAEL MISCHIN: Thank you, Madam President.

Hon Colin Barnett graciously asked the Governor to open that institution to avoid taking credit for something that had been initiated by the previous Labor government, unlike Premier Mark McGowan, who was only too anxious to get his name onto what was apparently looking to be a success. He tried to ameliorate that by having ex-Premier Barnett come along, but he was happy to tack his name to it. Ever since then, the Labor government has been doing the same thing.

I draw members' attention to an announcement on 20 July 2018 headed "Chelsea Football Club arrives in Perth", which states —

- First international soccer club appearance at Optus Stadium
- The club's only appearance in Australia
- Secured and supported by the McGowan Government through Tourism WA

...

The deal to bring Chelsea to Perth, struck by Tourism WA and Optus Stadium operator VenuesLive, will include ...

It goes on.

Talking about research, that lasted for about 24 hours, until members of the public started ringing talkback radio saying, "Hang on a minute, didn't Colin Barnett announce that before the election?" Sure enough, on 29 January 2017, a media release by the then Premier, also Minister for Tourism; Science, states in part —

- **Chelsea Football Club to play international friendly in Perth in 2018**
- **Supported by the Liberal National Government through Tourism WA and VenuesWest**

Extract from Hansard

[COUNCIL — Thursday, 27 June 2019]

p4770c-4782a

Hon Michael Mischin; Hon Peter Collier; Hon Colin De Grussa; Hon Robin Scott; Hon Colin Tincknell; Hon Alannah MacTiernan; Hon Nick Goiran

The McGowan government is prepared to stoop to that level to disseminate false information to the public. Perhaps Hon Alannah MacTiernan will tell us about research there. But it does not stop there. On the value of tourism; now we seem to have tourism invented by the McGowan Labor government. Hon Colin Barnett said something about the value of tourism to Western Australia, and stated —

“Major events will help us reach that goal which is why we have committed \$30 million to bringing business, sporting and entertainment events to WA, including \$19 million to attract big events to Perth Stadium.

“This commitment has already seen a State of Origin and a Bledisloe Cup match locked in for 2019.”

I turn now to 21 June 2019 when the Minister for Sport and Recreation, Mick Murray, said, and I quote —

“This weekend’s Origin kicks off the biggest winter of sport Western Australia has ever seen, with Manchester United, the Bledisloe Cup, blockbuster AFL matches and the Australian Boomers all to come in the next few weeks.

“The McGowan Government has secured this top-class calendar of sporting events to capitalise on Optus Stadium and RAC Arena’s full potential, for local fans and in support of tourism, hospitality and small business.”

Lies, lies, lies, or at least half-truths—the government is concealing and taking credit for the initiatives of others.

I do not expect governments to work in a vacuum. Yes, we should give credit to governments when it is due, because they represent the state. However, to claim credit for and put the McGowan badge on those things is an outrage. In case it is thought to be a mistake, here is a statement headed “Bledisloe Cup coming to Perth Stadium in 2019”. This is Colin Barnett speaking on 7 December 2016 about bringing to Perth the rival teams the Qantas Wallabies and New Zealand All Blacks —

“It is a great coup for Western Australia to host this spectacular sporting event at the magnificent Perth Stadium.

Flash forward to a media statement from 30 July 2018 under the names of Hon Paul Papalia, Minister for Tourism, and Hon David Templeman, Minister for Local Government; Heritage; Culture and the Arts. Comments in this press release are attributed to the tourism minister, Hon Paul Papalia. Members should see whether this sounds familiar. He states —

“It is a great coup for Western Australia to host this spectacular sporting event at Optus Stadium.

Colin Barnett said —

“It will be the only time the All Blacks and the Wallabies play on Australian soil in 2019 in the lead up to the Rugby World Cup, and we expect thousands of people to travel to Perth from the Eastern States and overseas for the game.

Flash forward to Paul Papalia —

“It will be the only time the All Blacks and the Wallabies play on Australian soil next year in the lead up to the Rugby World Cup, and we expect thousands of people to travel to Perth from the eastern states and overseas for the game.

Paul Papalia does not even have the wit or ability not to plagiarise! Schoolchildren are taught not to do that. It is a pity that Hon Sue Ellery is not here in her capacity as Minister for Education and Training. Paul Papalia plagiarises, and takes credit for it. Flash back to Colin Barnett —

“The match will be broadcast across Australia and internationally, providing a great platform to show off our transforming city ...

Those words are attributed to Paul Papalia, when he states —

“The match will be broadcast across Australia and internationally, providing a great platform to show off the new face of Perth ...

It is just terrific! Watch the silver, folks, if you invite any of these ministers to your place!

It goes further. We have already had some examples of the alleged \$40 billion debt. That has been corrected on numerous occasions. In fact, the other day it grew to \$44 billion according to the Treasurer, Hon Ben Wyatt. Gareth Parker corrected him on radio and said that it did not get anywhere near that. The Treasurer backtracked and said, “Oh, no, that is what it was projected to be.” That lie has been perpetrated on numerous occasions. Even Hon Stephen Dawson had to admit that it was only projected guesswork when he was examined on a bill.

I am running short of time; I appreciate that. However, I remind members of a number of occasions on which second reading speeches have been misleading and, when tested in Committee of the Whole, have been proved to contain

Hon Michael Mischin; Hon Peter Collier; Hon Colin De Grussa; Hon Robin Scott; Hon Colin Tincknell; Hon Alannah MacTiernan; Hon Nick Goiran

false or misleading information. The occupational health and safety legislation handled by Hon Alannah MacTiernan last year, or the year before, was an example of that. Various examples that were given in the second reading speech when tested proved to be utterly misleading or false. In the Committee of the Whole we have had the experience of answers not being given to questions. More recently, Hon Sue Ellery made a comment. When we tried to pin her down on that comment, she said, “I have already answered that”, and wanted to move on, perhaps because she realised that she may have gone too far and was hoping for ambiguity, I suggest, so that it could not ultimately be asserted that she had misled Parliament. She simply refuses to answer, or confirm, propositions.

Correspondence has been delayed or not answered. On 22 April this year, I wrote to Minister Templeman and Minister Johnston about problems with a particular shire and breaches of the occupational health and safety legislation. I received a response only two days ago from one of those ministers. I have received nothing, not even an acknowledgement, from Minister Johnston. People may recall that Minister Johnston was the one who misled, I suggest, the Assembly about the residential tenancies and domestic violence legislation, when he claimed, among other things, that if certain amendments were allowed to pass, women and domestic violence victims would be taken to court and charged with offences. That was a nonsense, as was subsequently confirmed by the minister handling the bill here, Hon Alannah MacTiernan, when those matters came back before this place.

With answers to questions without notice, it seems to take at least two or three questions to tease out information from Hon John Quigley. One of the more recent examples was when I asked for a status report on about half a dozen different projects. All he could tell me was, “Yes, we are progressing with those.” That is not a status report; that is a fob off. Why do I have to ask twice for information? What is so secret that this government is locked into campaign mode and cannot be open, full and frank? It is deplorable that at this stage of the government we are still faced with those sorts of instances.

I was given an answer to another question that was patently wrong, but no-one has bothered to correct it. That was a question I posed about the consideration for parole of several life-termers in prison. The answer I received earlier this year—I have it here somewhere; I will find it—was in fact false. It suggested that the Attorney General, Hon John Quigley, had received a report from the Prisoners Review Board of Western Australia dated December 2019. That was a stupid typographic error—I accept that—but it was read out by a member of this place on behalf of the Attorney General. It was not corrected. I thought that commonsense and a respect for Parliament would have involved noticing that that was an absurd date—a date in the future when he was alleged to have received something—and the minister would have said, “Hang on, I’m not satisfied with the answer. I will get a confirmation and get back to you.” But no—it was read out and it has remained uncorrected for months. That is the level of contempt that this government shows this Parliament and the people of Western Australia.

We have received half answers. We asked whether the Attorney General had received any submissions regarding his multiple murderers and serial killers legislation. His response was that he had received no formal submissions. I did not ask about formal submissions; I asked about any submissions on that legislation. It took another question to get him to admit that he had received correspondence, but he did not regard it as a submission because it was not framed as a submission but as correspondence and a complaint. That is the sneakiness of this sneaky government. If my questions to ministers in this place seem overlong, it is because I am trying to cover every base, because I have absolutely no confidence in those opposite, with the exception of one minister, Hon Stephen Dawson, who does answer questions in Committee of the Whole and does return answers to the ministers until he is satisfied with them. He may be guilty of other things, but at least I have learnt to respect him. As for the others, there seems to be a culture of sneaky, shifty answers. That goes back to the Brian Burke days, when he made an art of answering questions literally and leaving lots and lots of wriggle room. That is one of the reasons I say that this Premier has learnt a lot from him.

This culture has to change. It will bring this government into disrepute in due course. I look forward to the response from a responsible minister.

HON PETER COLLIER (North Metropolitan — Leader of the Opposition) [9.39 am]: I stand to support the motion. Unfortunately, yet again we have to talk about the standards in this house, which have not improved over two years. I draw members’ attention yet again to a comment made by the now Premier on 18 June 2016 —

“The public interest must come first, transparency must come first, openness must come first.

I am going to keep on repeating that, over and again, ad nauseam, because, quite frankly, the standards that were promised by the Premier have not been adhered to. It is easier to get into the Kremlin than to get information out of this government. Every time there is a sensitive issue, it takes us dozens of questions and dozens of freedom of information applications and section 82 applications with regard to commercial-in-confidence to get answers. It has become a culture. It is automatic for this government to put its hand up. The so-called Glad wrap government is the alfoil government, without a doubt, and that standard started long before this government was established. I have mentioned this before. The fact is that the Leader of the House tried to get someone on this side of the chamber to be President so that the government could just bulldoze legislation through, and that stands testament

Hon Michael Mischin; Hon Peter Collier; Hon Colin De Grussa; Hon Robin Scott; Hon Colin Tincknell; Hon Alannah MacTiernan; Hon Nick Goiran

to the culture that exists with members opposite. When the Leader of the House cancelled pairs, it showed that conventions mean nothing to the government. It would do all it possibly could to get its legislation through, and that is what we have to deal with and why we have to keep on dealing with these things.

With regard to finance, members opposite get out of bed every day and reaffirm their mantra, “Blame the Libs, blame the Libs, blame the Libs”, along with financial incompetence and all the rest of it. They say, “Yes, we’re doing something to fix the budget. We’re restricting public servants to a \$1 000 a year wage increase; we’re going to freeze members’ salaries; we’re going to freeze judges’ salaries.” That is fine, but at the same time they are saying, “Do as we say, not as we do.” That is what members opposite say all the time.

What have we done through parliamentary questions et cetera? We have drawn out a number of things. Not long after members opposite took the Treasury bench, the Minister for Education and Training, the Minister for Transport and half the public service went over to Sydney to have a look at some high-rise schools. The only problem was that they did not look at any schools and they cancelled the school that they were going to build here, so that went well. In addition to that, it took me dozens and dozens of questions to find out how many ministers had double dipped on their car allowances—nine ministers. In a party that purports to look after the proletariat, nine ministers sitting over there took an extra \$5 300. That is \$1 300 more than every public servant in Western Australia has had for four years, and those ministers got that overnight. It is a no-brainer. The thing is, it took me so long to get that information because the transparency of this government simply does not exist. This goes on time and again.

After 12 months, one would think that there would be a degree of modesty from members opposite in recognition of 12 months in power—not on your life. They had all the subtlety of a flamethrower. They went down to the Perth Convention and Exhibition Centre and had an almighty knees-up; I have mentioned this before. How indiscreet is that? They were sitting down there, sipping on their Moët and chomping on their sirloins. What about the people in Moora, the Schools of the Air and the people who are struggling day after day with their utility charges? “Oh, let them eat cake.” Not only did they go down there and live the high life in their penguin suits and nice frocks, they also tweeted it all—arm in arm, champagne and all the rest of it. How insensitive. I thought members opposite were in the party of the worker. What happened to that? That is exactly what happened. Dozens of those photos went up on Twitter; interestingly enough, a number of them have been deleted since I first raised that issue. It must have struck a raw nerve.

Let us have a look at some other standards—on travel, for example. It is so hard to get information out of this government on travel. Every single ministerial travel report has been late by months. Let us have a look at the government’s use of the government jet. Hon Alannah MacTiernan seems to spend an enormous amount of time taking the jet down to Albany. On 7 September 2017, just after the Labor Party took government, Hon Alannah MacTiernan, her chief of staff and two advisers took the jet from Perth —

Hon Samantha Rowe: Because she works hard!

Hon PETER COLLIER: The member has not heard what I have said yet. She will not like it.

She took the jet from Perth to Broome, then from Broome to Karratha, then from Karratha to Perth, and then not back to Perth, but to Albany. Why did she go to Albany? Because it happened to be a Friday. Did the jet come back with Hon Alannah MacTiernan? No, it came back with her advisers and she stayed in Albany. She took her taxi down to Albany and stayed in Albany for the weekend. This is a government jet, and members opposite carry on about us being the party of privilege. The jet is not for taking a minister down to her holiday home for the weekend, but that is exactly what happened. Even worse, a few months later she got the jet to drop her off at the Leeuwin concert. While Jackson Browne was singing *Running on Empty*, she was sitting there, high-fiving with the corporate sector. That is exactly what she did, and she said that there was an “element of official business”. I would love to know what official business took place around the tables at the Jackson Browne Leeuwin concert. I went to a Leeuwin concert as minister as well, but I drove myself down there, paid for my accommodation and paid for my ticket. I certainly did not get the jet to take me down there. It is unbelievable that members opposite can actually think that that is appropriate.

Let us have a look at these ministerial travel reports. Every single ministerial travel report has been late. Why? It is because they always have something to hide. Every single one. I will go through them: 257 days late, 165 days late, 180 days late, 146 days late, 152 days late and the last one, 219 days late. It is interesting that the last one was 219 days late, because it was a significant revelation. Just after the winter break last year, Hon Alannah MacTiernan went on holiday but decided to stop off at Doha on the way through. She took her chief of staff there for one day; the chief of staff came back—\$5 000. That is how much it cost the Western Australian taxpayer, and that is \$1 000 more than every public servant, teacher and police officer got over four years. That was for one day, or less than one day. I challenge members opposite to read this travel report and say that it was worth it. This is the one that the minister tabled. Did we get value for money from that? We most definitely did not. She went to Doha and then

went on leave; she probably went to Europe or somewhere. Her chief of staff came back. She went to a supermarket in Doha. Why did she not go to Coles or Woolworths? There are plenty of supermarkets over here that she can look at; she does not have to go to Doha to look at a supermarket. She could have met with Qatar Airways here in Perth. Members opposite should have a look at this travel report and tell me whether it is value for money. This is the party that purports to look after the proletariat. I say: is it really the party of the worker when the minister is taking her taxi all over the state and going to Doha for a very dubious couple of days?

Well over half of our freedom of information requests have been delayed. Let us look at what it has taken me to try to get information on Carnegie Clean Energy. There have been months and months of delays. What about the section 82 requests on commercial-in-confidence? So far, over two years the McGowan government has issued 39 section 82 requests. The previous government had nine in its first term and 67 in total. The McGowan government has managed to lodge half that number in its first two years, purporting commercial-in-confidence. Members opposite have to be joking. They talk about transparency; they have no transparency.

There is so much. I could talk about this for hours, but I will finish on this one, which I have mentioned before. I put a question on notice with regard to the Environmental Protection Authority. It was vital that we got information, and members opposite were scurrying like rock crabs on that one. On this question there was a typo; there was a “(c)” instead of a “(b)”, so the Premier, who signed off on it, said that the question did not make sense. The government waited until the end of the question period, which was about three months, and I got the response that the question did not make sense. Why on earth did someone not just ring up, like we always did, and say —

Hon Adele Farina: No, you didn’t.

Hon PETER COLLIER: We did, I can tell the member; I certainly did. Why did they not just ring up and say, “You obviously meant ‘(b)’ instead of ‘(c)’”? It is not just me; I am not a “Nigel No Friends” on this. Hon Martin Aldridge got one that was exactly the same. He put in a question and he misdirected it to the Minister for Tourism when it should have been to the Minister for Industrial Relations. The government waited the entire time and then came back and said that it was not for the Minister for Tourism. Members opposite should grow up. If they want transparency, they should show it. At the moment their transparency is lower than a pregnant ant. Members opposite need to grow up in their responses to these questions and provide the transparency and openness they promised when they were in opposition.

HON COLIN de GRUSSA (Agricultural) [9.49 am]: I rise on behalf of the Nationals WA to make a contribution to this excellent motion brought to the house by Hon Michael Mischin. Of course, the Nationals have also experienced a lack of transparency and clarity from the government, and an inability to get answers when we have asked questions about some of the purported increases in the budget. It is very, very challenging when it appears as though ministers and departments do not know what they are doing. Perhaps it is because when this government came into office in some Chernobyl-like fashion, it dropped a nuclear bomb on the public service. Now all those public servants are running around and do not know who they are working for or what they are doing. When we ask questions, some little worker ant will scurry around trying to figure out who they work for and how to get that answer. There is no better example of that than in the agriculture portfolio, a portfolio dear to my heart. Indeed, in the other place only last week, my colleague the member for Moore brought before the chamber a very important motion condemning the McGowan government for its deliberate deception in Western Australia’s agricultural sector, by claiming magical and new funding of \$131.5 million for the industry when we know that in fact there is no new money. It has been very difficult to extract the truth behind that funding claim. I will quote the member for Moore’s comments as he read in that motion. He said —

We know that the Western Australian public, this house and the agricultural industry have been deceived into believing that a vast sum of money has been injected by the current government into the Department of Primary Industries and Regional Development to carry out functions previously carried out by the Department of Agriculture and Food. The government has claimed that \$131.5 million of extra money has gone into the agricultural industry, agricultural research and support for the agricultural sector. We contend that it has not. This misconception that has been put about has been very cleverly played out and presented. I refer to a press release of 18 April from Minister MacTiernan in which the minister claims —

- McGowan Government’s 2019–20 Budget to include \$131.5 million of additional expenditure in the Department of Primary Industries and Regional Development ...

Subsequently, of course, the estimates hearings occurred. My colleagues in the other place did some excellent work dissecting the government’s claim to try to find out exactly what is going on, as best they could. That is basically an example of the government’s use of smoke and mirrors. After the estimates hearings, my colleague the member for Moore was again clear on this when in a media release he stated —

According to budget estimates, the \$131 million figure comprised just \$58 million of consolidated revenue, with the additional \$78 million ... from Royalties for Regions and a mix of ongoing funds, levies and fees.

Extract from Hansard

[COUNCIL — Thursday, 27 June 2019]

p4770c-4782a

Hon Michael Mischin; Hon Peter Collier; Hon Colin De Grussa; Hon Robin Scott; Hon Colin Tincknell; Hon Alannah MacTiernan; Hon Nick Goiran

“These claims are further diluted by the revelation that it includes \$22.5 million in Federal Government funding from the Grains Research and Development Corporation,” ...

Is that not interesting? Farmers pay those levies every year; they are not new and that is certainly not new funding. That money comes from farmers yet the government claims that it has created this funding in agriculture. It is not new funding. That is just another example of the use of smoke and mirrors that we have come to expect from this government.

In terms of public sector reform—the cuts, the merger of departments and the explosion in the size of departments—we cannot get answers about the role of various people in departments. During the estimates hearings in this place I asked the Minister for Regional Development whether she could provide a split of the staff in the Department of Primary Industries and Regional Development so that I could try to ascertain what functions they perform, what roles there were and how many people actually worked in agriculture. The minister responded, “No, it’s not really possible to do that because some of the areas have sort of come together, so we have staff performing multiple functions.” Surely those staff must have clarity in their roles, or do they turn up to work not knowing what they are doing? It must be clear to them that they are working in the agricultural industry and that even if they are not working in a full-time capacity, they must be able to split that up. They must know that they will be performing some duties in soil science or agribusiness, whatever the case may be, even if those roles are combined with others, yet we cannot get a truthful answer about what is happening. I suspect that that may well be because the truth would hurt. I suspect that we would, in fact, find that fewer people are working in agriculture, fisheries or regional development because of the nuclear bomb that has gone through the department and due to the compression of multiple roles into a few.

Further on in those estimates hearings, the director general of the department tried to give me a figure in this respect. He said —

In terms of the degree to which the department has become fundamentally integrated, so not this, or that, or that, is probably in the order of 40 per cent, and continuing to move into more and more integration as we go forward, ...

So 40 per cent of the staff of the department have roles across multiple areas. There is nothing wrong with that, but surely we should know what those roles are and what part of their role is being given to one part of the department or another. Surely we should be able to find out the answer to that, but, no, we cannot. We have continued to ask more questions about this, yet we do not get answers about what these people do. It must be incredibly difficult for those people working in that department to not know what their job is—to not know whether they are a soil scientist today or whether they are going to be doing some research on rock lobsters or in regional development. It must be incredibly challenging for those people in the department to go to work every day and not know what they will be doing. I certainly feel for them after this flawed merger, if you like—this compression of departments together.

As Hon Michael Mischin alluded to, we have a government that is hiding things. It is being very much opaque and certainly not transparent, and it is not telling us exactly what is going on. We have asked a number of questions in this place, and as others members have said—I will not go into that detail—we get answers all the time that fail to provide a response. We ask for a report to be tabled and are told that there is not enough time to table a report. I am sure that it is not hard to get a copy of a report and table it. Why is it so difficult for questions to be answered in a timely fashion so that we on this side are well informed on exactly what is going on? I suspect that the answer is that the government probably does not want us to know what is going on. It probably wants to continue with the smoke and mirrors, deception and trickery, and to hide these things from us. Frankly, that is not acceptable from a government that stated prior to the election that it wanted to be transparent, open and accountable. The government is everything but that. The people of Western Australia are the ones ultimately being deceived. It is unacceptable that any member of this place seeks to do that.

Again, I congratulate the member for bringing this motion to the house. I also congratulate those members who have spoken and who have raised the continuing problems that we on this side experience to understand what is going on and to learn the real truth behind government decisions. We have heard members talk about the challenges that they have face when they have not been sufficiently notified of a visit by a minister to their electorates. It is a huge issue. It is a particularly big issue for regional members because if they are lucky and that notice comes at 5.00 pm the day before a minister plans to visit their electorate—sometimes they get no notice at all—it is sometimes tricky to just pop over to those events if they are at the other end of their electorate, which could be 1 000 kilometres or more away. It is certainly also disrespectful to not give local members notice in a timely fashion so they can attend those events in their communities so that they can understand what is going on from the government’s perspective. That is our job. Local members are certainly expected to be at as many, if not all, of

these things, but it is very tricky when they do not know they are happening. Again, congratulations to the member for bringing this excellent motion to us.

HON ROBIN SCOTT (Mining and Pastoral) [9.59 am]: I had no intention of putting anything forward on this non-government business motion, but Hon Michael Mischin piqued my interest on a couple of really interesting things. The first one was about providing full and frank answers to questions without notice. I have particularly noticed this issue when Hon Alannah MacTiernan has answered some of my questions about renewables generating hydrogen. I asked Hon Alannah MacTiernan whether she was aware that it cost \$11 a kilogram to generate hydrogen from renewables, whereas unleaded fuel costs about \$4.50, diesel costs \$3.50, and coal costs 35¢. The answer I received was that I should go back and check my information because it was out of date. The minister said that hydrogen was now down to \$9, unleaded fuel was up to \$6.50, and diesel was up to about \$5.50. That was correct. The only thing, though, is the honourable member added excise tax and GST onto the cost of unleaded fuel and diesel. I have noticed over the past 25 months that Hon Alannah MacTiernan can stand up for an hour talking about things and sound terribly confident, but know absolutely nothing about what she is talking about. In fact, I really believe that she could speak for an hour about steam navigation and still sound confident about it!

Another thing that got my attention was the emails from ministers visiting my electorate. I think the last email I got was at 10 past five one day, telling me that a minister was going to visit my electorate the very next day. Hon Michael Mischin has only 872 square kilometres to contend with in his electorate; I have 2.2 million square kilometres. If I get a message when I am in Kalgoorlie that a minister is going to be in my region and I have no idea where they will be, I do not even know why they waste their time sending me the email. They may as well send it through the post! If I got it a week later, it would not make any difference.

The third and last thing that really annoys me is when I request a meeting with a minister. I actually say in the email that I need only 15 minutes of a minister's time. I have not even received a response to the last one I sent. I have sent emails only to be told, "We're sorry. The minister is just so busy at the moment, but try again later down the track." I am also very, very disappointed about that.

Going back to questions without notice, Madam President always reminds us that the answers we get are the answers we have to accept. I do accept that. It is just unfortunate that these answers are not true. They have not been looked into properly. All I request are full and frank answers. A lot of my questions might seem trivial to this chamber, but they are not—they are coming from my constituents. That is why I ask them. Unfortunately, I give them the answers that I get. Some people just burst out laughing; some are in tears!

HON COLIN TINCKNELL (South West) [10.03 am]: I have a few brief words to say about this motion. When I saw this motion in non-government business, my basic feeling straightaway was, "Oh no; not again! We have heard this discussion before." The reason the feeling of "Oh no, not again!" keeps coming up is that nothing has changed about the lack of transparency and the refusal to give frank and straightforward answers to questions. I have witnessed that for the past two and a half years. That is very frustrating. I can see why this keeps coming up during non-government business. A few other things could have been added to the motion, such as arrogance and poor consultancy.

Hon Samantha Rowe: Who's arrogant, member?

Hon COLIN TINCKNELL: I am not going to get personal. I am talking in general terms.

Hon Samantha Rowe interjected.

The ACTING PRESIDENT: Order, members! Hon Colin Tincknell has the call.

Hon COLIN TINCKNELL: A lot of other things could have been added to this list, such as a lack of consultation. However, the problem we face is that there does not seem to be any wont on the government side to live up to its promise of openness and transparency, which was the style of government that the Premier wanted to lead. We have not seen that in action. That is the frustrating part.

As a new member of Parliament, I was expecting accountability and transparency to be two of the most important things. I have seen it slipping; it does not seem to be improving. I am on the Standing Committee on Estimates and Financial Operations, which is all about accountability and transparency. I have seen how committees work and I am very happy with that. However, when I come into this place, the rules seem to change. That is very disappointing. In the end, the questions we ask come from the public of Western Australia—I would say 90 per cent of them. It is not us asking the questions; we are just the conduit between the public of Western Australia and the government of the day. The government of the day needs to come back with straightforward answers that contain all the information that is available. If it has not got that information, it should make it available later. That happens in some cases, but on many occasions it does not.

Hon Michael Mischin; Hon Peter Collier; Hon Colin De Grussa; Hon Robin Scott; Hon Colin Tincknell; Hon Alannah MacTiernan; Hon Nick Goiran

They are the reasons I chose to speak today on this motion. I am tired of this sort of motion coming up during non-government business. I looked around the house when Hon Michael Mischin got up to speak and there were not too many members in the house, because I think they are all pretty tired of this discussion as well. That is the real truth. They are the facts. Many members have not spoken on this motion because, once again, they are just tired of it. It is going to stay this way for just under two more years unless there is an improvement in transparency and full and frank answers are given to questions.

With that, I say to government members that it is up to them. Members of the government of the day are the only ones who can change this. We will continue to ask questions. The questions will continue to come from the public of Western Australia. They are interested in what is going on. I hope that the answers and the transparency improves.

HON ALANNAH MacTIERNAN (North Metropolitan — Minister for Regional Development) [10.07 am]: We have been down this path on quite a few occasions. I understand that this is a fact of government and we will always have these debates and incidents. I sit in this house every day and look at the questions that are asked. The rigour and the culture that we have in answering questions is of a very high order. We are certainly taking very seriously our obligation and desire to provide information and transparency to members. As Hon Michael Mischin acknowledged, in a rare act of insight, some of these questions are getting extremely long. We very rarely take the step of saying, “It’s too long, put it on notice”, although sometimes it creates great difficulty in trying to provide such very detailed information in a short time. We are committed to doing this.

There will always be tension between government and opposition on these issues. We believe we are doing a much better job than was done by the previous government. One of the ironies is that with some of the things we want to disclose, for example, our biggest problem is getting the information from the Leader of the Opposition. As members know, if a document has anything to do with the cabinet process, it is subject to cabinet confidentiality. There have been a number of interesting cases when we, as a government, have written to the Leader of the Opposition and said that we would like to get access to a document, because there had been a request for it, and we have been unable to get the Leader of the Opposition to agree to release the document. Hon Martin Aldridge has a particular case —

Hon Michael Mischin: Are you asking to change the rules of cabinet-in-confidence?

Hon ALANNAH MacTIERNAN: No, we are asking for permission. We are not saying the rules should be changed, but we want to make clear what is happening on these provisions.

Hon Michael Mischin: Would you do that if we asked for something that is cabinet-in-confidence? Would you provide that information?

Hon ALANNAH MacTIERNAN: It might depend on the specific case. The member must understand that it was a process, and it is still a process, of the former government, such as on the agricultural lime routes. Hon Martin Aldridge wanted to see the business case. We wrote to Hon Mike Nahan and he declined to provide it. In order to better understand the environment that we are working in as a government, we sought to obtain some very controversial contracts, such as the TransAlta Energy arrangements for power in the Pilbara, which are highly problematic. The government is trying to deal with these issues, but we cannot get access to all the documents so that we actually understand how we ended up in this position. Similarly, there is the Metronet business case for Forrestfield. Let us understand that there are lots of complexities here. We do not see, in many respects, on the part of the opposition, when it has access and control over these documents, a great preparedness to perform better than it did when in government.

A key thrust of Hon Michael Mischin’s concerns was the lack of credit that we are giving to the previous government. I want to put on record that I think that Hon Colin Barnett was particularly gracious in many instances, when he invited us when we were in opposition. In my case, two weeks after the change of government, Hon Colin Barnett invited me to the opening of the Geraldton foreshore development. Similarly, there was the opening of the Forrest Highway.

Hon Michael Mischin: You just dashed up and cut the ribbon.

Hon ALANNAH MacTIERNAN: I was just quicker than most people—I am sorry. I just had more experience in ribbon cutting. We have always acknowledged the graciousness of Hon Colin Barnett, but I have seen that graciousness returned. I recall that when we first came into government —

Several members interjected.

The ACTING PRESIDENT (Hon Matthew Swinbourn): Minister, please resume your seat. Members, the debate will continue without interrogation or interruption across the chamber. The minister has the call; can we please listen to her contribution in silence, and respectfully?

Hon ALANNAH MacTIERNAN: Thank you, Mr Acting President.

Hon Michael Mischin; Hon Peter Collier; Hon Colin De Grussa; Hon Robin Scott; Hon Colin Tincknell; Hon Alannah MacTiernan; Hon Nick Goiran

As I was saying, when we first came into government in 2001, there was the opening of the Western Australian Maritime Museum. We invited, and gave a prominent position to, Hon Richard Court, the former Premier, absolutely recognising that this project had been very much aligned with him.

Hon Michael Mischin: Who was the Premier back then?

Hon ALANNAH MacTIERNAN: That was Geoff Gallop.

Likewise with the opening of the stadium. No-one would deny that the stadium project was very much driven by former Premier Colin Barnett, and we made sure that when the stadium was opened, Colin Barnett was invited, and the work that he did was acknowledged.

The member had some concerns about our government, particularly in the tourism area. We have a very effective Minister for Tourism, who is doing great stuff, but the member is a bit concerned that he is taking over work that was commenced by the previous government, and this is a shocking thing. I have not had an enormous amount of time to read them, but I have been flicking through media releases that I put out on the Northbridge Link project. It was only made possible by the development of the Mandurah rail line and the sinking of the Mandurah line and linking it up to the Joondalup line. This project, at the time, was steadfastly opposed by the opposition. For me, trying to get this project built was like five years on the Somme, because of the extent of the opposition. We made various announcements about the Northbridge Link and what we were doing to revitalise the Northbridge Link and, lo and behold, we see very similar statements coming out under the name of Colin Barnett a year or so later. Likewise, with the Perth Arena, we see statements put out by the former Premier Alan Carpenter, and Michelle Roberts—it is not a project that I had any direct involvement with—and then we see, sometime later, very similar phrases being used in a media release by one Colin Barnett and Hon Terry Waldron. In these media releases, there is no recognition that this project was started under the previous government.

Unfortunately, time moves on, and although there is absolutely a role for being gracious and recognising that many projects, because of their long gestation, start under previous governments, at the end of the day, the ministers responsible for completing those projects get to do the opening. This has happened many times historically. I remember once opening the duplication of the Narrows Bridge, and people saying that we had only just come into power, and we had nothing to do with it. I agreed, but said it was a great project. When the first bridge was opened, it was absolutely the work of the Bert Hawke Labor government, but it lost government just before the bridge was ready to be opened, so it was opened by David Brand, the then Liberal Premier. These things happen—grow up, get beyond it. It is going to happen, and this is the way the cycles of government work.

There has also been concern that members are not being informed of ministers' visits. Hon Alanna Clohesy has told me that, during her time in Parliament, she never once received an invitation from her fellow East Metropolitan member, Hon Donna Faragher, inviting her to an event in this area. I will do a mea culpa. There have been a couple of occasions when we have been late in giving notice of big events, and we are trying to improve. But sometimes we do not get a lot of encouragement. My office sent this email to Hon Simon O'Brien —

This is a courtesy email to advise you that the Hon Alannah MacTiernan, Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Agriculture and Food, will be in the Victoria Park electorate of South Metropolitan region on Friday 15th September 2017 visiting Bentley Technology Park.

The answer I got was —

Thanks for the warning! I shall take care to avoid the area!

Hon Alanna Clohesy: Who sent that?

Hon ALANNAH MacTIERNAN: It was Hon Simon O'Brien.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon ALANNAH MacTIERNAN: So we can tick that one off! It was wild dogs. No wonder he was scared of wild dogs!

Strangely, we were in Kalgoorlie the other day and we had invited all these people to a big aged-care facility that we were opening, and we acknowledged that the work was started under the previous government. We knew that the member for Kalgoorlie was around—he had been at previous functions, pretending that these were projects that he had invented but had nothing to do with, of course—but when we opened the Pringle Village, which is a fabulous aged-care facility for which no expense has been spared, we noticed that the member for Kalgoorlie was not there. But we did note that former National Party member Tony Crook was there. Often we see in play these blue on green wars and, presumably, Kyran O'Donnell did not want to be seen anywhere that nice things were going to be said about the National Party.

Hon Michael Mischin; Hon Peter Collier; Hon Colin De Grussa; Hon Robin Scott; Hon Colin Tincknell; Hon Alannah MacTiernan; Hon Nick Goiran

Hon Jacqui Boydell: Can you put me on the invite list, please?

Hon ALANNAH MacTIERNAN: We will put the member on the invite list.

The previous government was pretty appalling in this respect, but we will try to do better. Certainly, my view is that if we are opening infrastructure or projects are completed, we absolutely want to invite you guys and give you the opportunity. Members on this side of the house who were in this place in the term of the previous government have very strongly suggested that the number of times they have been invited to events has been fairly limited.

Very quickly, I will address the issue of Qatar. I had prepaid a private trip to Europe via Qatar. The live export issue erupted due to the absolutely studied negligence by the federal Liberal–National coalition. I decided that I would interrupt my trip for a day to go and talk to industry representatives and to work them through these issues and to do what we could to protect the reputation of Western Australia and protect the markets—and it worked.

HON NICK GOIRAN (South Metropolitan) [10.22 am]: Today the McGowan government’s obsession with secrecy has come back to haunt it. I remind members that at the beginning of this year, the government decided that its priority piece of legislation would be what we have generally referred to as the surrogacy bill. I said at the outset that the government should release the Allan report. The government pretended that the Allan report was not in its possession, only to be embarrassed during question time when it was revealed that it had had the report since 8 January. I said to the government at the time that I would not stop talking on the bill until it released that taxpayer-funded report—a report that was funded to the tune of a quarter of a million dollars. At that time, Minister Cook, a minister of the Crown and the minister responsible for this shambolic piece of legislation, told the media that the report had nothing to do with the bill before Parliament. He begrudgingly tabled the report in March this year and, lo and behold, it was immediately apparent that the report had everything to do with the bill currently before Parliament. The following month, in April, when the government decided that it wanted to ram the bill through this place and not allow members of Parliament sufficient time to digest a two-volume report funded by taxpayers to the tune of a quarter of a million dollars, I asked members to support me in my endeavour to send the bill to a parliamentary committee. The government even tried to block that motion. I note that the record shows that the motion was passed by the house 14 votes to 13, because the government once again tried to block proper scrutiny of that legislation.

Is it not very interesting that today, Thursday, 27 June 2019, that report has been tabled in Parliament? Earlier this morning, Hon Dr Sally Talbot tabled that report for the benefit of all of us. Many members in this place will not have had the opportunity to read that report yet, but let me tell them what it says. It says that this bill has unlawful provisions and that if we pass this bill, we will in effect be asking the women of Western Australia to line up at the High Court with their anti-discrimination writs and plead with the High Court over issues of discrimination, inconsistency and invalidity of Western Australian laws. Let us remember that the great Minister Cook, the member for Kwinana, said to the media and everybody else, “What is going on in the Legislative Council is very selfish. This member is taking up too much time talking.” He pretended that he did not have the report. He pretended that it had nothing to do with the matters before Parliament.

Hon Michael Mischin: False, false, false.

Hon NICK GOIRAN: It was false at every turn. He said that these were simply commonsense reforms and mere technical matters. With all due respect to Minister Cook, the parliamentary committee has now obtained independent legal opinion that confirms that the bill will create unlawful discrimination against women. As Hon Michael Mischin, the very learned shadow Attorney General, has said in this motion before the house, it is appalling that this government continues with its lack of transparency and its persistent refusal to give full, frank, timely and correct information to members of Parliament, including a report funded by taxpayers to the tune of a quarter of a million dollars. It resisted it at every turn. It had the gall at the time, and it continues to have the gall, to criticise me for the length of my speech. Because of its obsession with secrecy, it has been exposed for trying to ram through Parliament a bill that will create unlawful discrimination against women.

I hasten to add that members in this place will have differing views on the appropriateness of whether men should have access to surrogacy, and I respect the right of members to hold differing views on that. But I am confident that the significant majority of members in this place will agree that whatever law gets passed needs to be a lawful law. We cannot pass unlawful laws. We cannot pass laws that will cause women to line up at the registry of the High Court of Australia and ask it to issue their writs. It is a disgrace by this government. It has been exposed because of its obsession with secrecy, its pretence that information does not exist and, as Hon Michael Mischin has indicated, its persistent refusal to give full, frank, timely and correct information.

I find this approach by the government over the last two and a bit years particularly galling given that these comments were made by none other than Hon Sue Ellery on 17 March 2016. She said, in this place, and I quote from *Hansard* —

Hon Michael Mischin; Hon Peter Collier; Hon Colin De Grussa; Hon Robin Scott; Hon Colin Tincknell; Hon Alannah MacTiernan; Hon Nick Goiran

Accurate and timely information to Parliament and its transparent dissemination is essential. Secrecy, obfuscation, avoidance and inaccuracy, whether deliberate or not, and dishonesty, are in fact the enemies of our parliamentary democracy.

It seems to me that the McGowan Labor government is the enemy of our parliamentary democracy, because it has breached every single one of those standards that Hon Sue Ellery thought was important enough to bring to our attention on 17 March 2016. She raised a point and a set of criteria that I wholeheartedly agree with. But it seems that as soon as she arrived on the treasury bench, she forgot about all these things. She is the Leader of the House; she should be coaching and mentoring the rest of her team. She should be showing proper leadership and ensuring that government members provide full, frank, timely and correct information to Parliament, and that they are transparent at every turn. I have not forgotten the promise to the people of Western Australia prior to the last election that they would lead a government that would adhere to a gold standard in transparency. I have not forgotten that and I am sure many other members have not forgotten that either, yet when we simply ask for the tabling of a quarter-of-a-million-dollar taxpayer-funded report, the government resisted. It resisted and it accused people who tried to hold it to account of being selfish. It is now running off on another little crusade, talking about another piece of legislation, which it has not even brought to the Parliament yet, and scaremongering about other tactics that may or may not be —

Hon Alannah MacTiernan interjected.

The ACTING PRESIDENT (Hon Matthew Swinbourn): Minister! Order! Hon Nick Goiran has the call.

Hon NICK GOIRAN: There we have it—they still have not learnt. Minister, your government —

The ACTING PRESIDENT: Hon Nick Goiran will direct his inquiries through the Chair.

Hon NICK GOIRAN: Mr Acting President, I am appalled by the comments of the Minister for Regional Development. What the Minister for Regional Development has obviously forgotten is that her government tried to hide from the Western Australian Parliament a quarter-of-a-million-dollar taxpayer-funded report. The government pretended it did not exist. When it was exposed that the report had great relevance to the bill, the government then tried to oppose it going to a committee. The committee has now found that that very bill, which Hon Alannah MacTiernan is so passionate about, would actually create unlawful discrimination against women. If she wants to fire up and be agitated at anyone, she should be agitated with Minister Cook.

Hon Alannah MacTiernan: You shouldn't be a lead speaker on a vote of conscience.

The ACTING PRESIDENT: Order, minister!

Hon NICK GOIRAN: Had I not been the lead speaker on the Human Reproductive Technology and Surrogacy Legislation Amendment Bill 2018, we would have women lining up at the registry of the High Court because of the attitude of the Minister for Regional Development. She decries and is very concerned that I would be the lead speaker on a bill. Why? Are you so concerned about transparency, accountability —

Hon Alannah MacTiernan interjected.

The ACTING PRESIDENT: Minister! Order! Hon Alannah MacTiernan, the member's time is limited. Please stop interjecting.

Hon NICK GOIRAN: I associate myself very much with the remarks of Hon Michael Mischin. This government continues to show a lack of transparency. It has consistently refused to provide full, frank, timely and correct information. The surrogacy inquiry proved that.

HON MICHAEL MISCHIN (North Metropolitan — Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [10.33 am] — in reply: I rise to reply and I thank members for their contribution to this important debate. Frankly, the government's response has confirmed everything that I was concerned about. It was an example of obfuscation and deceit. In the government's response, this motion was reduced to two propositions: a lack of acknowledgment and credit was bending us out of shape, and that we did not get invitations to events. That is what it said it came down to. No; the point about the invitations was the offer of further information, which was ignored by senior advisers at the Premier's office, as an illustration of this government's failure to do its job, and its deceit, secrecy and fearfulness of providing any information at all. It was a classic example. For the Minister for Regional Development to get up and walk the debate into those two propositions simply confirmed the problem. Those members do not get it. They still like to play politics rather than be a government. As for acknowledgements and credit, that was useful, actually. It showed the difference between a Gallop government and a McGowan government. A generation ago, it had some standards, not like the good old "Burkie" days and the effort that we have just had here. An example of cluelessness is the honourable minister somehow equating her experience in dealing with a ministerial problem with the Somme—for goodness sake! It is like her efforts at the City of Vincent Anzac Day ceremony for the 100th anniversary of Gallipoli, equating her experiences with the Mandurah rail link with Gallipoli and sympathising that she understood how they felt—for goodness sake! I mean, really, that is the level of a McGowan government minister.

Extract from *Hansard*

[COUNCIL — Thursday, 27 June 2019]

p4770c-4782a

Hon Michael Mischin; Hon Peter Collier; Hon Colin De Grussa; Hon Robin Scott; Hon Colin Tincknell; Hon Alannah MacTiernan; Hon Nick Goiran

Getting back to the point, the minister raised one issue as an excuse and that was cabinet-in-confidence. Cabinet-in-confidence is an established principle and one that is not waived. Suddenly, because we do not abrogate that principle, we are at fault for being secretive. When this government in response to a question in this place that is germane to a piece of legislation it is trying to get through waives cabinet-in-confidence, I will go back and revisit the question of whether it ought to be done by the opposition when it is out of office. None of what she said about that had anything to do with the government's inability to answer a single question in this house. I have never heard a minister say, "Sorry, I can't answer your question because the opposition won't release something that is cabinet-in-confidence", yet we have had that argument put up repeatedly in legislation matters that we have been dealing with. The answer is: "Sorry, I can't tell you what the consultation was. That's cabinet-in-confidence." No, it is the government's cabinet-in-confidence. The government should start waiving it if it believes that that principle ought to be. I will wait.

Likewise, with legal professional privilege, we have examples of the Attorney General coming out and saying, "I have got legal advice that says that what the opposition says about this is rubbish." He should release it, but he will not. It allows him to mislead the public and to keep secret the basis of whether that advice even exists, let alone whether it supports his propositions. We have had examples of that over the last few days. The most recent was about the homosexual convictions legislation. Members recall that the question of whether the CEO ought to be the decision-maker was asked specifically in this place on numerous occasions. We were told, "Sorry, can't reveal that. It is covered by cabinet-in-confidence or legal professional privilege." The government will not even show the Auditor General the advice so she can decide whether that is made out. That is the level of secrecy in this place.

The question is about this government's performance and the alleged gold standard. If members on the other side think that this is okay and this is great fun, remember that what goes around comes around. At some stage, having now set this gold standard and having had brought to the house's attention this alleged gold standard and how it works in practice, those members will be visited with the same thing and they will have no cause to complain.

As for secrecy, we had set up an office block for public servants in Joondalup. It happens to be across the road from my electorate office. That was opened some six months ago by the Premier and all the rest of the "smoothie chops" ended up there, glorying in that opening. I was not even given the courtesy of being told that it was being opened. I do not care about an invitation.

Motion lapsed, pursuant to standing orders.