

TREASURER — MINISTERIAL CODE OF CONDUCT

Standing Orders Suspension — Motion

MR M. MCGOWAN (Rockingham — Leader of the Opposition) [12.24 pm] — without notice: I move —

That standing orders be suspended so far as to allow the following motion to be debated forthwith —

That this house calls on the Treasurer to resign from cabinet for his significant breaches of the Ministerial Code of Conduct.

We raised this issue yesterday in the house, and the response from the government was absolutely as weak as water. We had half an hour for the government to debate these issues, and the sum total of the time taken for the Treasurer's defence of himself and the Premier's defence of the Treasurer was 11 minutes. They had half an hour to defend their case and they took 11 minutes. The Premier's defence was absolutely half-hearted because he knows that we have the Treasurer on toast with a conflict of interest under the Ministerial Code of Conduct and that this Treasurer has behaved inappropriately. Now we are saying that in light of new information, we want to raise it again and ensure that this motion is debated. I am seeking an indication from the Leader of the House that we will have 15 minutes a side.

Standing Orders Suspension — Amendment to Motion

MR J.H.D. DAY (Kalamunda — Leader of the House) [12.26 pm]: As the Leader of the Opposition said, we did debate this issue yesterday, and so it is puzzling as to why the opposition feels the need to raise it again. However, so as not to waste time, I move —

To insert after “forthwith” —

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

Amendment put and passed.

Standing Orders Suspension — Motion, as Amended

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

Question put and passed with an absolute majority.

Motion

MR M. MCGOWAN (Rockingham — Leader of the Opposition) [12.27 pm]: I move —

That this house calls on the Treasurer to resign from cabinet for his significant breaches of the Ministerial Code of Conduct.

This is a government that does not understand standards. Here is a classic example of a minister who has confused his private interests with his public duty. He has confused his private shareholdings with his public duties. What do we see from the government? Nothing! There is no consequence for a minister behaving appallingly and owing shares in a corporation in which he participates in a decision that provides a benefit to them. That is unacceptable, and there must be a consequence for that.

Earlier this year or late last year, we saw a consequence for the Minister for Transport, but now we see no consequence for the Treasurer of Western Australia—and his offence is worse! What the government always does is this. First of all, the government denies that there is a problem. Then the Premier redefines the standards and says that the standard has to be a gross impropriety such as the minister taking money or something of that nature. Then the Premier says, “Oh, it's all okay because belatedly the minister goes and sells the shares, and therefore whatever the conflict was that happened prior is no longer relevant.” That is because on the Premier's standards the Treasurer has now sold the shares. I will give the Premier the tip: the Treasurer should have never owned the shares in the first place. He, as a minister, should never have held shares in mining companies, telecommunication companies and insurance companies, each of which has significant dealings with the Western Australian government—each one of them does.

However, I want to specifically deal with the case of the QBE Insurance shares. The original line from the Treasurer is this: “They pay a good dividend”, he said on the television, and that was his excuse for keeping the shares. Then the line turned to, “Well, I did have a meeting with them or their lobbyist to discuss compulsory third party motor vehicle insurance, but we're not outsourcing that anyway, so there's no conflict.” That is what the line was, and the Treasurer said, “That's the only dealing that QBE has with the Western Australian

Mr Mark McGowan; Mr John Day; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Colin Barnett; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Speaker; Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Bill Johnston

government.” Then we discover that the Western Australian government has very significant dealings with QBE, and the Treasurer holds shares in that corporation. The Western Australian government was the underwriter of that corporation, QBE, in home indemnity insurance. That is what we then discovered. Then we have the Treasurer’s excuse in Parliament yesterday—I wrote it down, it is so good. It is so good to listen to the Treasurer’s excuse. He said —

QBE used to be the insurer for home indemnity, but QBE pulled out of that. We, the state, insure that now. Through the Department of Commerce, QBE processes the forms and gets paid for it. The state wears the indemnity for home insurance.

“The state wears the indemnity for home insurance.” So, the Treasurer’s excuse now in relation to this massive conflict of interest is this: the state has assumed all the risk from the company in which I hold shares. That is now the Treasurer’s excuse. The Treasurer’s excuse is: we have provided a huge benefit to the company in which I hold shares, and therefore that excuses me for holding those shares. That is an outrageous excuse!

Dr M.D. Nahan: Is that all you have?

Mr M. McGOWAN: That is an outrageous excuse! Absolutely —

Dr M.D. Nahan: Pathetic!

Mr M. McGOWAN: The Treasurer is right: it is a pathetic excuse.

The SPEAKER: Treasurer, I am going to call you to order for the first time. You are going to have your turn to speak. I only want to hear the Leader of the Opposition, and when the Treasurer speaks, I only want to hear the Treasurer.

Mr M. McGOWAN: The Treasurer’s excuse now is: I do not benefit because I provided a benefit to QBE, and the state is now out of it. It is an outrageous excuse in relation to these matters!

But the Treasurer also said yesterday in the house that —

The Minister for Commerce did renew QBE’s decision to process home indemnity insurance, and that was a decision for the Minister for Commerce.

In other words, saying, “I had nothing to do with it.” That was the Treasurer’s excuse yesterday. He compounded the error and I will tell members why: it was because he misled the house in respect of this matter. We asked a question in the upper house last evening. It turns out that the extension of the 2010 heads of agreement was considered by cabinet on 20 May 2013. Who was sitting in cabinet as Minister for Finance on 20 May 2013 when the decision was made to extend the agreement that assisted QBE, and guess who was sitting in cabinet holding shares in QBE? It was none other than the Treasurer.

Several members interjected.

Mr M. McGOWAN: So, when the Treasurer said the decision was made by the Minister for Commerce, firstly he misled the house because it was not; it was made by the cabinet, according to answer C337 given by the Minister for Commerce. It was made by the cabinet itself. Then, just to confirm it, the Department of Commerce “Annual Report 2013–14” states —

Private insurers ceased underwriting home indemnity insurance in Western Australia from 1 November 2013.

A date when the Treasurer held shares and sat in cabinet. The report continues —

The state entered into an interim agreement late October 2013, with the two remaining insurers Calliden and QBE, to 100 per cent reinsure policies issued after 1 November 2013, ...

The report continues —

The Building Commission Division has worked closely with the Department of Treasury and the Insurance Commission of Western Australia to examine options for a public sector scheme, and after considerable evaluation recommended to Cabinet that the current contracts with Calliden and QBE be extended for a period of 24 months whilst the parameters of home indemnity insurance are reviewed to attract renewed private insurer interest in the medium to long term.

In other words, it was recommended to cabinet in November 2014. Who was sitting there in cabinet recommending or being part of this decision, and who no doubt signed off on this decision? It was none other than the Treasurer, who owns shares in QBE and who would have benefited from this decision.

Several members interjected.

Mr Mark McGowan; Mr John Day; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Colin Barnett; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Speaker; Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Bill Johnston

Mr M. McGOWAN: My goodness; there is no more clear-cut a case of a conflict of interest than this. This is as stark as it gets. In light of what happened to the Minister for Transport who lost the finance portfolio, it is now incumbent on the Premier to exercise the same standards in relation to this minister; otherwise, it will be said that there are no standards in this government. They slip and slide depending upon the circumstances and how much of a favoured son or daughter the individual involved is. That is what has happened here. The Treasurer has misled the house, and he has benefited from a decision of a cabinet in which he sat, and for those reasons he should go.

MS R. SAFFIOTI (West Swan) [12.35 pm]: I want to reinforce some of the points made by the Leader of the Opposition. I want to start with claims yesterday that the Department of Finance does not oversee information and communications technology anymore in this state. Again, that was another false claim by the Treasurer yesterday. In fact, it was the ICT issue that the Minister for Transport got caught out on. The Treasurer yesterday said that the Department of Finance does not oversee ICT contracts, but when we go to the Department of Finance website and see the ICT contracts, we see that what he said was again false.

Let us go through this QBE issue, because it is a key issue. QBE was one of the two insurers in home indemnity insurance from 2010 to the end of June 2013. There was an extension of those arrangements, but in October 2013 the arrangements were changed in that the state government took all the risk and basically became the reinsurer. In relation to that, it is important to note that QBE actually wanted to pull out of the home indemnity insurance market. The Economic Regulation Authority report in 2013 noted that QBE wanted to pull out because its returns were not strong enough. That is what is written in the government's own ERA report. So, basically, new arrangements were struck with QBE in late October 2013. This Treasurer was sitting around the cabinet table as Minister for Finance when new arrangements were struck with QBE. Let us compare what he said in this place yesterday with the facts. He said the new contract with QBE was simply processing home indemnity insurance, and, "It is not a reinsurance issue." What does the Department of Commerce annual report actually state? That it is a reinsurance issue, and that the state entered into an interim agreement in October 2013 with Calliden Group and QBE to 100 per cent reinsure policies. The Treasurer said yesterday that it was not a reinsurance issue. Why does the government annual report say it was a reinsurance policy issue? Again, it is a complete contradiction.

I turn to the *Government Mid-year Financial Projections Statement*—the document the Treasurer specifically has responsibility for; he signed off on it. In 2013, the midyear review notes that new arrangements were struck with QBE in which the state wholly underwrites the insurance market. That was extended a year later when the member for Riverton was Treasurer. To come into this place and say that the QBE relationship is null and void and does not exist is absolutely wrong. I will tell members why. We asked another question yesterday in the upper house about whether the government has an existing arrangement with QBE in relation to insurance matters. The minister in the upper house said yes.

The key point here is that cabinet sat around and renegotiated these agreements with QBE. The then Minister for Finance, now Treasurer, had shares in QBE. It is clear-cut. The midyear review of 2013–14, and the midyear review of 2014–15, which this Treasurer signed off on, allocated more expenditure, and money actually flowed directly to QBE—\$500 000 flowed to QBE from July 2014 to February 2015. It is clear-cut. The now Treasurer was then a minister and he was in cabinet. The cabinet was renegotiating a very complex matter with a company that the Treasurer held shares in. It was a matter that his company wanted to exit from. So, basically, the Treasurer was doing what the company had wanted.

Basically, to come into this place yesterday and say, "Look, the Department of Finance no longer has ICT responsibility", was wrong, to say that those mining companies had no operations in WA was wrong, and to say that QBE does not have any contractual relationships with this state government is wrong! The now Treasurer sat around the cabinet table when companies he had shares in were having agreements struck with the government. It is clear-cut! The Treasurer should have sold those shares within 60 days of becoming a minister; that is what he should have done. I do not know whether anyone on his side told him that, but that is what he should have done. The Treasurer is seriously conflicted. There is so much evidence to show that he was a minister, and he was Treasurer in some instances, when key decisions were made to give funding or contracts to companies in which he had shares.

MR C.J. BARNETT (Cottesloe — Premier) [12.40 pm]: I note that yesterday the Treasurer indicated that he will be selling his shares in four different companies that form part of his superannuation fund. As I said yesterday, I think it is desirable than ministers do not hold shares.

Ms M.M. Quirk interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Girrawheen!

Mr Mark McGowan; Mr John Day; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Colin Barnett; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Speaker; Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Bill Johnston

Mr C.J. BARNETT: Yesterday, and again today, opposition members have made a series of claims. They have demanded the resignation of the Treasurer, and on it goes. I want to address some of the claims that have been made by the opposition, and the Treasurer will address some of the others. Again, most of what I will say was stated by the Treasurer yesterday. The Treasurer's shareholdings are ABM Resources and Medusa Mining, which are both in the gold industry, QBE Insurance, and Telstra. First, with respect to the mining shares, as was stated yesterday, ABM Resources has several gold discoveries in the Northern Territory. That is its focus of activity. Its head office is in Alice Springs, although it does have a Perth office. ABM Resources has no tenements in Western Australia; it operates in the Northern Territory.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members!

Mr C.J. BARNETT: The claims there are completely unfounded. Beyond that, the Treasurer has no responsibility for the administration of tenements—none at all. The opposition is wrong on that one.

Several members interjected.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: Decisions on tenements do not go to cabinet. They are not cabinet decisions. Please understand that. The administration of mining is the responsibility of the Department of Mines and Petroleum and the Minister for Mines and Petroleum. Tenements do not go to cabinet. Therefore, there is no conflict; there is no interest at all in that respect. As the Treasurer explained yesterday, Medusa Mining operates solely in the Philippines. It has no mining operations in Western Australia. In fact, it has no mining operations in Australia. Therefore, there are no issues at all with those two shareholdings. As I said, mining tenements come under the responsibility of the Minister for Mines and Petroleum, not the Treasurer in any sense, and those issues do not ever come to cabinet.

I want to address the issue of Telstra. Members opposite made a lot of Telstra yesterday, but they are a bit quiet on it this morning, I have noticed. Let us talk about Telstra.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members!

Mr C.J. BARNETT: Members opposite made a big push on this yesterday, and suddenly they have changed tack—because it fell flat, didn't it?

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members!

Mr C.J. BARNETT: In September 2010, cabinet considered a joint submission from the Minister for Commerce and the Minister for Regional Development on a royalties for regions funding allocation of \$40 million over three years for a regional mobile communications project. That is a deserving and good project. There are a lot of gaps, and for the convenience of people, for safety on our roads—a host of reasons—building more mobile phone towers around the state is an excellent thing. The intention, as I say, was to address the gaps and establish as many mobile phone towers as possible. It was very clear when cabinet considered that matter that that project was subject to a competitive tender process. The submission to cabinet did not refer to Telstra in any sense. It was a submission to put money into a process in which there would be a competitive tender. Yes, Telstra was one of the three companies that bid for that work, and Telstra won that work.

Mr M. McGowan interjected.

The SPEAKER: Leader of the Opposition!

Mr C.J. BARNETT: No; listen. The awarding of that contract was the responsibility of the Minister for Commerce, it was done according to the procurement rules of government, and it was settled by Commerce. It did not come back to cabinet. The Treasurer and minister at the time had no involvement, other than to agree that we would spend as a government \$40 million on mobile phone towers. The process was then followed, absolutely appropriately, by Commerce.

Several members interjected.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: Members opposite giggle! That is because they would not have done that.

Mrs M.H. Roberts: You're a hypocrite!

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I am a hypocrite, am I? The standards of this government, compared with those of members opposite —

Several members interjected.

Mr Mark McGowan; Mr John Day; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Colin Barnett; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Speaker; Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Bill Johnston

Withdrawal of Remark

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Mr Speaker, I withdraw that comment, because I realise that it is unparliamentary.

The SPEAKER: Thank you.

Debate Resumed

Mr C.J. BARNETT: There is another big point that members opposite tried to make yesterday. They held up a media release, which had on it photos of the Treasurer and the Minister for Commerce, about a further budget allocation of \$45 million for the mobile phone towers. Again, that was handled in the same proper way, and a bidding process took place. If they had taken the time or been honest enough, they would have seen that every budget press release had a photo of the Treasurer on it—one was in arts, one was in science, one was in water, and whatever. That is standard practice. Members opposite tried to imply yesterday that this was the Treasurer's decision. It was not the Treasurer's decision. It was not a cabinet decision.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Warnbro, I call you for the first time. Member for Girrawheen, I call you for the first time. The opposition spoke for 12 minutes, and I called one person. I want the same courtesy extended the other way.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: The opposition tried to build an argument around this media release. There were probably a dozen media releases with the Treasurer's photograph on them, along with that of the responsible minister. That is standard budget practice, because the Treasurer has overall responsibility for the budget. The opposition's argument yesterday was that the Telstra matter went to cabinet, and the Treasurer held shares and he signed off on that. They are wrong, because the Telstra matter never went to cabinet. The only thing that went to cabinet was the decision to fund the program and to leave the Department of Commerce, according to the normal rules of government contracting, to run a tender —

Ms R. Saffioti interjected.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: No, I do not want to hear from the member for West Swan.

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

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Willagee, I call you to order for the first time. Member for Albany, I call you to order for the first time.

Ms M.M. Quirk interjected

The SPEAKER: Member for Girrawheen!

Mr C.J. BARNETT: The claim was made yesterday that the Treasurer had sat at the table when cabinet considered a contract with Telstra. That did not happen. Cabinet made a decision to fund the mobile phone tower program. The responsibility lay obviously with the Minister for Regional Department from a policy point of view but the handling of that contract was done through the Department of Commerce. The tender process was run by Commerce, Telstra won it and the contract was awarded. It did not come back to cabinet. Members opposite are 100 per cent wrong on that.

Mr B.S. Wyatt: So why is he selling his shares?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: For goodness' sake! How many more times do I have to explain that? I will leave it to the Treasurer to comment on the QBE Insurance issue. But, on those issues, opposition members are wrong in what they said. Opposition members did not do their research. They held up one press release out of 12 and claimed it was the Treasurer's decision. It was not; it was a Department of Commerce tender.

Mr F.M. Logan interjected.

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

DR M.D. NAHAN (Riverton — Treasurer) [12.48 pm]: I want to reiterate what the Premier said. The first is the accusation about Telstra. When the member for Cannington waved that document, it was clear that my picture was on it. I could not read the detail, and I was reluctant to respond to it, because usually everything he says is wrong, but I went back and looked at it. It was a budget statement about the allocation of \$45 million for a tender to build mobile phone towers. It had no reference to Telstra, contrary to what the member for Cannington claimed in this house. It was allocated to the Department of Commerce. The Department of Commerce, through tender arrangements, put out a tender, and Telstra evidently won that contract. On the issue

Mr Mark McGowan; Mr John Day; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Colin Barnett; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Speaker; Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Bill Johnston

about allocation, as the Premier said, cabinet does not oversee tenders. Those are administered by the Department of Commerce. They went out to a competitive tender and Telstra won. I had no input into the tender process, which is appropriate, and no knowledge about who was going to win the tender and who the bidders were for that tender. The parade yesterday of press releases and whatnot was just a facade. That highlights the issue here. This is a muckraking exercise.

I now go back to the mining companies. None of those mining companies have any tenements in Western Australia.

Mr W.J. Johnston interjected.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: They have none—the opposition claimed otherwise, but they have none. By the way, this is my self-managed super fund. The listing of those shares was transparent to everybody. It did not take the shadow minister for accountability very much effort. She only had to go to the Clerk's office and get a photocopy of the record. That is all she did. First the opposition went around here and told everybody that there had been a conspiracy, but it did not check to see where the assets were. There is no substance to this claim about Telstra, Medusa Mining and ABM Resources. QBE was one of two private insurers for home indemnity—the government has a rule that there must be household indemnity insurance—but they were not regulated by the government. In 2013 or thereabouts—probably before that—QBE announced that it was pulling out of, exiting, the market, and it did. It no longer insures houses for household indemnity insurance in this state. In 2013 cabinet decided that it would pick up the liability, not for QBE but for households. QBE left the market. We are not underwriting QBE; we are underwriting Western Australian households. That is what is in the books, that is what is transparent and that is what has been discussed here. It is a major issue. The Western Australian government now carries that insurance. When the government entered into that in 2013, rather than starting the paperwork again, the Department of Commerce hired QBE and Calliden Group, which was the other insurer, to levy the fees and process the claims. That is it. The opposition claims repeatedly that we underwrote it—that is false.

Mr P. Papalia interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Warnbro, I call you to order for the second time.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: The opposition repeatedly claims that we were underwriting QBE's liabilities—that is wrong. In 2013 the Western Australian government assumed the liabilities. QBE had a contract with the building authority to collect the fees and pay that—that is it. The Department of Commerce decided to contract that out—that is it—and it was reimbursed for the cost. The Economic Regulation Authority put it in a report at the request of the Treasurer and laid this out in full. Of course, the member for West Swan can distort it to say that QBE may leave the market, which it did. It is not in the market. It was in the market as a private enterprise charging households with no government regulation or involvement, but it exited the market. How can that be a conflict of interest? QBE is no longer in the house indemnity insurance market in Western Australia. Before that it was selling insurance to households in a competitive market and the government was not yet an intermediary. What is the problem? In 2013 the Department of Commerce signed an agreement for it to collect the fees and pay the payouts. It had an option to renew, which it did under the option in 2014. It renewed an existing contract. The opposition is saying that the Treasurer should go to the Department of Commerce and get involved in contracts. Maybe that is what members opposite would do, but I do not. It is the height of hypocrisy for members opposite to lecture me or anybody on this side of the house about propriety. Before coming to government, I was a public servant when Brian Burke and Julian Grill reigned supreme and were parachuting their minions into the public service one after another.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members!

Dr M.D. NAHAN: I came back to Western Australia when "WA Inc Mark II" was in full run. We saw one disgraced minister after another, not by leadership on the part of members opposite, but by the Corruption and Crime Commission. The member for West Swan worked for a series of Western Australian opposition leaders and Premiers and whatnot. She worked for a slew of them as a permanent public servant from Treasury to the office. Shortly before the 2008 election, when she knew she had a safe seat, she shifted over and got a \$178 000 payout, yet she is sitting there lecturing me! When she left government she worked for, I believe, the Dockers for a while.

Point of Order

Mr Mark McGowan; Mr John Day; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Colin Barnett; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Speaker; Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Bill Johnston

Mr P. PAPALIA: Standing order 92 states that imputations of improper motives and personal reflections on a member of this place can be made only through a substantive motion. It is clear that the Treasurer is doing that. I request that you call him to order.

The SPEAKER: Carry on, minister.

Debate Resumed

Several members interjected.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: There was!

Mrs L.M. Harvey: There goes the pointy finger again!

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Yes, here we go! It is just a statement of fact. There was no conflict of interest.

Ms R. Saffioti interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order, member for West Swan!

Mr N.W. Morton interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Forrestfield!

Ms R. Saffioti interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for West Swan! Treasurer, through the Chair.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Despite the opposition's argument, there was no conflict of interest with Telstra. There is no substance to the opposition's argument. There was no conflict in the mining share. It does not own mining tenements in this state and one of them does not own them in this country. There is no conflict of interest with QBE. Members opposite have not made a case. They are just hopping up and down. Yesterday, I announced a major review of the electricity industry.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON (Cunnington) [12.57 pm]: The problem with the Treasurer is that he does not get his story straight from one day to the next. On Monday he said —

Several members interjected.

Mr C.J. Barnett: "Mr Sleaze".

The SPEAKER: Order, members! I do not want to hear a wall of noise.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: On Monday he said —

Withdrawal of Remark

Mr M. McGOWAN: I call on the Premier to withdraw the statement he just made about a member of this house. It is completely and utterly unparliamentary to refer to a member of this house as "Mr Sleaze" and I ask that he withdraw.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I withdraw.

Debate Resumed

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: On Monday the Treasurer said that QBE has no contracts, but today he said that it only has contracts. He said that Telstra does not have any deals with the government, yet it has million-dollar deals with the government. Let me go back to Bob Kucera. Bob Kucera resigned when he was the Minister for Sport and Recreation not because he gave money to Alinta, but because he made a decision that may have given money to Alinta. That is exactly what has happened here. The Treasurer made a decision that allowed Telstra to get money; that is exactly the same as what happened with Bob Kucera.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Wanneroo, I call you to order for the first time. I do not want to hear from anybody else.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: Bob Kucera sat in cabinet and participated in a decision that may have benefited Alinta—it did not benefit Alinta, but it may have. The Treasurer sat in cabinet and made a decision that may have benefited Telstra. He was a part owner of Telstra. His situation is exactly the same as that of Hon Bob Kucera. The difference is that Bob Kucera was honourable because he came into this chamber and resigned. They are exactly the same circumstances; there is absolutely and utterly no difference between what Kucera did with respect to Alinta —

The SPEAKER: Time, member!

Extract from Hansard
[ASSEMBLY — Wednesday, 25 March 2015]
p2153b-2160a

Mr Mark McGowan; Mr John Day; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Colin Barnett; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Speaker; Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Paul Papalia; Mr Bill Johnston

Division

Question put and division taken with the following result —

Ayes (20)

Ms L.L. Baker	Mr W.J. Johnston	Mr P. Papalia	Mr C.J. Tallentire
Dr A.D. Buti	Mr F.M. Logan	Mr J.R. Quigley	Mr P.C. Tinley
Mr R.H. Cook	Mr M. McGowan	Ms M.M. Quirk	Mr P.B. Watson
Ms J. Farrer	Ms S.F. McGurk	Mrs M.H. Roberts	Mr B.S. Wyatt
Ms J.M. Freeman	Mr M.P. Murray	Ms R. Saffioti	Mr D.A. Templeman (<i>Teller</i>)

Noes (34)

Mr P. Abetz	Ms E. Evangel	Mr S.K. L'Estrange	Mr D.C. Nalder
Mr F.A. Alban	Mr J.M. Francis	Mr R.S. Love	Mr J. Norberger
Mr C.J. Barnett	Mrs G.J. Godfrey	Mr W.R. Marmion	Mr D.T. Redman
Mr I.M. Britza	Mr B.J. Grylls	Mr J.E. McGrath	Mr A.J. Simpson
Mr G.M. Castrilli	Dr K.D. Hames	Ms L. Mettam	Mr M.H. Taylor
Mr V.A. Catania	Mrs L.M. Harvey	Mr P.T. Miles	Mr T.K. Waldron
Mr M.J. Cowper	Mr C.D. Hatton	Ms A.R. Mitchell	Mr A. Krsticevic (<i>Teller</i>)
Ms M.J. Davies	Mr A.P. Jacob	Mr N.W. Morton	
Mr J.H.D. Day	Dr G.G. Jacobs	Dr M.D. Nahan	

Pair

Mr D.J. Kelly

Mr I.C. Blayney

Question thus negatived.