

Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Eric Ripper; Mr Christian Porter; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Joe Francis; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr David Templeman; Mr John Quigley; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr John Hyde

---

**MEMBER FOR CANNINGTON, COMMENTS OF 16 SEPTEMBER —  
REFERRAL TO PROCEDURE AND PRIVILEGES COMMITTEE**

*Standing Orders Suspension — Motion*

**MR R.F. JOHNSON (Hillarys — Leader of the House)** [2.58 pm] — without notice: I move —

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

That this house refers the comments made by the member for Cannington in this house on 16 September 2010 that —

The member for Wanneroo can explain himself, and other members can explain why they have had their names expunged from the Corruption and Crime Commission's records.

to the Procedure and Privileges Committee to —

- (1) advise the house whether or not such comments amount to a breach of parliamentary privilege or otherwise unparliamentary conduct; and
- (2) report to the Assembly at the earliest possible opportunity, but no later than 21 October 2010.

It is very serious to move a motion to refer any conduct or comments by a member of this house to the Procedure and Privileges Committee; we do not do so lightly.

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

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Midland!

**Mr R.F. JOHNSON:** The reason —

**Mrs M.H. Roberts:** You would never send that to privileges for investigation, would you?

**The SPEAKER:** There is a serious matter in front of the house, and I hope every member in this place gets a chance to hear what the Leader of the House is saying in support of that motion at this point. The Leader of the House has the call.

**Mr R.F. JOHNSON:** Mr Speaker, I intend to be brief, I assure you and the house, because I would prefer this to go to a vote and go to the Procedure and Privileges Committee so that it can make a decision in relation to what is a very serious matter.

**Mr M. McGowan:** You should have given me some notice—five minutes' notice!

**Mr R.F. JOHNSON:** I gave you the same notice she gave me!

**The SPEAKER:** Members!

**Mr R.F. JOHNSON:** We were hoping that the member for Cannington would actually stand up after question time and apologise for the defamatory comments he made against another member specifically, and other members unspecifically, on this side of the house in relation what could amount to a criminal act. That is why we wanted to give the member for Cannington the opportunity to be able to do that. He stood and said that he had corrected *Hansard*—he had corrected *Hansard*! Mr Speaker, *Hansard* is the correct version of what happens in this house, verbatim, and members make note of what people say. Just because, afterwards, a member may think, "I'd better change that. I could get into trouble for that; I'll change that", that is not an excuse. I want the privileges committee to listen to the tape, because it will hear the truth.

Several members interjected.

**Mr R.F. JOHNSON:** It will hear the truth, the same as I, and other members on this side of house, did.

Several members interjected.

**The SPEAKER:** Thank you, members; Member for Warnbro!

**Mr R.F. JOHNSON:** Mr Speaker, there could be a very simple outcome: if the privileges committee looks at this matter, it can consider, indeed, whether the *Hansard* has been improperly changed, can I say, because that is not the purpose of trying to correct *Hansard*. Members can correct minor issues, not a serious issue like this—not a serious issue of defamation, Mr Speaker. That is why we on this side of the house believe that this should go to the privileges committee.

Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Eric Ripper; Mr Christian Porter; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Joe Francis; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr David Templeman; Mr John Quigley; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr John Hyde

---

I am not going to take any more than about another minute, because I and members on this side of the house want this to happen. We wanted to give the member an opportunity; he forwent that opportunity. The member has made many outrageous comments in this house before now —

**Mr M. McGowan:** This is going to backfire!

**Mr R.F. JOHNSON:** — and if we allow this sort of behaviour to continue, then the conduct and the comments allowed in this house will deteriorate into something we cannot tolerate. It is a very simple motion; basically, the motion is to suspend standing orders so that we can then debate the substantive motion.

**MR E.S. RIPPER (Belmont — Leader of the Opposition)** [3.02 pm]: The state Parliamentary Labor Party will support this motion because there is nothing for it to be ashamed of on this side, there is nothing for it to hide, and the member for Cannington has done nothing wrong and an inquiry will reveal that.

What I want to talk about, before I go into some detail about the member for Cannington's position, is the absolute hypocrisy of the government. Last week, for example, the member for Jandakot alleged that the member for West Swan had leaked —

Several members interjected.

**The SPEAKER:** Take a seat. Member for Victoria Park, I am formally going to call you to order for the second time today. Leader of the Opposition, what we have here, in fact, is a motion to suspend standing orders. We are not talking to the substantive motion; we are simply talking to the motion to suspend standing orders.

**Mr E.S. Ripper:** Mr Speaker, I got, perhaps, a little overexcited. I will support the suspension motion, and then I will support the substantive motion, but in some detail.

**The SPEAKER:** Members, as this is a motion without notice to suspend standing orders, I will need an absolute majority for it to succeed. Members, I also provide the following: if I do hear a dissentient voice, I will be required to divide the house.

Question put and passed with an absolute majority.

**The SPEAKER:** Members, I provide further information that I have counted the assembly and have satisfied myself that there is an absolute majority present. I declare the motion carried. The Leader of the House has the call.

*Motion*

**MR R.F. JOHNSON (Hillarys — Leader of the House)** [3.04 pm]: I move —

That this house refers the comments made by the member for Cannington in this house on 16 September 2010, that —

The member for Wanneroo can explain himself, and other members can explain why they have had their names expunged from the Corruption and Crime Commission's records.

to the Procedure and Privileges Committee to —

- (1) advise the house whether or not such comments amount to a breach of parliamentary privilege or otherwise unparliamentary conduct; and
- (2) report to the Assembly at the earliest possible opportunity, but no later than 21 October 2010.

As I said when I moved the suspension motion, this is a very serious motion to be moved in this house and it should not be moved lightly. Certainly we on this side of the house have deliberated for some time about whether we should bring this on. We actually wanted to give the member for Cannington an opportunity to apologise for those comments because we believed that that was the very least he could do. But he chose not, and instead he told the house that he had corrected *Hansard*—he had corrected *Hansard*!

**Mr P. Papalia:** Maybe Hansard got it wrong.

**Mr R.F. JOHNSON:** Obviously he corrected it when he must have realised that what he said went too far and was defamatory.

**Mr P. Papalia:** Or Hansard got it wrong.

**Mr R.F. JOHNSON:** Oh, Hansard got it wrong!

Several members interjected.

**Extract from *Hansard***

[ASSEMBLY - Thursday, 23 September 2010]

p7274b-7289a

Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Eric Ripper; Mr Christian Porter; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Joe Francis; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr David Templeman; Mr John Quigley; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr John Hyde

---

**Mr R.F. JOHNSON:** It is: “Anybody but me; anybody’s at fault but me!” What a stupid comment; I will not go any further.

I do not intend to waste the time of this house because I think a very, very serious motion has been moved, and, as Leader of the House, it is my job to move it from this side of house. But I would be very interested to see what the Leader of the Opposition has to say when he supports this motion. Is the Leader of the Opposition supporting this motion?

**Mr E.S. Ripper:** Yes.

**Mr R.F. JOHNSON:** He is; so we do not need to spend too much time, because I think it is important that this goes through to the privileges committee.

**Mr E.S. Ripper:** No; we’ll spend as much as time as necessary to explain what has gone on.

**Mr R.F. JOHNSON:** I think it is important in areas like this, when there are allegations of —

**Mr E.S. Ripper:** Let’s see if you want to gag this debate.

**Mr B.S. Wyatt:** Yes; gag your own debate.

**The SPEAKER:** Members!

**Mr R.F. JOHNSON:** — serious misconduct, and unparliamentary comments that breach privilege. I just wonder whether the member for Cannington would have said the same things outside the house. I think that is very unlikely. We have seen a history of members on the other side making comments in this house under parliamentary privilege that they have not had the guts to say outside the house. That gives this house a bad name. That is why we believe on this side of the house —

**Mr B.S. Wyatt:** Have you said the same thing to the member for Jandakot?

**Mr R.F. JOHNSON:** — that this should go to the privileges committee so that it can investigate it. If the committee comes back and says it does not believe that the member for Cannington contravened the privileges of this house or the conduct of any member of Parliament in this house, we will accept that. But the situation that we are looking for is to have that particular committee sit down, call the member for Cannington in, call in any other members it wishes to who heard exactly what he said, call in the *Hansard* recordings, and look and see where the alterations have been made in *Hansard*. It is quite clear that the member for Cannington has altered those initial records of *Hansard*; he said he had corrected them—he said he had corrected them! He had corrected them in his mind, but to any other people —

**Ms R. Saffioti:** We all correct them.

**Mr R.F. JOHNSON:** Of course he has altered them; he has altered them.

**Mr B.S. Wyatt:** When you sit down, your draft *Hansard* will roll up.

**Mr E.S. Ripper:** Your *Hansard* must need considerable correction!

**The SPEAKER:** Everybody in this place will have an opportunity to have their say if they want, but I would prefer that it happened in a more orderly fashion than it is happening at the moment. The Leader of the House has the call.

**Mr R.F. JOHNSON:** The only times that we are supposed, as members, to correct *Hansard* is when a word has not been used properly or there is some ambiguity of the meaning of what the member is trying to say. They are the benefits that we get from *Hansard*. It is not a function that members of Parliament should expect *Hansard* to change very important comments that a member makes if it does not suit the member’s purpose. That would be totally wrong. I can tell members that these are all my *Hansards*—I do not even read them. I do not change them. I do not even read them.

Several members interjected.

**Mr R.F. JOHNSON:** I do not even read them; I have faith in *Hansard*. If there is an area that I might have said that is not quite correct, then I stand by that and I have to wear that, and so should other members, particularly when they make serious comments about misconduct of other members in this place—criminal conduct very often, as we have heard many times in the past.

All we suggest by this motion is that this particular issue, which we take very seriously, infers that a member of Parliament has possibly committed a criminal act. That accusation is totally unacceptable, unless the member making the accusation has substantive evidence that can be put forward that the other member has done what is

Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Eric Ripper; Mr Christian Porter; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Joe Francis; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr David Templeman; Mr John Quigley; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr John Hyde

---

suggested. I am very pleased that the Leader of the Opposition has agreed to this motion, and I would hope that the privileges committee will be able to look thoroughly into all that has been said in the past on this particular area so that it can either find that the member for Cannington has erred in his parliamentary duty by his conduct and comments, or not. It is very simple.

**MR E.S. RIPPER (Belmont — Leader of the Opposition)** [3.10 pm]: The state Parliamentary Labor Party supports this motion. We believe that there is nothing for the state Parliamentary Labor Party to be ashamed of with regard to these events. We strongly believe that the member for Cannington has done nothing wrong. I warn the government that this manoeuvre has the potential to seriously backfire on government members. I will provide an explanation that the government will not want to hear and that it will not enjoy hearing. There is an element of hypocrisy in what the government does. Only last week the member for Jandakot accused the member for West Swan of leaking the 2004 budget. That was an accusation —

**Mr J.M. Francis:** What did I do straight away?

**Mr E.S. RIPPER:** I will come to that.

Several members interjected.

**The SPEAKER:** This is an opportunity for the Leader of the Opposition to talk to the motion. It is not an opportunity for other members to talk to it.

**Mr E.S. RIPPER:** That was an accusation of a criminal act. As I said by way of interjection at the time, there was a Corruption and Crime Commission inquiry into the leaking of the 2004 budget. The member for Jandakot, to his credit, approached me outside the house. I will quote what he said.

**Ms R. Saffioti:** He never approached me.

**Mr E.S. RIPPER:** He approached me. I will paraphrase his comments. I would not normally paraphrase a conversation that I have had with a member outside this chamber. The member for Jandakot approached me and said that he had not realised that there was a CCC inquiry into the matter. I think he said “I’m going to back off from this.”

**Mr J.M. Francis:** I apologised.

Several members interjected.

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Swan Hills, I do not need to hear from you.

**Ms R. Saffioti:** What did he say?

**The SPEAKER:** Member for West Swan, there is a process occurring in this place at the moment. The only person I want to hear from is the Leader of the Opposition. I appreciate and accept that the Leader of the Opposition sought an interjection from the member for Jandakot. I give the call to the Leader of the Opposition.

**Mr E.S. RIPPER:** That was the nature of the interaction that occurred when the member for Jandakot made his accusation in this house of what amounted to an accusation of criminal conduct by the member for West Swan. As the member for West Swan said by way of interjection, it would have been far preferable if the member for Jandakot had approached her directly to make that statement or apology. It would have been even better if he had done so in the house. He did at least approach me and make that comment. While the member for West Swan has a justified sense of grievance, we on this side of the house have not taken the issue further. We have not sought to bring the member for Jandakot before the Procedure and Privileges Committee. We accept that there is theatre in Parliament and that members make strong statements in Parliament that they sometimes regret when things have calmed down.

I do not know what the government has against the member for Cannington. It clearly decided to target him after he became an elected member of Parliament. The member for Cannington is an excellent member of Parliament. He is a strong representative of his electorate and he is making increasingly substantial contributions to parliamentary debate. He is a very valued colleague on this side of the house.

I turn to the matter before us. The section of *Hansard* that is quoted in the motion reads —

The member for Wanneroo can explain himself, and other members can explain why they have had their names expunged from the CCC’s records.

I do not have the full *Hansard* in front of me. However, reading that sentence does not lead me to conclude that the member for Cannington has made an allegation against the member for Wanneroo. In the *Hansard* from which the government has quoted there is a comma and then the relevant statement is “and other members can explain why they have had their names expunged from the CCC’s records”. That is not an accusation against the member for Wanneroo. None of us has the relevant *Hansard* in front of us. We have to go back to the full

Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Eric Ripper; Mr Christian Porter; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Joe Francis; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr David Templeman; Mr John Quigley; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr John Hyde

---

context to see what the member for Wanneroo was saying and doing at the time before we can understand what the member for Cannington was referring to when he made that statement about the member for Wanneroo. On the evidence that the government has presented to the house, I do not think his words amount to an accusation against the member for Wanneroo.

What I do know and what the Procedure and Privileges Committee will now be required to investigate is that there is an allegation that the member for Carine was mentioned in a CCC transcript and that the CCC transcript was later changed to delete the name of the member for Carine. The government has inadvertently set off an inquiry into the member for Carine because the Procedure and Privileges Committee cannot possibly investigate the validity of the statements made by the member for Cannington without calling in the CCC and talking to it about what happened with its transcript, why the member for Carine's name was removed, what correspondence was entered into between the member for Carine and the CCC and what the lawyers said to each other. All that now has to be investigated. Government members can understand why we on this side of the house support the motion. I thank the government for commissioning a parliamentary committee investigation into one of its own members, the member for Carine. It is an interesting story. Why would a CCC transcript be changed? How did that happen? Is it a bit like changing the *Hansard*? How does it happen?

I met with the member for Cannington and asked him about his statement. I asked him about his statement that he corrected the *Hansard*. The Leader of the House is being outrageous in his statements about *Hansard* corrections. We receive duplicates of our speeches so that we can correct a mishearing or a construction that misrepresents what we say. We cannot change what we said, but if the construction misrepresents what we have said or there has been a mishearing, we can seek to correct it and *Hansard* can decide whether or not to accept the correction. Sometimes *Hansard* refers to the recording of a debate. The member for Cannington has advised me that the correction he made—I am looking at him to make sure that I have this right—was to the words “and other members”. The member for Cannington told me that the correction he made was to change that to “and another member”.

Several members interjected.

**The SPEAKER:** Order, members!

**Mr C.C. Porter:** Let him answer. What did you say?

**Mr W.J. Johnston:** I said “and another member”.

**Mr E.S. RIPPER:** The words recorded in *Hansard* are “and other members”. The correction that the member for Cannington wished to have was “and another member”. Anyone can see how that could happen very easily. The words “and other members” and the words “and another member” are very similar in sound but not precisely the same in meaning. That is the correction that the member for Cannington was talking about in his statement.

I ask government members to think about the explanation that I have given and the stupidity of what they are proposing. If they want to go into Corruption and Crime Commission records and who had their names expunged from CCC records —

**Mr R.F. Johnson:** We don't have to.

**Mr E.S. RIPPER:** They do have to. They absolutely have to do that; and, if they do not do it, it will be a kangaroo court, and it certainly will not be accepted by this side. The government has set up this inquiry, and now it has to go to the CCC matters. If the government does not go to the facts, how can it possibly judge the contribution to the debate of the member for Cannington? The government cannot judge it in isolation. It has to listen to his explanation, and then it has to check his explanation. To check his explanation, it will have to call the member for Carine. It will have to do that. If it does not do that, there will be no legitimacy to the inquiry whatsoever. The government will have to call in the CCC investigators. It will have to do that; otherwise there will be no legitimacy whatsoever. On this side of the house, we will be watching the conduct of that inquiry very, very closely. We will be insisting that it be a full inquiry and that it go to all the facts and all the issues, and we will be insisting that those issues be ventilated here in the house. We can insist. The inquiry may not deliver that. But we will certainly be making our comments along those lines.

I repeat: I have spoken to the member for Cannington. I believe that he has nothing to be ashamed of—nothing to hide. I believe that an inquiry will reveal the member for Cannington to have acted properly and in accordance with parliamentary requirements. Therefore, I have no fear about where this inquiry is going, and I have no hesitation in committing the state Parliamentary Labor Party to supporting this motion and the inquiry. However, I warn the government that it has bitten off more than it can chew. It has now commissioned an inquiry into one of its own members, and it cannot back off from that, having moved this motion.

Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Eric Ripper; Mr Christian Porter; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Joe Francis; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr David Templeman; Mr John Quigley; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr John Hyde

---

**MR C.C. PORTER (Bateman — Attorney General)** [3.21 pm]: I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his input and for his warnings. When we look at this matter—I am just looking now at a corrected version —

**Mr E.S. Ripper:** You've shown your political inexperience, Attorney General; that's what you've shown.

**Mr C.C. PORTER:** I will last longer than the Leader of the Opposition.

**Mr E.S. Ripper:** What an arrogant man.

**Mr C.C. PORTER:** When we look at *Hansard*—this is the corrected version of *Hansard*—we see that that Deputy Speaker said —

Member for Cannington, come back to the point.

The member for Cannington said —

I am exactly at that point. You should certainly draw me to the provision we are dealing with, Mr Deputy Speaker. We are discussing accountability. It is an issue that the Liberal Party has great trouble dealing with. We have seen that. The member for Wanneroo can explain himself, and other members can explain why they have had their names expunged from the CCC's records.

Leaving aside just for a moment the contention of the Leader of the Opposition that the comma means that that is not in any way an accusation against the member for Wanneroo that he managed to have his name expunged from a CCC record, which is, in my view, a ridiculous statement, and taking into account what the Leader of the Opposition said with respect to the member for Cannington's explanation, as I understand it, it is this. I think we all start from the position that accusing someone, whoever it may be in this place, of having orchestrated the removal of his or her name from a record of the CCC is a very serious allegation. Indeed, what is most interesting about this, Leader of the Opposition, is that whomever the member for Cannington says he made that allegation of, he did not make it by way of substantive motion, which is precisely what we would expect —

**Mr E.S. Ripper:** I'll tell you what's interesting about that, Attorney General. It is that no Liberal member dared to take the point of order. That's what's interesting about that.

**Mr C.C. PORTER:** And, again, it was not moved by way of substantive motion, which is precisely what we would expect with an allegation of that level of seriousness. But, as I understand it, what the Leader of the Opposition is now saying, based on advice that he has received from the member for Cannington, is this: firstly, that what I have just read from the corrected version of *Hansard* is not, according to the member for Cannington, what he actually said; secondly, that he attempted to make a correction to *Hansard*, based on his understanding of what he actually said, and somehow that correction did not make its way into —

**Mr E.S. Ripper:** It might not have been accepted by *Hansard*.

**Mr C.C. PORTER:** I am just saying that somehow that correction did not make its way into the version that I have just —

**Mr E.S. Ripper:** The correction was put in. *Hansard* may have decided that its version was the correct version.

**Mr C.C. PORTER:** Yes, I accept that that is one of the reasons why it may not have made its way into the version of *Hansard* that I have just read.

**Mr E.S. Ripper:** Good. I'm glad you accept that.

**Mr C.C. PORTER:** Okay. I thank the Leader of the Opposition.

So we have a situation in which the Leader of the Opposition maintains that this is not what the member for Cannington said. Fair enough. In fact, that might be a very good reason for it to go to the Procedure and Privileges Committee, because it can listen to the tape recording and make a determination as to what was actually said. However, I would raise this: what the Leader of the Opposition has said is that “and other members” was actually “another member”; so he says that “and other” turned into “another”. But when we read what that would have been, it is “can explain himself, another member can explain”. That sounds very odd to me—“and another member” or “another member”. But we will have the Procedure and Privileges Committee look at that matter.

**Mr E.S. Ripper:** There's a further line of argument, Attorney General, which is that the statement in *Hansard* does not, even as it is, implicate the member for Wanneroo.

**The SPEAKER:** Take a seat, Attorney General. We have a motion in front of this place, Leader of the Opposition. You have had a chance to talk to it. Other people who want to make a substantial contribution are also welcome to do so. In a formal sense, the Attorney General has the call.

**Mr C.C. PORTER:** I will read that sentence out again. First of all, the version that appears in *Hansard* states —

Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Eric Ripper; Mr Christian Porter; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Joe Francis; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr David Templeman; Mr John Quigley; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr John Hyde

---

The member for Wanneroo can explain himself, and other members can explain why they have had their names expunged from the CCC's records.

The contention now is that what the member for Cannington actually said but which never found its way into this version of *Hansard* is —

The member for Wanneroo can explain himself, and another members can explain why they have had their names expunged from the CCC's records.

It does sound like a very odd form of words to me. Nevertheless, we will listen to the tape. Surely the important point here is that whether or not the member for Cannington made the allegation against the member for Wanneroo, all the parliamentary members of the Liberal Party or the member for Carine, a completely unsubstantiated allegation has been made against someone. It seems a rather bizarre thing, when the member is offered the opportunity to apologise and withdraw, to say, "Well, in actual fact I didn't mean to accuse the member for Wanneroo of something as serious as this; it was someone else." What is interesting also is that in the personal explanation that the member for Cannington gave, he said that he had mentioned a number of times the member for Carine in and about that debate. What fascinates me is that looking at the pages before and after that particular statement that is now in question, there is no mention —

**Mr P. Papalia** interjected.

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Warnbro, I formally call you for the first time. I suggest to you, member for Warnbro, that if you want to make a contribution, you get to your feet and seek the call. I formally call you for the first time.

**Mr C.C. PORTER:** I cannot see in the interchange that is involved in and about that statement that is now in contention either that the member for Carine is quoted in *Hansard* at all or that he is mentioned at all by the member for Cannington.

**Mr T.R. Buswell:** He might not have even been in the house.

**Mr C.C. PORTER:** Indeed. So it will be very interesting to hear that tape recording of the proceedings that went on at that time. At its essence here, we have a situation in which an incredibly serious allegation is made. Based on the face of that statement, it appears to me that the plain and ordinary meaning of that statement is that the member for Wanneroo somehow managed to have his name removed from some unidentified CCC report or document that would have otherwise represented something adverse to him. Now what we have from the member for Cannington is some explanation that the person that he directed that statement towards was not the member for Wanneroo but the member for Carine. But, again, it is a statement that is totally unsubstantiated and yet incredibly serious. It may well be that listening to the tape recording of this matter reveals something, and it will be interesting to see whether or not those words that appear in *Hansard* were the words that were spoken. But, in any event, the meaning of that sentence is not open to endless interpretation —

The member for Wanneroo can explain himself, and other members can explain why they have had their names expunged from the CCC's records.

So let us have a testing of the proposition and the allegation that some or other members here have managed to have the CCC remove something that was adversely said about them in some or other document. That is an incredibly serious allegation, and I suspect that the fact that the member for Cannington had not undertaken that by way of substantive motion means that he had nothing to substantiate such a serious allegation.

**MR W.J. JOHNSTON (Cannington)** [3.29 pm]: I rise to support this motion. I will quote from the original transcript from the Corruption and Crime Commission of 7 December 2004, the examination-in-chief of a Mr Kukulj. He was being examined by Ms Chong, who was at that time the counsel assisting the CCC. Mr Kukulj was asked by Ms Chong —

And who was your friend?---Mr Tony Krsticevic.

Mr Tony who?---Krsticevic.

And what was he doing?---This was on the Saturday. He was just out and, yeah, he didn't have time. I don't know, kids or something. Asked me to hand in the election ballots.

Is this Mr Krsticevic an elector to your knowledge?---I don't know.

How well do you know Mr Krsticevic?---Just from the community.

From the community?---Yes.

So, you happened to run into him in Jones Street?---Um --

**Extract from Hansard**

[ASSEMBLY - Thursday, 23 September 2010]

p7274b-7289a

Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Eric Ripper; Mr Christian Porter; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Joe Francis; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr David Templeman; Mr John Quigley; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr John Hyde

---

Jones Street?---Yes.

Does he reside in Jones Street?---I - - I actually don't know where he resides exactly.

MS CHONG: So, he happened to be walking along Jones Street?---It was - - I saw - - I seen him at the shopping centre.

Where is the shopping centre?---Stirling Village, I believe it is.

Sorry?---Stirling Village.

Stirling Village. Is that where Jones Street is?---I believe so. I apologise. I believe so. yes.

Well, you say you met him. So, you either met him or is this just a dream?---Sorry?

You met Mr Krsticevic - -?---I bumped into him.

You bump into him?---I bumped into him. Yes.

And what did he give you?---He just gave us half a dozen votes, that he had for the family, to hand in.

For his family?---Yes.

How well do you know this Tony Krsticevic?---Excuse me. Just through the community. Just over the past years.

He's not a fictitious name that you have plucked out from the air, is he?---That - - that's correct. He's not fictitious.

He's not fictitious. So, if we went out looking for Tony Krsticevic we will find him in Jones Street?---I can't answer that. I can't answer where you'd find him.

But we will find him?---Yes.

On the electoral rolls?---Yes.

Right. So, he gave you some envelopes. How many envelopes?---There was half a dozen.

Half a dozen?---Yes.

How many people were in his family?---I can't answer that.

And what did he want you to do?---Oh, he just asked if I could do him a favour and drop them in.

Drop them into where?---The council.

Council office?---Yes.

This is on a Saturday?---Yes.

MS CHONG: Right. Didn't you tell him you couldn't handle any ballot papers?---No.

You didn't tell him?---No. He - - he asked as a favour.

He ask what?---He asked me to do it as a favour.

He asked you to do it as a favour?---Yes.

Right; but you were aware, were you not, through these meeting with Mr Spagnolo, that Mr Spagnolo's instructions were very specific you were not to collect any ballot paper?---Well, I think there's two different things that we're talking about. Number one is a - - sort of, a ruling, and then you got contact with people and I think we need to differentiate between being a human and being a - - being a machine. If you could appreciate what I'm saying.

Well, I don't. So, explain to me, pleas?---Mm. Yeah. Human nature. You know, we have goodwill.

Yes?---Yes.

So, what was the goodwill here?---I did a favour. I just put it in. He had - - he hadn't had time and I took it in for him.

Didn't you tell him he could just drop it into the post box?---Again, it's the difference between a - - being a machine and a human being.

The transcript continues on. If one goes to the CCC today to have a look at those transcripts, the name "Tony Krsticevic" has been replaced with the word "suppressed". Therefore, I ask—I do not make an allegation, I ask—how did that occur? That is exactly what the *Hansard* said. The *Hansard* record I have seen today appears

Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Eric Ripper; Mr Christian Porter; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Joe Francis; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr David Templeman; Mr John Quigley; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr John Hyde

---

to imply that I said more than one Liberal member had had their name expunged. That was not what I said. I said “a member”. I said “another member”. That is what I said.

Several members interjected.

**The SPEAKER:** Thank you, members!

**Mr W.J. JOHNSTON:** That is exactly what I said and it is exactly true. I made no allegation against anybody in this place. I have nothing to apologise for, and that is why I have not. That is why I am perfectly happy to have this matter investigated because the issue is, of course, that we need to know why it was that the CCC expunged the name of the member for Carine from its record. We have some issues here; we need to deal with the question of the purpose of public hearings of the CCC. On a number of occasions in former Parliaments, we have had issues raised regarding people who have been mentioned in public hearings of the CCC. Members of this house have been making all sorts of outlandish allegations and accusations based on the evidence that was provided in public at the CCC. That was by all sorts of people in this chamber, and the reason they are able to make those comments and things is that the names of those people mentioned in evidence are public in the CCC’s transcripts. On the date in question, 16 September, I did not want to embarrass the member for Carine about the fact that his name had been expunged from the record. I do not know why it was expunged; I have never discussed the matter with him.

**Mr C.C. Porter:** Do you know what the word “expunged” means?

**Mr W.J. JOHNSTON:** I have never discussed the matter with him. But now we will have a parliamentary inquiry into why his name was expunged, and I think that is a very good thing.

**MS R. SAFFIOTI (West Swan) [3.35 pm]:** I rise again to support this motion. As the Leader of the Opposition has outlined, the Labor Party supports this inquiry because we are open; we have different standards of accountability. As I said, the other day —

Several members interjected.

**The SPEAKER:** Member for West Swan.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** As I said, we do have different standards of accountability. I think that this is an unfair attack on the member for Cannington. This is just another attack on another member on this side. Basically, what was just read out by the Attorney General arguing whether it was “another” or “other members”, frankly, was a joke. But, again, this side of the house will support the motion because we actually do believe in accountability and we do have different standards.

However, I do want to clarify something. The other day the member for Jandakot accused me of leaking the 2004 budget papers. It was a very, very serious allegation that was saying that I actually did something illegal against what was my government. I worked in the Premier’s office, and alleging that I leaked the budget papers against the Premier and the Treasurer of the time, undertaking something completely illegal, was a terrible accusation to make. It was far worse than what we are debating today, in my belief, because it was a clear accusation. We raised it today and the member for Jandakot said that he withdrew the remark immediately. I do not think that he did.

Several members interjected.

**The SPEAKER:** Thank you, members! Member for Bassendean!

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** The member for Jandakot said —

This is from the person who leaked the 2004 budget from the Premier’s office to the media.

I said —

I ask the member to say that again.

The member for Jandakot said —

You know what I’m talking about.

That is what he said. I went on to say that I did not leak it. The member for Bassendean stood and asked that the member withdraw the remark. The member for Jandakot said —

If you can give it, you can take it. Just get on with it.

That was not an apology. That was not immediately rectifying the remark made. As I understand —

**Mr D.A. Templeman** interjected.

Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Eric Ripper; Mr Christian Porter; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Joe Francis; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr David Templeman; Mr John Quigley; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr John Hyde

---

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Mandurah, I do not need to hear from you in this particular debate, unless you want to formally get to your feet and seek the call to contribute.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** As I understand, some subsequent comments have been made to the Leader of the Opposition and I welcome those. Like I said, it would have been nice for the member for Jandakot to approach me, not some sort of paternalistic figure, and apologise, but he has not.

Several members interjected.

**The SPEAKER:** Thank you, members!

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** That is how members opposite operate; they approach somebody else and apologise to someone else, instead of apologising to me.

Like I said, we will support this inquiry because we have nothing to hide. In fact, I feel sorry for the member for Carine because —

Several members interjected.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** I actually do! I feel sorry for the member because his party has just dropped him in it and there will be an inquiry into him. That is always not nice and he should not have to go through it, frankly. However, this is what has happened; the wise heads on the other side have sought to drop the member in it and launch an inquiry into him over some words in *Hansard*, if they were said or were not said, who corrected them and whether they were corrected. A number of comments are said to people on this side of the house daily by members of the Liberal Party. Daily we are accused of things. There was an accusation against the member for Carine just the other week that the member for Hillarys made. Every day we are subject to accusations. If we took all of those to the privileges committee every day —

Several members interjected.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** Sorry, I meant the member for Girrawheen. If we took all those accusations to the privileges committee, it would be sitting permanently. This is simply an unfair attack on the member for Cannington because the member for Cannington gets under the government's skin and the government thinks this is the way to get at him. However, members opposite have dropped their own member in it! I am very sorry for the member for Carine because there will be an inquiry into him led by his own side. I feel very sorry for the member, he should not have to go through it, but that is what has happened.

**MR J.M. FRANCIS (Jandakot) [3.40 pm]:** I ask for the indulgence of the house for a couple of minutes. Last week, it may have been Wednesday or Thursday, in the heat of debate across the house, I did make an interjection. However, members opposite failed to point out that I withdrew the allegation in that interjection, without direction of the Speaker. I believe that the Deputy Speaker was in the Chair at the time, and he ruled that there was no point of order and I did not have to withdraw, but I did it anyway because it was the right thing to do and because I am big enough to admit that I made a mistake. I did have words with the Leader of the Opposition outside, and I did apologise. If the member for West Swan still feels she was unjustly treated by me, I can put my hand on my heart and say that I am sorry. I am sorry. I am doing it right now! I withdrew my remark, contrary to the direction of the Deputy Speaker. The Leader of the Opposition was in the house at the time. He is shaking his head; but he knows what I am talking about. Contrary to the direction of the Deputy Speaker, I still withdrew. I stood here and I said: if it may please the Parliament and the member for West Swan, I withdraw. They were my exact words. I have not checked if they are my exact words in *Hansard*, but they were my exact words. If the member for West Swan still feels aggrieved, I apologise. That is fine. Whether the member feels aggrieved or not, I am man enough to stand here and say I am really sorry. That is easy. There is one easy way for this to progress: the member for Cannington can do exactly the same thing. I have to say, as a general observation about the standards, having been in this house for two years, I have heard some horrible, horrible language, which was not recorded by Hansard, fly across this chamber. I recall a particular division—I think it was on mandatory sentencing, I may stand corrected—when members opposite called us Nazis and jackbooters. And I found that grossly offensive, and I raised it. I found it grossly offensive.

**The SPEAKER:** As I said previously, members, I will give any member any opportunity to stand and talk to this motion. However, I am not interested in other members of this place introducing extraneous matters. I think everybody in this place recognises the seriousness of the motion, and the proposition of the motion. I am quite prepared to stay here and listen to the serious part of it, but not for extraneous comments that add absolutely nothing to this debate or to the standing of this place. I do not know if the member for Jandakot has finished.

**Mr J.M. FRANCIS:** I am not a saint when it comes to interjections across the floor of the house. But if someone takes offence at something that I have said, I am man enough to say I am sorry and I am man enough to apologise. That is exactly what the member for Cannington should do right now.

Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Eric Ripper; Mr Christian Porter; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Joe Francis; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr David Templeman; Mr John Quigley; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr John Hyde

---

**MR B.S. WYATT (Victoria Park)** [3.44 pm]: I too rise to support the substantive motion for the suspension of standing orders moved by the government today. I will make some comments generally about this suspension. It is clear that this motion has blown up in the government's face. I am sure that neither the member for Carine nor the Premier expected the direction this debate would go this afternoon. As the Leader of the Opposition has pointed out and as the member for Cannington pointed out, the inquiry now has to investigate the member for Carine. It has to investigate and speak to the Corruption and Crime Commission and find out why the member for Carine's name was suppressed on those transcripts. I have seen the Attorney General in court. This afternoon was not the Attorney General's finest hour, I must say! I note that the Attorney General looked through the final *Hansard* without looking at what led to the comments made by the member for Cannington on 16 September.

**Mr C.C. Porter:** I read it.

**Mr B.S. WYATT:** The Procedure and Privileges Committee will now have the opportunity to look at this. Before we get to the comments made by the member for Cannington, I will refer to a history of the interjections made during the contribution of the member for Cannington. At one point *Hansard* does not pick up the interjections and *Hansard* reads only that Mr Miles interjected. The member for Cannington responds —

If we are talking about accountability, the member for Wanneroo should not go there. He can stand up and explain why he has not been accountable to the people of his electorate. But we will not worry about that.

The Deputy Speaker yells out "Members!"

The member for Cannington continues —

As he very well knows, we are having a discussion about accountability.

Mr Miles interjected again, and the member for Cannington goes on to say, referring I think to his previous comments, that the member for Wanneroo can explain himself and why he is not accountable to his electorate. Then he goes on to say, as the member for Cannington has said —

... and other members can explain why they have had their names expunged from the CCC's records.

The opposition will support this motion, because we will get to the bottom of what occurred that day and what the member for Cannington meant. However, if the government wants to make sure that this inquiry is more than a kangaroo court, the member for Carine is obviously in its sights. The inquiry has to look at what happened at the CCC; it has to get the CCC up here and ask it why the member for Carine's name was suppressed on those transcripts. The member for Jandakot made the point —

**Mr C.C. Porter:** I think the word was "expunged".

**Mr B.S. WYATT:** The Attorney General's less than adequate performance this afternoon has already gone through. The Attorney General had his chance. We heard the Attorney General's less than adequate response just a minute ago. As I said, I have seen the Attorney General in court, and today was not his finest hour! The member for Jandakot made the point, when he got to his feet, that that belated apology to the member for West Swan occurred in the "heat of the debate". Let us reflect on what occurred during private members' time last week during my debt debate. I had been on my feet for an hour. The member for Jandakot had not been in here at all. The *Hansard* will prove that. If members look through the *Hansard* there is not one comment from the member for Jandakot. I had been on my feet an hour, and then the member for West Swan got to her feet. She had been on her feet for quite a considerable time, and there is quite useful commentary—discussion between the member for West Swan and the Minister for Planning, who is no longer in the house, and the member for Mandurah. There were some good discussions. The member for Jandakot had not appeared at all. He came into the house, he sat down and he said —

This is from the person who leaked the 2004 budget from the Premier's office to the media.

This was not in the heat of debate!

**Mr J.M. Francis** interjected.

**Mr B.S. WYATT:** The member for Jandakot had his chance. There was one other comment from the member for Jandakot in that debate. This was not said in the heat of debate. This was an exchange about debt levels in Western Australia, for heaven's sake. It was not exactly the heat of debate. It was quite a rational discussion. The member for Jandakot came in, I dare say, for a specific purpose: to sit down there and throw that out. The exchange is as follows —

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** I ask the member to say that again.

**Mr J.M. Francis:** You know what I'm talking about.

Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Eric Ripper; Mr Christian Porter; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Joe Francis; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr David Templeman; Mr John Quigley; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr John Hyde

---

Then he went on to say —

If you can give, you can take it. Just get on with it.

The member for West Swan said —

I ask the member to withdraw. This was a very serious allegation.

The member for Jandakot then says, “Take it up with the Deputy Speaker.” This is in *Hansard*. The Leader of the Opposition then informed the house that there had been a CCC investigation, and then the member for Jandakot reluctantly got to his feet and withdrew that allegation.

The Premier knows now that the member for Carine is in the sights of the privileges committee. He has to be. If the Premier wants this to be a fair-dinkum investigation, the member for Carine’s activities now have to be investigated, and the reasons why the CCC suppressed those names have to be examined and that report explained to the Parliament of Western Australia.

**Mr C.C. Porter:** It is “suppress” now!

**Mr B.S. WYATT:** It says “suppress”. Does it not say “suppress”? I am going on what the Attorney General said. If the Attorney General is now saying something else from his short participation in the debate this afternoon, that is too bad. Maybe somebody else will stand and speak on the Attorney General’s behalf.

What has happened is that the government has come in here this afternoon, which is a fair bit of time after this debate occurred—more than a week after this debate occurred—and is going after the member for Cannington for political purposes. That is what happened and that is what the government is doing. It is having an inquiry into one of its own members. If the government does not examine the activities of the member for Carine and ask the Corruption and Crime Commission why the member for Carine’s name was suppressed from that transcript, the opposition cannot accept any outcome from that report. The government knows it. This has blown up in the government’s face and that is why the opposition is very keen to support a legitimate inquiry of the Procedure and Privileges Committee.

**MR D.A. TEMPLEMAN (Mandurah)** [3.50 pm]: Dear, oh dear, oh dear—is this not interesting? Earlier, in the government wings as the government was preparing for question time, some bright spark has come up with a bit of paper and said, “We’ve got them now. We’ll go and dump this one down during question time and we’ll get the member for Cannington.” That reminds me of the 60-second bloopers for the week segment on Channel 7 every Friday night at the end of the sports coverage on the news. That segment goes through all the bloopers that have occurred in sport over the past week. Often own goals in soccer are shown and the footage is usually reversed. An incident occurred not long ago when a woman was standing with another bloke while compering a game and a ball that had been kicked came through the air and hit the woman in the head, which was very sad for her. She was commentating and then, ping! They played it over and over again. This is exactly like that.

**Mrs L.M. Harvey:** This is a serious issue.

**Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN:** It is very serious. I am demonstrating how bad the government’s tactics are. This is a classic example of the government scoring an own goal. I can see the ashen-faced members for Jandakot, Wanneroo and Carine. We all now feel the greatest sympathy for the member for Carine. This is the biggest example of an own goal that I have ever seen, and the Leader of the House walked right into it. We will now pass a motion that will put into the frame one of the government’s own members. I am sure that he will be okay, but the government will put into the frame one of its own members and waste some very important time of a parliamentary committee.

**Ms R. Saffioti:** We might get something useful out of it.

**Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN:** We could get something useful out of it.

**Mr E.S. Ripper:** We will certainly have another debate when the report comes down.

**Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN:** We will indeed. This is happening because someone in the government’s strategy meeting either this week or late last week came up with this brilliant idea that has now exploded in the government’s face. This reminds me of the old cartoons in which there was a round bomb with a short, fizzing fuse that everyone chucks to someone else and Wile E. Coyote always ended up holding it. This has gone off in the face of the Leader of the House and now the government will have to wear it.

**Mr A.J. Waddell:** It is the Acme motion!

**Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN:** It is the Acme motion! The message out of this might be that members will think twice before making allegations in the future, even if they are made across the chamber. I hope that the member for Fremantle calls a division on this because I would love to be the teller for the ayes because I would win one!

Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Eric Ripper; Mr Christian Porter; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Joe Francis; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr David Templeman; Mr John Quigley; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr John Hyde

---

At least, I would hope so, unless the government suddenly changes its mind. I encourage the member for Fremantle to call a division. She has got it wrong a couple of times in the past. I will give her a prompt if she needs it. I would love her to call for a division on this because it would be very interesting to see which way some members vote.

**Mr T.G. Stephens:** Would you be attracted to an amendment to this motion to try to find out where the false accusation came from that the member for Jandakot lobbed into the house? Who gave it to him to lob into the house?

**Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN:** That might be an amendment the member might consider but which I could not possibly consider. I am very keen to see this motion go to the vote. There is a chance here for the member for Fremantle. We will be supporting the motion and it will be interesting to see the outcome of this motion for the Procedure and Privileges Committee to inquire into this matter. It will be very interesting to see whether we see the government demonstrate tactics like this again.

**MR J.R. QUIGLEY (Mindarie)** [3.55 pm]: I shall be brief in my comments because I totally support the Leader of the Opposition, who initially said that we needed the transcript of the *Hansard* from 16 November present, but who did not have that advantage. Of course my friend the member for Victoria Park was so possessed of it when he rose and he was able to explain to this chamber the context in which the member for Wanneroo was referred. That was, of course, that there was a debate about accountability, the 500 Club and the member for Wanneroo's accountability to his own constituents in the electorate of Wanneroo. When the Attorney General stood up, he read selectively from *Hansard* —

The member for Wanneroo can explain himself, and other members can explain why they have had their names expunged from the CCC records.

The Attorney General then gave his own definition of the word “expunged” and on having this adverse finding removed, which was an allegation or a comment that was never made by the member for Cannington. The member for Cannington was obviously addressing the interjection that the Deputy Speaker had called the member for Wanneroo to order over. The member for Cannington then went on to say —

The member for Wanneroo can explain himself, and other members can explain why they have had their names expunged from the record.

The fact that the transcript of a CCC hearing is an official record of the commission is clear. The transcripts are posted on the CCC's website as its official record of the proceedings. I do not want to take up the time of the chamber by referring to all mentions made at the hearing to Mr Krsticevic, who is now the member for Carine. However, we know what the CCC was investigating at that time. A reference before the CCC caused it to investigate the conduct of one Mr Adam Spagnolo, whom we all remember from the graphic footage on the television when Mr Spagnolo was scrounging in rubbish bins to get voting forms for the City of Stirling's election. The CCC was investigating why one of the witnesses was receiving voting forms and asked whether it was not irregular. Of course the CCC wanted to investigate Mr Krsticevic's —

**Mr P. Papalia:** Unlawful behaviour.

**Mr J.R. QUIGLEY:** It could be unlawful, but the CCC was investigating Mr Krsticevic's actions in this matter by assisting Mr Spagnolo in what turned out to be Mr Spagnolo's highly improper dealings with voting forms during the City of Stirling's local government elections.

**Mrs L.M. Harvey:** They were not investigating Mr Krsticevic.

**Mr J.R. QUIGLEY:** The member for Scarborough is quite right. The CCC was not investigating Mr Krsticevic; it was investigating Mr Spagnolo, but who had his paws all over these voting forms? It was Mr Krsticevic from Carine. The CCC was asking whether Vlado Kukulj was making up the name “Mr Krsticevic” and trying to wriggle out of the impropriety by blaming someone who does not exist.

If we go to Jones Street, will we find a Mr Krsticevic? Will we know there is a Mr Krsticevic? He usually sits in this chamber but he has absented himself for this debate. The Attorney General says that the next thing that is improper about the conduct of the member for Cannington is that he has used the word “expunge”. Members can explain why they have had their names expunged. Let us go to the *Australian Pocket Oxford Dictionary* for a definition of the verb “expunge”. I will read the definition into *Hansard* —

... erase, remove (especially a passage from a book or a name from a list) ...

It is derived from the Latin word *expungere* meaning “prick”, sorry, “prick out”. That is pretty relevant, is it not! I am talking about his name! Was there any misuse of this word that pricks out—this word “expunge”? Of course there was not, because we have heard the original version of the transcript read. The transcript that was up

Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Eric Ripper; Mr Christian Porter; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Joe Francis; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr David Templeman; Mr John Quigley; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr John Hyde

---

on the internet that the member for Cannington had judiciously printed before someone had gone to the Corruption and Crime Commission on bended knees saying, “Please expunge my name; please prick it out, because now that I am going into public life, if it became public knowledge that my little paw prints were all over those voting forms that Mr Adam Spagnolo was in trouble for, it would reflect badly on me.” I can well understand why Mr Krsticevic wanted his name expunged from the record; I can well understand why the member for Carine has absented himself from this chamber during the debate—he has expunged himself out again, if I can use that analogy. I did not say the other word!

We know that the Attorney General’s contention that there has been no expunction, just a mere suppression, is wrong because we know it existed on the transcript, we know it was there for all of Western Australia to read. It became relevant, and a relevant concern to the member for Carine, only when he stood for election to this place. He said to himself, “Crikey! I know a transcript exists with my name on it and I know there was a subsequent transcript produced—a second version of the transcript.” The second version of the transcript is the incorrect version because it contains the word “suppressed”. The word “suppressed” was not used in the original transcript of the hearing. What took place was an expunction. Someone has gone back to the CCC and said, “Please expunge; please expunge that name”, and that is what happened. The Attorney General wanted to say that if it was an inappropriate use of the word “expunge”, he would tie it to adverse comment. There was no suggestion by the member for Cannington that the member for Carine had his name expunged from adverse findings. The member for Cannington was saying that there was a member on that side who wanted his name expunged from a record of the CCC that implicated him very closely in vote rigging, and he did not want it to come out in public. That is what the Procedure and Privileges Committee of this Parliament is charged by this motion with investigating, and I strongly support the motion.

**MRS M.H. ROBERTS (Midland)** [4.04 pm]: I support this motion and in supporting it I would like to comment on the double standards exhibited by the Liberal Party in this house. I note that the Leader of the House interjected on the member for Mandurah just before he sat down and I quote him, “Do you know what you have done? You have supported an inquiry into the member for Cannington.” Why would he interject that? Why would he say, “Do you know what you have done?” when plainly members of the government are those most targeted by the motion before the house? Of course the member for Mandurah knows what he has done, as does the member for Victoria Park, the member for Mindarie and everyone else who has spoken on this motion. And I know what I am doing by doing so too. Members should think about why he interjected with those comments. It is because he judges people by his own standards.

Earlier today he would not support referring the behaviour and the standards of the Minister for Education to the very same Procedure and Privileges Committee and I suspect that is because she is one of his own. He did not look at the merit of the case, he did not look at the fact that she was not taking any notice of clause 12 of the Ministerial Code of Conduct, that she has breached section 74 of the Public Sector Management Act and that she was also probably in breach of the Western Australian College of Teaching Act. He did not look at the merit of the motion. He said, “She is one of ours; therefore, we are not going to vote for it.” I gave notice of the motion to refer the legislative breaches of the Minister for Education to the Procedure and Privileges Committee at 9.00 am this morning. The Leader of the House ran off and gave a radio interview; I was told he was not available to come into the house. He is the Leader of the House but he was not in this place; he was conducting other business. He was not available to be told that we wanted to bring that motion on.

**Mr R.F. Johnson:** You could have done it after I had given my media talks.

**Mrs M.H. ROBERTS:** You are too old, you are too tired and you should not be here! The Leader of the House should be sitting in the house and managing the business of the house, not running off. His priorities, as Leader of the House, should be in this place. How slow does someone have to be, when a member comes in and gives notice to send a matter to the Procedure and Privileges Committee, and when a member says that a minister of the Crown is in breach of two acts of Parliament, not to take note and to think that maybe she is going to move a motion today? Any thinking, agile, enthusiastic Leader of the House would put one and one together and get two and say that the member for Midland came into this place this morning intending to move a very serious motion against the incompetent Minister for Education. She wanted to refer breaches of the Ministerial Code of Conduct, and breaches of two acts of Parliament, to the Procedure and Privileges Committee and she put a motion in the notice paper. The Leader of the House thinks, “Oh, well, that’s business as usual. I’ll go off and do a couple of radio interviews.”

**Mr R.F. Johnson:** It was not on the notice paper. You didn’t give notice yesterday.

**Mrs M.H. ROBERTS:** The government Whip was told 10 minutes beforehand. I endeavoured to tell the Leader of the House 15 to 20 minutes beforehand, but he was not available. I would just like to explain this to him

Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Eric Ripper; Mr Christian Porter; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Joe Francis; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr David Templeman; Mr John Quigley; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr John Hyde

---

because I know he is a bit slow. I thought that maybe he had not worked out that I actually gave notice of that motion this morning for a reason—to give the Leader of the House more than an hour’s advance notice. His attitude has been exposed this afternoon. He said to himself, “The Minister for Education is one of our own; she is the member for Churchlands. We are going to protect her. We couldn’t possibly vote for a motion to have an inquiry into one of our own members.” That is why he is so gobsmacked that people on the opposition side of the house say, “Sure, let’s have an inquiry into one of our own members. Let’s clear his name.” We have confidence in the committee’s ability to fairly assess the situation and to see that the member for Cannington has absolutely no case to answer. The only embarrassment felt in sending the matter to the committee would have been by at least one person on the government side of the house, although the Leader of the House, of course, would also have felt considerable embarrassment.

A number of people during the course of this debate have talked about parliamentary standards. Do members remember the promise that the Premier gave just two years ago when he first took on the job that he would have different parliamentary standards; when he got that editorial in *The West Australian* newspaper in which he said that he would not be using grubby little dorothy dixers that other parties had used in government? Do members remember when he said that? Do they remember *The West* editorial when he said that he would rise above all that? It almost sounded as though he would not have dorothy dix questions at all. We have seen the low standards members opposite have sunk to in recent months. It has climaxed today with the Attorney General doing a grubby little dorothy dixer that has blown up in his face. Do members remember when this Premier said that he would not only apply different standards at question time, but also have higher standards for his ministers? A lot of people in the community probably believed him. People probably thought quite highly of the member for Churchlands because there are literally reams of her comments in *Hansard* about public standards and accountability. For example, on 30 November 2006 she said —

This house notes the failings of ministers to abide by high standards of conduct . . .

I will talk about an aspect of ministerial behaviour and responsibility that relates to question time. I refer to the Commission on Government reports, which I consider to be a bit of a bible.

What has happened to the member for Churchlands’ bible now?

**Mr B.S. Wyatt:** She has become an atheist.

**Mrs M.H. ROBERTS:** She has become an atheist; she has given up on the Commission on Government. She then went on to read what the Commission on Government had to say about question time—double standards and hypocrisy. The member for Churchlands supported a motion that was moved by the Leader of the House calling on the government to raise its standards. Is it not interesting the low standards that that member and the Leader of the House have now sunk to? If there are matters to be referred to the privileges committee—I think it is appropriate that the member for Cannington’s name is cleared by it—the matters I have referred to this morning about the member for Churchlands are the ones that need clearing up.

I note that the debate this morning was guillotined with, unfortunately, the support of the member for Fremantle. I thought she would have higher standards than that. Even when the member for Churchlands was an Independent member in opposition, she did not support the guillotine, yet the member for Fremantle did. People will no doubt draw their own conclusions about that. I will quote something the member for Churchlands said on 1 December 2005 because I think it is pertinent to the member for Cannington’s issue. A motion was before the house on 1 December 2005 that referred to the former Leader of the Liberal Party, the member for Kalgoorlie. In her concluding remarks in voting to support a matter connected to him going to the Procedure and Privileges Committee, the member said —

The way in which he has handled this motion says to me that the Procedure and Privileges Committee must get to the bottom of it and not just for him—he should want the committee to get to the bottom of it—but for the Parliament and the Legislative Assembly itself.

...

I support the motion and the amendment. The issues contained in the motion should go to a Procedure and Privileges Committee. Only in this way do we have a chance of getting to the truth of the matters before us. It is in the Leader of the Opposition’s best interests that we do so. I support the motion and the amendment.

They are the kinds of things the member for Churchlands used to say a few short years ago. I note that my motion was guillotined this morning with zero defence of the member for Churchlands’ actions.

**Mr J.R. Quigley:** She is guilty.

**Extract from Hansard**

[ASSEMBLY - Thursday, 23 September 2010]

p7274b-7289a

Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Eric Ripper; Mr Christian Porter; Mr Bill Johnston; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Joe Francis; Mr Ben Wyatt; Mr David Templeman; Mr John Quigley; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr John Hyde

---

**Mrs M.H. ROBERTS:** Yes. We have not heard a peep from the member for Churchlands. She has not said, “The member for Midland has got it all wrong; I didn’t actually breach section 74. I have got a communications agreement with the Western Australian College of Teaching.” We can bet our bottom dollar that if I had got it wrong, a backbencher would have asked her a question in question time to the effect of “Minister —

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Midland, I have listened to you with interest and I am sure other people in this place have too. But with the greatest respect, I think you may have strayed away somewhat from the substantial motion we have in front of us. I will give you the opportunity to return to it.

**Mrs M.H. ROBERTS:** Thank you, Mr Speaker; I am just about to conclude. The question would have asked, “Minister, the member for Midland has given notice of a motion referring these matters concerning you to the PPC; is there any basis to the claims in her motion?” The minister could have stood here and replied, “No; there’s no basis to those claims. I’ve got the communications agreement; I have not breached the Ministerial Code of Conduct. So what, it is only four months; I think that is as reasonable as practicable.” There has been no defence whatsoever. The government shut down the debate. Those are the standards we are now seeing from the Premier and his lazy Leader of the House. When it is about one of their own, members opposite say, “Shut down the debate.” When it is indefensible, as it was with the Minister for Education, as indicated in the motion I moved this morning, the government simply mounts no defence. The government simply shuts down the debate and uses the weight of its numbers, aided and abetted by the member for Fremantle. Hopefully, her electors will judge her for that.

Talk about different standards, though. When concerns were raised about one of our members, we said, “Sure, the Procedure and Privileges Committee is there for a reason. It has a purpose and we are not afraid to have our members’ actions scrutinised before it.” The Premier should think his double standards and about how low he has sunk in just two years. I suggest he refer back to *The West* editorial of two years ago and think about what he said at that time when he said that he would have different parliamentary standards, that he would not do the grubby little dorothy dixers, and that his ministers would have the highest of standards, because they do not.

I support the motion before the house, not because the member for Cannington has done anything wrong but because it is appropriate his name be cleared by the committee. It is a shame that the same standard—the standard that we on this side of the house are showing—is not shown by the Premier and the Leader of the House in not subjecting their own members to the same level of scrutiny.

**MR J.N. HYDE (Perth)** [4.17 pm]: I also commend this motion to the house and request, Mr Speaker, that you direct the Procedure and Privileges Committee to conduct this hearing in public. I think it is very important that we note that the house has been made aware of issues to expunge information only because the CCC held a public hearing and because the CCC posted transcripts on the internet. This chamber should show its commitment to transparency by directing that the PPC hold this inquiry in public. It would serve as a reminder to those members who are seeking to curtail the use of public hearings, because it is only in public hearings that we get transparency and the opportunity for the full information to be told. That also relates to people being able to clear their names. We know of instances in the past when people who have appeared at public hearings of the CCC and, in that arena, have been able to clear their names fully. That same privilege should be afforded to the member for Cannington, not in a secret meeting behind closed, musty doors where people are trying to limit damage to an ill-thought out motion moved by the government. The government has started this and it should ensure that this matter comes to a proper conclusion in a public arena. I encourage you, Mr Speaker to direct this house to ensure that this hearing occurs transparently in public.

Question put and passed.