

MEMBER FOR CARINE

City of Perth — Personal Explanation

MR A. KRSTICEVIC (Carine) [2.51 pm]: I rise under standing order 148 to seek permission to make a personal explanation.

The SPEAKER: Yes.

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: On Tuesday, 15 May 2018, I gave my contribution to the budget speech and spoke extensively about some of my concerns about the actions of both councillors and staff of the City of Perth. My speech highlighted a number of areas that I thought needed to be put on the public record so that the City of Perth inquiry panel and others could look into the issues raised and investigate the actions of both the suspended councillors and relevant staff. As a result of that speech, Dr Green and Mr Fini raised a concern about my assertion that Dr Green, as Acting Lord Mayor, should have declared a perceived conflict of interest during a debate at the City of Perth council meeting held on 19 December 2017 at which, from the chair, she moved and voted on a motion to give Historic Heart of Perth \$300 000. Dr Green and Mr Fini subsequently submitted statements to the Procedure and Privileges Committee, which were tabled on Thursday, 14 June. In response to this, I seek to correct some misimpressions raised in Dr Green's statement.

In her statement, Jemma Green states, and I quote —

The Member for Carine made no attempt to contact myself —

Point of Order

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: Standing order 148 is very specific. It allows a member to make an explanation of their own behaviour. The provision reads —

When there is no business before the Chair and with the consent of the Speaker, a member may explain a matter of a personal nature. A personal explanation will not be debated.

There is no capacity in this standing order for the member to make any reflections on any other person. He has to explain only himself.

The SPEAKER: Yes, he can. He can correct a misimpression. That is the ruling.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: I understand your ruling, Mr Speaker. Does the member need to withdraw the comments about Jemma Green? He made an allegation about a person who is not in this chamber in a personal explanation. Will he have to withdraw those comments?

The SPEAKER: It was in the context of what it was and he just said in the context. Member for Carine.

Personal Explanation Resumed

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: Thank you, Mr Speaker.

In her statement, Jemma Green states, and I quote —

The Member for Carine made no attempts to contact myself or Mr Fini prior to making these statements.

She continues —

The Member's comments ... suggest that I have acted improperly, that I have broken the law, that I have sought to personally gain from doing my job at the City of Perth.

First, I address her statement that I made no attempt to contact Dr Green or Mr Fini. The reason I made no attempt to contact Mr Fini is because my concerns and issues had nothing to do with Mr Fini. My focus was extensively on the actions of the suspended councillors and certain staff at the City of Perth. There was no reason to contact Mr Fini as I had no issues about his conduct, no intention to mention him in that light and, indeed, I did not reflect negatively on Mr Fini in my speech. Nevertheless, I am sorry if there has been any misunderstanding of my comments. With respect to Dr Green, I did contact her.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members!

Ms R. Saffioti interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member, this issue has been brought to myself and the Clerk and we passed it. The member for West Swan can shake her head, but under the standing orders he is allowed to do it. If you have any problems with it, I cannot help at the moment. The Clerk and I looked it. What he is doing is perfectly legal.

Extract from *Hansard*

[ASSEMBLY — Wednesday, 27 June 2018]

p4016b-4017a

Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr David Templeman

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: I phoned Dr Green and we agreed to meet at 3.30 pm on Tuesday, 6 March. At 3.01 pm on Tuesday, 6 March, Dr Green sent me a text message to reschedule the meeting for a later date. That was the last contact I had with Dr Green as she made no attempt to reschedule the meeting that she cancelled.

Secondly, I refer to Dr Green's contention that my comments suggest she acted improperly, broke the law and sought to personally gain from doing her job at the City of Perth. I did not make any such allegation. At the time of giving my budget-in-reply contribution, based on the information available to me, I was firmly of the opinion that Dr Green should have declared a perceived conflict of interest and not voted on the motion in question. The Freehills Project Percy information was particularly compelling in forming that view. Thank you.

Mr J.N. Carey interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Perth!

Mr J.N. Carey interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Perth!

Members, this was put to the Speaker and the Clerk and was found to be perfectly in order. I am sure members are much more knowledgeable than the Clerk. We have found that it is proper. Minister for Tourism, you can sit there with all your knowledge and shake your head, but it has been passed by the Speaker and the Clerk.

Point of Order

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: I have a question about the insertion into *Hansard* of the two statements from Mr Fini and suspended councillor Green and the status of those now that the member for Carine has made his statement.

Mr V.A. Catania interjected.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: I am asking a question. Maybe you might want to shut up and listen.

Withdrawal of Remark

The SPEAKER: You withdraw.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: I withdraw.

Point of Order Resumed

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: It is an important matter.

The SPEAKER: It is an important matter.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: The Procedure and Privileges Committee addressed or examined two letters from Mr Fini and Councillor Green and this house, through your statement to the place, Mr Speaker, agreed for those statements to be included in *Hansard*. We now have a contradiction to those statements by the member for Carine and I am asking about the status of those two letters and the status of *Hansard* as this matter is recorded.

The SPEAKER: The member was clarifying his position in a personal explanation. Shake your head as much as you like, Minister for Transport. It is in the rules. If you want to change the rules, go right ahead and do it.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: I understand your explanation.

Mr V.A. Catania: You're canvassing the ruling again.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: I have a further question.

My point is that there is now in *Hansard* as per the insertion made through the house and one of the statements has now been contradicted. What is the status of *Hansard*'s recording of those?

The SPEAKER: If they are not happy, they can send a letter to the Parliament like they did before. The member is clarifying his position, which he has the right to do.