

**MINISTER FOR REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT — ENERGY MADE CLEAN**

*Standing Orders Suspension — Motion*

**MR D.T. REDMAN (Warren–Blackwood)** [3.00 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 calls on the Premier to remove his Minister for Regional Development from cabinet for her failure to fully declare her financial involvement with Energy Made Clean, which is a material and perceived conflict of interest with her ministerial oversight of the Albany wave energy project.

I believe there is an understanding between the Whips that we are prepared to bring on this motion for debate.

*Standing Orders Suspension — Amendment to Motion*

**MR D.A. TEMPLEMAN (Mandurah — Leader of the House)** [3.01 pm]: I move to add to the motion —

To insert after “forthwith” the following —

, 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 the support of an absolute majority for it to proceed. If I hear a dissentient voice, I will be required to divide the Assembly.

Question put and passed with an absolute majority.

*Motion*

**MR D.T. REDMAN (Warren–Blackwood)** [3.02 pm]: I move the motion.

A lot of material on this topic has obviously been through the house. Very quickly, I want to recap that material for the sake of bringing everyone up to speed with what has happened so far. The Labor Party clearly made a commitment to have a wave energy project in Albany. It was a big commitment, well beyond what was ultimately rolled out. I have a very famous photograph that shows the now Premier, who was the Leader of the Opposition at the time; the now Minister for Energy, who was the shadow Minister for Energy at the time; and, of course Hon Alannah MacTiernan, who had no formal status here as either a member of Parliament or in any formal role in the energy space, yet she was very close to this project. We know, at one stage, that the Minister for Regional Development had shares in Energy Made Clean, which we now know to be a wholly owned subsidiary of Carnegie Clean Energy. She declared that and she sold the shares just after becoming a member of Parliament and prior to becoming a minister. We also know that a tender process ran with all roads leading to Rome; all roads led to an outcome that landed Carnegie Clean Energy as the successful tenderer. That included changing the amount of royalties for regions funds that this government put on the table, because \$14.5 million was not going to cut it for Carnegie. The government upped it to \$16.5 million, which allowed Carnegie to be in the race. We know that Carnegie Clean Energy had a licence for an area of sea floor off the coast of Albany. It was pretty much the only area where we could have put a wave energy farm next to a substation. That was in the tender documents. If we look around at where else we could put a wave energy farm, there is pretty much nowhere else. Again, that led to Carnegie’s successful tender.

All the commentary in statements pointed to Carnegie, including those made by the Premier in media statements put out prior to securing the contract. Carnegie was mentioned in dispatches. We know that the Department of Primary Industries and Regional Development ran the process, despite advice from DPIRD to the contrary. I will quote from a document obtained by the freedom of information process, dated 24 July 2017 —

DPIRD’s recommendation to utilise Tenders WA would open the process to a wider range of potential proponents; thus mitigating any concerns about the process.

Later, the document states —

However, following discussions with your office, —

That is, the minister’s office —

an alternative approach is to issue the RfP —

That is, the request for proposal —

directly (and solely) to the three most advanced Western Australian wave energy development companies.

Mr Terry Redman; Mr David Templeman; Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Mark McGowan; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Bill Johnston

---

The minister directly intervened on advice from her agency, which was designed to mitigate the perception that there was a conflict of interest and some sort of outcome was favoured. That has come out in documents obtained by the freedom of information process. There was no business case. Questions that were put in the Public Accounts Committee yesterday by the member for North West Central to the Department of the Premier and Cabinet highlight, as I understand it, that no business case was put up for the project. There were also some concerns that it might have been a grant rather than a process for tendering and therefore some sort of presumption that business cases did not apply. Feedback I have had from the member for North West Central suggests that the department had concerns about that. It will be interesting to see how that discussion plays out. This was the Minister for Regional Development's number one project. What was the cabinet process around it? There is no doubt she had her signature at the bottom of the submission and then she obviously went *carte blanche* without going back to cabinet because I know that the Premier has been uncomfortable with this issue all along.

Financial problems then emerged, including missed milestones from the company. That was the first signal that some sort of financial challenges were coming. There were capital writedowns by the company and significant signals throughout the media that there was concern. At one point, an annual report came out that highlighted from the company a material uncertainty about it being able to carry out its duties and its ongoing concerns. Still, after all of that, the minister signed off on a \$2.6 million grant in compensation for at least a part payment of the first missed milestone. It was signed by the minister.

Further information has now emerged through the good work of the ABC. I highlight Kathryn Diss and Rebecca Turner who did this work. They were getting complaints, as I have, that the minister has not been telling the truth in the upper house. This minister is not telling the truth in the upper house. What is she not telling the truth about? I refer to question without notice 172, asked on 14 June 2017 by Hon Jim Chown. I quote —

- (2) Has the minister ever had shares or other financial interests in Energy Made Clean, Carnegie Clean Energy or Carnegie Wave Energy?

The question had a number of parts but the minister made a very shortened response. I quote, in part —

I had some shares in Energy Made Clean that I had acquired instead of remuneration for the work that I did for the company.

It was instead of remuneration for the work she did for the company. The question was whether she ever had shares or other financial interests and she said she had shares only “instead of remuneration”. There was no mention of being paid \$30 000 as a business development manager for Energy Made Clean, which is now a wholly owned subsidiary of Carnegie Clean Energy. We know that John Davidson was the minister's boss at the time and we know he was an executive director of Carnegie Clean Energy. The minister would have had to have known that because she worked very closely with him in the former company. There is a strong association firstly between the minister and the earlier company, which the Premier seems to dismiss, and secondly between the people who were involved in that company who then became executive directors of Carnegie Clean Energy. It received a \$15.75 million grant signed by this government for a wave energy project in Albany. There is the link. The minister failed to declare an interest that she was being paid up to \$30 000 for business development manager responsibilities. That is the link. The minister signed off on \$15.75 million of taxpayers' funds on a project for a company that she had historical and undisclosed links to.

This is now a question about the Premier's transparency and probity. What has the Premier done about this? In question time today, he said there was no issue. He came to government on the platform of transparency but he said there was no issue. I have highlighted an issue. From sitting here, it appears that the minister is misleading the other place because she did not disclose a historical interest when she was asked a very direct question. There was a relationship to her boss at the time, John Davidson, who became executive director of Carnegie Clean Energy. The existing relationship, which should have been disclosed, highlights that she was the wrong person to be running the project. We have told members all the way along that these issues have emerged—every time they popped up—but they were dismissed every time when they were put to members opposite. The Premier now needs to step up to the plate because it will define him and his transparency. It will define his support for the integrity that he espouses in this place. He has come up short and his answers in question time show that.

**DR M.D. NAHAN (Riverton — Leader of the Opposition)** [3.09 pm]: It is clear, from the many debates in this and the other house, that Hon Alannah MacTiernan, the Minister for Regional Development, has promoted a project, through thick and thin, in which she had a direct commercial and personal interest. She promoted the project despite it having no business plan. She has repeatedly made statements in the other house that are not true. I will make the case that she promoted Carnegie Clean Energy as the proponent of the project, that it was the only company that was ever going to win the tender, and that the selection process was a sham.

Hon Alannah MacTiernan had been a long-term promoter of the Carnegie wave project down in Albany. She had worked for Energy Made Clean. As the member for Warren–Blackwood pointed out, the minister said her only relationship with the company was to get shares in lieu of remuneration. Information provided in documents

obtained by the ABC under a freedom of information request, which, by the way, was not provided in our freedom of information requests, outlines that she also got money.

The Labor Party made an announcement on 23 February 2017 in a release entitled “Jobs boost: New facility to allow Albany wave energy to become a reality”. In that release, Mark McGowan stated —

“A new common user facility will allow Carnegie Clean Energy and others to establish wave energy ...

In other words, when Labor made the announcement, it announced that the successful operator was going to be Carnegie Clean Energy. Of course, Carnegie Clean Energy had to report to the ASX that this would have a material impact on its balance sheet and activity. Then, on 13 March, after the election, Carnegie Clean Energy announced to the ASX —

“We’re delighted to be working with the newly elected Government of Western Australia to deliver on the potential of wave energy at Albany.

It announced that it was actively involved as a proponent of the project, as the Labor Party had announced before the election. What happened to Carnegie Clean Energy’s share price? It jumped 23 per cent. The market quite rightly assumed, like everybody else, that it was a done deal—that Carnegie was going to get the project. The government then went through the tender process, which I will come back to shortly. On 13 June 2017, prior to the announcement of the winning tenderer, the *Albany Advertiser* quoted Hon Alannah MacTiernan as saying —

“The project will create about 140 direct jobs during construction.

The article also stated —

Carnegie Clean Energy will headline the wave energy farm ...

Hon Alannah MacTiernan announced, before the issue of the tender, as she had done repeatedly throughout this process, that Carnegie Clean Energy was going to be the proponent. Not surprisingly, Carnegie said on 6 October that it had won the contract.

We have asked numerous questions of Hon Alannah MacTiernan. Was she involved in the tender process? She stated in answer to a question in the other place —

I had no meetings with any of the proponents during the tender process. It would not be appropriate for me to have meetings with them during the tender process.

We have found that she did have meetings, but with only one tenderer—Carnegie. She had extensive meetings with that company. The ABC reported that the freedom of information documents it obtained show that she was overseeing her department’s financial negotiations with Carnegie, which included project milestones to be met for funding payments. In other words, she was actively involved in negotiation with one of the tenderers for the tender, which eventually won it. Another question the minister was asked in the upper house was about whom else she had met with. There were five tenderers all told. She met with one—Carnegie. This was a set-up. Professor David Harries, who I think had been the head of the department or the office of sustainability, is actively involved in this issue. I think he was on the board of Energy Made Clean with Ms MacTiernan, in between her stints in political life. Everyone looks at this and knows that it was a dodgy arrangement. Carnegie, a firm with which the minister had longstanding commercial interests, got the contract. The whole tender process was rigged.

After Carnegie got the tender, it was clearly struggling financially, because it was having a hard time absorbing Energy Made Clean. That is evident in the various reports that Carnegie issued and other commentary in the press. When Carnegie came to meet its milestone commitments, it failed. Indeed, it was so bad at it that it delayed asking for it. The minister renegotiated the milestones. She gave Carnegie some money and told it to come back in a number of weeks. During that time, Carnegie issued its annual report, which showed that the firm was on the way to bankruptcy and insolvency because it was burning cash. In other words, anybody who looked at that would have known that this firm could not meet its obligations under the contract. What did the minister do? She gave it \$2.65 million. We then asked why, if Carnegie had fallen over, the minister did not go back to one of the four other tenderers, which she had stated in answer to questions in the other house had put in viable and appropriate tenders. They were not as good as Carnegie—I assume that is why they did not get the contract, according to her rhetoric—but they met the threshold. She did not go back to them. She had one firm in mind all along the way.

**MR M. MCGOWAN (Rockingham — Premier)** [3.16 pm]: The government will obviously not agree to this motion. I repeat the point that, on Tuesdays, the opposition has a matter of public interest motion available to it. Members opposite knew about this issue this morning—the article was published this morning—but once again those opposite have abused the processes of the Parliament. The abuse of the processes of Parliament by a Liberal member of the Legislative Council is also happening as we speak.

As I outlined to the house during question time, the Minister for Regional Development had a minor shareholding and minor involvement with a company in 2011—a different company from the one that won the

tender in 2017. She divested herself of the shareholding in the other organisation before she became a minister. The \$30 000 payment for work as a private citizen in 2011 is completely and utterly irrelevant.

**Mr D.T. Redman** interjected.

**Mr M. McGOWAN:** I did not interject on you once—not once.

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Warren–Blackwood, you had your turn in silence!

**Mr M. McGOWAN:** It is completely and utterly irrelevant. Back eight years ago, she had a role as a private citizen, as people do. Before members were elected to Parliament, they all had roles as private citizens. She fulfilled that role. When we came to office, she set up an independent process that was headed up by a range of government organisations—the Public Utilities Office, the Department of Regional Development and the Department of Finance—to deliver an election commitment the government had made. That election commitment was delivered by that independent process—a tender panel—which came up with an outcome, which was that Carnegie Clean Energy would deliver a renewable energy project in Albany. Hon Alannah MacTiernan never held shares in Carnegie Clean Energy. She never held a role in Carnegie Clean Energy. She divested herself of her role in the other organisation in 2011. To try to draw a link between those different things is bizarre. I heard the Leader of the Opposition muttering about shares. Hon Alannah MacTiernan held a shareholding worth \$6 000 in Energy Made Clean, which she divested herself of before becoming a minister and before any of the processes around, and certainly the awarding of, the contract with Carnegie Clean Energy took place. Seriously, to try to draw a link between those things is beyond pathetic.

In light of the fact the opposition has raised this, I want to draw a few links. I want to outline a couple of real conflicts of interest. When I was Minister for Racing and Gaming, I brought in small bar reforms. One of the things I did—we succeeded in the metropolitan area—was allow all bottle shops to sell liquor on Sundays. One of the opponents was the member for Warren–Blackwood. He was running around the place lobbying against it. He was opposing it with all his worth. I remember him lobbying outside and inside, in the press, wherever, against the reforms. It turned out he owned a bottle shop that would suffer if the reforms we were bringing in came to pass. That was a conflict of interest, if members really want one.

**Mr D.T. Redman:** Will you take an interjection?

**Mr M. McGOWAN:** No, I will not. I did not interject on the member.

I will refer to another conflict of interest. Imagine that a minister issuing grants to a major telecommunications company owns shares in that company. That would be a conflict of interest. Do we know of a case in which that occurred? Yes, we do. The Leader of the Opposition, who owned shares in Telstra, was issuing grants to Telstra when he was the Treasurer to put in place infrastructure in Western Australia. Okay, there is a conflict of interest. I accept there is a conflict of interest. Do members know who agrees with me? Colin Barnett. I refer to *The West Australian* of March 2015 titled “Premier admits Nahan broke ministerial code”. There is a conflict of interest.

I already outlined earlier today the member for Bateman. I am pretty sure there might be another frontbencher who had a conflict of interest on a property matter that might come up shortly in the house. I am pretty sure there might be another one. They are real conflicts of interest.

This burrowing away to demean and defame a respected member of the community about a shareholding —  
Opposition members interjected.

**The SPEAKER:** Members, you were heard in silence!

**Mr M. McGOWAN:** — she held in a company, that was not the company that was issued a contract, and in any event she divested herself of eight years later is, frankly, ridiculous.

**Dr M.D. Nahan** interjected.

**The SPEAKER:** Leader of the Opposition, I call you to order for the second time.

**Mr M. McGOWAN:** It is embarrassing that it would even be raised. It is embarrassing that it would be written. It is a preposterous, ridiculous link and a preposterous, ridiculous story designed just to defame and run down the name of someone who is elected to public office. If there are real conflicts of interest, raise them, but that one raised by the opposition is, frankly, ridiculous and pathetic. The Leader of the Opposition never came in here and apologised for owning shares in a telecommunications company that he then gave money to as a minister.

**Dr M.D. Nahan** interjected.

**Mr M. McGOWAN:** The Leader of the Opposition never came in here and apologised. He never owned up to that.

**Dr M.D. Nahan** interjected.

**The SPEAKER:** Leader of the Opposition, I call you to order for the third time. When you spoke from this side of the house, there was complete silence. I want the same for here.

Mr Terry Redman; Mr David Templeman; Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Mark McGowan; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Bill Johnston

---

**Mr M. McGOWAN:** The future Leader of the National Party, the member for Warren–Blackwood, I repeat, owned a bottle shop and was campaigning against the reforms we were making that would have diminished the value of his bottle shop. That is a conflict of interest.

**Mr D.T. Redman** interjected.

**Mr M. McGOWAN:** The member should go and talk to the Clerk if he wants to.

**Mr D.T. Redman:** I did. I took advice from the Clerk at the time.

**Mr M. McGOWAN:** Okay. The member should stand and explain himself; make a personal explanation. He should explain what happened. I had to fight the Liberal Party up hill and down dale to put in place the small bar liquor reforms, the restaurant reforms and the liquor store reforms. I had to fight up hill and down dale to beat the Liberal Party. The National Party never gave in, and I know why—because the member for Warren–Blackwood was conflicted!

**MS R. SAFFIOTI (West Swan — Minister for Transport)** [3.23 pm]: Yet again, the opposition has suspended standing orders but does not present a case. It asserts today that if a member worked somewhere before becoming a minister, they cannot conduct any affairs in that ministerial role that relates to that industry. That is basically what the Liberal Party is asserting today. For example, could a member who worked for Qantas become the Minister for Tourism? I do not think they could, under the opposition's new rules. Could a member who worked in the banking industry become the Minister for Finance? Obviously not. Could a member who worked in the agricultural industry somehow, as a minister, be involved in administering that portfolio? No, according to the opposition. That is its new bar. Its new bar is that if a member worked or took payment in an industry years before becoming a minister, they cannot be the minister with the portfolio that has anything to do with that industry. That is its new rule. The Liberal Party is setting a ridiculous bar.

The Premier outlined the member for Warren–Blackwood's complete conflict of interest in respect of small bar reform in this state. One member opposite worked in the banking industry and then became the Minister for Finance. Another worked for Qantas and then became the Minister for Tourism. Did that minister ever conduct any business with Qantas when she was the Minister for Tourism? Did she? She should have conflicted herself out of that. That is the new standard being produced today.

A month does not go by in this place without these guys trying to attack Hon Alannah MacTiernan. She is a forthright, hardworking member in regional WA delivering for regional WA, and the opposition cannot handle it. Again, the opposition has suspended standing orders. As members know, I enjoy debate in this place. But there is nothing to respond to because, yet again, the opposition has not made its case. How could the Minister for Regional Development be conflicted if she were not a minister at the time she was involved in that industry?

The Premier has outlined that the Leader of the Opposition held shares in Telstra and QBE. He sat as a minister and made decisions in relation to those two companies. The then Premier said it was a conflict of interest. That is a pure fact. The member for Scarborough, who has now left this chamber, was involved in promoting tens of millions of dollars of government funding in an investment on the doorstep of her investment properties. I will not tell members today just how much rental returns have increased by as a result of that investment, but it is significant. We might go through that another day. No wonder she has left the chamber. How can members opposite sit here —

**Mrs A.K. Hayden** interjected.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** How is your successful small business going, member for Darling Range? Maybe you should declare what your successful small business was —

**Mrs A.K. Hayden** interjected.

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Darling Range!

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** — so if, heaven forbid, you ever become a minister, we will know what industry you should not be involved in! What was your successful small business?

**Mrs A.K. Hayden:** You wouldn't know.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** No-one knows!

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Darling Range, I call you to order for the second time.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** Member for Darling Range, what was your successful small business?

**The SPEAKER:** Minister, through the Chair.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** I think she should declare that because we need to know what potential conflict of interest she is creating in the event she ever takes on executive power. We need to know exactly what that successful small business was, member for Darling Range. When you said to the people of Kalamunda, when running to become mayor, that you were a successful small business woman, I am waiting to hear what successful small business that was.

**Mrs A.K. Hayden** interjected.

Mr Terry Redman; Mr David Templeman; Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Mark McGowan; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Bill Johnston

---

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Darling Range, I call you to order for the third time.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** Yet again, the opposition has suspended standing orders but presents no case. We can spend the next few hours in this place suspending, going through all the history of those opposite, where they worked before, all the decisions they made when they were ministers in that industry, and then say “They should never have held that job as minister”, if that is the new standard. It is completely out of this world. Yet again, they do not do the research and they do not present the facts —

**Mr D.C. Nalder:** So your redundancy payout was okay?

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** Say that again.

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

Several members interjected.

**The SPEAKER:** Minister for Tourism, I call you to order for the first time.

**Mr D.C. Nalder** interjected.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** I have not gone after you. There is plenty of ammunition to!

Opposition members interjected.

**The SPEAKER:** Members, please! You were heard in silence.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** There is plenty of ammunition to. I feel sorry for the fact that the Premier’s office was undermining you every day. I would hate that if I were you. I know you still resent it, as I would if I were you.

But the reality, again, is that members opposite have not presented the case and the new standard means that basically someone cannot become a minister of anywhere where they might have been employed because they received some income 10 years ago and therefore they cannot administer a portfolio or industry in the realm of where they might have been employed.

**MR W.J. JOHNSTON (Cannington — Minister for Industrial Relations)** [3.29 pm]: I want to draw to people’s attention what a conflict of interest is. I quote the Ministerial Code of Conduct —

Public duties must be carried out objectively and without consideration of personal or financial gain. Circumstances which could give rise to a serious conflict of interest are not necessarily restricted to those where an immediate advantage will be gained. They may instead take the form of a promise of future benefit, such as a promise of post-parliamentary employment. Any conflict between a Minister’s private interest and their public duty which arises must be resolved promptly in favour of the public interest. The same is as true for a perceived conflict of interest as an actual conflict.

The question is: what does the opposition say is conflicting for Hon Alannah MacTiernan and her decision-making?

**Mr D.T. Redman:** Don’t you think the historical relationship with this company is relevant to her duties?

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Warren–Blackwood, I call you to order for the second time. You have had your go.

**Mr W.J. JOHNSTON:** To answer the rhetorical question from the interjection: no, because I am not that stupid. A person cannot have a conflict with their past. It is not possible. Otherwise, the member for Bateman would be held to account for the loan given to Vinalco by the ANZ bank after he left. That is ridiculous. I have never said he was responsible for that. Here is a minister who was shown to have breached the ministerial code. As Mr Peter Conran said in the report that was tabled in this chamber —

This creates an actual conflict of interest with the Minister’s responsibilities for government ICT matters and procurement.

That is a quote from the paper tabled by Hon Colin Barnett in this chamber. The Liberal Party understands conflicts of interest because it was guilty of one. The member cannot be serious to think that because someone got paid for work, as is required by the law, years before they were a minister, it creates a conflict of interest. Read the English language, gentlemen. Look at what the words say. Where is the conflict? Where is the minister’s personal financial gain? Where is it? What are they saying is the personal gain?

*Division*

Question put and a division taken with the following result —

**Extract from *Hansard***  
[ASSEMBLY — Tuesday, 9 April 2019]  
p2251a-2256a

Mr Terry Redman; Mr David Templeman; Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Mark McGowan; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Bill Johnston

---

Ayes (18)

Mr I.C. Blayney  
Mr V.A. Catania  
Ms M.J. Davies  
Mrs L.M. Harvey  
Mrs A.K. Hayden

Dr D.J. Honey  
Mr P.A. Katsambanis  
Mr A. Krsticevic  
Mr S.K. L'Estrange  
Mr R.S. Love

Mr W.R. Marmion  
Mr J.E. McGrath  
Dr M.D. Nahan  
Mr D.C. Nalder  
Mr K. O'Donnell

Mr D.T. Redman  
Mr P.J. Rundle  
Ms L. Mettam (*Teller*)

Noes (38)

Ms L.L. Baker  
Dr A.D. Buti  
Mr J.N. Carey  
Mrs R.M.J. Clarke  
Mr R.H. Cook  
Ms J. Farrer  
Mr M.J. Folkard  
Ms J.M. Freeman  
Ms E.L. Hamilton  
Mr T.J. Healy

Mr M. Hughes  
Mr W.J. Johnston  
Mr D.J. Kelly  
Mr F.M. Logan  
Mr M. McGowan  
Ms S.F. McGurk  
Mr K.J.J. Michel  
Mr S.A. Millman  
Mr Y. Mubarakai  
Mr M.P. Murray

Mrs L.M. O'Malley  
Mr P. Papalia  
Mr S.J. Price  
Mr D.T. Punch  
Mr J.R. Quigley  
Ms M.M. Quirk  
Mrs M.H. Roberts  
Ms R. Saffioti  
Ms A. Sanderson  
Ms J.J. Shaw

Mrs J.M.C. Stojkovski  
Mr C.J. Tallentire  
Mr D.A. Templeman  
Mr P.C. Tinley  
Mr R.R. Whitby  
Ms S.E. Winton  
Mr B.S. Wyatt  
Mr D.R. Michael (*Teller*)

---

Pair

Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup

Ms C.M. Rowe

Question thus negatived.