

28 days after you were elected as the member for Nelson, is another matter. Solomon probably would not have envisaged that would occur, so there would not be a requirement.

But when you stand up in this House and there is an apparent or real conflict of interest, you would be expected to say: 'I am not going to vote on this because I am a member of AFLNT.' Another case may arise, if we talk about INPEX, I might have been a member of one of the industry bodies for the oil and gas industry. I might have subscribed to their newsletter that comes out on a monthly basis. As an Independent member or an opposition member, you probably subscribe to all sorts of journals or you are members of organisations to get access to journals - would you necessarily put those down? No. But if you were a cabinet minister and you were also a member of an organisation lobbying the federal government on emission trading and you had to take a position on it, you would have to declare an interest.

Would you be castigated or brought before privileges because you did not put that on your register 28 days after becoming a member of parliament? No. Could you have reasonably foreseen there would have been a conflict? No. But as soon as you are aware that there is either a conflict or a potential for conflict, it is for us, as members of parliament, to identify that as soon as possible. That is what this particular clause is trying to pick up.

Madam CHAIR: Chief Minister, you have an amendment.

Mr HENDERSON: Madam Chair, I seek leave to insert under the schedule. There was a drafting omission to insert a requirement for members to declare any other substantial source of income and the required information to declare that source of income. Obviously, it is very reasonable to expect. This is a drafting error, for which I apologise – the government did not pick it up.

As members of parliaments, it is appropriate that if we have a second job, for example - whatever that second job may be, that provides us with a substantial source of income - that there is a requirement and should be a requirement, for us to declare that substantial income and the source of that particular income - be it through a second job, a part-time job, a family trust, or significant financial disbursements from trusts. Obviously, shareholding is picked up elsewhere in this legislation, but it does go to the intent that, as a member of parliament, you are expected to discharge your duties to the maximum of your ability and, if you are in receipt of substantial income from other sources, then a requirement to

declare those sources is a commonsense amendment to the schedule.

Mr ELFERINK: A very quick question for the Chief Minister. When did you become aware of this drafting error?

Mr HENDERSON: I am advised that we became aware of it at the end of last week. Parliamentary Counsel drafted the amendment. It was circulated to the opposition yesterday, I am advised, and formally tabled this morning. But the end of last week was when it became apparent.

Mr ELFERINK: That is fine. I put on the record that we received a slap from the Attorney-General for exactly the same time frame as one of the other bills that we debated before the House. Perhaps the Attorney-General would care to give the Chief Minister a similar slap.

Amendment agreed to.

Schedule agreed to.

Remainder of the bill, by leave, taken as a whole and agreed to.

Bill reported with amendment; report adopted.

Mr HENDERSON (Chief Minister): Madam Speaker, I move that the bill be now read a third time.

Motion agreed to, bill read a third time.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY (MEMBERS' CODE OF CONDUCT AND ETHICAL STANDARDS) BILL (Serial 12)

Continued from 22 October 2008.

Mr MILLS (Opposition Leader): Madam Speaker, the opposition supports this bill. However, it is important to acknowledge that statements of this kind, standards that are described, serve a purpose, perhaps, as a reminder to honourable members. We can have someone called an honourable member who may not be. We may have words that are describing the behaviour of members, but they may do whatever they like and, yet, we have a standard set.

It is important that we put into perspective, when we use words like 'integrity', 'honesty', 'fair dealing' and all those things, that we take the time to be challenged by what is being referred to. Otherwise, it is quite meaningless as, sadly, a lot of the processes we go through in the parliament are just for the exercise. I hope that this is not for the exercise. There are many debates and