

Thanks,

Just to clarify I was not implying that Wotif donation was against NSW laws, I was seeking to understand why the donation should be considered as an individual one rather than a corporate donation given you would assume a donation like that was corporate if it came from Rupert Murdoch.

I was seeking your personal opinion on the Wotif donation, given you state to be against corporate donations

Thanks

Peter

Sent from my iPad

On 16 Oct 2015, at 12:33 pm, Jamie Parker  
<[Jamie.Parker@parliament.nsw.gov.au](mailto:Jamie.Parker@parliament.nsw.gov.au)> wrote:

Hi Peter,

The NSW Greens have a long standing policy not to accept union or corporate donations and if you check the record you can see we were pressuring the ALP state government for many years on the issue. Greens amendments in 2010 were adopted by the Parliament to ban gaming, tobacco and alcohol entities from making political donations – a solid step forward. We Greens do not take credit for this but recognise it was credit to the community who pushed hard for reform and the Parliament (no one party had a majority) who passed the laws.

The Greens did not take the matter to the High Court it was taken by Mr McCloy who sought to overturn the ban. We support the ban so we wouldn't take it to the Court.

The cap was not doubled for Liberal and National. As the parties don't contest every seat they are only entitled to funding in the seats they contest so there is no way to double funding unless they both stood against each other in every seat. In regards to the individual donation from the founder of Wotif you are mistaking this individual donation at a federal level with NSW laws. There is no cap on individual donations at a Federal level. A corporate donation is from a company is from an individual.

Best Wishes

<image001.png>  
Jamie Parker MP

Member for Balmain  
Parliament House | Macquarie St  
Sydney NSW 2000

T (02) 9230 2803 |  
www.jamieparker.org.au

Electorate Office  
112a Glebe Point Road Glebe 2037  
T (02) 9660 7586

**From:** Peter Wicks <[wixxyleaks@gmail.com](mailto:wixxyleaks@gmail.com)>  
**Date:** 16 October 2015 at 2:39:34 AM AEDT  
**To:** Jamie Parker <[jamie@jamieparker.org](mailto:jamie@jamieparker.org)>  
**Subject: {Disarmed} Re: High Court decision, Save the Powerhouse, Family Fun Day, Student travel on light rail**

Hi,

I am looking to write an article for Wixxyleaks regarding this High Court decision.

I was wondering if you could respond to some queries that may enable me to better understand the role the Greens played in this matter.

You say you have been leading the charge, I was wondering if you could explain what part you played in the decision to ban donations from any of the industries you mention in your email

You appear to be claiming credit for the laws that were upheld, can you please tell me which Greens members voted for the Coalitions legislation that was overturned and which voted against it.

Can you explain the Greens role in taking this matter to the High Court.

Can you explain why the Greens supported allowing donations at the cap level to be made to both the Nationals and the Liberal Party separately effectively doubling their cap. Can you also shine a light on how this decision "Fights corruption" that you claim to "lead the charge" on.

Am I also right to assume from your email that you do not charge for tables at any of your events to fundraise?

The Greens were the recipients of Australia's largest ever corporate donation from the former CEO OF Wotif. Some Greens claim this was not a corporate donation and was a personal donation. Can you tell my readers whether you believe it to be a corporate or personal donation, and if personal would you consider a donation of the same amount from Gina Rinehart or Rupert Murdoch a personal or corporate donation?

Given The Greens were speaking out at the time against corporate donations can you perhaps explain why as a Party who don't appear to abide by the standards

that they seek to impose on others why readers should think they have any credibility at all on this subject?

Can you also tell readers why this shouldn't be viewed as the Greens attempting to gain credibility for something Labor has achieved and then followed through on?

If you could respond to these queries by next Wednesday evening it would be greatly appreciated.

Thanking you in advance

Peter Wicks  
[Wixxyleaks.com](http://Wixxyleaks.com)

Dear Peter –

As you know, I have been leading the charge on political donations reform and fighting corruption.

In a highly anticipated decision, the High Court of Australia has found that NSW laws which ban specific classes of political donors are constitutionally valid. NSW laws currently ban alcohol, tobacco, gambling and developer interests from making political donations. The Court also upheld our laws which apply caps on the amount of political donations.

**It was a fantastic result which gives us the opportunity to continue to clean up our political system. Elections should be about the contest of ideas, not the contest of cash. Whether it is cash in a brown paper bag or buying a table at a fundraising event the community needs to be sure that politicians are not being bought... [Read more](#) from the article in the SMH.**

My team and I are available to help with concerns you may have about public housing, public transport, health, planning and development, education, childcare or any other local or state issue.

Call us on **9660 7586** or email [jamie.parker@parliament.nsw.gov.au](mailto:jamie.parker@parliament.nsw.gov.au).

Best wishes and thank you for your support.