

Mr Colin Barnett; Speaker; Mr John Kobelke; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr Max Trenorden; Mr Eric Ripper; Mr Mark McGowan

**ESCAPE FROM SUPREME COURT, ASSEMBLY TO OVERSEE TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR
INDEPENDENT INQUIRY**

Standing Orders Suspension - Motion

MR C.J. BARNETT (Cottesloe - Leader of the Opposition) [2.38 pm]: I move without notice -

That so much of the standing orders be suspended as is necessary to allow this House to debate a motion for this House to oversee the drafting of the terms of reference for the proposed inquiry into the escape of nine dangerous prisoners from the Supreme Court last week.

I note that the Premier reacted to that motion to suspend standing orders with a cynical laugh. There is no cynical laughing in the community. Nine dangerous prisoners walked out of the Supreme Court and three of them remain at large. On Wednesday this week, a break in and robbery occurred at a TAB facility in South Perth. It was a violent attack that included the firing of a shot from a sophisticated hand revolver. Dangerous, hardened criminals are at large in our community. This issue has been raised in Parliament repeatedly throughout the week. We have had nothing but attempts by this Premier and the Minister for Justice to change the agenda to anything but the Government's accountability. This matter should be inquired into.

Dr G.I. Gallop: It will be.

MR C.J. BARNETT: So says the Premier. Will it be an independent inquiry? What is the point of holding an inquiry if it is not truly independent? Earlier this year the Premier attempted to cover-up the fiasco when Western Power lost power across the State on 18 February. That was an absolute fiasco. The Government spent \$700 000 on an inquiry that did not even look at the root cause of the loss of power or the ineptitude of the Minister for Energy. It did not inquire into his failure to plan and prepare for a summer peak load. The point I make and why standing orders need to be suspended is that that inquiry was not independent. In saying so, I do not reflect on the people who undertook it; the terms of reference were too limited because they were established by the Premier and the minister, who wanted to do nothing but limit the scope of the inquiry. Today exactly the same thing has happened.

The Minister for Justice came into the House yesterday and read out a hastily put together ministerial statement referring to the Hooker inquiry. It is a vague one-and-a-half page statement. It is not specific. It is anything but terms of reference. When questioned today the Premier could not answer questions about what were the terms of reference. We then found out from the Minister for Justice in response to another question that a meeting will be held tomorrow involving people under her and the Premier's jurisdiction to dream up and work out the terms of reference of the inquiry. This is an absolute sham. I would have confidence in Mr Hooker to conduct the inquiry if he were given legitimate terms of reference.

I refer again to the question asked by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. He asked -

I refer the minister to her comments on ABC Radio this morning in response to a claim made yesterday that the terms of reference of the Hooker inquiry into the great escape had not yet been released, to which the minister stated, "That was just completely wrong."

On radio this morning, the minister implied that the terms of reference have been released. I presume she was referring to the one and a half pages of vague comments in her ministerial statement yesterday. When the Premier was tackled on this same question, he said that he did not know whether there were terms of reference. The minister talked about draft terms of reference, and she then talked about generalised terms of reference. I might not be Einstein, but I think there is a difference between a one-and-a-half page vague and hastily written ministerial statement, a draft terms of reference, a generalised terms of reference, and a real terms of reference. If this inquiry is to have any credibility, it must have formal terms of reference; and if it is to have any credibility as an independent inquiry, those terms of reference must be drafted by people not subject to that inquiry. The minister is subject to that inquiry. How can the minister, or anyone in her office or agency, play any role in determining those terms of reference? To do so would immediately compromise the inquiry. That is why standing orders must be suspended. If this inquiry is to be legitimate in assessing the role of the minister, it must have formal terms of reference.

THE SPEAKER: Order! The member for South Perth has indicated that the level of conversation at the rear of the Chamber is such that he cannot hear the debate. I ask those members who are having private conversations to have those conversations outside of the Chamber.

MR C.J. BARNETT: During the past three days in this Parliament, the Government has been finding excuses, trying to divert attention and spin a line to the media. The member for Pilbara moved a motion yesterday that standing orders be suspended so far as to enable debate on a motion that a standing committee of this Parliament

Mr Colin Barnett; Speaker; Mr John Kobelke; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr Max Trenorden; Mr Eric Ripper; Mr Mark McGowan

be directed to carry out an inquiry into this matter. The Government would not allow even that debate to take place. Ever since the great escape took place, the minister has sought to blame the judges, blame the Opposition, blame AIMS and blame the department. She has sought to blame everyone else rather than accept any personal responsibility. Then, when the heat came on and the minister was all over the shop and was getting - deservedly - poor coverage in the media, she dreamt up the Hooker inquiry and read out a one-and-a-half page poorly-written ministerial statement. Is that the terms of reference? We do not know. That is a fair question. I want to know, Mr Speaker. Do you know, Mr Speaker? You are in charge, Mr Speaker, of conduct in this Parliament. That is a responsibility that you carry as Speaker. I doubt, Mr Speaker, whether you could say whether we have legitimate terms of reference. Was the brief ministerial statement the terms of reference? It was not labelled in that way. It was labelled "Independent Inquiry into Supreme Court Incident". It was not the terms of reference. Today the Premier did not have a clue. He did not know whether there were terms of reference or not. When it was put to the minister on radio that there were no terms of reference, she categorically denied that, thereby implying to the listening public that there were terms of reference. Today the minister cannot distinguish between -

The SPEAKER: Order! I am sure the Leader of the Opposition knows the rules of this debate. I am sure he will now, after he has been speaking for seven minutes, address the reasons that standing orders should be suspended, rather than the motion that he wishes to debate, and I urge him to do that.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: Mr Speaker, I have repeatedly made the point, and I make it again, that we need to suspend standing orders to allow this debate to take place. For the past two days we have been asking the Government questions on this matter. Today we asked a series of questions of the Premier and the minister.

Mr J.N. Hyde interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the member for Perth to order for the first time.

Mrs M.H. Roberts interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order, minister!

Mr C.J. BARNETT: When the Premier was asked straightforward questions, he ran for cover. He scurried out of the Chamber and hid in his office. Now he has gone again. He does not want to be anywhere near this debate. The Premier - "Good News" Geoff - does not want to be anywhere near this. He is jumping out of the Morris Minor, as we see in the Alston cartoon in yesterday's *The West Australian*.

Another reason that we need to suspend standing orders is that the only institution that can bring a minister to account is the Parliament. How can we possibly expect to have an independent inquiry that will examine the minister's performance and role if the terms of reference of that inquiry are set by the Premier and the minister involved? It is an absolute disgrace.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I am very hesitant to respond to the interjections of members opposite, because I am conscious of the fact that I have been called to order twice. It is important that the same rules apply to all to keep the balance in debate, so I will address the Chair and the motion to suspend standing orders.

In question time today, the Premier refused to answer. The minister would not answer. As I have said, the only institution that can bring a minister to account is the Parliament. There have been all sorts of failures in this matter. The issue at the Supreme Court relates to the condition of the holding cells. The holding cells have probably been there for close to 100 years. They are inadequate. However, the great escape happened last Thursday.

Mr J.N. Hyde interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the member to Perth to order for the second time.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: The great escape happened not four years ago, but last Thursday. It followed a report by the Inspector of Custodial Services in November 2001 that pointed to the state of the facilities at the Supreme Court and made a number of recommendations, including the fact that contract staff of AIMS should not be in charge of high-risk prisoners. That report was handed down during the watch of the minister's predecessor, the now Minister for Health. The minister had not even read that report. It is highly pertinent that the Minister for Justice, who has been in that portfolio for a year, had not read a significant report from the Inspector of Custodial Services in November 2001. How can we expect the minister to have taken any action to prevent that escape if she had not even bothered to read that report? Part of the problem is that the minister is a lazy minister. A lazy minister is a minister who does not attend to her duties. That is another reason that we need to suspend standing

Mr Colin Barnett; Speaker; Mr John Kobelke; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr Max Trenorden; Mr Eric Ripper; Mr Mark McGowan

orders. The minister needs to be brought to account. Why had the minister not read that report? Why had she not undertaken those actions? Why is the Government now spending money on making cosmetic improvements to the Supreme Court, as pointed out by the member for Nedlands, instead of attending to the matter that was identified in the 2001 report; namely, the security shortfalls? This inquiry will be another sham. I do not know Mr Hooker. He is obviously a very competent barrister and capable of conducting inquiries. However, how can he do his job if he is given terms of reference by a Premier and by a minister whose own negligence is part of the problem? How can he possibly do his job? Although this report will probably not be as expensive, it will be of as little value as the report into the energy crisis this State faced when four high-profile, very expensive consultants were paid \$4 000 a day each to tell us that we had run out of electricity. The report was of little value because the terms of reference were too limited. That is the point. This Parliament should oversee the writing of the terms of reference.

When the member for Pilbara sought to establish a standing committee to investigate this matter, he was not even given the opportunity by this Government to debate the issue. I do not know whether I agreed with his action, but he had the right at least to have standing orders suspended so that he could present his argument. However, no, Dr Gallop, the Premier, who would not be accountable to this Parliament, stopped that debate. The Leader of the House is sitting opposite with a smug look on his face because he will guillotine this debate. He will not let this minister be exposed to one more moment of parliamentary scrutiny. He will not allow her to stand in this Chamber and be questioned and challenged in debate. The Premier will not be here because he has already done a runner. We saw him do that last night. When this minister was being challenged, the Premier came in here only to vote. He did not show his face once until a vote was taken.

Several members interjected.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: We hear the interjections.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! Are members finished with their cross-Chamber interjections?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: This is a serious issue. Three dangerous criminals are still at large, yet this Government does not want the Parliament to debate that fact and deal with probably the most pressing issue on the minds of the citizens of Perth right now. People are scared. Do you understand, Mr Speaker, that elderly people in our community are scared? An elderly woman hid terrified in her shed while those criminals were at large in her community.

Mr A.J. Carpenter interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr C.J. BARNETT: When the Minister for Education and Training interjects and trivialises the fact that an 80-year-old woman cowered, frightened, in her garden shed, it tells me a lot about him. An 80-year-old woman in South Perth hid in fear in her shed and all he can do is laugh at her. What sort of member of Parliament would laugh at an 80-year-old woman who hid frightened in her shed because an armed hoodlum is at large? That reflects the attitude of this Government.

This motion to suspend standing orders is a test of this Parliament's credibility. Mr Speaker, you are the person in the Chair. History will record whether this Parliament will play its proper role in scrutinising, overseeing the preparation of, and perhaps agreeing to, the terms of reference for an inquiry into matters, including the conduct of this Minister for Justice. Or will you, Mr Speaker, as the person sitting in the Chair, preside over a Parliament that fails its responsibility to be accountable? If so, it will reflect on your record, Mr Speaker, as much as it will on this Parliament. That is what this debate is about. That is why we should suspend standing orders. I hope you are giving informal advice to your colleagues on that side, Mr Speaker, to support the suspension of standing orders. If the Leader of the House jumps up now and guillotines this debate, it will, in part, be on your head. This is the forum of debate and accountability.

MR J.C. KOBELKE (Nollamara - Leader of the House) [2.57 pm]: The Leader of the Opposition often does some remarkable things; for example, he seems to choose any opportunity to make himself look even sillier than everyone knows he is. He is seen throughout the length and breadth of Western Australia as someone who is simply not up to the job. He has grabbed the opportunity today to see how he can make himself look even sillier than everybody knows he is. He puts a few chook scratchings on a piece of paper and seeks to suspend standing orders in a speech that lasts for more than 15 minutes during which he failed to address why we should suspend standing orders. There is no reason to suspend standing orders.

On Tuesday we debated the escape of the prisoners from the Supreme Court lockup. On Wednesday we debated the same matter, and on Tuesday and Wednesday, and again today, a series of questions were asked on that same issue. Those questions and that debate highlighted the fact that the minister has acted promptly and responsibly

Mr Colin Barnett; Speaker; Mr John Kobelke; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr Max Trenorden; Mr Eric Ripper; Mr Mark McGowan

in dealing with the matter. Also highlighted in that debate was that we have an Opposition that is without standards. It is not interested in improving prison security. In the debate yesterday its members waved around press releases and, in a bullying and nasty way, tried to stop people hearing what the minister was saying. We saw today something that we do not see very often, Mr Speaker; namely, despite all the latitude you gave, you still had to name the Leader of the Opposition and the person on his left, whatever title he has - we are uncertain about that.

Point of Order

Mrs C.L. EDWARDES: The Leader of the House knows that if he wishes to canvass your rulings that you have given on numerous occasions, Mr Speaker, he can do so by way of substantive motion; therefore, I suggest you call him to order.

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: I am not canvassing your ruling, Mr Speaker. I know the ruling for this place. The trouble is that outside this House the Leader of the National Party uses a different title. Therefore, the appropriate title by which he should be known in public is open to conjecture.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is a point of order. People's titles in this place are to be used as they appear on the various publications used in here. The member for Avon is the Leader of the National Party.

Debate Resumed

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: The point I am making is that people in this Chamber can make their own judgement.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! I call to order the member for Dawesville for the first time in a couple of years.

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: The interjections of members opposite came in on chorus. I simply suggested that people make a judgment on them and they confirmed again that they are rabble. We feel sorry for them because they have no leader. They are behaving like leaderless rabble because they are leaderless. We know they are leaderless because they have someone who seeks to achieve silliness at every opportunity. The people in the public gallery know that they are leaderless rabble.

There is no basis for suspending standing orders. The Opposition is seeking to debate in a substantive motion the terms of reference for the inquiry into the escape of prisoners from the Supreme Court. The Minister for Justice has already tabled - it has been made public - a document indicating the terms of reference, that they are to be fully developed and by whom they are to be developed. That is standard practice when seeking to establish a serious inquiry headed by a competent and respected barrister. That person, with people of standing in the public sector, will review those terms and see to what extent they should be varied or teased out so that the actual terms of reference will deliver a report that will cover appropriately and properly the issues that are covered in the letter from the Minister for Justice. That is what it is about. Was one word of concern heard in debate yesterday from the Leader of the Opposition about the detail of the terms of reference? Not one single issue was raised suggesting that those terms of reference were inadequate.

A second point I make about the total incompetence of the Leader of the Opposition is that if we entered into such a debate, and this House determined those terms of reference, not only would we not have the expertise of the barristers who will confirm those terms of reference, but also the terms of reference would be decided by a majority of this Chamber; and a majority of this Chamber is the Government. Therefore, the Government would set the terms of reference. Then the Leader of the Opposition, seeking another opportunity to look silly, would most probably jump up and say that the terms of reference are not acceptable because the Government set them; we should have lawyers setting them. That is how absolutely silly this Leader of the Opposition is. On that basis, we should not suspend standing orders so that this matter can be debated. We should let the minister do what she is doing most competently; namely, establishing this inquiry. People of competence and standing, such as the barrister, should be able to get on with the job. When we have clearly defined the detail of the causes of what went on, and which should not happen again, we can take steps to ensure it never happens again. That is proper process. All we have with this little stunt is the Leader of the Opposition, for a reason that escapes me, trying to make himself look even sillier than he is.

MR M.W. TRENORDEN (Avon - Leader of the National Party) [3.00 pm]: Obviously, I support the motion for the suspension of standing orders.

Mr E.S. Ripper: You are the deputy leader of the Opposition. We would expect you to.

Withdrawal of Remark

Mr Colin Barnett; Speaker; Mr John Kobelke; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr Max Trenorden; Mr Eric Ripper; Mr Mark McGowan

Mr C.J. BARNETT: The Deputy Premier referred to the Leader of the National Party as the deputy leader of the Opposition. Mr Speaker, you have just ruled on that. I suggest you call him to order.

The SPEAKER: The point of order is correct. I can do without the advice from the Leader of the Opposition. I direct the Deputy Premier to withdraw that comment.

Mr E.S. RIPPER: I withdraw.

Debate Resumed

Mr M.W. TRENORDEN: This is an exceedingly serious matter.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order, members! I can do without the Leader of the Opposition's advice totally on how this place should operate. I call the Leader of the Opposition to order for the third time for that outburst. Members, it is inappropriate to interject at such a level that the Leader of the National Party cannot contribute to this debate.

Mr M.W. TRENORDEN: This is a very important moment in this Parliament. Members on this side of the House are asking whether this is an attempt to move something that is a responsibility of this Chamber and of this House, so that there will be another whitewash. That is absolutely our responsibility, and we are attempting to get this House to give that matter due consideration. A range of questions must be asked. I am particularly interested in one at the end. However, there are some important questions up front. Why is this not happening in the House? Why is this inquiry not the property of this Chamber? The only place in which this minister is accountable is this Chamber. It is a serious matter for the Government to try to move that to somewhere else. In that process, a range of questions need to be answered before any inquiry occurs. Who will fund this inquiry?

Mrs M.H. Roberts: The Government of Western Australia.

Mr M.W. TRENORDEN: Then how can it be an independent inquiry? If the money is coming out of the minister's budget, how can it be an independent inquiry? If the money is coming out of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet's budget, how can it be an independent inquiry? He who pays the piper calls the tune. If the money is coming from any of those agencies, and not under the same process that applies to a royal commission, how can the inquiry be independent? Who will employ the staff? Who are the people? We know who will head the team, but who will employ the staff? Who will administer that process? What is the role of the previous Minister for Justice in all this process? For several days in this House we have been talking about a report that dates back to 2001. A different minister was in charge at that stage, as you know, Mr Speaker. We have a right to know whether that minister has any role in or responsibility for what has occurred in recent times. That is a legitimate question that this House needs to ask. In fact, we must know the answer. Is that a part of the terms of reference of the inquiry?

We have heard today that there are and there are not terms of reference. I will deal with that in a few moments. To whom will the inquiry report? Who will receive that report?

Mr C.J. Barnett: Who will receive the draft report and have a right to comment on it?

Mr M.W. TRENORDEN: That is the point I want to make. Mr Speaker, you and I both know who should receive that report. You should receive that report. You are our representative in this place. It is your responsibility to receive that report and give it to us - not as an individual. I see that you are frowning a bit, Mr Speaker. It is your responsibility, through your office, to bring that report to us. That is your role. In all likelihood, that report will go to one ministerial office or another in a draft form, and be rewritten.

Mr C.J. Barnett: And vetted. That is what will happen.

Mr M.W. TRENORDEN: It will be vetted and rewritten. That is the accountability process.

The SPEAKER: I am sure that the Leader of the National Party will get to the actual motion to suspend standing orders and why we should suspend standing orders, rather than deal with where the final report will go or anything of that nature. I direct that the Leader of the National Party now start talking to the motion.

Mr M.W. TRENORDEN: I am talking to the motion, Mr Speaker. This is a very important issue. This motion is about the suspension of standing orders, and I need to put on the record why I believe there needs to be a suspension of standing orders. There is long precedent in this House about how that occurs. I am just going through that process, as I am sure you understand, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: It has not ever been the case that members are permitted to discuss the actual merits of the motion that they wish to debate if a suspension is granted. Members should debate whether we should suspend.

Mr Colin Barnett; Speaker; Mr John Kobelke; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr Max Trenorden; Mr Eric Ripper; Mr Mark McGowan

Mr M.W. TRENORDEN: Mr Speaker, I will not canvass your rulings. However, I wish to speak for a few more -

A government member interjected.

Mr M.W. TRENORDEN: There are a lot of “buts” on the other side - there are a lot of hot “buts” on the other side. There is a problem with the so-called terms of reference that have been placed in front of us.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order, members!

Mr M.W. TRENORDEN: There is a problem. In the terms of reference that the minister just outlined to us, why is the Inspector of Custodial Services to be investigated? That is a reasonable question for this Parliament to ask and to have answered before any inquiry commences. Why will that individual be a part of the inquiry? The minister has said that these are the terms of reference for her inquiry, and point 2 refers to -

The role of . . . the Inspector of Custodial Services in these matters.

We are heading into an inquiry, and we would like to debate why the role and all the responsibilities of that officer should be investigated. Why will the role of that officer be included in this inquiry? Does the minister know something that we do not know? This is meant to be a very serious inquiry.

Mrs M.H. Roberts interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order, minister!

Mr M.W. TRENORDEN: I know the tensions are high. I apologise if I am going through the process, but I want the House to know that I take this matter exceedingly seriously. We have a situation in which a minister is under pressure. In this House, there is no more important process than ministers being accountable. All we are seeking to do is ask questions about how that process will work. We are seeking a suspension of the standing orders so that we can go through a process to establish why that will be the case. We also want to know about the currency and urgency of this argument. This is about this House. This House has challenged the minister and the Premier to be accountable. We want to ensure that whatever actions come from this place, they are appropriate for this House. There seems to be a range of people who do not want this House to have that information. We moved the motion to suspend standing orders so that we can establish a raft of important issues before any action is taken, by the Government I might add, so we do not have Caesar judging Caesar, which is what we are facing. It is a critical issue for this House. I have been a member of this Chamber for many years -

Mr J.C. Kobelke: That is no reason to suspend standing orders.

Mr M.W. TRENORDEN: No, it is far from a reason for suspending standing orders. However, in all of that time, it is rare that a minister comes under the sustained pressure of calls for her head. Those calls are not just coming from the opposition benches; they are coming from publications and from the people who watch our actions. This place must be accountable to itself. Fifty-seven members were elected to this place and at the start of the session each of those members filed up to the Table of the House and swore to carry out their responsibilities as members of Parliament.

Mr J.C. Kobelke: Speak to the motion.

Mr M.W. TRENORDEN: I am speaking to the motion. I am telling members why standing orders need to be suspended so we can debate these issues. Fifty-seven members of this Chamber have sworn to carry out their responsibilities. The practice of the Westminster system is that when a minister comes under pressure, we should undertake our role as members of Parliament - the primary role of all 57 of us in this Chamber - and not take a partisan role. If the minister is free of all guilt, then that should be for the Parliament to decide.

Mr J.C. Kobelke: It has already decided it.

Mr C.J. Barnett: No, it has not.

Mr J.C. Kobelke: Yes, it has. It was done yesterday. The Parliament voted on it. That is your argument; it has been answered.

Mr E.S. Ripper: We did it twice; we did it on Tuesday and we did it again on Wednesday. Now, we are about to do it again.

Mr M.W. TRENORDEN: Those interjections only increase the reasons for suspending standing orders. Members opposite are saying that the Executive of this State should dominate this House and that the decisions

Mr Colin Barnett; Speaker; Mr John Kobelke; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr Max Trenorden; Mr Eric Ripper; Mr Mark McGowan

of this House should be made from the Terrace or behind some back door by not so faceless men and women who come to this Chamber and tell the people of Western Australia, the people whom you and I represent, Mr Speaker, that we do not have a role in this process. The Leader of the House is making a very serious allegation that only the Executive should make a decision.

Mr J.C. Kobelke: I made no such allegation.

Mr M.W. TRENORDEN: Yes, he did. That is precisely what he is saying. The suspension of standing orders is a legitimate tool of this House to bring accountability to this process. I can see blank looks on members opposite and I doubt whether this motion will succeed. However, if this motion does not succeed and we do not suspend standing orders, a very substantial cloud will hang over any investigation that occurs, no matter what the ability of the investigator. I have to say, as I said yesterday, I do not know the individual. I have no idea of the person's competency but I have no doubt he is a very competent person of great integrity; I have no question about that at all. However, at the very least we should be able to suspend standing orders and debate the terms of reference. I suggest that the terms of reference put forward are more like a statement; it cannot be called anything else other than a statement. Will the terms of reference be established by this Chamber?

Mr C.J. Barnett: Are there any now?

Mr M.W. TRENORDEN: Do any already exist? The Premier says they do not exist; the minister says they do.

Point of Order

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: The question before the House is the suspension of standing orders. When the member on his feet occasionally throws the words "standing orders" into his speech it does not mean he is speaking to the motion. I suggest to you, Mr Speaker, that, given he has been going on for some considerable time, most of what he has had to say has had nothing do with the motion before the Chair.

The SPEAKER: The Leader of the House is accurate in that assumption. In the last five minutes the Leader of the National Party has touched more upon the motion than in the first 10 or so minutes. However, he is actually touching upon the motion sufficiently not to breach my previous ruling.

Question to be Put

Mr M. McGOWAN: I move -

That the question be now put.

Question put and a division taken with the following result -

Ayes (28)

Mr P.W. Andrews	Dr G.I. Gallop	Mr J.A. McGinty	Mr J.R. Quigley
Mr J.J.M. Bowler	Mrs D.J. Guise	Mr M. McGowan	Ms J.A. Radisich
Mr C.M. Brown	Mr S.R. Hill	Ms S.M. McHale	Mr E.S. Ripper
Mr A.J. Carpenter	Mr J.N. Hyde	Mr A.D. McRae	Mrs M.H. Roberts
Mr A.J. Dean	Mr J.C. Kobelke	Mr N.R. Marlborough	Mr D.A. Templeman
Mr J.B. D'Orazio	Mr F.M. Logan	Mr M.P. Murray	Mr M.P. Whitely
Dr J.M. Edwards	Ms A.J. MacTiernan	Mr A.P. O'Gorman	Ms M.M. Quirk (<i>Teller</i>)

Noes (20)

Mr C.J. Barnett	Mr J.P.D. Edwards	Mr R.F. Johnson	Mr M.W. Trenorden
Mr D.F. Barron-Sullivan	Mr L. Graham	Mr W.J. McNee	Mr T.K. Waldron
Mr M.J. Birney	Mr B.J. Grylls	Mr P.D. Omodei	Ms S.E. Walker
Mr J.H.D. Day	Ms K. Hodson-Thomas	Mr P.G. Pandal	Dr J.M. Woollard
Mrs C.L. Edwardes	Mr M.G. House	Mr R.N. Sweetman	Mr A.D. Marshall (<i>Teller</i>)

Extract from *Hansard*
[ASSEMBLY - Thursday, 17 June 2004]
p3907b-3914a

Mr Colin Barnett; Speaker; Mr John Kobelke; Mrs Cheryl Edwardes; Mr Max Trenorden; Mr Eric Ripper; Mr Mark McGowan

Pairs

Mr R.C. Kucera
Mrs C.A. Martin
Mr P.B. Watson

Mr M.F. Board
Mr J.L. Bradshaw
Mr R.A. Ainsworth

Independent Pairs

Dr E. Constable
Mr B.K. Masters

Question thus passed.

Standing Orders Suspension Resumed

Question put and a division taken with the following result -

Ayes (20)

Mr C.J. Barnett
Mr D.F. Barron-Sullivan
Mr M.J. Birney
Mr J.H.D. Day
Mrs C.L. Edwardes

Mr J.P.D. Edwards
Mr L. Graham
Mr B.J. Grylls
Ms K. Hodson-Thomas
Mr M.G. House

Mr R.F. Johnson
Mr W.J. McNee
Mr P.D. Omodei
Mr P.G. Pandal
Mr R.N. Sweetman

Mr M.W. Trenorden
Mr T.K. Waldron
Ms S.E. Walker
Dr J.M. Woollard
Mr A.D. Marshall (*Teller*)

Noes (28)

Mr P.W. Andrews
Mr J.J.M. Bowler
Mr C.M. Brown
Mr A.J. Carpenter
Mr A.J. Dean
Mr J.B. D'Orazio
Dr J.M. Edwards

Dr G.I. Gallop
Mrs D.J. Guise
Mr S.R. Hill
Mr J.N. Hyde
Mr J.C. Kobelke
Mr F.M. Logan
Ms A.J. MacTiernan

Mr J.A. McGinty
Mr M. McGowan
Ms S.M. McHale
Mr A.D. McRae
Mr N.R. Marlborough
Mr M.P. Murray
Mr A.P. O'Gorman

Mr J.R. Quigley
Ms J.A. Radisich
Mr E.S. Ripper
Mrs M.H. Roberts
Mr D.A. Templeman
Mr M.P. Whitely
Ms M.M. Quirk (*Teller*)

Pairs

Mr M.F. Board
Mr J.L. Bradshaw
Mr R.A. Ainsworth

Mr R.C. Kucera
Mrs C.A. Martin
Mr P.B. Watson

Independent Pairs

Dr E. Constable
Mr B.K. Masters

Question thus negatived.