

Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Fran Logan; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Dr Mike Nahan; Mr David Templeman; Mr Peter Abetz; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr John Quigley; Dr Janet Woollard; Mr Mick Murray

**FRANCHISING BILL 2010 — REFERRAL TO
ECONOMICS AND INDUSTRY STANDING COMMITTEE**

Standing Orders Suspension — Motion

MR R.F. JOHNSON (Hillarys — Leader of the House) [11.21 am]: I move —

That standing orders be suspended as is necessary to enable the following motion to be moved forthwith —

That the Franchising Bill 2010 is hereby immediately referred to the Economics and Industry Standing Committee for consideration and will report no later than 26 May 2011.

MR M. McGOWAN (Rockingham) [11.21 am]: The opposition supports the suspension of standing orders.

Question put and passed.

Motion

MR R.F. JOHNSON (Hillarys — Leader of the House) [11.22 am]: I move —

That the Franchising Bill 2010 is hereby immediately referred to the Economics and Industry Standing Committee for consideration and will report no later than 26 May 2011.

I will be brief because the opposition might have something to say. By the sounds of it, they will move an amendment to the motion. I wait eagerly to see what the amendment is. The purpose of moving the motion is so that the Economics and Industry Standing Committee will have the opportunity to look at the bill in detail. There are mixed views in this chamber about the bill as it now stands. It is appropriate to send the bill to the relevant standing committee—which happens from time to time—for an adequate and fair appraisal. That is the reason for the motion. I wait to hear what the opposition says about the amendment it will move.

Amendment to Motion

MR F.M. LOGAN (Cockburn) [11.23 am]: I move —

To delete all words after “Franchising Bill 2010” and substitute the following —

be immediately debated and taken through all remaining stages at this day’s sitting, including the existing capacity for any member to move after the second reading has been agreed to that the bill be referred to a committee.

The reason for moving this amendment is straightforward. The Leader of the House’s justification for referring the Franchising Bill 2010 to the Economics and Industry Standing Committee is that members in the chamber have mixed views about the bill. We do not know that. The chamber has not heard any views about this bill apart from the views of the mover of the bill. The Liberal Party may well have very mixed views on the bill in its party room, but so far this chamber has not heard any complaints about the need to make changes to the bill. All we have heard is the second reading speech given by member for Southern River. The Leader of the House knows that it is the custom and practice of the house to refer a bill to a committee after the second reading debate if there is a problem or an issue with it. A bill is not referred to a committee before the opposition has even had an opportunity to comment on it. The government intends to send the bill to the Economics and Industry Standing Committee before this house has had an opportunity to hear one word about the bill, apart from the member for Southern River’s second reading speech. The Leader of the House knows that is not the custom and practice of Parliament. All members are given the opportunity to speak in the second reading debate of a bill before the bill is referred to a committee. The Leader of the House knows that. This is a simple tactic the Liberal Party is using to shut up the member for Southern River. That is all this is about. What issues has the government raised about the structure or content of the bill and the problems and mixed views that the Leader of the House refers to? None. None of the issues that the Leader of the House is saying justify the referral of this bill to the Economics and Industry Standing Committee have been raised. Talk about an abuse of parliamentary process. Let us make it very clear that the opposition supports the bill.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr A.P. O’Gorman): Order! I ask members to desist interjecting. It makes it very difficult for the Hansard reporter to hear what the member on his feet is saying. I remind the member for Mandurah that he must occupy his seat when interjecting.

Mr F.M. LOGAN: The Leader of the House asked for the opposition’s opinion on this bill. We would like to have expressed an opinion on it during the second reading debate. The Leader of the House is trying to shut up

Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Fran Logan; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Dr Mike Nahan; Mr David Templeman; Mr Peter Abetz; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr John Quigley; Dr Janet Woollard; Mr Mick Murray

us and, more importantly, the member for Southern River, by referring the bill to the Economics and Industry Standing Committee before the opposition has even had a chance to express its view on the bill. The Leader of the House has the hide to interject and ask us what the opposition thinks about the bill. We would like to let our views on it be known, if the Leader of the House would let us.

Mr R.F. Johnson: Has it been to your caucus? Do they support it?

Mr F.M. LOGAN: It has been to caucus and we support the passage of the bill. We have no problems at all with it. We have no problems with the wording or with the member for Southern River moving it. The Leader of the House knows that we would like to see the bill passed through this house and sent to the upper house to be passed because I have spoken to him about it. The Leader of the House and the Liberal Party's party room are stopping it because they want to shut up the member for Southern River. That is exactly what is happening. I want to know whether the mover of the bill—the member for Southern River—has a problem with the bill. Does he have so many concerns with it that he believes it should be referred to the Economics and Industry Standing Committee? Of course he does not. Does he agree that the matter should be referred to that committee? No, he does not, and he has put that in writing to the Leader of the House. He will not stand and say it in the house now, but the member for Southern River has put it in writing. The very mover of the bill actually opposes the matter being referred to the Economics and Industry Standing Committee. He put it in writing to his own party, and they rolled him. What we are seeing here in this chamber now is a move by the Leader of the Opposition and the Leader of the House —

Mr R.F. Johnson: The member for Rockingham prompted you; I can see his hand up your back!

Mr F.M. LOGAN: Sorry; the Premier. I keep forgetting I am on this side of the house!

It is a move by the Premier and the Leader of the House to shut up the member for Southern River. It is no more, no less than that. The government is gagging one of its own members. What policies and issues does the Liberal Party raise with us? "Oh, we are all independent. Under the Liberal Party we can put up some legislation and we will not be bound by that horrible Labor Party caucus that bloody drives everything. We are far more independent than that." This is an example of Liberal Party policy about the freedom of its members to vote freely being absolutely trashed. Any time a Liberal member stands to say, "We don't have the type of caucuses that you have where you've got the party discipline, where you've got to follow the party room." Well, today is an example that shows that that is all rubbish—lies! The Liberal Party is actually crushing the member for Southern River to comply with its own party view. That is what it is doing. That is what this is all about. Why is the government so adamant about getting this bill referred to the economics committee? It is because it wants to kill this bill! The minister himself does not agree with the bill —

Mr R.F. Johnson: I tell you what: will you agree to bring it on in private members' time next week?

Mr F.M. LOGAN: No; no.

Mr R.F. Johnson: Oh, no, no, no. It's a private member's bill but he does not want to do that!

Mr F.M. LOGAN: He is a member of the Liberal Party, and that party is in government.

Mr R.F. Johnson: It is not a government bill.

Mr F.M. LOGAN: He is a member of the Liberal Party and it is in government.

What the Leader of the House should remember, and he forgets, is that we have already given up our time to the member for Southern River to allow him to second read the speech. We have already done that. We have already given up our time. It is about time the Liberal Party showed a bit of courtesy to its own member and gave up some government time to allow this second reading debate to continue. But it is not; the Liberal Party is crushing him. Why is the government sending it off?

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr A.P. O'Gorman): Member for West Swan, I call you to order. I have already advised you that you need to be in your seat to make a comment across the chamber. The member for Mandurah did the same thing a minute ago and I advised him. I take it all members heard me. Member for West Swan, I call you to order.

Mr F.M. LOGAN: Why is it the Liberal Party wants to kill off the bill? Why is it that it wants to send it off to the Economics and Industry Standing Committee? It is chaired by the member for Riverton—an extreme right-wing economic rationalist, and one of the world's last neocons! The Liberal Party knows that as soon as this bill goes off to him, it is as good as dead. He will make sure it is buried so deep that it will never ever see the light of day! That is why the government is sending it off to that committee.

Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Fran Logan; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Dr Mike Nahan; Mr David Templeman; Mr Peter Abetz; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr John Quigley; Dr Janet Woollard; Mr Mick Murray

Several members interjected.

Mr F.M. LOGAN: It could, because a component of the bill deals with extraterritorial powers that may have justified it being sent off to the Joint Standing Committee on Delegated Legislation. It could have been sent off to that committee because it contains a clause about extraterritorial powers. There would be some justification for sending this bill to a committee. But the government did not send it to that committee; it wants to send it to the Economics and Industry Standing Committee —

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Riverton, I can hear you above everybody else and I am supposed to be able to hear the member for Cockburn. I ask that you desist from interjecting and having conversations across the chamber. I call you for the first time.

Mr F.M. LOGAN: They are not sending it to the delegated legislation committee, where it should go, over one of its particular clauses, if it was to go to any committee; they are sending it off to the Economics and Industry Standing Committee because it is chaired by one of the world's last neocons, who is going to kill that bill! Why is the government so afraid of one of its own members introducing a fairly simple bill that just gives some basic rights to small franchisees in this state? The bill will provide a place for franchisees to go to have contractual complaints dealt with, to have their complaints —

Point of Order

Dr A.D. BUTI: Could the Acting Speaker please ask the member for Riverton to withdraw what he just said. It was an offensive word; he knows what it was.

Dr M.D. Nahan: I said “Be quiet!”

Dr A.D. BUTI: No, you didn't. Don't lie. He is misleading Parliament. He knows he did not say that.

Mr M. McGowan: Say what he said.

Dr A.D. BUTI: I will spell it out—f-u-c-k o-f-f. That's what he said.

Mrs L.M. Harvey: He did not! What a load of rubbish.

Dr A.D. BUTI: If he said “Be quiet”, I would not have got up!

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr A.P. O’Gorman): Members, I am trying to hear a point of order. If everybody is shouting at the same time I cannot hear the point of order. I would like to hear the point of order so I can make a ruling on it. Member for Armadale, your point of order?

Dr A.D. BUTI: It is very unparliamentary language, Mr Acting Speaker. I would not have said it if he did not say it. He knows he said it. I ask him to withdraw it.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: I did not say that.

Mr P. Papalia: What did you say?

Dr M.D. NAHAN: I said, “Be quiet!”

Mr P. Papalia: That sounds exciting!

Dr M.D. NAHAN: He kept interjecting on me.

Mr P. Papalia: I can see him mixing that up!

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Warnbro! Members, I did not actually hear what the member for Riverton said. I trust, like all members in this place, that members are honest and truthful, and that if he did say something that was unparliamentary, that he would withdraw it. He said he has not, so there is no point of order.

Debate Resumed

Mr F.M. LOGAN: Why is the government so afraid of having one of its members introduce —

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Leader of the National Party, I am going to call you to order, as well as the member for Warnbro. I have asked that we hear the member for Cockburn in silence. All these conversations are going on behind the member on his feet. Hansard cannot hear and I certainly cannot hear. I ask that we hear the member in silence.

Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Fran Logan; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Dr Mike Nahan; Mr David Templeman; Mr Peter Abetz; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr John Quigley; Dr Janet Woollard; Mr Mick Murray

Mr F.M. LOGAN: Why is the government so afraid of one of its own members of Parliament introducing a bill into this house that provides relatively simple, straightforward protection for small businesses in this state? It provides an opportunity for small franchisees to be able to go to a conciliation and arbitration process to have matters pertaining to their contracts, or to their whole franchise operations, dealt with, when they cannot deal with giant franchisors as a mum and dad business operation. Why is the government so afraid of it? I will tell the house why it is so afraid of it. The government is afraid of it because it is afraid of the member for Vasse. This is all about the member for Vasse's ego and about his record as the Minister for Commerce. The disgraced member for Vasse, in his role as a very poor, I would say, Minister for Commerce made it very clear that he did not support this type of legislation. He strongly does not want to provide those protections contained in this bill for franchisees. He made it very clear to organisations when he was a minister, and he has made it very clear to his party room that he is totally opposed to this. The reason he is opposed to it is because somehow in his own mind this would sully his record as the Minister for Commerce. That is the reason he is so bitterly opposed to it. It is the member for Vasse and his domination of the Liberal party room that is causing the problem we have today. The member for Vasse has leant on the Minister for Commerce to make him kowtow to his position and not agree to this bill. The member for Vasse has bullied the member for Southern River, and I put it to the Premier that the person who leaked the information about the bullying of the member for Southern River during the party room discussion the other day to Peter Kerr from *The Australian Financial Review* was none other than the member for Vasse. That is who I believe it was. He phoned Peter Kerr from *The Australian Financial Review* and said, "The member for Southern River got the equivalent of a stoning in the party room for having the audacity to raise this bill and try to get members to support it". I put that to the Premier; it is now his opportunity, as Premier, to haul the member for Vasse into his office and ask him whether he did it. He has form, and the Premier knows it; it is now up to the Premier to show some leadership on his behaviour.

I will give members an idea of the extent to which the member for Vasse will go to stop this legislation from being passed and to silence the member for Southern River. Apart from bullying him in the party room, and leaking information from the party room to embarrass the poor fellow, he also rang him up and made allegations. He said that there were rumours going around that the member for Southern River was putting this legislation up only because he had received campaign donations from a certain company. He also said that there were rumours going around that the member for Southern River had a conflict of interest in respect of his daughter and son-in-law's franchise, and that that was another reason for his putting this legislation forward. The member for Vasse said, "I'm only saying this to you, member for Southern River, because these are the rumours that are going around, and you should watch your back." That is what the member for Vasse does to the member for Southern River. In any other workplace, Premier, that would be called bullying and the member for Vasse would be up before the chief executive of the company, and an investigation into his behaviour would be launched.

What is the Premier's position on this? He goes out to the media and says what a great bloke the member for Vasse is, what a fantastic performer he is, and how he should be brought back into cabinet! How does the Premier explain the fact that he turns around and bullies one of the Premier's own members to such an extent that he will not vote with this amendment? The member for Southern River will vote with the government, and why? It is because he is afraid of the member for Vasse. He has been bullied by the member for Vasse and he knows what will happen to him in the party room, yet the Premier wants to bring the member for Vasse back! That is the sort of behaviour the Premier wants on his front bench. It would not be tolerated by any other company in Australia, but the Premier wants to bring him back to the front bench. What a disgrace. Show some leadership, Premier. Haul him in, ask him if he leaked from the party room and ask him about his bullying of the member for Southern River. That is what the Premier should do, and he should do it immediately after this debate.

That is the reason behind the amendment moved by the opposition to allow the debate to continue. The motion before the house is to flick the Franchising Bill off to the Economics and Industry Standing Committee; it is being done to kill off the bill at the behest of the member for Vasse, who is absolutely and implacably opposed to it, first because of his own ego, secondly because of some weird philosophical view, and thirdly because the Franchise Council of Australia has been in his ear and is telling him what to do; he has probably made promises to it. Those are the reasons for this motion to send the bill off to the Economics and Industry Standing Committee; if they are not the reasons, the member for Vasse should stand and explain that everything I have said is untrue.

It is for those reasons that the opposition has moved this amendment. We believe that a full second reading debate should continue on this bill, and if the government then wishes to flick it off to a committee, we can have this debate afterwards. However, it is the custom and practice of this house to not refer matters such as this to a committee until the second reading debate has been completed. All we have had so far is the member for Southern River offering an explanation of and some justification for the bill. The opposition has made it very

Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Fran Logan; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Dr Mike Nahan; Mr David Templeman; Mr Peter Abetz; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr John Quigley; Dr Janet Woollard; Mr Mick Murray

clear that it will support the bill, and we want to put on the record why we support the bill. There may well be members on the government side who also want to support the bill; I know that plenty of them do. They may well want to stand and say that they support it. We know that the disgraced former Minister for Commerce will also want to stand and bitterly oppose the bill for all the reasons I have already set out. However, this house must be given the opportunity to debate the bill; that is why the opposition has moved this amendment, and I ask members of the house to support it.

MR D.A. TEMPLEMAN (Mandurah) [11.46 am]: The member for Cockburn has very clearly outlined why this government is attempting to hide behind a move to despatch the member for Southern River's bill to the Economics and Industry Standing Committee. That is the government's clear intention, and the member for Cockburn has also outlined exactly why the opposition has moved an amendment to the motion before the house.

Not only has there very clearly been undue bullying of the member for Southern River by his own party, there have also been attempts made by various members of the government to discredit the member for Southern River. It is very interesting that, during the course of this debate, a number of government members have gone across to the member for Southern River to continue what I think is a very clear process of intimidation of that member. It is likely that when the opposition's amendment is put, it will be defeated because of the numbers in the house, and that when the unamended motion moved by the Leader of the House is put, it will be carried. However, I would like to foreshadow that, if the opposition's amendment is defeated, I will move a motion at the next sitting of this house that the member for Southern River be co-opted to the Economics and Industry Standing Committee as a full voting member for that inquiry, so that that member will have an opportunity for his legislation to be analysed by the committee. I would anticipate full support for that foreshadowed motion next week, and if the motion is not supported by the government, I will be very interested to know why, because it will further demonstrate that members of the Liberal Party not only despise the legislation put forward by the member for Southern River but also, it would seem, despise him. We saw the member for Southern River put into that position only a few weeks ago when the opposition moved to ensure that the member's bill was given the opportunity to be second read and the government opposed the motion. But, of course, commonsense prevailed and the opposition won the vote on that motion and the member's bill was listed. It was a grave embarrassment to the Premier and the government at the time. The simple fact is this —

Mr R.F. Johnson: It was subject to the standing orders at the time—you realise that. Can I tell you something?

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: No, the Leader of the House will not tell me anything because he has already demonstrated his bumbling capacity —

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr A.P. O'Gorman): Members!

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: — as Leader of the House!

Mr R.F. Johnson interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Leader of the House, the member has clearly rejected your interjections so I ask that you actually let him get on and stop shouting across the chamber.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: The Leader of the House has already demonstrated his bumbling capacity as Leader of the House. Last night, the Premier cracked it! The Premier got a bit of the proverbial on the liver and decided that despite the Leader of the House's wishes, he would see the second reading of the appropriation bills through to midnight, overriding the Leader of the House. The Premier cracked the proverbial and decided to steer things through. Therefore, I must say that I do not have a great deal of confidence in the Leader of the House's capacity to advise me on issues of protocol in the house, because the history ain't too good! The history is pretty bad. The history is pretty poor.

However, leaving that aside, the foreshadowed motion that we can put in place if the government very shortly wins the vote on this amendment to the motion —

Mr R.F. Johnson: Just so you know, we'll support that.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: The government will? In that case, I might actually see whether I can get another member co-opted to that committee as well! That member might be from the opposition. If the government is looking like it might be a little lenient with regard to the foreshadowed motion, I might push the boundaries even further! We might co-opt as many members as possible onto the Economics and Industry Standing Committee.

Mr F.M. Logan: I'd like to go on it!

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: The member for Cockburn has already indicated an interest, and since this bill —

Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Fran Logan; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Dr Mike Nahan; Mr David Templeman; Mr Peter Abetz; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr John Quigley; Dr Janet Woollard; Mr Mick Murray

Mr R.F. Johnson: They won't be travelling.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: The committee probably will not, although it might go across to Colonel Sanders' major headquarters in Chicago or wherever it might be! I am sure if that is the case, a few more members might be keen to be co-opted onto that committee.

I am pleased that my foreshadowed motion might be supported next week by the government, which will see the co-option with full voting rights, by the way —

Mr R.F. Johnson: No, it won't be!

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: Full voting rights!

Several members interjected.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: So the government will allow the member to advise the committee, but it will not allow him to have a say! The government is already doing that now: it will not allow the member to have a say. Is the government going to make the member scissor kick his way over the bar again? He had to do that a few weeks back when he suddenly realised the situation and, like a rabbit caught in headlights, he had to scissor kick—he did this marvellous display of scissor kicking—over the bar so that he was not on the floor of the house to vote; hence, he gained the reputation and name as the “Scissor Kicker from Southern River”! However, the fact is that we are very supportive of the member for Southern River at this point in time. We are very supportive.

Several members interjected.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: We are the only ones! The member for Southern River has more friends on this side of the house than he has on his own side. The body language of the member for Wanneroo is very clear: look at him! The member for Wanneroo is leaning as far away as possible from the colleague he sits next to. In fact, the member for Wanneroo probably hopes that the cameras are not panning across the chamber and focusing —

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member, I realise your contribution is very entertaining, but I draw your attention back to the question that is before us; namely, that the words to be deleted be deleted.

A member interjected.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: I issue this warning to the member for Southern River. The member was not in this place at the same time as the former member for Ningaloo—as the seat was then known—Mr Rod Sweetman. The member for Wanneroo is darting out now; see—he is so concerned! The former member for Ningaloo crossed the now Premier, and his political career ended abruptly.

Mr M. McGowan: Ignominiously!

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: Absolutely! He was sent to the bottom of the harbour up there in Carnarvon —

Point of Order

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Mr Acting Speaker, the member for Mandurah is not taking any notice of your direction. I ask that he do so.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: I certainly would not take any notice of the Leader of the House's direction!

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Mandurah, you are directed to come back to the question that is in front of us; that is, that the words to be deleted be deleted.

Debate Resumed

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: And so they should be deleted, Mr Acting Speaker! This motion, as moved by the Leader of the House, should absolutely be deleted and we in this place should have our say on this legislation that has been brought forward by the member for Southern River—a piece of legislation that seeks to protect small business franchisees in the state of Western Australia. We have only had the opportunity to hear the second reading speech by the member a few weeks back, and now the government of the day, the member's own side, is attempting to terminate any further discussion on the issue.

I was listening to ABC radio last week when the honourable member, the member for Southern River, was on and there were a number of calls from people who outlined their negative experiences of franchises that they held or currently hold. A number of callers raised very, very important issues about how they as people who take out a franchise are not protected. The member for Southern River has brought a bill to this place that seeks to protect people such as those who rang into the Geoff Hutchison show a week or so ago and highlighted that issue. Why should we in this place not have the ability, the capacity and indeed the opportunity to debate the bill

Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Fran Logan; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Dr Mike Nahan; Mr David Templeman; Mr Peter Abetz; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr John Quigley; Dr Janet Woollard; Mr Mick Murray

that the member for Southern River has presented? The government has bullies in its ranks and because it does not want the member for Southern River's legislation to see the light of day, it wants the bill dispatched to a government-controlled standing committee so that the member for Riverton, as the chairman, can slice the bill to pieces as quickly as possible and dispatch it out of the way. The government's message is, "Go away, member for Southern River; don't ever raise these sorts of issues here and embarrass us!"

Quite frankly, the house and all those independent-thinking people in this house should support the amendment put by the member for Cockburn and reject the original motion moved by the Leader of the House. This house should allow the member for Southern River's legislation to be heard and debated. If, as the member for Vasse has said on a number of occasions, the legislation is flawed, let us debate that. Let us actually have that debate and give the member the opportunity to say why the legislation is flawed. Let us give other people in this place who represent small business people in their communities the opportunity to stand and support their constituents. That is what we are keen to do and that is what we are keen to debate. The government is trying to stop the bill; it is trying to hold it and dispatch it to a government-controlled committee and that, of course, demonstrates its despise for the member for Southern River, and indeed the bullying that has continued within this house.

Dr J.M. Woollard: Do you not have any faith in our committees, member?

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: Here is the Independent!

Several members interjected.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: Here is the defender of free speech! Where is the member going to go in the next vote? I know where the member will go! The member will park herself over there with her Liberal mates. She will sit on that side of the chamber and say, "It's all right, Premier; I'm with you; I'll look after your interests. I'm an Independent Liberal but I will look after your interests." The member is not—she is about as independent as a Delaware potato! The member has no independence at all; she is a Liberal, she will always be a Liberal, and she will continue to be a Liberal. Why does the member not stop with the facade that she keeps presenting of how wonderful she is with her independence? The simple fact is this —

Mr B.J. Grylls interjected.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: It will be interesting to see where the Leader of the National Party goes! His party is puncturing holes in the *Titanic* that is the Liberal Party alliance now. This morning, Hon Col Holt, my very good brother, has indicated that he will oppose the name-and-shame legislation now. Good on him! He is a good man, my brother; he is a marvellous fellow.

Mr F.M. Logan: He looks like you too.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: He does—similar. However, I would like to know what the Leader of the National Party's view is on this. Does he want to just dispatch the bill off to the committee? Does he not want to have a debate in here? He does not want to have a debate; the Leader of the National Party does not want to have a debate.

The simple fact is this: by supporting the opposition's amendment, we will give the member for Southern River the capacity to have the bill that he has put forward dealt with—it should be in government time, because he is a government member at this stage. That may not be the case after Christmas. There might be another Independent sitting on that side; one never knows.

Mr M.P. Murray: One of those Kentucky fried chooks!

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: It could be.

That is what members will be doing if they support the motion by the member for Cockburn; they will be supporting an opportunity for the debate to be had in this place. If there are flaws in the legislation, and if there are holes that a person could drive a Kentucky fried delivery truck through, that is fine, but let us have the debate. Let us make sure that we have the opportunity to have the debate. If members do not want to have that debate, they must have something to hide. They must be very, very afraid that what the member for Southern River is saying is possibly sensible.

MR P. ABETZ (Southern River) [12.01 pm]: I am certainly delighted to hear of the very warm support for my bill from that side of the house; I am very delighted to see the warm support for my bill from some of the Independents; and I am also delighted to have the very positive support of many on my side for this bill. I am very appreciative of that. I am also very appreciative of the many people in the organisations in the community who have come out in support of my bill. The fact is that the Retail Traders' Association of Western Australia is fully supportive of the bill, and the Motor Trade Association of Western Australia is supportive of the bill.

Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Fran Logan; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Dr Mike Nahan; Mr David Templeman; Mr Peter Abetz; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr John Quigley; Dr Janet Woollard; Mr Mick Murray

Yesterday, Jim Penman, who is the biggest franchisor in Australia, came out in support of this bill, because he says that a lot needs to be done. I fully appreciate all the support for this bill that people have expressed to me. I think all of us have heard stories about what has been done to franchisees by rogue franchisors. I would like to think that none of us would want to allow a system to continue that would perpetuate that kind of conduct. The fact that someone like Jim Penman has come out in support of action to support franchisees is, I believe, very commendable.

The bill that I brought into this house was very carefully crafted. I am certainly no lawyer, so I was very dependent on the expertise of Professor Frank Zumbo, who was also instrumental in drafting the Piccolo bill in South Australia on the franchising issue, and on other legal people from the Parliamentary Counsel's Office and so on. A lot of experts helped me with that drafting. We have also sought senior counsel's advice on some of the legal questions that have been raised about this bill. Nonetheless, I certainly appreciate the fact that members on my side of the house, in particular, want to be 100 per cent certain that those legal questions are in fact answered. Once that is done to their satisfaction, they will be in a position to fully support my bill. I am not afraid of this bill undergoing the scrutiny of a committee; I certainly have no fear of that at all.

I have spoken to the member for Riverton, who is the Chairman of the Economics and Industry Standing Committee, and he assures me that it will not be a wide-ranging inquiry; it will focus on the legal issues. The opposition is saying that this bill is going to be buried somehow. I have just spoken with the Premier, and he has given me the assurance —

Several members interjected.

Mr P. ABETZ: I trust the Premier, and he assures me that after 26 May when this bill is reported on, it will go back onto the agenda.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mrs L.M. Harvey): Member for Collie–Preston and other members, will you please stop interjecting on the member for Southern River. I have given him the call and he has declined to take your interjections.

Mr P. ABETZ: Thank you, Madam Acting Speaker. The Premier has given me the assurance that it will —

Mr M.P. Murray interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Collie–Preston, I formally call you to order for the first time. I think I was very clear in my previous instruction. I have given the call to the member for Southern River.

Mr P. ABETZ: The Premier has given me that assurance. Incidentally, this bill is, in a sense, the property of this house. It is up to this house to decide what to do with this bill. I have brought this bill into the house, and I have done the first and second readings. As happens in the federal Parliament, some legislation goes straight to a committee to be dealt with, and then comes back to the house for debate. I am happy to live with that. That is not a major problem to me at all. It may be that some people, particularly the franchisees who have spoken to me, are eager for this bill to go through the house quickly. I would love to see it go through quickly, but, by the same token, we must make sure that legislation is spot on. We do not want to let legislation go through this house and then afterwards say, "Oops, we got that a bit wrong."

Mr F.M. Logan: Come on, member for Southern River. Show us the bruises the member for Vasse gave you!

Mr P. ABETZ: He did not give me any bruises—no bruises at all. I would simply say —

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order, members; please! Member for Warnbro, I have given the call to the member for Southern River, and I would like to hear the rest of his discourse.

Mr P. ABETZ: I have no objection to the bill being scrutinised, as I said earlier. I have every confidence that the bill will come through with a clean bill of health, so to speak, because those legal opinions have been sought. However, if the committee, to satisfy itself —

Mr F.M. Logan: Member for Southern River, you're the least confident bloke I've ever seen!

Mr P. ABETZ: I am very confident that it is a sound bill, and that is all there is to it. Therefore, I am happy for this bill to go to a committee and for the committee to report back to the house. Unfortunately, it is going to take a little time because the committee is currently dealing with the gas inquiry. Nonetheless, the committee will report back on 26 May, and I believe that that is adequate.

Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Fran Logan; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Dr Mike Nahan; Mr David Templeman; Mr Peter Abetz; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr John Quigley; Dr Janet Woollard; Mr Mick Murray

MR W.J. JOHNSTON (Cannington) [12.08 pm]: I support the member for Cockburn's amendment. Once upon a time the Premier of Western Australia stood for decisions, not delays. Now he stands for delays, not decisions. The second reading debate is very important, because that is the opportunity for the Parliament to speak about the principles involved in a bill—not the detail, the principles. It allows the members of this chamber to put on the record where they stand on the principle, on the policy, of a bill. That is the purpose of a second reading debate. This is an abuse of process to prevent members of Parliament explaining where they stand—not on the detail of the bill; this process is designed to prevent us telling the community where we stand on the policy contained in the bill. If any persons in this chamber want to put on the record where they stand on the policy contained in this bill, they are being denied that opportunity by this device. This artificial contrivance is being used to prevent us saying where we stand. Where does the member for Vasse stand on this issue? We do not know. He is not being given the opportunity to stand and to speak; to let us know where he stands on this bill. It is a contrivance to deny the member for Vasse the opportunity to come into this chamber to explain exactly where he stands on this bill. That is what is happening here. Because the committee inquiry will not look at the policy matters but the detail—the very fine detail of the administration of the bill—the member for Cockburn allows in his amendment for an inquiry to take place into the issues of the detail. It will allow the member for Vasse to tell us where he stands on this matter. It will allow the government, through the office of the minister responsible for consumer protection, to explain where it stands on the bill. However, we are being denied that opportunity.

I refer members to page 7 of the notice paper and the 28 February date by which the Economics and Industry Standing Committee will have completed the gas inquiry referred to it by the Parliament. There will be no six-month inquiry into this bill as could be suggested by this being November and the reporting date being in May. Only the period between the end of the other inquiry in February and the reporting date of 26 May will be available for this inquiry. It will be a very brief inquiry and a detailed examination will not occur by way of this process. It will be a very imprecise process. It is not only that. Nobody moving the resolution moved by the Leader of the House could have read the member for Southern River's second reading speech. He pointed out the number of times this issue has already been investigated around Australia. Anybody who has read the member for Southern River's second reading speech will know that—I should not have to explain this to the Leader of the House—his bill arises from the Ripoll inquiry; an inquiry of the federal Parliament. These are matters that have been traversed by parliamentary inquiries for a decade. Nobody who had read the member for Southern River's second reading speech could not be aware of that. Nobody who had taken an interest in these matters could not be aware of the detailed work that has been done, including the inquiry into the operation of franchising business in Australia referred to, which took place in this state. Nobody who knows anything about this or who has done something as simple as read the member for Southern River's second reading speech would support this resolution. This is a con job. It is a deliberate attempt to delay, for as long as possible, the Liberal Party telling the people of Western Australia where it stands. Does it stand with small business or does it not? Does it stand in favour of giving assistance to the weak in business or does it not? Does it want to help small business in this state or does it not? We are being denied the opportunity to hear from the members on the government benches. The government has denied the opportunity for this bill to be debated; the Leader of the House voted against the opportunity to bring this bill on for debate two weeks ago, and he now denies an opportunity for this bill to be properly debated by this chamber. Everybody in this chamber knows that the second reading speech goes to the policy contained in the bill, and not to the detail. The Leader of the House should not come up with this device to prevent embarrassment about the deep divisions in the Liberal Party coming to the surface on this day. That is what this is about. That is why he voted against allowing this bill to be debated in this chamber. And that is why he created the contrivance that we have in front of us today.

Mr R.F. Johnson: You tell the truth!

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: Thank you very much, Leader of the House, for asking me to tell the truth. As the only person in this chamber who has been proven to have told the truth to this chamber, I continue to tell the truth. If the minister believes that I am not telling the truth, refer my behaviour to the privileges committee again. The minister has already done it once; he referred my behaviour to the privileges committee and that committee reported back that when I said that a member of the Liberal Party had had his name expunged from the Corruption and Crime Commission records it was demonstrated to be the truth. That is why I am again telling the truth today. The Leader of the House voted against allowing debate on this bill at the last session of Parliament, and that is the contrivance he is using today to hide the member for Vasse's opinion. We often think that the Liberal Party hides the member for Vasse, but sometimes we do not know why it hides his opinions. However, in this matter, we are very interested in his opinion. We have heard from the member for Cockburn about the telephone conversations, none of which have been denied. The member for Southern River spoke in this place after the member for Cockburn, and never once contradicted any of the elements of the member for Cockburn's contribution. Not once! He spoke in this chamber after the member for Cockburn and never once

Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Fran Logan; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Dr Mike Nahan; Mr David Templeman; Mr Peter Abetz; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr John Quigley; Dr Janet Woollard; Mr Mick Murray

demurred from the facts put on the record by the member for Cockburn. We know what this is about. The journalists listening to the debate know what this is about. And the people of Western Australian know what this is about. This is about hiding the truth. That is why the Leader of the House has moved this resolution.

MR J.R. QUIGLEY (Mindarie) [12.15 pm]: I rise to support the motion that the words to be deleted be deleted. I wish to compare the progress of this bill, the Franchising Bill 2010, to the progress of a couple of other government bills that went through this chamber. I wish to compare the difference. For this bill, the member for Southern River has consulted widely with interest groups. I know that he has consulted in detail with the Shop, Distributive and Allied Employees Association of WA, Mr Bullock and all the people interested in the employees working in franchise businesses who suddenly lose their employment when the franchisor takes back the franchise at the end of a franchise period without negotiating in goodwill. The member for Southern River has consulted with interest groups.

The Attorney General suggested that we think this is easy legislation; no-one has suggested that. Inquiries around Australia have resulted in very similar legislation, as for example in South Australia. The member for Southern River brought in academics from the eastern states, including Professor Zumbo, to whom he has referred, and other leading lawyers, and has paid the opposition the courtesy of an invite to conference with them. When drawing up this bill, the member for Southern River took us into his confidence so that we would be in a position to support it. We appreciate the cooperation of the member for Southern River, as Mr Bullock appreciates the cooperation of the member for Southern River, in bringing forward this legislation. Think what would have happened had the honourable Minister for Police taken the opposition into his confidence when redrawing the stupid amendments he brought forward on the hoon legislation, which he has had to bring back to this chamber to do and redo. It is not as if this referral to the Economics and Industry Standing Committee is to improve the bill; the government has no intention of doing that. If that were its intention for the legislation that comes into this house, the ill-thought-through amendments to the hoon legislation would have —

Point of Order

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Madam Acting Speaker, I would ask that you direct the member who is speaking to the motion that is before the house—which is, the words to be deleted be deleted—and to not extraneously go to all sorts of other subjects and bills that have nothing to do with the motion before the house.

Mr J.R. QUIGLEY: On the point of order: I am trying to demonstrate that sending this bill to the Economics and Industry Standing Committee is not a genuine move by the government; it is an attempt to bury the bill. By referring to the passage of other legislation, I am comparing and contrasting, and testing the proposition.

THE ACTING SPEAKER (Mrs L.M. Harvey): To the point of order: are you still addressing the point of order, member?

Mr J.R. QUIGLEY: I am addressing the point of order, Madam Acting Speaker. By referring to the other legislation, I was comparing and contrasting the way that other far more contentious legislation has been treated by the government as opposed to this bill, and that is within the ambit of the debate.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Mindarie, to the point of order; it is a broad brush and I ask you to come back to the motion “That the words to be deleted be deleted”.

Mr J.R. QUIGLEY: That is right.

The ACTING SPEAKER: I have given you some leeway in your explanation, but we need to come back to the motion before the house “That the words to be deleted be deleted.”

Debate Resumed

Mr J.R. QUIGLEY: The reason I want it deleted is that the opposition does not want this buried in a committee. The government has no interest in what the committee has to say, because it did not want the stop-and-search legislation to go to a committee; it wanted to thump it through this chamber. It then denigrated a committee that ultimately looked at it in another place. The government is not interested in outcomes of committees; it wants to bury this legislation now. The opposition compliments the member for Southern River for his wide consultation already. He has consulted the leading academics in Australia on how to draw up this legislation and has consulted the parliamentary draftsman in this jurisdiction, who helped the member for Southern River. As the member for Cannington said, the second reading debate is the time when members of this chamber flag whether they will or will not support the general propositions in the bill. If after that general flagging, as the member for Cannington has said, there is some further examination or tweaking to do, that can happen in consideration in detail. That is what always happens and that is the way the government proceeded on its other contentious legislation, for example, the hoon legislation, which failed and which has been a chaotic mess, and the stop-and-

Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Fran Logan; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Dr Mike Nahan; Mr David Templeman; Mr Peter Abetz; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr John Quigley; Dr Janet Woollard; Mr Mick Murray

search laws, which have failed to get through this Parliament. The government did not go to a committee to examine all those bills; it did not say it had to have the benefit of a committee's consideration before it proceeded with those bills—not a bit of it. The government thumped those bills through this Parliament. Now the member for Southern River has come up —

Mr C.J. Barnett: The stop-and-search committee of the upper house went for a year!

Mr J.R. QUIGLEY: And what happened at the end? The government rejected what that committee had to say—comprehensively rejected what it had to say.

Mr C.J. Barnett: You just said they did not have a committee. Of course, they did!

Mr J.R. QUIGLEY: The Premier did not want to have a committee of this Assembly. The Premier did not want to put it before a committee in this Assembly. The Premier wanted to push it through this Assembly on a crunch of numbers after a very short debate. Now we come up with a piece of legislation that is counter-intuitive to some members of the Liberal government. But this is not legislation that is inherently faulty in its drafting or in its terms, because the member for Southern River has gone to the leading academics in Australia and to the parliamentary draftsman and stakeholders in Western Australia. Now it is time for the government to say whether in general it supports the legislation. This Parliament does that during the second reading debate, and if something happens during the second reading debate or during the process of consideration in detail that requires some further examination that was not foreseen, perhaps that will be the time to consider whether it should even go to a committee. It should not go now to cut it down. I warned the member for Southern River when we were in the room with the academics that his party room would find some way to gag him, to kneecap him and to put him down quietly with the least fuss. It is going to be behind the closed doors of the Economics and Industry Standing Committee. This is disgraceful.

DR J.M. WOOLLARD (Alfred Cove) [12.23 pm]: Madam Acting Speaker, I would like to speak on the amendment “That the words to be deleted be deleted”.

Mr J.R. Quigley: You have to be good, if you want to keep that staffer.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order, members!

Dr J.M. WOOLLARD: What is the function of committees? The function of the Economics and Industry Standing Committee is —

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mrs L.M. Harvey): Members, please, I have given the call to the member for Alfred Cove. She has barely been able to complete one sentence without interjections. We have a very serious matter before the house and I request that you give the member for Alfred Cove the opportunity to speak to this motion, which is “That the words to be deleted be deleted”.

Dr J.M. WOOLLARD: I congratulate the member for Southern River for all the work that he has done on this excellent bill. I know that it is not a bill that has taken just a short while to put together; it is something that the member has been working on for some 12 months —

Mr P. Abetz: Two years.

Dr J.M. WOOLLARD: He has been working on it for two years with community members and businesses in Western Australia and in other states. He has been working very hard on this. I believe it is excellent legislation. However, we have a motion to refer this piece of legislation to the Economics and Industry Standing Committee. The functions and powers of that committee are to review and report to the Assembly on —

- (a) the outcomes and administration of the departments within the Committee's portfolio responsibilities;
- (b) annual reports of government departments laid on the Table of the House;
- (c) the adequacy of legislation and regulations within its jurisdiction;

I think it is appropriate that this bill go to that committee. Personally, I think our committee structure should be reviewed and we should allocate more resources to our committees. I think that our committees should look at a lot more of the legislation that comes into this house. I would support a lot more of the legislation that comes to this house going to our committees. I think that the motion to refer the legislation is an excellent motion, and I hope that the government's motion is not only supported by both sides of the house, but also sets a precedent and we start to send a lot more of the legislation that comes to this house to our committees.

MR M. McGOWAN (Rockingham) [12.26 pm]: The amendment moved by the member for Cockburn will ensure that this matter is brought on for debate as soon as possible. That is what the opposition is seeking. I draw

Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Fran Logan; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Dr Mike Nahan; Mr David Templeman; Mr Peter Abetz; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr John Quigley; Dr Janet Woollard; Mr Mick Murray

members' attention to the fact that at the beginning of this week the government moved a motion that we should bring on for debate without delay a range of legislation to allow that legislation to be carried through the Parliament; in other words, the government suspended standing orders on the ordinary operation of the Parliament to allow bills to be debated. That is essentially what is being done here by the member for Cockburn; he is just trying to ensure that legislation that is of some public moment is brought on for debate. I do not think that is an unreasonable request. If members opposite vote this down, which I assume they will, the Parliament will lose the opportunity to debate a piece of legislation that has considerable public interest. There are other ways, of course, that we could ensure that this matter is dealt with in the next little while, if the Premier thinks the debate will be long and fulsome. My view is that the debate should be short and sharp. The member for Vasse, the member for Southern River and the member for Cockburn should put their points of view, and then we should have a vote. Then we will know, once and for all, whether these laws to deal with franchising are going to proceed. That is my view, and it can be a quick, easy and simple debate and we will know, once and for all, whether the bill will proceed forward. If the Premier thinks that the debate is going to go on, next week is the last sitting week of the Parliament in 2010—we finish on 25 November —

Mr C.J. Barnett: Perhaps. It could be a bit more.

Mr M. McGOWAN: We can sit extra weeks. The Premier has just agreed with me that we can sit extra weeks if that is what is required to deal with this bill. I think the debate could quite easily be concluded in one or two hours. We can sit an extra week and bring it on for debate. At least at the end of that period, we will know whether these laws will pass or fail because, as members know, the Economics and Industry Standing Committee has already extended the reporting date on its domestic gas pricing inquiry—an important inquiry—and, who knows, it may extend it again. That committee has a history of extending these matters, and the Franchising Bill may not emerge from that committee for some considerable time.

Mr E.S. Ripper: The committee will strangle the bill.

Mr M. McGOWAN: The easy way of dealing with it is to sit for another week and for Parliament to make a decision, because that is what Parliament is here for. Why is that not happening? Other members have canvassed it. The committee is set up under the leadership of the potty-mouthed member for Riverton to ensure that this bill never reappears. That is what is going on. Why is the Premier not allowing it? It is because he is so angry. He is such an angry man. He looks like a bulldog that swallowed a bee. Look at him. Last night he was so angry that he was misleading people about what happened in the house last night —

Point of Order

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: The manager of opposition business is not speaking to the motion. He is using this motion to make denigrating remarks about the Premier and I ask you to direct him back to the motion before the house.

The SPEAKER: The motion before the house is that the words to be deleted be deleted.

Debate Resumed

Mr M. McGOWAN: I am about to conclude my remarks.

This opportunity will not be taken up by the government partly because the Premier is such an incredibly angry and unhappy man about a range of issues. He has been defeated, flogged and frustrated over a number of things he wanted to do, and he is taking out that shocking anger and frustration on Parliament.

Mr B.J. Grylls: I know he is frustrated about his predicament.

Mr M. McGOWAN: His predicament? I am unaware of the predicament.

Mr B.J. Grylls: You.

Mr M. McGOWAN: Perhaps the Premier can enlighten us about what that predicament is.

Mr B.J. Grylls: It is you for wanting to sit there.

Mr M. McGOWAN: The Leader of the National Party is such a funny guy. The Premier and the member for Vasse should explain why they will not allow this debate to go ahead. We have not heard an explanation, except by the pummelled member for Southern River, on the need for the legislation. The Premier should say why he will not allow this debate to go forward so we can have a proper debate on this important legislation. If the Premier does not do that, all we can assume is that the government opposes this bill. We saw the look on the Attorney General's face. We know that the government opposes the bill. There is no other way of explaining it. The Premier and the member for Vasse need to explain why they oppose the legislation and why they have treated the member for Southern River so appallingly badly, according to all reports coming back to us, and why they will not allow Parliament to make a decision on this matter.

Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Fran Logan; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Dr Mike Nahan; Mr David Templeman; Mr Peter Abetz; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr John Quigley; Dr Janet Woollard; Mr Mick Murray

MR M.P. MURRAY (Collie–Preston) [12.33 pm]: I will give a brief history lesson to the house. Only a few weeks ago we debated the Liquor Control Amendment Bill 2010 and the opposition moved an amendment to refer that bill to the Economics and Industry Standing Committee. We heard at length from government members during the debate about why the bill should not be sent to that committee. The vote was very close. I believe it was 20–21 against sending it to the committee. The same people who are being asked to do exactly the same thing now are sitting on the opposite side of the fence. The member for Alfred Cove, who voted against the motion to send the Liquor Control Amendment Bill to a committee, has the gall to argue the opposite case today. The hypocrisy of members opposite is unbelievable. We have a chance to send the bill to the committee. I repeat the warning to the member for Southern River about Rod Sweetman. When that former member wanted to have a say in this house, the now Premier took him apart stitch by stitch and inch by inch. The member for Cottesloe took away Rod Sweetman’s preselection on three separate occasions. I warn the member for Southern River to take a sickie. He should go to his doctor and get a medical certificate because his preselection is certainly under scrutiny by the Premier. I tell the member that because the Premier has the runs on the board. Under the liquor bill, government members argued for many hours that the bill should not be referred to the standing committee. Now they are arguing the opposite. What a mob of hypocrites they are. Members opposite are looking at me with vacant faces and the Premier has shut his eyes. I am not sure whether he is embarrassed or whether he has gone to sleep. Government members do not have a policy or direction. They have been bullied within their party by a few members who want to get back onto the frontbench. They are being pushed around. The back bench does not have a say even though we professes to have an open and honest Parliament. The member for Southern River should stick to his guns. He should refer the bill to the Economics and Industry Standing Committee if he wishes, but he should stick to his guns and not be bullied and embarrassed by other members. The next time the member for Southern River jumps the bar, he should make sure that it does not have barbed wire on it; otherwise, he might leave a couple of googlies behind! That is what will happen to the member in the future. He cannot run and hide. The member has made a stand and I am asking him to follow through with it.

DR M.D. NAHAN (Riverton) [12.35 pm]: The author of the Franchising Bill 2010, the member for Southern River, made a very important decision. He is a backbencher and does not have the resources of either a minister or a political party. He has looked very carefully at this bill. As members know, this is a private member’s bill. The member has sought advice widely and has received a great range of advice. He and I, as members of Parliament, have received conflicting advice. There are pros and cons to the issue. We have a committee system that is designed to improve legislation, as the member for Alfred Cove pointed out. One of the functions of the standing committees is to scrutinise legislation. The member for Southern River wants to get a bill through and has wisely asked for it to be sent to the Economics and Industry Standing Committee so that it can be improved. The member wants good legislation, not bad legislation. He has worked on it. We have all received submissions, for instance, from the Queensland Law Society, that raise potentially significant legal issues. We should send the bill to the appropriate committee, which, according to the terms of reference, is the Economics and Industry Standing Committee. The member for Cockburn said that the committee is just a patsy that is meant to stall the bill. He is saying that the members for Cannington and Collie–Preston, who are the Labor members of the committee, are just stooges and mushrooms who are unable to express an opinion or scrutinise legislation. The member for Cockburn is implying that as the chairman of that committee, I would dictate the will of the committee. If that is the case, why did the opposition refer the inquiry into domestic gas prices to the Economics and Industry Standing Committee?

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mrs L.M. Harvey): Order, members! Hansard has no opportunity to record this contribution on the very important issue before the chamber.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: The government’s motion proposes to send the bill to the committee and that the committee is to report by 26 May. The committee will do that, unless members opposite make it impossible. The committee has no intention whatsoever of postponing the reporting date of the current inquiry into domestic gas prices to later than 28 February. The Labor Party moved the original motion to refer that inquiry to the committee. There is no desire to bury the Franchising Bill 2010. It will come forward and be rigorously scrutinised, I assume, by all members, including the Labor members of the committee, and we will vote on it. The committee system is meant to improve legislation, and the author of the bill supports the motion to refer the bill to the Economics and Industry Standing Committee. We are trying to make good legislation better. The motion to amend the original motion is an opportunity of the Labor Party, as usual, to make personal attacks and innuendo. We are here to ensure that legislation is well drafted. A backbencher does not have the resources necessary to scrutinise all issues when putting together a bill. The Economics and Industry Standing Committee is the appropriate route. We would deal with it in an appropriate manner and get it to this house at the end of May next year.

Extract from *Hansard*
[ASSEMBLY - Thursday, 18 November 2010]
p9165b-9179a

Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Fran Logan; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Dr Mike Nahan; Mr David Templeman; Mr Peter Abetz; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr John Quigley; Dr Janet Woollard; Mr Mick Murray

Amendment put and a division taken with the following result —

Ayes (24)

Ms L.L. Baker	Mr J.C. Kobelke	Mr J.R. Quigley	Mr C.J. Tallentire
Dr A.D. Buti	Mr F.M. Logan	Ms M.M. Quirk	Mr P.C. Tinley
Mr R.H. Cook	Mr M. McGowan	Mr E.S. Ripper	Mr A.J. Waddell
Ms J.M. Freeman	Mr M.P. Murray	Mrs M.H. Roberts	Mr M.P. Whitely
Mr J.N. Hyde	Mr A.P. O’Gorman	Ms R. Saffioti	Mr B.S. Wyatt
Mr W.J. Johnston	Mr P. Papalia	Mr T.G. Stephens	Mr D.A. Templeman (<i>Teller</i>)

Noes (29)

Mr P. Abetz	Mr V.A. Catania	Mr R.F. Johnson	Mr A.J. Simpson
Mr F.A. Alban	Mr M.J. Cowper	Mr A. Krsticevic	Mr M.W. Sutherland
Mr C.J. Barnett	Mr J.H.D. Day	Mr W.R. Marmion	Mr T.K. Waldron
Mr I.C. Blayney	Mr J.M. Francis	Mr P.T. Miles	Dr J.M. Woollard
Mr J.J.M. Bowler	Mr B.J. Grylls	Ms A.R. Mitchell	Mr J.E. McGrath (<i>Teller</i>)
Mr I.M. Britza	Mrs L.M. Harvey	Dr M.D. Nahan	
Mr T.R. Buswell	Mr A.P. Jacob	Mr C.C. Porter	
Mr G.M. Castrilli	Dr G.G. Jacobs	Mr D.T. Redman	

Pairs

Mrs C.A. Martin	Dr E. Constable
Mr P.B. Watson	Dr K.D. Hames

Amendment thus negatived.

Motion Resumed

Question put and a division taken with the following result —

Ayes (29)

Mr P. Abetz	Mr V.A. Catania	Mr R.F. Johnson	Mr A.J. Simpson
Mr F.A. Alban	Mr M.J. Cowper	Mr A. Krsticevic	Mr M.W. Sutherland
Mr C.J. Barnett	Mr J.H.D. Day	Mr W.R. Marmion	Mr T.K. Waldron
Mr I.C. Blayney	Mr J.M. Francis	Mr P.T. Miles	Dr J.M. Woollard
Mr J.J.M. Bowler	Mr B.J. Grylls	Ms A.R. Mitchell	Mr J.E. McGrath (<i>Teller</i>)
Mr I.M. Britza	Mrs L.M. Harvey	Dr M.D. Nahan	
Mr T.R. Buswell	Mr A.P. Jacob	Mr C.C. Porter	
Mr G.M. Castrilli	Dr G.G. Jacobs	Mr D.T. Redman	

Noes (24)

Ms L.L. Baker	Mr J.C. Kobelke	Mr J.R. Quigley	Mr C.J. Tallentire
Dr A.D. Buti	Mr F.M. Logan	Ms M.M. Quirk	Mr P.C. Tinley
Mr R.H. Cook	Mr M. McGowan	Mr E.S. Ripper	Mr A.J. Waddell
Ms J.M. Freeman	Mr M.P. Murray	Mrs M.H. Roberts	Mr M.P. Whitely
Mr J.N. Hyde	Mr A.P. O’Gorman	Ms R. Saffioti	Mr B.S. Wyatt
Mr W.J. Johnston	Mr P. Papalia	Mr T.G. Stephens	Mr D.A. Templeman (<i>Teller</i>)

Pairs

Dr E. Constable	Mrs C.A. Martin
Dr K.D. Hames	Mr P.B. Watson

Question thus passed.