

**YALLINGUP FORESHORE LAND BILL 2002
VOLUNTEERS (PROTECTION FROM LIABILITY) BILL 2002
HOME BUILDING CONTRACTS AMENDMENT BILL 2002**

Council's Message

Message from the Council received and read notifying that it had considered Assembly messages Nos 3 and 4 relating to the Yallingup Foreshore Land Bill 2002, the Volunteers (Protection from Liability) Bill 2002 and the Home Building Contracts Amendment Bill 2002. In response, the Council invited the Assembly by return message to state that it had passed the Bills and stated that, on receipt of such message, the Council would deal with the Bills appropriately.

MR J.C. KOBELKE (Nollamara - Leader of the House) [1.55 am]: I move -

That the message be made an order of the day for the next sitting of the Assembly.

MR R.F. JOHNSON (Hillarys) [1.55 am]: The Opposition is happy to consider this message at the next sitting of the House, but I put on the record now that the Opposition takes very seriously what is said in that message from the other place to this House. Does this motion mean that we will be able to debate this message at the next sitting of the House?

Mr J.C. Kobelke: The point of this motion is to give you time to consider the message, and to enable us to arrange a convenient time to debate it.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: That is fine. I have to question these things because I do not trust everything that the Government does these days. The Leader of the House has such a penchant for whizzing this stuff through the House that I want to make absolutely sure that we will have the opportunity to debate this message. The Leader of the House has said that we will be able to debate this message at the next sitting of the House.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr A.D. McRae): We are not in consideration in detail. We are dealing with a motion to put this message on the Notice Paper for the next day's sitting.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I just wanted to make certain that we would have an opportunity to discuss this message. I do not wish to delay the House any further. The Opposition is happy to comply with the motion to discuss the message at the next day's sitting.

MR D.F. BARRON-SULLIVAN (Mitchell - Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [1.57 am]: The leader of opposition business has indicated that the Opposition is happy for this matter to be considered at a later stage. I will make a couple of points to the Leader of the House. The first is that it is probably appropriate that this happen, because we may receive another message from the Legislative Council and the Leader of the House may consider it appropriate to deal with the two messages cognately. In the interim, I implore the Leader of the House to seek the best possible advice on and consider very carefully the information presented in this message before it is deliberated upon in this Chamber. I say that because the original message sent to the upper House advised the Legislative Council that on Friday, 28 June 2002 -

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order, Deputy Leader of the Opposition! The question before the House is not the substantive part of the message. The question before the House is that the message be placed as an item of business on the Notice Paper for the next day's sitting of this place. It is my view that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is straying into matters of substance on the message and is not dealing with the motion that has been moved by the Leader of the House.

Mr D.F. BARRON-SULLIVAN: Thank you, Mr Acting Speaker. I shall explain why I am saying that it is appropriate to delay the matter.

Mr J.C. Kobelke: It is a procedural matter. You may debate why you want it put off for a week or month, but you do not have the opportunity under standing orders to debate the substance of the message.

Mr D.F. BARRON-SULLIVAN: I am not debating the substance. I am pointing out why the Opposition supports delaying the matter. I might be saying that we should debate the matter now.

Mr J.C. Kobelke: We cannot under standing orders.

Mr D.F. BARRON-SULLIVAN: The deliberative matter cannot be debated under standing orders. The only question is whether we deal with it now or later.

Mr J.C. Kobelke: We cannot deal with it now.

Mr D.F. BARRON-SULLIVAN: I know we cannot deal with it now. That is why I am saying that we support the idea of its being dealt with later. If the Leader of the House is not prepared to listen to some friendly advice when we are talking about two very important Bills that he is already responsible for delaying, be it on his own head.

Question put and passed.