

Hon Sue Ellery; Hon Peter Collier; Hon Nick Goiran; President; Hon Matthew Swinbourn; Hon Jacqui Boydell;
Hon Aaron Stonehouse; Hon Colin Tincknell; Hon Alison Xamon; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Martin Aldridge

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE — EXTENDED SITTING HOURS

Standing Orders Suspension — Motion

HON SUE ELLERY (South Metropolitan — Leader of the House) [10.11 am] — without notice: I have a motion without notice to suspend the standing orders to deal with variations to the order of business and sitting days and times next week. I will read that out now, Madam President.

The PRESIDENT: I am just wondering whether you want to wait until it has been distributed so that everyone has a copy in front of them.

Hon SUE ELLERY: I move —

That so much of the standing orders be suspended as to enable the following variations to the order of business and sitting days and times to those agreed by the house on 16 October 2019 as follows —

- (a) Tuesday, 3 December 2019:
 - (i) The sitting to commence at 10.00 am;
 - (ii) The sitting be suspended between 1.00 pm and 2.00 pm; 4.15 pm and 4.30 pm; and 6.00 pm and 7.00 pm; and
 - (iii) Members' statements and business under standing order 5(5) be taken at 10.30 pm or at an earlier time ordered by the house.
- (b) Wednesday, 4 December 2019:
 - (i) The sitting to commence at 1.00 pm;
 - (ii) No committee reports;
 - (iii) The house to sit beyond 9.45 pm until the Committee of the Whole House completes its consideration of the Voluntary Assisted Dying Bill 2019, including any recommittal, and the committee's report on the bill is made to the house; and
 - (iv) Members' statements and business under standing order 5(5) be taken at a time ordered by the house.
- (c) Thursday, 5 December 2019:
 - (i) If the previous day's sitting is adjourned, the sitting to commence at 12.00 noon or at a time ordered by the house.
- (d) The house to sit on Friday, 6 December 2019 at 10.00 am and conduct the following business:
 - (i) Prayers and formal business;
 - (ii) Orders of the day;
 - (iii) The sitting be suspended between 1.00 pm and 2.00 pm; 4.15 pm and 4.30 pm; and 6.00 pm and 7.00 pm;
 - (iv) Questions without notice to be taken at 4.30 pm;
 - (v) The house to sit until the question on the third reading of the Voluntary Assisted Dying Bill 2019 is put and determined and, if applicable, standing order 140 is suspended for that purpose; and
 - (vi) Members' statements and business under standing order 5(5) be taken at a time ordered by the house.

This motion reflects an agreement that was reached between the party leaders behind the Chair, and I thank the party leaders for their assistance in this matter. In particular, I want to thank the Leader of the Opposition. The motion essentially will have the effect that we will start earlier on Tuesday, and we will take members' statements at 10.30 pm.

Just by way of explanation, a number of the subparagraphs of the motion refer to standing order 5(5). That is the standing order that allows the house to read in a bill after members' statements if a bill is available.

On Wednesday, we will start at 1.00 pm. The essential part of this motion is subparagraph (ii), which states that the house will sit beyond 9.45 pm until we complete the Committee of the Whole House stage, including any

Hon Sue Ellery; Hon Peter Collier; Hon Nick Goiran; President; Hon Matthew Swinbourn; Hon Jacqui Boydell;
Hon Aaron Stonehouse; Hon Colin Tincknell; Hon Alison Xamon; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Martin Aldridge

recommittal, and the committee's report on the bill is made to the house. Members, that may well mean that we will sit very late.

For Thursday, we need to put in a starting time. However, I indicate to members that the intention is that depending on how late we sit on Wednesday, we may make a judgement at the end of that period that we want to sit either earlier or later, depending on when we finish the session the day before, and this will give us the opportunity to do that.

On Friday, the house will start at 10.00 am, and, essentially, we will continue to sit until we have completed the third reading. Members will note that subparagraph (v) of that part of the motion refers to standing order 140 being suspended for that purpose. That would allow the house, if necessary, to consider and accept the report and proceed to the third reading on the same day.

Members, we have tried, and I have done my best, to enable additional hours to avoid the prospect of having to sit unreasonably late or through the night, but we find ourselves in a situation in which it is now not possible for us to do this. This is a way forward to ensure that we will complete the bill at the end of our scheduled sitting week. I appreciate that it will be difficult for people. I hope we will not need to do any all-nighters, but that is a prospect, and we need to go into this with our eyes wide open.

Again, I thank everybody for their assistance in putting together the proposition, and I commend the motion to the house.

HON PETER COLLIER (North Metropolitan — Leader of the Opposition) [10.17 am]: The Liberal Party will support the motion, but I want to mention a couple of things. The Leader of the House is correct in saying that this motion reflects discussions that have been held behind the Chair, with the intent of getting through all stages of the Voluntary Assisted Dying Bill.

I would also like to emphasise that for Wednesday, subparagraph (iii) of the motion is written in such a way that it is in effect the guillotine, which I am a little uncomfortable with, but, in essence, it reflects our discussions that we will get through the committee stage on that day. Given the progress that has been made and the fact that we will have today and tomorrow, and all day Tuesday and Wednesday next week, I am not sure how long that will take, as the Leader the House said. It may be a long night; I am not sure. Anyway, we want to ensure that we have given everyone an opportunity to make as many points as they want on this vitally significant piece of legislation.

Just to reinforce it, what happens on Thursday will depend on what occurs on Wednesday, which will determine when we will start and finish on Thursday, even if it is for only a few hours, and then sit on Friday for the third reading.

I want to mention one thing to the Leader of the House. There is no allocation for a dinner break on the Wednesday.

Hon Sue Ellery: By way of interjection, this is in addition to what I have already said. It is already provided for. This sits on top of our existing standing orders.

Hon PETER COLLIER: The existing standing orders do not provide for a dinner break on a Wednesday night.

Point of Order

Hon SUE ELLERY: We have done this in a cumulative way, so this sits on top of the changes to the standing orders that we made on 16 October. Therefore, there will be a meal break on Wednesday.

Hon PETER COLLIER: So long as it is clarified that the meal break will be taken between six and seven o'clock on the Wednesday.

Hon Sue Ellery: Yes.

Debate Resumed

Hon PETER COLLIER: As I said, there has been quite a bit of discussion and communication through party leaders and also the parties, including the Liberal Party, so the opposition will support the motion.

HON NICK GOIRAN (South Metropolitan) [10.19 am]: I wish to contribute to the consideration of this motion, but before I do, could I seek clarification from you, Madam President, about whether paragraph (b)(iii) contains an implication that the consideration of the Voluntary Assisted Dying Bill 2019 must be concluded by midnight on Wednesday, 4 December?

The PRESIDENT: I am not too sure why you would suggest that. The way it reads, and my understanding of it from having listened to the Leader of the House, is that the debate will continue beyond 9.45 pm until completed. Each of the elements of that are listed in the motion, with reference to any recommittal and the committee's report on the completion of the committee stage. As the member knows, it is a case of how long is a piece of string in this place, so who knows how long that will take. I do not believe there was any expectation that this would be completed by midnight.

Point of Order

Hon Sue Ellery; Hon Peter Collier; Hon Nick Goiran; President; Hon Matthew Swinbourn; Hon Jacqui Boydell;
Hon Aaron Stonehouse; Hon Colin Tincknell; Hon Alison Xamon; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Martin Aldridge

Hon SUE ELLERY: With your indulgence, Madam President, this is probably not really a point of order, but I will provide some clarification. I am advised that with the way this motion is drafted, a sitting day is different from a calendar day. A sitting day ends when a sitting day ends, whether or not that crosses into another calendar day.

The PRESIDENT: In fact, if Hon Nick Goiran looks at what is listed under paragraph (c) for the Thursday, we could almost read it as though if we do not complete the sitting that we start at 1.00 pm on the Wednesday, we may very well be working all the way through to some time on Thursday, and that will still be the same sitting day. But I hope that will not be the case.

Debate Resumed

Hon NICK GOIRAN: Thank you for that clarification, Madam President and Leader of the House. We can all now be on the same page. That is exactly how I read it as well; I just wanted to make sure that there was nothing untoward taking place. I expected that there was not, and I am glad to have received confirmation that there is not.

I have some comments that I wish to make on the motion before the house. I have said on previous occasions that I support any extension, as the government sees fit, to deal with the government's priorities with respect to this legislation. I have previously given my view on whether this is actually the most important thing for Western Australia at this point in time. I hold the view that it is not; others hold a different view, as is their entitlement. I have said previously that, as a matter of principle, I do not support the notion of lawmaking being done at unreasonable hours. I draw to members' attention comments made by the Premier in the other place on 5 September this year, when he said —

I understand the sentiments behind the proposed amendment.

He went on to say —

However, in any event, we will not accept the amendment now, on the run. We will consult about what the member is proposing between here and the upper house with doctors, the health department and the like. I do not propose to amend the bill at quarter to one in the morning with some words written on a piece of paper. We will consult between here and the upper house, which I think is the right way to deal with legislation.

For once, I agree with the Premier—it is not appropriate to be dealing with this type of matter at —

Hon Alannah MacTiernan interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Hon Nick Goiran has the floor.

Hon NICK GOIRAN: Thanks, Madam President. I agree with the Premier that dealing with this type of matter at a quarter to one in the morning is not appropriate, let alone on a bill of this significance. Whether members are for or against so-called voluntary assisted dying or assisted suicide or however one wants to describe this piece of legislation, I think we all agree that it is a significant piece of legislation. I have heard some members say that it is the most significant piece of legislation ever. That is probably a contestable point, too, but irrespective of that, we all agree that it is a significant piece of legislation. Should it be dealt with at two, three, four or five o'clock in the morning? I do not think so; I do not think that is appropriate.

I think it is quite telling that the government has pursued a narrative over an extended time that it is very important that this legislation pass before Christmas. We now have a motion before us to make sure that, no matter what, it is passed by 6 December. I do not know whether the McGowan government has suddenly brought forward Christmas, but my understanding is that that has always been on 25 December and not 6 December. Be that as it may, again, the government is entitled to move this kind of motion and seek support for it. There is nothing improper about all those things.

I will just take a moment to say that although I am not going to oppose the motion before us, I want to make it clear that I do not think it is proper lawmaking to be doing things at those times of the night. Equally, if I have been left with only a choice between asking questions and scrutinising the bill at two or three o'clock in the morning or not at all, I will choose scrutiny, because that was the job I was sworn to do when we were sworn in as members of the fortieth Parliament. I am not going to vacate the space because of a decision of a government or other members to use a battering-ram approach.

I want to take this opportunity to respond to the intemperate remarks made by the Minister for Health today on the passage of this legislation, and why I think those comments are not helping the process before the house.

The PRESIDENT: Member, you probably are going to have a significant opportunity at a later stage of today to make those comments when you actually get to deal with that particular piece of legislation. I do not know whether referring to media comments today is actually pertinent to the motion in front of us, which deals exclusively with changes to our sitting arrangements for the next week. I know that you might come back with a sharp retort on

Hon Sue Ellery; Hon Peter Collier; Hon Nick Goiran; President; Hon Matthew Swinbourn; Hon Jacqui Boydell;
Hon Aaron Stonehouse; Hon Colin Tincknell; Hon Alison Xamon; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Martin Aldridge

that, but I am trying to contain this debate, so I ask you to give consideration to just narrowing your comments to the matter that is right in front of us about the sitting hours. That is what we are dealing with. If you want to make reference to any other points that have been made outside of this place by any other member or minister, then I am sure you will do so when you have that opportunity later today—at length, I assume.

Hon NICK GOIRAN: Thanks, Madam President. When we resume later today on clause 42 of the Voluntary Assisted Dying Bill 2019, which is order of the day 25, I will be restricted and restrained by the Chair and the Deputy Chairs to provide remarks only with regard to clause 42.

Point of Order

Hon MATTHEW SWINBOURN: The time for the member is not counting down.

The PRESIDENT: Thank you; we have noted that and it has now been rectified.

Debate Resumed

Hon NICK GOIRAN: I note that the motion moved by the Leader of the House at this time asks for us to sit beyond 9.45 pm on Wednesday, 4 December, until the Committee of the Whole House completes its consideration of the Voluntary Assisted Dying Bill 2019. That seems to be the narrative of the government at this time. The Minister for Health has said today —

“The fact they —

Plural —

have sought the call, moved so many motions and asked so many often repetitive questions really just shows they’ve got contempt for the public,” ...

The PRESIDENT: Member, I have already raised this with you. I really think you are stepping away from what we need to be talking about. Members have already had the opportunity to discuss whether they agree to these new arrangements. You have already indicated that you do support them. I think you are starting to bring into this debate matters that are not entirely relevant. With respect, I ask that you just focus your comments on the proposed arrangements in front of you, rather than on other matters.

Hon NICK GOIRAN: Thank you for your guidance, Madam President. Perhaps there has been some misunderstanding, because I have not said that I support the motion before the house; I said that I will not oppose the motion before the house. There is a significant difference.

The PRESIDENT: Yes. Perhaps I misheard you.

Hon NICK GOIRAN: Thanks, Madam President. Given that I have been misunderstood, I will take a few more moments to make sure that there is no further misunderstanding.

During the course of this debate, for many weeks now, Madam President, improper remarks have been made about me in the conduct of this debate and the role of the Legislative Council. That has been relentless, one could say. Members will forgive me if I just take a few moments now to get my thoughts —

Hon Alannah MacTiernan: No, we won’t.

Hon NICK GOIRAN: Members may or may not forgive me, but I will take the opportunity to get my thoughts on the record to confirm that although I do not oppose the motion before the house, it remains my view that we can get through this. The role of the Legislative Council is to scrutinise this legislation. The Leader of the House would like us to complete our consideration of the Voluntary Assisted Dying Bill in the Committee of the Whole House on Wednesday, 4 December, but, as we confirmed earlier, that may roll over to Thursday, 5 December. That would be the effect of the motion that has been moved by the Leader of the House.

For the Legislative Council to give effect to what the Leader of the House wants us to do, we will be required to continue to scrutinise each of the clauses that are left in the bill. At this stage, we are up to clause 42. My recollection is that this bill has 184 clauses. I trust that members are satisfied, as this motion will inevitably pass, that the time that remains—today, tomorrow we are also sitting, Tuesday we are also sitting, and Wednesday we are sitting and, according to paragraph (b)(iii) of the motion, we will be sitting as long as necessary—will be sufficient for us to progress from where we are at now, clause 42, to clause 184. I do not know the answer to that question, but I do know that I have responded to an inordinate number of questions from people outside the chamber about the progress of this bill. It seems to me that, perhaps understandably, there are those outside the Legislative Council who do not understand our processes or the passage of legislation. There seems to have been some facile assessment that the pace in which clauses are moved through at the beginning of a bill is indicative of how clauses might be moved through at the end of a bill and that, somehow, however long we took on clause 1 is indicative of how long our

Hon Sue Ellery; Hon Peter Collier; Hon Nick Goiran; President; Hon Matthew Swinbourn; Hon Jacqui Boydell;
Hon Aaron Stonehouse; Hon Colin Tincknell; Hon Alison Xamon; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Martin Aldridge

scrutiny of the bill will take. I recall a member in this chamber rose to her feet and decided to provide some statistical analysis along those lines.

Those facile assessments do not assist the passage of this bill. What will assist the passage of this bill is what happened yesterday. I commend the Minister for Environment and the approach that was taken by the government yesterday. Yesterday was, I think, quite a breakthrough day for the passage of this legislation. I think that a different approach has been taken by members. Some of my faith was restored in our lawmaking capacity in this state yesterday when we could see members intellectually engaging in the process. That is what will be required of us over the next few sitting days. I think that members will have capacity to do that during normal sitting hours. I really question whether we will have the ability to do that at one, two, three, four or five o'clock in the morning. I do not think that we will, but, as I said, if I am left with the alternatives of continuing to fulfil my duty or not, I will always take the option of fulfilling my duty.

HON JACQUI BOYDELL (Mining and Pastoral — Deputy Leader of the Nationals WA) [10.33 am]: The motion as put to the house is reflective of conversations that have occurred within the last couple of days and indeed all party leaders and members of the house have tried to facilitate the debate on the Voluntary Assisted Dying Bill as best we can in the last couple of weeks. We knew prior to the bill coming to the house that this would be a significant sitting period for the Legislative Council, so I do not think that that is anything new. I think we knew that that was coming and the motion best reflects how we can deal with it in the scheduled sitting weeks left to try to avoid extra sitting days. Members will appreciate that. It will not be an easy week and it will be difficult for members to engage should it be two or three o'clock in the morning, but I hope that members will support the debate and be as involved in the debate as they possibly can. Hopefully, we will be able to get through it in the scheduled sitting weeks. I will support the motion.

HON AARON STONEHOUSE (South Metropolitan) [10.34 am]: I would like to raise one issue I have with the extended sitting. Let me from the outset say that I support the motion moved by the Leader of the House and I am happy to sit extended hours as is necessary within reason. I draw members' attention to paragraph (d)(v), which states —

The house to sit until the question on the third reading of the Voluntary Assisted Dying Bill 2019 is put and determined and, if applicable, standing order 140 is suspended for that purpose;

That allows us to move straight from the consideration of the Committee of the Whole House on to the third reading. I understand that in some extraordinary cases that might be necessary, although I do not think it is appropriate in this case. We are dealing with a very large complex piece of legislation that has been subject to several amendments. I am not sure what the tally is so far, but this is very complex legislation that is being amended quite substantially, and that pause between the acceptance of the Committee of the Whole House's report and the third reading is to allow, as I understand it, the clerks, among others, to go through and ensure that all these amendments are recorded correctly and there are no mistakes before that final report is then adopted.

It also provides members an opportunity to read the final product. Right now, I am not sure what we have agreed or disagreed to. It is very hard to keep track of all the different amendments we have considered and agreed to at this point. There may be a document somewhere that keeps track of these things, but I am not aware of one. We have the supplementary notice papers, but a lot of amendments have been moved from the floor without prior warning. Unless we go back and check *Hansard* and look for every amendment, it is difficult to know what the bill looks like at this point. I would much rather that we do not suspend standing order 140 and allow the normal period to transpire to allow us to consider the bill before the third reading. I am concerned about that, but I think I may be in the minority.

I am more than happy to sit extended hours, as I am very keen to see this bill pass in a timely manner. As Hon Nick Goiran pointed out, I think that we will see it pass in a timely manner. Most of the topics that members were interested in were covered in earlier clauses of the bill. There is not much more of substance that can be debated, but perhaps the more technical detail on the operating clauses of the bill. I do not think it will take much longer and we are starting to see things speed up. However, I am concerned about the open-ended sitting prepared for Wednesday, 4 December. I appreciate the respectful and perhaps conciliatory tone that the Leader of the House has applied in her negotiations about extended sitting hours. It has really been appreciated. However, I cannot help but fear that we are preparing for siege warfare. We are going into a siege mentality perhaps, whereby on Wednesday night we may sit throughout the evening to, basically, wear down members who still have questions to be asked on specific clauses.

This kind of siege warfare, I believe, was employed in the debate in the Legislative Assembly. In fact, I think I can see someone digging trenches behind the opposition Whip. There is a trebuchet behind the Leader of the House, I think I see some sanitation trenches back here behind the crossbench and some mantelets being constructed over there! I am really concerned that if we get into a siege warfare mentality, the government may

Hon Sue Ellery; Hon Peter Collier; Hon Nick Goiran; President; Hon Matthew Swinbourn; Hon Jacqui Boydell;
Hon Aaron Stonehouse; Hon Colin Tincknell; Hon Alison Xamon; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Martin Aldridge

adopt an approach of trying to wear down opposition and crossbench members and members of its own party who still have questions to be asked about clauses of the bill. I think that would be a disservice to this place and it would undermine the Legislative Council's role of scrutiny. I hope we do not end up in that situation. I am willing to support this motion as it is now, but I am sure that I will have more to say if we are here at five o'clock in the morning, with members suffering sleep deprivation psychosis and voting on clauses of a bill that determines who can and cannot end their own life. I support it at this time, but I am very keen to see how things progress next week.

HON COLIN TINCKNELL (South West) [10.39 am]: I do not support this motion. I have been consistent on this all the way through. I think the premise of the whole discussion is wrong. Once again, we are here sitting extra hours because of a government-sponsored bill that it decided to put through this house, in my view, in a hurry. I think the government got that wrong from day one. This is supposed to be a conscience vote. It does not seem as though much has changed between this bill and other bills when I look at the behaviour that has gone on through the media and behind the Chair. There are discussions behind the Chair, yet other members of this house are not consulted when decisions are being made. It is done with the major parties and there is no discussion with the crossbench whatsoever. I want to remind members that back in 1980 —

Several members interjected.

Hon COLIN TINCKNELL: Other members will get their chance to speak.

In 1980, this house decided to improve the hours because members were working bad hours. Everyone agreed that it was really bad the way this place was being run. It does not look as though we have advanced much since that time. I have a news clipping here, if anyone wants to see it, that refers to how bad the hours were and that we were trying to improve them. People were voting against sitting crazy hours into the middle of the night.

Even the staff in this house work to a regime. They never work more than 12 hours a day because it is unsafe. Even for the staff in this house, it is not fair working conditions. If they work more than 12 hours, they have to volunteer their time; they are not allowed to work more than 12 hours. This is not about being tough: "Suck it up; you're weak"; this is about getting it right. If we sit ungodly hours into Thursday, that is 100 per cent wrong. It has been caused by the politics going on behind the scenes with this bill. We have read about it in the media. It is disgusting what the press has been reporting—it does not report the facts; it just reports a perception that it has created in the marketplace. The 36 of us in this house actually know the truth. I will not be hoodwinked by this.

Getting too little sleep could lead to risky decision-making. There are thousands of articles about how bad it is when members, or anyone, do not get proper sleep or proper conditions. If we are starting to drift back into that again, it is a major flaw. Sleeping too little is already linked to attention deficits, especially in older people. In fact, recent research has pointed out possible links to attention deficit hyperactivity disorder and sleep-related disorders. A thousand things can be caused by people not getting proper sleep and trying to make decisions when they are sleep deprived or sitting unreasonable hours. I know there are companies whose staff work more than 12-hour days; generally, they have a lot of procedures in place to make sure that it is done as safely as possible. However, most of what we are doing is pretty ad hoc—it is at the last minute. The arrangements to make it safer are not adequate. No real scrutiny has been done in this area.

Are we going to be provided with free-of-charge taxis, because no-one should be driving home at 3.00 or 4.00 am? That is an unsafe call straightaway. Are we going to do that? That is what is done for the staff in this place. I want members to know that it is part of the laws that they stick to.

What will we do about the bad decisions that will be made in this place because people are sleep deprived or working ungodly hours? Are we going to take any responsibility for that? Are we going to take any responsibility for our predecessors back in 1980 who were trying to improve conditions and now just let ourselves slip backwards? I do not believe the breaks we are having are sufficient and I do not think they can make up the difference. Have we accounted for people's ages or health conditions? Have we had any discussion about whether it is safe and reasonable to be sitting these crazy hours we are now starting to entertain again? Why are we doing it? It is because of all the time that has been wasted politicking, mainly between the major parties.

Several members interjected.

Hon COLIN TINCKNELL: They are the facts. I owe it to the people who voted for me to completely be aware of all matters going through this house. Others may not be committed to that, but I am. Members cannot be fully committed —

Several members interjected.

Point of Order

Hon NICK GOIRAN: Madam President, it is impossible to hear the honourable member at this time.

The PRESIDENT: Yes, I agree it was. Some people's voices are louder than others in this place.

Hon Sue Ellery; Hon Peter Collier; Hon Nick Goiran; President; Hon Matthew Swinbourn; Hon Jacqui Boydell;
Hon Aaron Stonehouse; Hon Colin Tincknell; Hon Alison Xamon; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Martin Aldridge

Debate Resumed

Hon COLIN TINCKNELL: Thank you, Madam President. If I were worried about the yellers and the shouters in here, I would not have come in here. It does not worry me one bit. As a matter of fact, it encourages me.

The PRESIDENT: It might not worry you, member, but it is very difficult for Hansard to hear what you are saying if there is other noise in the chamber.

Hon COLIN TINCKNELL: Thank you, Madam President, for your counsel.

As I have said before, we have a duty to the people who sat here before and we have a duty to the people who will sit here in the future. We need to operate in a way that is a community standard and the way members of the public would expect us to operate. If they know that we are going to be sitting ungodly hours and making bad decisions, that is not worth taxpayers' money. That is why I am against the motion. I have agreed to many extra hours because they have been reasonable requests. I am happy to work an extra week, but a lot of people are not. They want to go on their holidays—fine—but sitting ungodly hours will never get our support.

HON ALISON XAMON (North Metropolitan) [10.47 am]: I rise to indicate that the Greens will be agreeing to these extended hours, as we have been consistently agreeing to the extended hours in order to effect the timely debate of this legislation. I recognise that sitting all night will not lead to optimal lawmaking. I am hoping that we will not get to that scenario by the time that next Wednesday comes around. I agree that this is an extremely important bill, and as such it does require the most careful attention. I notice that we are making significant progress and that we still have a number of days ahead of us. Hopefully, we will not have to avail ourselves of the extended hours on Wednesday night; nevertheless, the Greens will be supporting the additional hours as proposed.

HON SIMON O'BRIEN (South Metropolitan) [10.48 am]: I think one thing we would all agree on is it is time to get on with this. I want to offer some comments as Chairman of Committees because, of course, the house has entrusted me with oversight of the management of bills throughout the committee stage. I make the following observations briefly, because I do not want this motion before us to become necessary just to finish the motion that is before us! I actually held out some hope that we might have finished the committee stage of said bill by afternoon tea or question time today, let alone Friday week! I make the point to members that just because time will be made available does not mean that things have to expand to fill the space available. If members do not want to sit here until next Pancake Tuesday, they might want to bear that in mind as well so that we get on with it.

I do not discount any observations that have just been made by members, but let me summarise the management of the house in this way: if you like sausages, don't watch them being made! The house will determine what it is going to do, and if it is determined to embrace these provisions that are now before us, we have to work out how the house is going to be managed. Madam President, I know you are concerned and I know that the Clerk is concerned about the welfare of staff, whether they be chamber staff, the "Clerks' Party", Hansard, and indeed even catering, security and other staff in the house. Members have confidence in and offer our collective support to those officers I have just mentioned in making sure that the welfare of staff is looked after.

In relation to the management of the house during the committee stage, we have already been sitting extended, indeed protracted, hours. The minister has spent some extraordinarily long times at the committee table, and that is set to get worse. I encourage members not to spare him a moment's thought, because it is their fault. However, the other group that is involved here, and I want members to acknowledge this, is the five Deputy Chairs of Committees who assist me. They have also been sitting extraordinary hours, and it is onerous to do that. I have been rejigging rosters to share the workload. I want to say to you, Madam President, in front of our colleagues, that the attitude displayed by Hon Martin Aldridge, Hon Robin Chapple, Hon Dr Steve Thomas, Hon Matthew Swinbourn and Hon Adele Farina—herself a former Chair of Committees—has been quite exemplary. I have not heard a word of complaint from any of them, and as I have chopped and changed rosters, they have seen fit to assist. I offer these generous and heartfelt comments in the sincere hope that that will not change, because I do not want to wear the lot of this myself. With those thoughts in mind, I advise Deputy Chairs that I will be now having to revisit rosters so that we can organise this mechanism. Rest assured that we will do our best collectively to facilitate things, but, as I said, if we knock the bill off by question time today, I do not think that will necessarily be a bad thing either.

HON MARTIN ALDRIDGE (Agricultural) [10.52 am]: I rise to make a short contribution on this motion for the suspension of standing orders, as I have done on the other occasions. On previous occasions, I have opposed the suspension of standing orders on various grounds. I am not terribly excited by the suspension motion that is before the house, but I am not going to oppose it.

I want to address first something that Hon Aaron Stonehouse said about standing order 140. I think he made a very valid point, but it is also interesting to reflect on that point in the context of this bill being very lengthy and complicated. It is not the only one like it that we have seen. Perhaps the Legislative Council needs to make an advancement, so that we can access a live copy of the bill as the debate is progressing. The difficulty we have, and

Hon Sue Ellery; Hon Peter Collier; Hon Nick Goiran; President; Hon Matthew Swinbourn; Hon Jacqui Boydell;
Hon Aaron Stonehouse; Hon Colin Tincknell; Hon Alison Xamon; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Martin Aldridge

I saw it occur yesterday, even when I am in the chair, is trying to understand when somebody is referring to an amendment that is no longer on the supplementary notice paper. We have to trawl back through the minutes and records of the house to try to work out what day the amendment was put and agreed, and then patch it all back together. Some will say that it is a responsibility of members to do that, but I would think it could be easily done by using modern technology and having a live document that we can all refer to electronically.

I am not opposed to extending hours to the extent needed to have the necessary time to consider this bill. My concern is the way in which the hours are being extended. We still have two clear weeks before the Christmas week, when I think there are opportunities for the house to sit extra days and, indeed, extra weeks to facilitate debate. I share the concerns of members about the impacts of sitting through the night. People will have seen the road safety campaigns about driving tired being as bad as driving drunk, so making decisions on amendments on complex matters at 10 o'clock last night was difficult in itself, but when we start doing it at three o'clock in the morning, I suspect we will reach a point of it being counterproductive to the consideration of this bill.

I ask members to reflect on the point that we are each one of 36 members of this chamber, sharing the load of the debate and the consideration of this bill. I saw an article published in *The West Australian* today stating that one-third of the chamber had not yet contributed to the debate. I ask those members who are not actively contributing or who do not intend to actively contribute to reflect on some of the many other people, numbering fewer than us, who are required to continue the operation of the chamber. I have mentioned the Clerks and the chamber staff, but there are also the public servants, such as parliamentary counsel and the advisers. The minister is relying on a very small number of advisers to give him the expert advice he needs to answer our very important questions. Hansard, security and police are other staff members, and they all number fewer than us. I really think that, when we make decisions such as this, we should seriously consider the impact on those individuals, particularly given the way in which we have often had debates in this place about workplace safety and worker safety. Too often, I think, we consider ourselves and the inconvenience that it might cause us to sit late, as opposed to the impact that it might have on the health and wellbeing of others.

While I am on this point, one of the matters that may be missing from this motion without notice to suspend standing orders is some arrangement to provide for some periods of recess during these extended sitting hours. I understand that when debate occurred in a similar way in the Assembly, if I am not mistaken, every two hours of sitting, there was a short 10 or 15-minute recess. That is not catered for in the suspension motion before the house, and I am not sure how it will be accommodated, if at all, in this motion. I have not seen any indication from the government that the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for Health, or, indeed, any other minister or parliamentary secretary, will be stepping in and providing some relief for the Minister for Environment. Once we go beyond ordinary sitting hours on a Wednesday evening and potentially a Friday evening, I have a concern about how those types of arrangements may be put in place to provide for some period of recess.

The other matter I want to touch on is what happens when we reach the third reading stage. Part (c) of the motion gives the house some discretion to order a time of sitting on Thursday, 5 December, or otherwise, at 12 noon. Obviously, if we sit until seven, eight or nine o'clock on Thursday morning, it is clearly not appropriate for us to be resuming at 12 noon, and it may not be appropriate for us to be resuming at all on Thursday. That is not something that will be canvassed now, but I expect it will be canvassed when we reach that point late on Wednesday night or early on Thursday morning. Something that should transpire between now and then is a conversation about the appetite to participate in the third reading, and trying to get some understanding of how extended the third reading debate may be. If we can contain the third reading debate to the Friday, my preference would be that, if we sit all night into Thursday, we then resume on Friday to proceed with and complete the third reading of the bill, rather than coming back for a few hours on Thursday evening.

With those few words, I thank those members who have contributed, and I share many of their concerns.

The PRESIDENT: Members, the question is that the motion be agreed. Those of that opinion say aye, to the contrary no. I think the ayes have it.

Hon Nick Goiran: Is this in order to suspend standing orders?

The PRESIDENT: Yes; of course, my apologies. These types of motions require an absolute majority. Having counted the house, there was an absolute majority. There was a dissenting voice, however, but there was no division called, and the motion is agreed.

Hon Martin Aldridge interjected.

The PRESIDENT: All right; we need to have a division.

Division

Question put and a division taken with the following result —

Extract from *Hansard*
[COUNCIL — Thursday, 28 November 2019]
p9505c-9512a

Hon Sue Ellery; Hon Peter Collier; Hon Nick Goiran; President; Hon Matthew Swinbourn; Hon Jacqui Boydell;
Hon Aaron Stonehouse; Hon Colin Tincknell; Hon Alison Xamon; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Martin Aldridge

Ayes (33)

Hon Martin Aldridge
Hon Ken Baston
Hon Jacqui Boydell
Hon Robin Chapple
Hon Jim Chown
Hon Tim Clifford
Hon Alanna Clohesy
Hon Peter Collier
Hon Stephen Dawson

Hon Colin de Grussa
Hon Sue Ellery
Hon Diane Evers
Hon Donna Faragher
Hon Adele Farina
Hon Laurie Graham
Hon Colin Holt
Hon Alannah MacTiernan
Hon Rick Mazza

Hon Kyle McGinn
Hon Michael Mischin
Hon Simon O'Brien
Hon Martin Pritchard
Hon Samantha Rowe
Hon Robin Scott
Hon Tjorn Sibma
Hon Charles Smith
Hon Aaron Stonehouse

Hon Matthew Swinbourn
Hon Dr Sally Talbot
Hon Dr Steve Thomas
Hon Darren West
Hon Alison Xamon
Hon Pierre Yang (*Teller*)

Noes (1)

Hon Colin Tincknell (*Teller*)

Question thus passed with an absolute majority.