

**BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE — PRECEDENCE OF PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS
AND ALL STAGES OF BILLS**

Standing Orders Suspension — Motion

MR J.H.D. DAY (Kalamunda — Leader of the House) [12.21 pm]: I move —

That so much of standing orders be suspended as is necessary to —

- (a) give private members' business priority on Wednesday, 27 November 2013, between 4.30 pm and 6.00 pm; and
- (b) enable bills for the remainder of 2013 to proceed without delay through all stages on any day.

By way of brief explanation, this is a proposed change to the standing orders that usually occurs at this stage of the year in one form or another to allow the house to more fully focus on bills, and to deal with bills in a timely manner, without unduly restricting debate or without unduly restricting the opportunity for the opposition, in particular, to raise in debate other issues.

It is worth having a brief summary of what changes have been put in place over recent years. Last year, grievances were suspended; private members' business was reduced to one and a half hours, as we are proposing to do today; bills were able to be introduced without notice and to pass through all stages in any one day; and also bills received from the Legislative Council were able to be dealt with on the day they were received. In the previous year, 2011, there was a change to allow bills to pass through all stages on one day. In 2010, private members' business was reduced to two hours, and a change was also made similarly to allow bills to pass through all stages on one day. In 2009, private members' business was reduced to two hours, and bills were also able to pass through all stages on one day. In 2008, which was just after the change of government in September 2008, there was no change to the standing orders. Going back to 2007, which was in the time of the previous government, of course, bills were able to pass through all stages on any one day and able to be dealt with on the day they were received from the Legislative Council. In 2006, private members' business was suspended completely, and bills were also able to pass through all stages on any one day. In 2005, grievances were suspended, private members' business was reduced to two hours, and bills were able to pass through all stages on any one day.

The proposal that we are putting before the house today allows for some change, but it still allows, I believe, adequate opportunity for the opposition to debate and to raise other issues. I think we are taking quite a balanced approach, and I commend this motion to the house.

MRS M.H. ROBERTS (Midland) [12.24 pm]: I thank the member for Kalamunda for giving the house some interesting historical facts about similar motions to this that have been moved in previous years. I note that in some of those previous years in which the hours available for private members' business have been curtailed, sometimes that has been to two hours rather than the one and a half hours proposed by this motion. I also note that there is a second part to this motion. It is not just about restricting the amount of time available for private members' business. Part (b) of the motion that the member for Kalamunda, in his capacity as Leader of the House, has moved states that the suspension of standing orders is to enable bills for the remainder of 2013 to proceed without delay through all stages on any sitting day.

It will not come as any surprise to the Leader of the House to know that I believe that his government has mismanaged Parliament this year. I believe that had the government not mismanaged Parliament this year, this motion would not be necessary. But I do not hold the member for Kalamunda responsible for this; I hold the Premier responsible for this. It is the Premier who dictated the sitting weeks and it is the Premier who has presided over a cabinet that simply has not had its bills ready for debate in a timely fashion. It is the Premier who has overseen a government that has declared 15 bills urgent this year. It is also the same Premier who had the Parliament sit for three weeks in a row in October when he did not have sufficient business before the house. I will highlight what those weeks were. They were the sitting weeks that started on 14 October, 21 October and 28 October. Members will recall that one of the bills we dealt with during the week beginning 14 October was the Taxi Drivers Licensing Bill. We heard hours and hours of debate on the taxi bill. We heard government member after government member filibust on this bill, talking about their last taxi ride and stringing out the time. On that bill and, indeed, on a couple of other bills, government members and government backbenchers gave speeches at the third reading stage. No doubt when we get to the third reading stage of the Workforce Reform Bill, the Premier will be indignant and will probably want to guillotine it on the basis that it is time wasting. I point out that I think we had some figures that showed that it costs about \$33 000 a week for the Legislative Assembly to sit. We sat for those three weeks in October when, frankly, we did not have sufficient business on the agenda. Government backbenchers strung out not only the second reading debate by giving lengthy second reading contributions, but also the consideration in detail stage. Indeed, as you may recall, Mr Acting Speaker

Mr John Day; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr David Templeman; Mr Colin Barnett; Acting Speaker; Dr Mike Nahan

(Mr P. Abetz), they spoke longer and asked more questions than the opposition in consideration in detail on an uncontentious bill. That is the kind of mismanagement we have seen. On top of that, of course, the Leader of the House will recall that we went home early on most days during those final two weeks in October. I am not complaining about going home early.

Mr J.H.D. Day interjected.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: It was nothing to do with efficiency; it was all to do with inefficiency, because the fact of the matter is that we could have sat for just two of those weeks rather than the three and dealt with things even more efficiently. Alternatively, the government could have got its act together and introduced bills in a timely fashion. For example, the Workforce Reform Bill could have been introduced back in September. Why was it not introduced in September? If it had been introduced then, we would not have to take these measures now.

We know what the second part of the motion that the Leader of the House has moved—“enable bills for the remainder of 2013 to proceed without delay through all stages on any day”—means. This is effectively an amendment to the standing orders. The standing orders generally provide that if a bill is amended, we cannot go forthwith to the third reading until the next sitting day. That is the usual practice. That is what the standing orders provide for. The standing orders provide for that for very good reason. However, because the Premier and his government have mismanaged the legislative agenda in this house, the government now wants to chuck out that standing order. The government does not want to have to abide by that standing order. It wants to be able to amend bills, and probably guillotine them, and go straight to the third reading, all on the same day. Last night, the Premier moved to guillotine clause after clause of the Workforce Reform Bill. This year, 15 bills have been declared urgent. That is unprecedented. When we count the number of bills that the government has dealt with this year, the number is in the low to mid-30s, at the most. Fifteen of those bills have been declared urgent. That includes, unbelievably, the Appropriation (Consolidated Account) Capital 2013–14 Bill 2013 and the Appropriation (Consolidated Account) Recurrent 2013–14 Bill 2013. Both those budget bills were declared urgent. That is despite the fact that this is an incumbent government that was re-elected. The government should have brought down a budget in May, but it did not bring down a budget until August. The government then had to declare urgent its budget bills. That is complete mismanagement. That is why we now have this little hiccup at the end of the year and why the government needs to move this motion. It is not because the government has had any kind of hefty legislative agenda; nothing could be further from the truth. The government declared urgent the Barrow Island Amendment Bill 2013. It also declared urgent the City of Fremantle and Town of East Fremantle Trust Funds (Amendment and Expiry) Bill 2013 —

Dr A.D. Buti: That bill was very important!

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Indeed; that bill was so urgent that it had been sitting on the notice paper since 2012. However, because the Premier deigned that this would be a fresh year and everything would be done afresh and new bills would be introduced, it then had to scrounge around to find something to put onto the parliamentary agenda to fill the sitting weeks in the early part of the year, so the Premier said, “Let’s bring that bill back on, because we had it ready in 2012, but we never got around to it.” But, even then, the Premier could not manage to have that bill lay on the table for the three weeks that is required under the standing order before it was debated. Other bills that the government declared urgent were the Duties Legislation Amendment Bill 2013, the Electricity Corporations Amendment Bill 2013, the Hospitals and Health Services Amendment Bill 2013, the Insurance Commission of Western Amendment Bill 2013, the Minerals Research Institute of Western Australia Bill 2013, the Natural Gas (Canning Basin Joint Venture) Agreement Bill 2013, the Petroleum and Geothermal Energy Legislation Amendment Bill 2013, the Queen Elizabeth II Medical Centre Amendment Bill 2013, the Rates and Charges (Rebates and Deferments) Amendment Bill 2013, the State Agreements Legislation Repeal Bill 2013, and the Supply Bill 2013.

It was interesting that the Leader of the House gave us a little history of motions similar to the one that he has moved today and talked about why that has happened in the past. I ask the Leader of the House: in what other year ever have 15 bills been declared urgent and not been laid on the table for the standard 21 days?

Mr J.H.D. Day: I cannot answer that question precisely but I do make the point that they were not dealt with in an unreasonably short time. They might have been laid on the table for less than the technical three weeks that is required normally, but, generally speaking, at least two weeks was available before those bills were debated. So I do not think we are acting unreasonably.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: The standing orders are there for a reason. It is not just about the opposition; it is about making good law and giving the community the opportunity to have a say. One of the reasons that bills are laid on the table for three weeks is so that people who may be affected by the proposed legislative changes, be it a community group or an industry group, can look at the bill. All of us in opposition are not experts on every one

Mr John Day; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr David Templeman; Mr Colin Barnett; Acting Speaker; Dr Mike Nahan

of the bills that is laid on the table. It gives us the opportunity to get some advice and to do a bit of research on the bill. It also gives community and industry groups the opportunity to look at the bill and get in touch with the opposition on the bill. For example, if it is a health bill, doctors and nurses, and other health professionals, would be interested in the bill, and so too would members of the public. The same is true of other portfolio areas, be it police or education or any other area.

Mr W.J. Johnston: The government declared the Petroleum and Geothermal Energy Legislation Amendment Bill urgent in this place and then referred it to a committee of the other house when it got to that place. On the burqa bill, the government told us that it had consulted with community groups, and it then admitted in the other place that there not been any discussion with community groups on that bill.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: The member for Cannington is 100 per cent correct. That is another example of where the Minister for Police has misled the house. On that police amendment bill, which dealt with headwear and face coverings, the minister said not once, but on at least three occasions, that consultation had taken place with affected groups. That bill went through this house, but, in the interim, before it went upstairs, we had the opportunity to ask those groups whether they had been consulted, and the answer was no. That was subsequently confirmed by the government's actions in the upper house. That meant that the bill had to be amended in the upper house. I am glad that bill was amended in the upper house. But, guess what? That amendment was exactly the amendment that had been proposed by the members for Gosnells and Mirrabooka when we had our briefing. That bill then came back to this place in an amended form, and we had yet another debate in this house about that issue.

This government has mismanaged the affairs of this house. There has been plenty of time on the legislative agenda for the government to deal with these bills. The problem is that these bills have not been brought into this house in a timely fashion. The government resumed the parliamentary sittings, presumably with very little on its legislative agenda. Frankly, I thought that declaring a bill urgent would occur in the first half of the year only. However, it has been even more prevalent in the second half of the year. The government has had all year to get its act together, and at no point has it got its act together. Even now, on the Workforce Reform Bill, we have had no explanation from the government as to why it did not introduce that bill in August or September when it would have had plenty of time to debate that bill. Perhaps the government could have used a couple of those weeks that it had pencilled in for October, when it simply filibustered, to debate that bill.

In conclusion, we have seen a number of unprecedented things occur in this house this year. We have seen the government's diabolically shambolic legislative agenda, in which 15 bills were declared urgent. We would be lucky if we could find another year in which more than five or six bills have been declared urgent, Leader of the House. The 15 bills that were declared urgent include bills such as the two appropriation bills and the Supply Bill. That is absolutely unprecedented. We have also seen government backbenchers deliberately filibuster through the second reading stage, the committee stage and the third reading stage of bills.

Mr C.J. Barnett: Batting practice!

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: I am glad the Premier has put that on the record. That means that the community of Western Australia has had to pay \$33 000 for his backbenchers to be in this place and have batting practice. That is a disgrace. It is typical of the Premier's cavalier attitude towards Parliament. The Liberals are in government and have the numbers in this place, but it is not for the Premier to treat Parliament with disdain. It is not good government when executive government rides roughshod over Parliament, which is exactly what the Premier is doing, particularly with the Workforce Reform Bill 2013.

MR M. McGOWAN (Rockingham — Leader of the Opposition) [12.40 pm]: I rise to indicate that the opposition will not be voting for this, as a way of sending a message to the Leader of the House and the Premier that the way they have handled a whole range of things in this place this year has been nothing short of disgraceful.

Mr J.H.D. Day: You've got a short memory—very short.

Mr M. McGOWAN: I can hear the voice from the second row. There he is back there—the backseat driver of Parliament! Shortly a member who has been in this place for only six months will move to the front row. The Leader of the House has been here 20 long years and there he is sitting in the back row. That says it all. He does not run the show and he never shows leadership in the house. He never knows what is going on. During all the disasters we have had in the management of this place, which I will go through shortly, the Leader of the House has sat in the back row like Dickie Knee with his head poking up a little above the parapet as every now and then he says something incomprehensible while the Premier operates the puppet strings. The Premier walks over to the Leader of the House and tells him when to move the gag. He gives him instructions and the Leader of the House stands up and does what he is told. When we ask him what is going on, he does not know. Come down the front, son! Sit where you should. Show some leadership and run the place like a Leader of the House should.

Mr John Day; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr David Templeman; Mr Colin Barnett; Acting Speaker; Dr Mike Nahan

Dr M.D. Nahan interjected.

Mr M. McGOWAN: The member for Riverton has been here for only five minutes and would not know either.

The Leader of the House should come down the front and show some leadership, otherwise he will sit back there and constantly wonder, “What am I doing? Maybe I should say something. Maybe I should raise this. What will Colin think? Oh, I don’t know!” Come down the front and show leadership in this place—please! Send the Treasurer back to where he should be. I would not seat him behind the Premier—that might be slightly dangerous! In any event, the Leader of the House should come down the front and take the Treasurer’s seat, which is where he should sit, and move the Treasurer down the back. A member with 19 and a half years less experience than the Leader of the House—his junior—is about to move to the front row. The Leader of the House should show leadership in this house and move to the front row. If the house had been managed well and had been doing what it should have been doing, we would not be in this situation.

A government member: What did you do when you were in government?

Mr M. McGOWAN: We did not have taxi debates that went on for hours and hours during which members told us about a taxi they had caught in New York! That example is the par excellence of examples of the mismanagement of this house. But it is not unusual. A few weeks ago, in this marathon seventh week out of an eight-week sitting, the government wasted the time of the house in that manner. The government guillotined three bills, it gagged last night’s debates and now it wants to cut back today’s private members’ business. All of those things have conspired, in light of what happened a few weeks ago in the management of this house, and have led us to raise these issues in this manner because this is our opportunity to point out the way this house has been run.

Let us look at the facts. Fifteen bills have been declared urgent, including bills such as the Insurance Commission of Western Australia Amendment Bill 2013, which will rip out dividends from ICWA even though the government said that would not happen. When we were given a briefing on that bill, no-one from the Insurance Commission came, but we were expected to debate it the same day! Is that any way to run this place? The Barrow Island Amendment Bill 2013 was declared urgent. The Synergy–Verve legislation which, as it turns out, is not supported by anyone except the Premier, was declared urgent. Those massive pieces of legislation were declared urgent in this place when, only a few weeks before that, the government employed puerile and useless delaying tactics. The Premier was running around the place saying that the opposition would not be able to handle the pace of seven weeks of sitting. I was up for it! I did not fade last night. I did not fall asleep in the middle of Parliament last night. While we were asking questions, we watched as the Premier’s head started to droop towards his chest. I felt a bit sorry for him. Then the Leader of the House showed some leadership! Without instruction, he adjourned the house! For once, I thought he showed leadership; he exercised the mercy rule on the Premier, who was slowly fading as the night wore on. I was ready for an all-nighter. When I first got to Parliament, all-nighters were the norm. I loved them; indeed, let us have some more! I am not in the camp of the journalists who say that we should work from nine to five. I want the all-nighters. Let us get in here and do that and then we will see what the Premier is made of. We saw what he was made of last night. He fell asleep in the middle of the debate. He faded out. The only time he became animated was when the member for West Swan said something. Suddenly, the bile, abuse and nastiness that is especially reserved for the member for West Swan spewed forth, as it does. For some reason she seems to be the one who attracts the Premier’s nastiness and bile. Admittedly, I do too. One or two of my colleagues do not. I seem to attract it these days, whereas for 15 days I was “wonder boy”! These days I get nastiness—“You absolute grub”. The other day he called me a sleaze.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr P. Abetz): Leader of the Opposition, whilst this is entertaining, I urge you to get back to the motion.

Mr C.J. Barnett: Is this your end-of-year speech?

Mr M. McGOWAN: No. My end-of-year speech, which will be given next Thursday night, will be warm, friendly and full of goodwill. If the Premier wants to come along, please do. It will probably be late in the evening while the carousing goes on in the courtyard. Increasingly I find that I am the only one who sits in the chamber on the final Thursday night of a series of sittings. If the Premier wants to come along, I will be full of warmth and goodwill to all men and women in this place, which will be unlike the Premier’s treatment of the member for West Swan. Frankly, the way the Premier abuses the member for West Swan in this place is disgraceful.

I come back to the mismanagement of the house. Important bills have been declared urgent one after another. The gag has been applied time after time on what has been fairly controversial legislation. Last night the government did not answer the questions we put. The budget of this re-elected government was brought down in August. When has that ever happened? Frankly, the budget was a spectacular flame out. The reverberations

Mr John Day; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr David Templeman; Mr Colin Barnett; Acting Speaker; Dr Mike Nahan

resulting from this disastrous government can still be heard. It has ripped up contracts with ordinary Western Australians. The government is full of holes and broken promises and misleading information based on what the Liberals took to the election. The government has shown a failure to answer the most basic of questions. How many times do we have to ask a question about the Kwinana Bulk Terminal? It is not a hard question: whose idea was it? The poor old shadow Treasurer has asked seven times. He still lives in hope. Every day he comes in here enthusiastic about getting an answer. But every day in question time he becomes crestfallen. He asks a question and then a supplementary question with a glimmer of hope in his eyes. But he becomes crestfallen when the Premier says, “Not only am I not going to answer it, I will not even find out myself.” We are asking questions in the Parliament of Western Australia.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member, please get back to the motion.

Mr M. McGOWAN: In any event, those are the reasons.

Mr C.J. Barnett: This is your swansong.

Mr M. McGOWAN: It is not my swansong. I fire on all cylinders, Premier!

The Premier does not answer the most basic and simple of questions. He gags debate and cannot handle the pace when it gets going. He mismanages this place and sprays abuse at members in this place.

Mr C.J. Barnett interjected.

Mr M. McGOWAN: I have never seen a Premier spray abuse the way that this Premier does. Let us have a look at last week versus the week before. Last week, the Premier was sitting in here as quiet as a mouse. I suspect that the Premier’s staff got in his ear and told him to not let McGowan get under his skin and that he is the Premier and above all that. Last week, he sat in here quietly. The week before, he screamed and yelled in a way that was shocking even by the Premier’s standards. I could tell by the looks on his colleagues’ faces that they were a bit perturbed by it as well. This week, the Premier has reverted to type. He has come steaming back, he is the way he was a couple of weeks ago, and I think he enjoys it. I think the Premier enjoys being wildly angry. I have tried to work out the Premier’s psychology on this and I think he actually likes being wildly angry all the time rather than act in a statesmanlike fashion—the way he should act. Backbenchers and shadow ministers pose questions and the Premier should answer them. He should act like an ordinary human being. The Premier should not let them get under his skin; that is my advice to him. But I do not think he can resist, because I think he enjoys it. I think he enjoys being wildly angry. I think he likes letting fly with the abuse and nastiness that he does in this place. I think, no matter how many times he is counselled not to, he cannot resist it and it emerges once again. There are some of my colleagues—member for West Swan, member for Cannington and member for Girrawheen, and a couple of others—who really seem to bring out the worst in the Premier.

In any event, the hopeless, hapless, useless management of this place dictates that we will not support the little manoeuvre the government is pulling today. Had the Parliament been run in an appropriate manner since March, we would not be voting against this. But I think that the Leader of the House knows in his heart of hearts that he has not done a particularly good job in here. I think he is looking forward to a time when he is not in here.

MR D.A. TEMPLEMAN (Mandurah) [12.51 pm]: I will be brief. I think this year will go down for the poorest handling of the Parliament for this millennium—certainly for a long time. The Leader of the House is often noted as a safe pair of hands and he is held in esteem for that. But this year, his handling of the house has been very much akin to a jalopy ride. It has been a jalopy ride from the beginning of the year until today and has culminated in this motion. The Leader of the House’s —

Several members interjected.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: I have touched a raw nerve.

I have not seen anyone as tired as the Premier was last night. It is amazing that a doona was not provided for him last night because I have not seen him that tired, and I think he would be the first to admit that. Do not worry; we were ready for an all-nighter last night. We were ready. This year has been a jalopy ride with Jeb as the Beverly Hillbillies’ driver sitting in the front; he has been changing the jalopy’s direction at very short notice. Jethro, the Treasurer, has been sitting in behind shouting instructions.

Point of Order

Mr C.J. BARNETT: This is absolute drivel. There is a motion before the house —

Mr D.A. Templeman: You would be used to it; you have been giving most of it this year.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr P. Abetz): Member for Mandurah, a point of order is to be heard in silence.

Mr John Day; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr David Templeman; Mr Colin Barnett; Acting Speaker; Dr Mike Nahan

Mr C.J. BARNETT: This is absolute drivel. There is a motion before the house relating to private members' business and that is what we should be debating. If the Leader of the Opposition wants to launch into a personal attack on myself or the leader of government business, he can move a motion and do it; we would welcome it.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Mandurah, I urge you to get back to the topic of the motion otherwise I will sit you down.

Debate Resumed

Mr P. Papalia: In the chair your performance was shameful last night. You were embarrassing.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: It has been a very interesting year. As outlined by the manager of opposition business, we have seen some 15 bills declared urgent. I think it may be unprecedented in parliamentary process that a bill like the City of Fremantle and Town of East Fremantle Trust Funds (Amendment and Expiry) Bill 2013 is declared urgent. I understand this bill was sitting in the drafting and process stages for decades; suddenly it becomes an urgent bill. Appropriation bills were declared urgent. Bills were rushed into this place purely because we did not have any debates of substance on legislation available to us. Each time the opposition was able, even at short notice, to provide appropriate contributions to debate, even on bills declared urgent, we saw the farce. The Premier talks about farce; the Taxi Drivers Licensing Bill 2013 a few weeks back was a farce. Government members were asked by the Leader of the House and the government Whip to make contributions to string out the debate over a number of days. There were members on the other side talking about taxi trips to Adelaide, what they wore during their taxi trips and their personal experiences. If we want to talk about a farce, that is a good farce; it is this government's farce. We find ourselves at this late stage of the parliamentary year running out of time. The government had plenty of time before, and it had to fill it up with rubbish and now it is running out of time and wants to take some of the opposition's time, particularly private members' business. Leader of the House, is there any indication that as part of the second part of the motion grievances will be suspended next week? Is that the Leader of the House's intention?

Mr J.H.D. Day: It is not part of the motion. I haven't contemplated that.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: But is it the Leader of the House's intention?

Mr J.H.D. Day: You did that when you were in government.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: No, I am asking if it is the Leader of the House's intention, because we would oppose that vigorously.

Mr J.H.D. Day: It is not part of the motion and we have not proposed it.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: Grievances are an important mechanism for opposition and government members.

I like the Leader of the House; he is a likeable and safe pair of hands. I would like to table my 2014 calendar, which will go out to my constituents next week. I offer it to the Leader of the House so he has a reliable calendar —

Mr J.H.D. Day interjected.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: There is an appropriate picture of local fauna on the top, a pelican, and the Old Mandurah Bridge is in the background. I would like to formally table this as a gift. The Leader of the House is welcome to take that calendar and use it appropriately for next year's planning, because this year it has been hopeless.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Before I give the call to member for Kalamunda, I want to call to order the member for Warnbro. I want to make it very clear that your comment about my conduct in the chair was totally unacceptable and if you want to rule dissent from the ruling of the Chair at any point, you are free to do that, but you are not free to call out and denigrate the ruling of the Chair.

Point of Order

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Is the Leader of the House in order guillotining his own motion? Given that he is the mover of the motion, is he in a position to move the gag motion?

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr I.M. Abetz): I had given the call to the member for Kalamunda, but if you are moving to put the motion, I understand that is not —

Dr M.D. Nahan: Mr Speaker —

Mr B.S. Wyatt: Mr Speaker —

Several members interjected.

Mr John Day; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr David Templeman; Mr Colin Barnett; Acting Speaker; Dr Mike Nahan

The ACTING SPEAKER: I am still dealing with this matter.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: I am not sure who was first.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: The member for Kalamunda was definitely on his feet. The member for Riverton.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Further to that point of order, Mr Acting Speaker, just to be clear on your ruling; have you ruled the member for Kalamunda's motion out of order?

The ACTING SPEAKER: No, not the motion. The motion —

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: His moving of the motion?

The ACTING SPEAKER: No, only the motion.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: The member for Kalamunda got to his feet and moved that the question be put.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Yes, that is out of order.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: He was the mover of the motion. Was that out of order or not?

The ACTING SPEAKER: That is contrary to standing orders.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Thank you.

Debate Resumed

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Given it was a point of order, it goes back to the person who I had given the call to.

Mr B.S. Wyatt: But you hadn't given him the call.

The ACTING SPEAKER: I had given the call to the member for Riverton.

Question to be Put

DR M.D. NAHAN (Riverton — Minister for Energy) [1.00 pm]: I move —

That the question be now put.

Division

Question put and a division taken, the Acting Speaker (Mr P. Abetz) casting his vote with the ayes, with the following result —

Ayes (32)

Mr P. Abetz	Mr J.H.D. Day	Mr C.D. Hatton	Mr N.W. Morton
Mr F.A. Alban	Ms W.M. Duncan	Mr A.P. Jacob	Dr M.D. Nahan
Mr C.J. Barnett	Ms E. Evangel	Dr G.G. Jacobs	Mr D.C. Nalder
Mr I.C. Blayney	Mr J.M. Francis	Mr R.F. Johnson	Mr D.T. Redman
Mr I.M. Britza	Mrs G.J. Godfrey	Mr R.S. Love	Mr A.J. Simpson
Mr G.M. Castrilli	Mr B.J. Grylls	Mr J.E. McGrath	Mr M.H. Taylor
Mr V.A. Catania	Dr K.D. Hames	Mr P.T. Miles	Mr T.K. Waldron
Ms M.J. Davies	Mrs L.M. Harvey	Ms A.R. Mitchell	Mr A. Krsticevic (<i>Teller</i>)

Noes (16)

Dr A.D. Buti	Mr W.J. Johnston	Ms S.F. McGurk	Mrs M.H. Roberts
Mr R.H. Cook	Mr D.J. Kelly	Mr P. Papalia	Ms R. Saffioti
Ms J. Farrer	Mr F.M. Logan	Mr J.R. Quigley	Mr P.B. Watson
Ms J.M. Freeman	Mr M. McGowan	Ms M.M. Quirk	Mr D.A. Templeman (<i>Teller</i>)

Pairs

Mr S.K. L'Estrange	Mr P.C. Tinley
Mr T.R. Buswell	Ms L.L. Baker
Mr J. Norberger	Mr B.S. Wyatt
Mr W.R. Marmion	Mr M.P. Murray
Mr M.J. Cowper	Mr C.J. Tallentire

Question thus passed.

Standing Orders Suspension — Motion Resumed

The ACTING SPEAKER: The question is that the motion be agreed to.

Extract from Hansard
[ASSEMBLY — Wednesday, 27 November 2013]
p6708b-6715a

Mr John Day; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr David Templeman; Mr Colin Barnett; Acting Speaker; Dr Mike Nahan

Division

Question put and a division taken, the Acting Speaker (Mr P. Abetz) casting his vote with the ayes, with the following result —

Ayes (32)

Mr P. Abetz	Mr J.H.D. Day	Mr C.D. Hatton	Mr N.W. Morton
Mr F.A. Alban	Ms W.M. Duncan	Mr A.P. Jacob	Dr M.D. Nahan
Mr C.J. Barnett	Ms E. Evangel	Dr G.G. Jacobs	Mr D.C. Nalder
Mr I.C. Blayney	Mr J.M. Francis	Mr R.F. Johnson	Mr D.T. Redman
Mr I.M. Britza	Mrs G.J. Godfrey	Mr R.S. Love	Mr A.J. Simpson
Mr G.M. Castrilli	Mr B.J. Grylls	Mr J.E. McGrath	Mr M.H. Taylor
Mr V.A. Catania	Dr K.D. Hames	Mr P.T. Miles	Mr T.K. Waldron
Ms M.J. Davies	Mrs L.M. Harvey	Ms A.R. Mitchell	Mr A. Krsticevic (<i>Teller</i>)

Noes (16)

Dr A.D. Buti	Mr W.J. Johnston	Ms S.F. McGurk	Mrs M.H. Roberts
Mr R.H. Cook	Mr D.J. Kelly	Mr P. Papalia	Ms R. Saffioti
Ms J. Farrer	Mr F.M. Logan	Mr J.R. Quigley	Mr P.B. Watson
Ms J.M. Freeman	Mr M. McGowan	Ms M.M. Quirk	Mr D.A. Templeman (<i>Teller</i>)

Pairs

Mr S.K. L'Estrange	Mr P.C. Tinley
Mr T.R. Buswell	Ms L.L. Baker
Mr J. Norberger	Mr B.S. Wyatt
Mr W.R. Marmion	Mr M.P. Murray
Mr M.J. Cowper	Mr C.J. Tallentire

Question thus passed.

The ACTING SPEAKER: As the motion has been carried, I advise there will be a dinner break tonight between 6.00 pm and 7.00 pm.