

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE — EXTENDED SITTING HOURS

Standing Orders Suspension — Motion

HON STEPHEN DAWSON (Mining and Pastoral — Deputy Leader of the House) [2.10 pm] — without notice:
I move —

That so much of standing orders be suspended to enable the following variation to the order of business and sitting times on Wednesday, 19 October 2022 —

- (a) that the Council continues to sit beyond 6.20 pm and takes members' statements at a time ordered by the house; and
- (b) that the sitting be suspended between 6.00 pm and 7.00 pm.

By way of explanation, I advised the party leaders of the government's intention to pass the Emergency Management Amendment (Temporary COVID-19 Provisions) Bill 2022 by the end of Wednesday, 19 October 2022, which is tomorrow. I have consulted party leaders about the time each party requires for each stage of debate on the bill. Based on that feedback, if all the time is required, it equates to a total of 12 hours. The house has a total of seven hours and 35 minutes' worth of orders of the day on a normal combined Tuesday and Wednesday sitting. To make up the additional three hours and 25 minutes that is required to get to 12 hours, the house will need to sit late tomorrow night. I am factoring in a one-hour dinner break between 6.00 pm and 7.00 pm.

Obviously, I am hopeful that it will not take the full 12 hours to finish the bill. If that is the case, we will move to members' statements as soon as the emergency management bill is completed.

HON NICK GOIRAN (South Metropolitan) [2.12 pm]: I rise to oppose the suspension of standing orders at this time. According to my notes, the Deputy Leader of the House said just a few moments ago that the house will need to sit late tomorrow. That is untrue. The house need not sit late tomorrow night. I have said this during previous debates, and members who have been here a little while will know that I have no problem whatsoever if the government wants us to sit extra hours or extra days. Anytime it wants to come and review legislation, call me up; I am available. What I find utterly unacceptable from the McGowan Labor government is the Deputy Leader of the House's suggestion that the bill the government wants to pass, the Emergency Management Amendment (Temporary COVID-19 Provisions) Bill 2022, will be passed tomorrow. Such is the edict from the McGowan Labor government.

With all due respect to the Deputy Leader of the House, the house does not need to sit late tomorrow. The only reason we will be sitting late tomorrow is that the government is demanding that Parliament pass this bill by no later than tomorrow. This could be considered on Thursday. Why are we interfering with the ordinary processes of Parliament for this week? Why are we sitting late tomorrow? Because the government does not want this matter to be considered on Thursday. I note that we are, in fact, sitting next week as well. This bill could be considered then. Perhaps the Deputy Leader of the House could explain to the house what is so urgent about this matter. Why is it necessary for this bill to be considered tomorrow evening?

I make it plainly clear that if members want to sit here tomorrow night—before or after midnight—that is no problem for me. I am as keen as mustard. What I will not agree to is the suggestion that this bill should have some kind of bulldozed scrutiny by the house of review. That is unacceptable. The government has not made a case. Not once, in the few words uttered by the Deputy Leader of the House, did he explain why this is necessary. He simply said that this is how it will be. As a result of that, the house will need to sit late tomorrow. In my view, that is inappropriate.

No extraordinary situation currently before us warrants us to put aside the standing orders, which is what we are being asked to do—suspend standing orders, park them for the time being, and proceed down the path the government wants us to take for tomorrow. The government is entitled to have its agenda dealt with by the Parliament, but the Parliament is entitled to have a proper period to consider the government's agenda.

I finish on this note: members should keep at the top of their minds that this particular bill—which the government insists we pass tomorrow because it could not possibly be considered on Thursday, apparently, unless it is in the wee hours of the morning—is the same bill that the government provided next to no notice on in the other place. We now have a repeat performance or a sequel. In the other place, the government decided to dispense with the ordinary rules of Parliament, and it is currently asking us to do the same. I am suggesting to members that the appropriate course of action is to vote no.

Division

Question put and a division taken with the following result —

Extract from *Hansard*
[COUNCIL — Tuesday, 18 October 2022]
p4512d-4513a
Hon Stephen Dawson; Hon Nick Goiran

Ayes (19)

Hon Klara Andric
Hon Dan Caddy
Hon Sandra Carr
Hon Stephen Dawson
Hon Kate Doust

Hon Peter Foster
Hon Lorna Harper
Hon Jackie Jarvis
Hon Alannah MacTiernan
Hon Kyle McGinn

Hon Shelley Payne
Hon Stephen Pratt
Hon Martin Pritchard
Hon Samantha Rowe
Hon Rosie Sahanna

Hon Matthew Swinbourn
Hon Dr Sally Talbot
Hon Darren West
Hon Pierre Yang (*Teller*)

Noes (11)

Hon Peter Collier
Hon Donna Faragher
Hon Nick Goiran

Hon Steve Martin
Hon Sophia Moermond
Hon Dr Brad Pettitt

Hon Tjorn Sibma
Hon Dr Steve Thomas
Hon Wilson Tucker

Hon Dr Brian Walker
Hon Colin de Grussa (*Teller*)

Pairs

Hon Sue Ellery
Hon Ayor Makur Chuot

Hon Martin Aldridge
Hon Neil Thomson

Question thus passed with an absolute majority.