Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY - Thursday, 27 February 2003] p4864b-4866a

Mr John Kobelke; Mr Rob Johnson; Speaker; Mr Jim McGinty; Mr Max Trenorden; Mr Larry Graham

LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION, CENSURE MOTION

Standing Orders Suspension

MR J.C. KOBELKE (Nollamara - Leader of the House) [2.52 pm]: I move without notice -

That so much of the standing orders be suspended as is necessary to enable the following motion to be debated forthwith with the time limits for the debate being twice those specified for a matter of public interest -

That this House censures the Leader of the Opposition for his deliberate and dangerous attempt to undermine the work of the Royal Commission Into Whether There Has Been Any Corrupt or Criminal Conduct by Western Australian Police Officers.

The Government has doubled the intended time limits for this debate on the basis that the Opposition will support it, and I hope it is willing to do that. I will not speak to the suspension motion. I will leave the debate to unfold when the Premier moves the substantive motion.

MR R.F. JOHNSON (Hillarys) [2.53 pm]: The Leader of the House approached me during question time and asked me whether the Opposition would agree to the suspension of standing orders to debate this motion. Obviously the Government has the numbers and therefore will win a division in this Chamber. I told the Leader of the House that this is a very serious motion to introduce and that I believed that the amount of time to debate it should be unlimited. However, I have since reconsidered that decision because the Premier is supposed to open a very important project long before the debate would be finished, and it is incumbent on the Premier to be here for the debate. Indeed, every minister should be here for a motion that condemns the Leader of the Opposition for a question that was asked in this Parliament yesterday. Unfortunately, one minister - the Minister for Health - is missing. That is a great shame because -

Several members interjected.

Mr J.A. McGinty: He is delivering a eulogy at a dead policeman's funeral.

The SPEAKER: Order members! The interesting conversations between members was such that the member on his feet could not continue his comments. It is bad enough when interjections are directed at the member on his feet; however, it is unacceptable when interjections occur across the Chamber on issues that do not affect the member on his feet.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: If the Minister for Health is at a funeral, my condolence goes with him. Frankly, this is Parliament and it is an important issue when a censure motion is moved against any member in the House. The Leader of the House could have brought on this motion at any time earlier in the day. I received notice very late yesterday that the Minister for Health would not be here today. The Opposition had two important questions to ask the Minister for Health that it was not able to ask. The Leader of the House should have moved this motion earlier.

The Opposition has contempt for the substantive motion the Leader of the House wishes to move. As I have said publicly, members on this side of the House do not get answers from the Premier or most ministers, apart from the Attorney General, who is pretty good at answering questions - I said that on radio, and I meant it. The worst culprit is the Premier. We never get an answer from him. We get wonderful answers to dorothy dixers that head off on tangents about the federal Government and the previous coalition Government, but we never get sensible answers. The Premier is a past master at it.

This House should not be wasting time on this motion. It is a little vendetta the Premier wants to use because he could not answer a question. I wondered how long it would take him to think out the answer; it is either yes or no. It will probably take the Premier a couple of weeks to answer a simple question. Yes or no - no other answer could be given to the question put to the Premier yesterday, but it was obviously too difficult for a Rhodes scholar.

I would like the motion to be amended, as the House should not waste two hours on the motion. It is important that the Premier be here throughout this debate. In deference to the Premier's going to a very important function, I would like to the motion to be amended so that the debate will last for one hour - the time for a matter of public interest - as I do not want this House to waste time. If the Leader of the House is willing to withdraw the motion and amend it to allow for a one-hour debate, the Opposition will agree to it.

The SPEAKER: Leader of the National Party, I will give the call to the Leader of the House as he may present a different motion to the House.

MR J.C. KOBELKE (Nollamara - Leader of the House) [2.58 pm]: I do not know whether the National Party or the Independents will give permission -

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY - Thursday, 27 February 2003] p4864b-4866a

Mr John Kobelke; Mr Rob Johnson; Speaker; Mr Jim McGinty; Mr Max Trenorden; Mr Larry Graham

Mr M.W. Trenorden: Of course you don't - you never talk to us!

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: I ask now whether the Nationals will accept the withdrawal of this motion and the substitution of a new motion giving MPI timing.

Mr M.W. Trenorden: I don't mind at all.

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: What about the Independents?

Mr L. Graham: By way of interjection, I have some tolerance for the request, but I have not spoken to my colleagues. I might want to speak on the matter.

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: If I take up the requests from the Opposition, it will be normal MPI timing; that is, it will allow time for Independents, but limited time.

Mr L. Graham: If you extend time for the Independents, we would probably -

Mr J.C. KOBELKE: That is not being recommended.

Mr L. Graham: Then, no.

Amendment to Motion

MR J.A. McGINTY (Fremantle - Attorney General) [2.59 pm]: I move -

To delete "twice".

MR M.W. TRENORDEN (Avon - Leader of the National Party) [2.59 pm] There is a big slice of deja vu here. In terms of open and accountable government, nobody has spoken to the National Party on this issue. Surprise, surprise! On such a critical issue, conversations took place across the Chamber and behind doors between the Liberal Party and Government, and that is fine. However, other members are in this Chamber also with the National Party and the Independents.

Mr N.R. Marlborough: Glad to see you here for a Thursday.

Mr M.W. TRENORDEN: Did the member read that? He said yesterday that he could not read, and I agreed with the member for Peel.

This is the second event today. We prepared a question for the Minister for Health. We gave notice of the question to the Minister for Health's office late in the morning, and staff in his office did not tell us that the Minister for Health would not be here for question time today.

Mr R.F. Johnson: He was here five minutes ago, member.

Mr M.W. TRENORDEN: We found out from the Whip that the minister will not be here.

After listening to the debate, it is clear that the Liberal Party was informed that the Minister for Health would not be here today. Was the National Party informed? No, who would bother? The Government is meant to be open and accountable -

Mr J.N. Hyde: Are you attacking the royal commission, like the Liberals?

Mr M.W. TRENORDEN: The member is on a really good substance; he should keep smoking it.

It would be nice to be included in the process. The National Party has six members in the Chamber, all of whom have a view. I agree that the Government has every right to move the motion, but how about giving the National Party some notice.

MR L. GRAHAM (Pilbara) [3.01 pm]: I will make a very short contribution to the debate in support of the motion to suspend standing orders. I am disappointed that the time allotted for Independent members will not be extended, but I can live with that. I have not formed a view about the way I will vote on the subsequent motion, but I am happy to support the suspension of standing orders.

Amendment put and passed.

Question (motion as amended) put and passed with an absolute majority.