

**BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE**

*Standing Orders Suspension — Motion*

**HON SUE ELLERY (South Metropolitan — Leader of the House)** [10.21 am] — without notice: I move —

That so much of the standing orders be suspended as to enable the following variations to the order of business and sitting times for next week as follows —

- (1) Tuesday, 5 December —
  - (a) The Council to sit at 10.00 am and suspend sittings between 1.00 pm and 2.00 pm;
- (2) Wednesday, 6 December —
  - (a) The Council to sit after 6.20 pm and suspend sittings between 6.00 pm and 7.00 pm;
  - (b) no motions on notice;
  - (c) no consideration of committee reports; and
- (3) Thursday, 7 December —
  - (a) No private members' business.

This motion reflects the agreement that has been reached behind the Chair about how we will deal with the remaining legislation that has been agreed will be progressed to completion by the time we rise on Thursday, 7 December. I add that there has been agreement behind the Chair that we will see where we are on Wednesday night and that, if we need to, we might also seek to sit a bit later on Thursday.

**HON PETER COLLIER (North Metropolitan — Leader of the Opposition)** [10.22 am]: I have not seen a copy of this motion. However, it does reflect what the Leader of the House has commented on.

**Hon Sue Ellery:** You were given a copy yesterday.

**Hon PETER COLLIER:** When?

**Hon Sue Ellery:** The Clerks gave you a copy.

**Hon PETER COLLIER:** Okay. Regardless, I have one concern with Wednesday, 6 December. This motion does not reflect a time when the house will rise. The agreement was that the house would rise at the usual time, which is 9.45 pm. I am comfortable to agree to this motion, so long as we have confirmation from the Leader of the House and all the other parties, because I think it does reflect what we intend to do and what we agreed at our meeting.

**HON SUE ELLERY (South Metropolitan — Leader of the House)** [10.23 am]: The Leader of the Opposition is correct. The explanation that the Leader of the Opposition has provided is what was agreed—that is, that the house would rise on Wednesday at the normal time that it would rise on a Tuesday night.

**HON JACQUI BOYDELL (Mining and Pastoral — Deputy Leader of the National Party)** [10.24 am]: I want to put on the record that my reflection of the meeting was that the house would rise at 9.45 pm on Wednesday. I ask the Leader of the House to clarify that members' statements will be taken after that time.

**HON SUE ELLERY (South Metropolitan — Leader of the House)** [10.24 am]: Yes. The understanding is that we will complete orders of the day at 9.45 pm, in the same way that we would complete orders of the day at 9.45 pm on a Tuesday night, and we would then go to members' statements.

**HON NICK GOIRAN (South Metropolitan)** [10.24 am]: This is the first I have seen of this motion, but I think the motion is absolutely fine. There have obviously been discussions with the relevant leaders, as there should be. There are obviously deficiencies in the wording of the motion, and I have to say I am not thrilled that we are just going to accept the motion on the basis of a few comments from the Leader of the House here and there. It is not abundantly clear to me why this motion cannot be improved on at some time over the course of today so that we get it right. Having said that, the point I really want to make is that if it is the case that on Wednesday, as per this motion, we will be sitting until the cows come home and into Thursday, that is absolutely not a problem with me. There are a number of pieces of legislation that I understand the government wants to deal with, and that legislation will need to be scrutinised at length in Committee of the Whole. If we will have to sit late on Wednesday to achieve the outcomes that the Leader of the House wants, from my perspective there will be no objection whatsoever.

**HON COLIN TINCKNELL (South West)** [10.25 am]: I want to highlight the point that on Wednesday at 9.45 pm, we will complete orders of the day. Speaking on behalf of the crossbench, we would be happy with that.

Question put and passed with an absolute majority.