

Dr Mike Nahan; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mr David Templeman; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Peter Rundle; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Dean Nalder; Dr Tony Buti

TEMPORARY ORDERS 40, 101, 146, 147 — STANDING ORDER AMENDMENTS

Amendment to Motion

Resumed from 13 March on the following motion moved by Mr D.A. Templeman (Leader of the House) —

That for 2019, the following temporary orders be adopted and commence from 19 March 2019 to the end of 2019 —

- (1) Standing Order 40 be amended by inserting the following sentence at the end of the standing order: “A stranger does not include a member’s baby being breastfed by that member.”
- (2) (a) The sections on “Motions” and “Other Bills” in Standing Order 101 be amended by —
 - (i) deleting “60” as the allocated time for the “Mover”, the “Premier or one member deputed” and the “Leader of the Opposition or one member deputed” and substituting “45”; and
 - (b) The section on “Third reading” under “Other Bills” in standing order 101 be amended by deleting the words of the section and substituting the following —

Third reading —

Mover	30 minutes
Premier or one member deputed	+30 minutes
Leader of the Opposition or one member deputed	#30 minutes
Any other member	15 minutes
Mover in reply	30 minutes

+ If not a Government bill

If not an Opposition bill
- (3) (a) Standing Order 146 be amended by —
 - (i) deleting “Four” and substituting “Five”; and
 - (ii) inserting the following sentence at the end of the standing order: “The fifth grievance will alternate between government and opposition each week.”; and
- (b) Standing order 101 be amended by deleting “7” and substituting “6” in the section “Grievance debate (S.O. 146)”.
- (4) (a) Standing order 147 be amended by deleting “Once” and substituting “Twice”, by deleting “six” and substituting “five”, and by deleting “90 seconds” and substituting “two minutes”; and
- (b) Standing order 101 be amended by —
 - (i) deleting “90 seconds” and substituting “2 minutes” in the section “Members’ statements (S.O. 147)”; and
 - (ii) deleting “Maximum of 6 members.” and substituting “Maximum of 5 members, twice weekly.”

to which the following amendment was moved by Mr S.K. L'Estrange —

In part (3)(a)(ii) —

To delete the words “alternate between government and opposition each week” and substitute —
be allocated to the opposition each week

DR M.D. NAHAN (Riverton — Leader of the Opposition) [10.03 am]: I had essentially finished my remarks but I will just summarise them. We are debating temporary changes to the rules that govern this house. As the member for Churchlands indicated in his learned speech, the rules are very important and, even though they will be temporary, there is an expectation that they will continue, if they work. They will be longstanding and will go across governments from one period to the next.

The history is that standing orders have been decided in a bipartisan manner. The most important committee in this house, the Procedure and Privileges Committee, assessed them. The committee polled us as parliamentarians and put recommendations to us on the basis of that polling. It recommended only those that had the overwhelming support of polled members. In this case, that was to reduce the length of grievances to expand the number of

Dr Mike Nahan; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mr David Templeman; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Peter Rundle; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Dean Nalder; Dr Tony Buti

grievances and, importantly, that the additional grievances be given to the opposition. That was what was proposed. The government, however, plans to use its numbers to unilaterally change that to split the grievances between the government and the opposition. That is what we disagree with. I might add that a deal was done. An offer made by the government was accepted by us on the condition that we meet a certain criterion. We met that last time we sat, which was two weeks ago, and now we find out this week that that offer and acceptance is now null and void, despite us meeting the conditions of it.

I emphasise that this is no way to set the rules for this house. Like the weather, politicians come and go—one day a party is in government and another time it is in opposition. That is why the history in parliamentary democracies is that the standing orders have been decided in a bipartisan manner. The government is basically saying that the party with the numbers can set the rules in the house of Parliament. The government sees it as saying the party with the power of its numbers can set the rules in its favour. The government is setting a very dangerous precedent. It is now noted in *Hansard* and we will remember that. We ask the government to do the right thing: to reconsider and go back to what the Procedure and Privileges Committee recommended, and what the overwhelming majority of its own members agreed to, and give the additional grievances to the opposition.

MRS L.M. HARVEY (Scarborough — Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [10.06 am]: I also rise to add my remarks to the proposed changes to the standing orders in this chamber. We as an opposition are actually quite alarmed at the way the government will use its numbers to ram through these changes. Parliamentary process generally in the Westminster system has the consensus vote of every single member in the chamber when it comes to changing the rules of debate and the rules within which we engage. That has been parliamentary convention in Westminster Parliaments right around the commonwealth from the beginning. When the standing orders have been changed previously in the Western Australian Parliament, there has been a long period of consultation and there has been a consensus view agreed upon by all parties in the chamber, whether it be the Labor Party, the Liberal Party, the National Party, the Greens, the Liberals for Forests, or whoever it might be. At the time that changes have been mooted, it has been by consensus—the changes have gone through on the voices. That is not what we are faced with at this time by this government.

In good faith, every member of this chamber participated in a survey to put their views forward on a number of different areas to the Procedure and Privileges Committee of this house. The privileges committee came up with a report that corralled all of those views, with some recommendations. The opposition was happy with the recommendations. One of the recommendations related to no longer excluding from the chamber during a vote or the business of this chamber a child who is being fed; that is, this house would no longer view that child as a stranger. We thought that that was a good initiative. The initiative around reducing the time for grievances and adding an additional grievance so that there would be five grievances, with that fifth grievance going to the opposition, was another recommendation of the committee. We agreed with that, and for good reason. Grievances are a very good opportunity for local members to raise issues with ministers and the government. Having sat on the government benches, I know that backbenchers on the government's team get better access to ministers and more opportunities to engage with ministers because they share the same caucus or party room. The opportunity for a backbencher on the government benches to resolve local issues with the relevant minister far and away exceed the opportunities of opposition backbenchers—far exceed it. One of the promises of this government was gold-standard transparency and better governance and accountability. One important step towards achieving that accountability would be to give the fifth grievance to the opposition. We are two parties in opposition—the Liberal Party and the National Party. We share opportunities to hold the government to account. Members would be aware of that. Yesterday, the Nationals ran private members' time from 4.00 to 7.00 pm and raised with the government issues of concern to them and their constituency. The Liberal opposition will have its opportunity in private members' time next week. We can raise matters of public importance but we share those opportunities with the National Party because there are two parties in opposition. The government is saying that it wants the fifth grievance to switch between the government and the opposition on alternate weeks, which sounds like a fair arrangement except that the government is failing to acknowledge that there are two parties in opposition. Switching that grievance every week between the government and the opposition means that for every four grievances over a four-week period, the government will get 50 per cent of them. The Liberal Party will get one, the National Party will get one and government backbenchers, who have unfettered access to ministers in their caucus room, will get two. It is the government's decision to alternate that grievance between the government and the opposition; it has the numbers and it is going to ram it through against parliamentary convention and contrary to the recommendation of the Procedure and Privileges Committee of this Parliament. Where is the respect for the Procedure and Privileges Committee in all this? The Procedure and Privileges Committee is our disciplinary committee. If the privileges committee recommends disciplinary action against one of our members, what will the government do? It thumbs its nose at something as innocuous as a fifth grievance being given to the opposition every week, which was a recommendation of its own committee; indeed, the Chair of the Procedure and Privileges Committee is the

Dr Mike Nahan; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mr David Templeman; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Peter Rundle; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Dean Nalder; Dr Tony Buti

Speaker of the Assembly, who is from the government's side of politics. Where does that leave future Procedure and Privileges Committee recommendations about very important matters, such as disciplinary procedures for members?

We are disappointed that the government has chosen to take this line—very disappointed. We were actually quite astonished; all of us in the Liberal Party were talking up what a great thing it was that the government came to that agreement with us on the last Thursday of sitting; namely, the agreement to get the container deposit scheme legislation though by four o'clock and debate the proposed changes to the standing orders of Parliament between 4.00 and 5.00 pm, with an agreement, as I understood it, to accept an amendment to allow bottle-fed babies to also be in the chamber and to allow the fifth grievance to go to the opposition. That was the agreement. In fact, the Leader of the Opposition was quite incredulous when he came into the LOOP office and said, "This is the deal I've just been offered. I can't believe it. I think we should take it." We unanimously agreed that we should take the offer because it was a rare moment of conciliation from a government that came to office in a landslide and has acted arrogantly and treated the opposition with absolute contempt from that moment on. We thought that perhaps the tide had turned and the government had decided to treat every elected member in this place as worthy of occupying their seats in representing their community and whose views are important—those views that were expressed in the survey that was considered by the Procedure and Privileges Committee that made recommendations based on the feedback it received from all members. Members should not forget that there are 40 members of the Labor Party in this chamber. The majority of responses, as I understand it, supported the recommendation of the Procedure and Privileges Committee. That is how the privileges committee formed its view; it looked at the majority of responses.

Mr W.R. Marmion: So 13 Labor people voted for us having the extra grievance.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: As I understand it, yes.

Several members interjected.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I can only assume because obviously the contributions were confidential.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr T.J. Healy): Members! Member for Scarborough, do you seek to take interjections?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: No-one is interjecting on me, Mr Acting Speaker, they are interjecting on each other—so, no!

The ACTING SPEAKER: I ask members from all sides to allow the member to make her contribution.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I will not labour the point because the point has been made by other members that we fundamentally disagree with the government's action to lock down transparency and governance opportunities for the opposition. We absolutely reject it. We do not think it is fair that in achieving the fifth grievance every week, we have sacrificed the time we get to prosecute our grievances. We are truncating the opportunity to expand on grievances to enable a fifth grievance, and that fifth grievance has now fundamentally been removed from opposition. We will get one in four. When Parliament sits, we will get an opportunity to take up that extra grievance once a month whereas the government will get that opportunity twice a month.

Mr D.A. Templeman: You'll get 10 extra.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: The government will get twice that. Government members will get double the opportunity for grievances in this chamber than Liberal Party members. I do not believe that that is acceptable, particularly when the government, occupying the benches over there, has backbenchers who have unfettered access to ministers and more opportunities to resolve their issues. I do not think it is fair, given that the National Party and the Liberal Party, with their limited resources, may have had one extra opportunity a week to prosecute a grievance to a minister. What is the government afraid of? Why is it afraid of letting us have that additional opportunity each week to prosecute issues in our constituency?

Mr D.A. Templeman: Are you going to stop suspending standing orders after every question time?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Leader of the House —

Mr D.A. Templeman: That provides you up to an hour a week; that is the habit you're doing. You've got a habit.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Leader of the House, I will take your interjection.

Mr D.A. Templeman: You've already got an hour you're taking from government business through a pattern of what we believe is an abuse of the standing orders.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I am pleased that the Leader of the House raises that issue because notwithstanding that we have suspended standing orders to debate matters that we believe are important, there has been no interruption to government business going through this house.

Dr Mike Nahan; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mr David Templeman; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Peter Rundle; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Dean Nalder; Dr Tony Buti

Mr D.A. Templeman: Yes, you have, because you've taken an hour of government business time.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: No, I disagree. We have negotiated with the Leader of the House who, every week, sends us a letter saying what legislation the government wants to get through. Every week the Premier's Statement is on there, which is the filler when the government runs out of things to do. If the Leader of the House can name one piece of legislation that has failed to pass in a parliamentary week because we have suspended standing orders, he should name it. Name it! Name the one piece of government business that was not debated because we suspended standing orders. We are doing the government a favour by suspending standing orders because we are taking up an hour of time for which there is no legislation to fill. That is what we are doing. We are helping the government out so that we do not go home at two o'clock on a Thursday. That is what we are doing every week by suspending standing orders. Can the Leader of the House name one piece of legislation that has not passed because we suspended standing orders? The government's legislative agenda is very light on. In the two years it has been in power, 75 per cent of the legislation it has put forward —

Mr D.A. Templeman interjected.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Acting Speaker, your protection, please.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members!

Mr D.A. Templeman interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr T.J. Healy): Leader of the House! Member for Scarborough, you indicated that you were happy to take the interjection and you seemed to be engaging in the discussion. From what you are saying, I take it that you are finished with that and you will continue with your remarks.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Yes. The opposition has noticed that 75 per cent or thereabouts of the legislation that has passed through this place in the past two years was crafted and drafted under the former Liberal–National government, lapsed at the prorogation of Parliament, and was reintroduced. The legislative agenda of the government is quite light on. I reiterate that in the time that we have been in opposition, there has not been a piece of legislation that has not passed this place in the week that the government has requested it to. Notwithstanding the interruptions to government business, which are apparently heinous interruptions, we have risen early on Tuesday nights and Thursday afternoons.

Mr D.A. Templeman interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Leader of the House!

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: It is not a strong argument. To conclude—I want to get this on the record very clearly—we participated in the changes to the standing orders in good faith. We accepted the report of the Procedure and Privileges Committee about recommended changes. We object to the government overturning the recommendations of the privileges committee for its own political purposes. We think that is very poor form and shows a lack of transparency and accountability. We believe that it is arrogant of this government to use its numbers to push through changes that are contrary to the recommendations of the privileges committee because it can. That is what it is doing.

Mrs J.M.C. Stojkovski interjected.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: One day the member for Kingsley will be on this side of the house and she will understand that the opposition has limited opportunities to hold the government to account. An additional grievance each week was an opportunity that the government said it would give the opposition, but it has now reneged on its commitment. That is what we see from this government. We do not see the government stepping up in a statesmanlike manner and saying, "We are running a good government here. An extra grievance a week isn't going to harm us because we are doing a great job." That is not what we are hearing. We are hearing that the government is going to reduce by 25 per cent the opportunities for the Liberal opposition to hold the government to account with that additional grievance. That is what the government is doing, and it can live with the consequences. When members opposite are occupying the opposition benches, they can expect to get the same treatment from a conservative government that they have given to the conservative opposition.

MR W.R. MARMION (Nedlands) [10.23 am]: I want to speak briefly—briefer than I had expected—on the amendment moved by the member for Churchlands to delete the words "alternate between government and opposition each week" and substitute "be allocated to the opposition each week". That is what I will be speaking to. I support the report of the Procedure and Privileges Committee and note the committee's composition. It is chaired by the member for Albany, the Speaker, and the other members are the member for Maylands, the member for Geraldton, the member for Pilbara and the member for Roe. They are esteemed members of this chamber. The

Dr Mike Nahan; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mr David Templeman; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Peter Rundle; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Dean Nalder; Dr Tony Buti

committee put forward only amendments that were unanimous. It was very cautious about putting forward changes to procedures, which I think is the right way to go. If we are going to change the way the democratic system works in Western Australia—the standing orders are paramount to the procedures of democracy in Western Australia—as there is an opposition, the approach should be bipartisan.

The Procedure and Privileges Committee has taken a very conservative approach and made sure that only the recommendations—Mr Acting Speaker, I cannot hear because there is a bit of noise and disruption.

I think this is a very conservative report. I return to the amendment, which would allow the fifth grievance to go to the opposition. In the questionnaire that went to our colleagues and fellow members of Parliament, the question received 32 yes votes and 15 no responses. It was unanimously in favour that the grievance —

Mr D.A. Templeman interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Leader of the House!

Mr W.R. MARMION: The Leader of the House can speak later.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Allow the member for Nedlands to continue with his remarks.

Mr W.R. MARMION: Let us look at the numbers. There were 32 votes for this proposal. If there are 19 members of Parliament on this side of the house, at least 13 members —

Dr A.D. Buti: It's not unanimous, is it?

Mr W.R. MARMION: The member for Armadale can speak. I withdraw the “unanimous”, so members opposite can all keep their mouths shut until they speak.

In a survey put out by the Procedure and Privileges Committee, 13 members of the Labor Party voted in favour of this amendment. It was at least 13, but, in fact, if we do the numbers, it could be more than 13.

Dr A.D. Buti interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Armadale, I am on my feet.

Mr J.E. McGrath interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Armadale and member for South Perth, I am on my feet, and I call you both to order for the first time. Member for Nedlands, I think you are not taking interjections.

Mr W.R. MARMION: I am not taking interjections.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Please direct your comments to the Chair.

Mr W.R. MARMION: At least 13 members of the Labor Party supported this amendment in its current form in a survey. It is probably 14 or more. A few people on our side might have forgotten to put in the questionnaire, so it is very likely to be more than 13. I am not looking at the members of the Nationals WA, because I am sure that they are all keen. It is probably someone on our side. What has happened? Why have those 13 or more people changed their view? I think they might have changed their view because their side of the house has decided that it is going to vote against it in a block, whereas on our side, we are voting as members of Parliament—not as the Liberal Party or the National Party. We are voting independently. I am very disappointed. We are all members of Parliament and this is very important. The Procedure and Privileges Committee put out a report on how we should behave and run the Assembly. It did a survey, and the results were 32 to 15. That is not a bad win, as far as I am concerned. Some of the outstanding members of the committee, the members for Albany, Maylands and Geraldton are not here. The member for Pilbara is here and I hope to see him get up to support our amendment shortly. The member for Roe will undoubtedly support this amendment. Unfortunately, I have to sit down now, but I urge all members to strongly support this amendment.

MR A. KRSTICEVIC (Carine) [10.29 am]: I, too, want to say a couple of words about the Procedure and Privileges Committee report, “Enhancing the Legislative Assembly’s Procedures”. The Procedure and Privileges Committee had the right intention of adding some value to this Parliament and its procedures and processes. The standing orders are vitally important to the effective running of the Parliament. As has been stated on a number of occasions, the Procedure and Privileges Committee has a number of well-credentialed individuals working on it, both committee members and committee staff. We know that a majority of those members are from the Labor Party. How did they come up with this report? The starting point was a survey of members, asking them what they would like the committee to consider and which way they would like it to consider certain issues. Obviously, a number of matters were raised in the report. One of the things we talk about a lot in this house is family-friendly hours.

Dr Mike Nahan; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mr David Templeman; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Peter Rundle; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Dean Nalder; Dr Tony Buti

One of the recommendations in this report provided an opportunity to improve the family-friendly hours by changing the sitting times on Tuesdays to 12.00 pm to 7.00 pm. That is a great idea. We could start two hours earlier and get rid of the dinner break so that people could go back to their families at a reasonable time. Did the Labor Party consider that to be an appropriate change to the standing orders? Did it think about family-friendly hours as an option worth presenting to this Parliament? No, it did not. It is not one of the changes that was recommended.

Mr D.A. Templeman: Oh, for Christ's sake! I'll raise this issue as well.

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: The member can raise this issue. I am just saying —

Mr D.A. Templeman: I'll raise this issue in my response. You are so dumb.

Withdrawal of Remark

The ACTING SPEAKER: Leader of the House, could you withdraw that remark, please.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: I withdraw.

Debate Resumed

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member, I think you are not going to take interjections.

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: No. I am happy not to take interjections.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Can you please direct your comments through the Chair.

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: Family-friendly hours is one of the issues that was raised in this place. I am not going to talk about the entire report. For now, I want to focus on the issue of grievances and their importance.

Mr S.K. L'Estrange: Just give us the fifth grievance that you promised us.

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: That is right. The Leader of the House made a promise. He came to us and said that if we do something —

Mr S.K. L'Estrange interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Churchlands, please allow the member to make his comments.

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: The Leader of the House is obviously not happy because he had to go back on his word. He came to us with a promise that we could have the fifth grievance, and now he has changed his mind.

Mr S.K. L'Estrange: Yes, but he said, "You can have the fifth grievance if you get our bill through by 4.00 pm."

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: That is correct. We did exactly what he requested. That is disappointing.

What did the report say? The committee recommended that the time allowed to make a grievance be reduced from seven minutes to six minutes, so that we can have that additional grievance. As was mentioned earlier, 32 members voted yes and 15 members voted no. The member for Nedlands indicated that at least 13 Labor Party members voted —

Dr A.D. Buti: They didn't vote.

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: Sorry, they ticked the box on the survey, saying that they thought there should be a fifth grievance and it should go to the opposition. I know that at least 14 members voted in favour because the member for Darling Range was not included in that survey. Therefore, we picked up an extra member of the Labor Party who supported that recommendation. We know that the Labor Party, as opposed to the Liberal Party, will get a majority of those additional grievances under this proposal because we share those grievances with the National Party. Therefore, our capacity to hold the government to account during grievances is reduced.

I want to raise one issue very quickly. I know that the manager of opposition business and the Leader of the House are having a big debate about suspending standing orders. A good point was raised during that debate. Members seek to suspend standing orders when serious matters need to be brought to the house. It is a mechanism for the opposition to raise those matters and to hold the government to account. We have been very considered in our approach when bringing those matters to the Parliament. If the government is creating situations to force us to do that, we will continue to do that. I do not think the government can run in a dysfunctional way and try to destroy people in the rock lobster industry, for example, by trying to destroy their business and then say that the opposition does not have the right to suspend standing orders to debate that issue or whatever havoc ministers are running in the community when they are trying to work against the best interests of people in Western Australia. It is our job to raise those issues.

A very good point was made that we are very supportive of the time frames to get legislation through this house. As a matter of fact, sometimes the Leader of the House makes a big deal about needing to get legislation through in a particular time and we support him, and then that legislation goes to the upper house and sits there for

Dr Mike Nahan; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mr David Templeman; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Peter Rundle; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Dean Nalder; Dr Tony Buti

six months; no-one looks at it and no-one cares. The leader of the government in the upper house does not consider it to be a priority piece of legislation whereas down here we are rushing to try to get it through to meet the demands of the Leader of the House and the government, which we are happy to continue to do. Therefore, we are doing our best to not only scrutinise the legislation going through this house, but also make sure that it gets to the other place as quickly as possible. Obviously, it is then up to the other place to do what it needs to do.

I want to return to a debate that occurred on 28 March 2012 in this house. Some members may remember that debate. It related to questions and question time. Members might remember that question time was truncated on one particular day by the then Speaker, Hon Grant Woodhams. A number of things were raised during that debate about parliamentary procedures and processes and, obviously, the importance of the house and the procedures of the house. I want to refer to a couple of points and some statements that members made during that debate. I will start with Hon Mark McGowan, the now Premier. This relates to the privileges committee, question time and Parliament itself. The now Premier said —

I think there are ways to manage this, if only the government would accept the recommendations of the Procedure and Privileges Committee.

He was very supportive of the Procedure and Privileges Committee's recommendations relating to question time that were made some two years prior to that, in 2010. He continued —

To return to the original point, question time is about accountability.

How can the opposition—he was in opposition back then—make sure that it keeps the government accountable? It does that through grievances and question time. He went on to say —

I just say that question time is the most important part of the day and I think that some ministers, in particular the Premier, should have a look at a video of themselves during question time; they should be embarrassed.

Those words are great. If the Premier looked at some videos of himself and his ministers during question time, he would definitely be embarrassed. If he thought that we had bad habits when we were in government, I would suggest that he has picked them all up and is reflecting them back to us, 10 times worse. That is interesting. The reason I mentioned those couple of points relating to question time is that this report is about enhancing the procedures of the Parliament. I think the Procedure and Privileges Committee should have gone further than just the questions asked in that survey and the points that were raised in this report. It should have looked at things like question time and the standing orders in more detail. We know for a fact that question time is really a waste of time, because there are no answers. Pretty much the standard answer for the first two years of question time has started with "When you were in government". That is pretty much the start of the answer to every single question when we raise points that are relevant to the people of Western Australia today about things that this government is doing and things that are happening in the community. It is really just a waste of time, so I think the Procedure and Privileges Committee should have looked at that.

Dr A.D. Buti: Do you reckon we should get rid of question time?

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: We pretty much have. It is just wasting time.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Carine, I assumed you were not taking interjections.

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: I will get back to grievances, but I want to focus a little bit on question time because the now Treasurer, the member for Victoria Park, said during that debate in 2012 —

As the member for Midland pointed out, time and again we have had ministers giving what should be brief ministerial statements in question time, and using question time to outline whatever issue the government wants to get up on the day.

That is exactly what you guys are doing. Ministers are making brief ministerial statements, especially the member for Bassendean. He gets up and talks for 10 minutes, trying to defend himself—not against the public or against us; I think he is trying to defend himself against you guys. He knows government members are lining up against him and he has his power base, so he wants to make sure government members know he has the power to make the decisions that he wants, and they all need to fall into line. It is interesting how the Parliament has descended.

Hon Eric Ripper was someone whom I think members on both sides of the house had some respect for. He made some very genuine statements in this Parliament about the way Parliament runs and the way it is managed. I want to read out a couple of lines that he said back in that debate. I quote —

I was in this place before we had brief ministerial statements. Brief ministerial statements were introduced to lessen the number of lengthy dorothy dixer questions and answers. Instead, they have become just an addition to the dorothy dixer questions and answers.

Again, we see that happening here in this Parliament. He went on to say —

Dr Mike Nahan; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mr David Templeman; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Peter Rundle; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Dean Nalder; Dr Tony Buti

All of us have a responsibility here to contribute to the proper running of the house. Some things are just a bad deterioration of behaviour.

He said that we all have a responsibility for the proper running of the house. Accountability and transparency are important. Grievances are important. Eric Ripper went on to say —

I ask all members of the house to think about their responsibilities to promote the efficient functioning of the house ...

He made some very strong statements, which I agree with, and I think most members in this house would agree with if they were to think about things independently of how their party or their Premier tells them to vote on a particular issue. I am sure there are very few members in this Parliament who do not think that a government, irrespective of the party, should answer questions from, and be honest and transparent with, the people of Western Australia. Grievances are obviously one of the very few ways in which members, especially members of the opposition, have a chance to raise issues. Sometimes ministers answer grievances genuinely and at other times they answer them from a purely political perspective when they do not really care about the issue that was raised. They are just happy to use it as an opportunity to throw mud back at the opposition. However, some ministers take their jobs more seriously and are more genuine in the way that they approach these things. They understand that we are all here representing our communities. We all represent people who have concerns and issues and they have a right to be heard. There are not that many mechanisms to exercise that right to be heard. As I have said, grievances are one of the few mechanisms, and that is something we need to understand.

The Minister for Tourism, the member for Warnbro, spends a lot of time travelling to open up international markets and to try to get direct flights into Western Australia. I want to quote what he said during the debate in 2012 —

The opposition has its say on behalf of the people of Western Australia. If people in the community have a grievance, they seek redress from the opposition when the government is not fulfilling its part of the bargain.

The current Minister for Tourism said that people seek redress from the opposition. The opposition raises grievances to seek redress on behalf of the people of Western Australia, not government members who get up to make dorothy dixer grievances. They are a bit like government questions. The minister continued —

The role of the opposition in the Westminster system is to hold the government to account. Government members cannot complain if the opposition asks embarrassing questions or attacks ministers who are not performing their role to the extent that they should.

The member for Warnbro, the current Minister for Tourism, said that we should hold government ministers to account and we should be attacking them. According to his words, we should be asking ministers embarrassing questions. Of course, they are not answering those questions, and now the government is taking away the opportunity for grievances.

The absolute worst part about this is the embarrassment that the Leader of the House should be feeling, because, as far as I am concerned, this is a reflection on his reputation. He came to us and put an offer on the table. He said, "This is what the Premier, the government and the Labor Party want to put on the table for you to consider." He said, "You can have this grievance. All you need to do is pass this piece of legislation on a particular day." That happened and it went to the upper house. We have been very flexible with the Leader of the House regarding his legislative agenda, albeit it is very thin on the ground, as has been indicated on many occasions. We have done our bit to make sure that the legislative agenda is met. Every time the Leader of the House gets up and says, "Oh! You're suspending standing orders!", he might want to look at why we are suspending standing orders. He might want to look at the issue we are raising, rather than saying, "You're wasting half an hour." It is 15 minutes per side, so, generally speaking, it takes up half an hour. That half an hour is 30 minutes less than the government can give to one of its backbenchers to filibuster on one of its bills. They can talk about whatever they like—not necessarily the bill, but to get a bit of experience talking on their feet in general. That is more important to the Leader of the House than the opposition raising a serious issue that is bubbling away out in the community. The community would like clarity on these issues and would like to hear the answer given by the government of the day to make sure it is not a serious issue. Opposition members raise these issues, not necessarily always to attack the government, but because there are concerns in the community. The community wants to know what is going on, as does the opposition. Therefore, we suspend standing orders to give government members the opportunity to clarify the issue and put some context around the debate that is going on in the community so that people feel comfortable and know they do not have to be concerned. I think that adds value to this Parliament, to the robustness of the debate and to the community. The Leader of the House therefore has very little empathy from me when he jumps up and says, "You suspend standing orders!" If that is holding up the business of this Parliament in some way, that is fair enough, but we do not have many late sittings like we did in the previous Parliament. As a matter of fact,

Dr Mike Nahan; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mr David Templeman; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Peter Rundle; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Dean Nalder; Dr Tony Buti

we finish early more times than we sit late. I do not think that the Leader of the House has a valid argument at all. Everybody knows that he does not have a valid argument. I think the Leader of the House needs to go back to the Premier and say, “You know what? Not only did we make a promise, but also it is good for robust parliamentary debate. When we are in opposition one day, this will also be good for us.” He should step back and try to look at it from the point of view of the people of Western Australia—try to look at it independently. I do not know why the government is so scared for ministers to be asked an additional grievance by a member of the opposition.

[Leave denied for the member’s time to be extended.]

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: Unless ministers have something to hide, they cannot defend their position and they do not want to be transparent and accountable for what they are doing, I could not understand why government members want to stop us from doing an additional grievance. Considering that ministers generally do not answer questions anyway, it just gives ministers another opportunity to do a ministerial statement during the grievances in some cases or say their usual line, which is that everything is because of what the previous government did.

MS L. METTAM (Vasse) [10.50 am]: I would also like to contribute to this debate and support the amendment moved by the member for Churchlands, which reads —

In part (3)(a)(ii) —

To delete the words “alternate between government and opposition each week” and substitute —
be allocated to the opposition each week

It effectively supports the report and the work undertaken by the Procedure and Privileges Committee. I understand a lot of research happened behind the scenes, by tallying votes and historical data as well, by not only the committee staff, but also, and importantly, the committee members who put a great deal of consideration into this report—namely, the Speaker of the house, the Deputy Speaker and the members for Geraldton, Pilbara and Roe. It is important to recognise and acknowledge that this is a Labor-led motion and a majority of the members of this committee are from the government’s side. It was a democratic process when it came to the recommendations that were put forward as part of this report looking at standing orders. Other members in this place have already spoken, and the member for Carine clearly articulated that there was potential for this report to be a bit more broad in what was looked at. Concerns about conduct in question time have been raised in this place and also felt by the public, and opposition members of this place who represent the communities of Western Australia are at times frustrated about the responses that we receive from the ministers of the Crown. But I go back to the report and the amendment moved.

The amendment supports and relates specifically to the report, as supported by the committee, that would see an additional grievance go to the opposition. Not only members on this side of the chamber, but also, as I understand it, and as articulated in the report, 14 members of the government side supported this recommendation. There is fair reason to. It is important that I now read the section of the report that states the value of grievances. It states —

Grievances are a particularly valuable opportunity for members to raise matters of interest or concern to them and/or their electorates without the restrictions imposed on Questions (with or without notice) or the need formally to propose a motion. Equally valuable, the member receives a response from the relevant Minister, unlike, for example, the House of Representatives where members grieve and Ministers very seldom respond.

As the member for Carine quite rightly said, we are often frustrated on this side of the house during question time about the lack of response that we get to questions asked on behalf of the community. That is the value of grievances. I read on —

The Committee is of the view that reducing the grievance and response to six minutes each would still provide adequate time for a member to put their case and for a Minister to make a considered response. Making a one-minute reduction to the time limit of each grievance and response would enable an additional grievance to be made and responded to each week. Over a parliamentary year, this would provide approximately 20 additional opportunities for Opposition members to raise a matter of importance with a Minister.

That is an important point, that “over a parliamentary year, this would provide approximately 20 additional opportunities for opposition members to raise a matter of importance with a minister.” That is the recommendation that was supported by this committee in what I would consider to be a relatively thorough process to support the fact that members on this side of the house do not enjoy the same level of unfettered access to ministers of this place. There are plenty of examples of how that plays out. As the member for Vasse representing my electorate, often times I seek to have a minister represent constituents in my area. Just yesterday, there was an issue affecting the region of Vasse and tourism at a broader level regarding mountain bike riding. This is an issue that I have

Dr Mike Nahan; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mr David Templeman; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Peter Rundle; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Dean Nalder; Dr Tony Buti

raised on a number of occasions. Although it was of some value to have a meeting on this issue with people from the department, it is pretty disappointing to have members from my community drive three hours north to Perth for a meeting at which a minister does not show up. That is often the reality of what we face on this side of the house—the fact that we do not enjoy the same access as members opposite to ministers on behalf of our community. That is why grievances are so very important. Such was the case with the grievance I presented most recently regarding the People Place, an issue that is of concern to the electorate of Vasse and has been raised by our shadow Minister for Community Services. The Empowering Communities program is experiencing an uncertain future and 15 different community groups across the state, including the People Place, will see no funding after 2019–20. That is a really important grievance to present on behalf of the community. I have also presented a grievance on a dual carriageway in my electorate. There are many other issues that deserve to be presented in this place and deserve a response from a minister, not for my gain, or my personal purpose, but for the residents and the community of the Vasse electorate who are very keen to hear the minister's view and an explanation on what their decisions mean and what that means for them going forward. It is very important that grievances are heard in this place.

This issue is a matter of principle, and as the opposition Whip, I believe there are two matters of principle here. The first matter is very relevant to my position as Whip in this place and the role that I undertake with the manager of opposition business in consultation with those on the other side—the government Whip and the Leader of the House. To a large extent it has been a very positive and constructive working relationship. We often have discussions about who the speakers coming up will be and how the government business of the day will be managed, and there is general agreement or disagreement and discussion and resolution on matters relating to the business of the day. The manager of opposition business and I have a lot of respect for government business and what needs to be achieved.

Last week in this place an agreement was made that if we completed the waste avoidance bill by 4.00 pm to the satisfaction of members opposite, the government would support the fifth or additional grievance going to a member of the opposition. Although that agreement was made in good faith, and we made that commitment in good faith with the manager of opposition business, it was not done lightly. It meant that the member for Darling Range was unable to contribute to debate on the container deposit scheme. I am aware that she wanted to raise specific issues about how that legislation would affect small businesses in her electorate. She raised the issues through the consideration in detail stage but I am sure that the community of Darling Range would have appreciated her having more time to express the views of her community on that bill. The member for Dawesville also had some points to make on the container deposit scheme relating to a policy that we created when we were in government. There are some issues surrounding how the bill will impact small businesses and how community groups can get involved in that scheme as well. There are a number of issues that those two members and a number of other members would like to have articulated, not on behalf of themselves, not for their own personal gain, but for the communities they represent, and that is what this place is meant to be about. We represent the communities in our electorates. Unfortunately, those members on this side were unable to speak because we made a commitment in good faith that we would debate until four o'clock the container deposit scheme in exchange for what we saw as the greater good, which was the opportunity to support the report of the Procedure and Privileges Committee and respect the thoughts expressed by members who polled in support of the motion to see the additional grievance go to the opposition. We did it also for the obvious value of seeing an additional grievance being presented by members on this side of the house in support of those communities that we represent.

I believe this motion shows disrespect to the Procedure and Privileges Committee. It is of great concern that this agreement between the manager of opposition business and the Leader of the House was not respected. It is disappointing because the substantive issue of how standing orders are managed has historically been done with bipartisan agreement. It is concerning that this has not been supported either. The nature of this process has been impacted by a move from the government to overturn an agreement with the manager of opposition business and also to ignore the recommendations of the report that were spelt out clearly. The report highlights that 14 Labor members supported the opposition having 20 additional grievances every year. That report was a product of much consideration by the committee and in consultation with members as well. It is disappointing that this bipartisan approach has been ignored by the government and that the recommendations of the committee have been ignored and overturned. It is disappointing that the government has not honoured an agreement made in good faith to provide more transparency in this place for the benefit of the communities that the opposition represents.

MR D.A. TEMPLEMAN (Mandurah — Leader of the House) [11.06 am]: Comments have been made in this debate and I want to put into context the amendment and the debate so far. Much was made of the results of the survey and the justification, therefore, of certain recommendations. One of the things I want to remind the house of is this: the survey was just that—a survey. It was not a vote for one thing —

Dr Mike Nahan; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mr David Templeman; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Peter Rundle; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Dean Nalder; Dr Tony Buti

Mr J.E. McGrath interjected.

Mr D.A. Templeman: I have been speaking for less than a minute. Can I just explain? The survey was sent out to members, canvassing a range of issues not subject just to the standing orders. The survey addresses a range of issues, including spaces, the allowance of electronic petitions, canvassing how those petitions might be dealt with when received and recommendations about forwarding them to a minister for a formal response and debating those petitions in the house. The survey included not only issues related to the change in the direct procedures of the place, but also highlighted varying degrees of responses. Opposition members have referred to a range of survey results to justify the position they have taken. One thing they forget is that the survey was done first. A process to debate and discuss the survey is taking place now, and that is part of the process. People actually do change their minds, and I will give an example. The motion I moved that is before the house contains no recommendation, as was suggested in the place, on survey question 1 about sitting times. Thirty-three members supported the sitting times being changed. Members should look at the survey. The proposal was to introduce a 12 o'clock start on Tuesdays and 33 members agreed.

But after discussion and debate in our caucus, and discussions with the Nationals WA in particular, other issues were possibly not canvassed when that question was put in the survey. They included the issues around regional members who were required to be here and who are not, unlike metropolitan members, able to be at home by certain times if those time changes had occurred. There was a broad discussion around that and I know that in discussions the member for Moore and the National Party were vehemently opposed to that proposal, despite 33 members saying yes. The logic here is that the strong "yes" of all those members should have been put. The member is saying that that is the argument.

Mr S.K. L'Estrange: No, it's not.

Mr D.A. Templeman: No, I am going to speak here. I will not take any interjections. That is not logical because this was a survey that canvassed views, and then the responsibility of the Parliament was to put a proposal to the house, and that is what we have done. The manager of opposition business knows that we had a discussion about this and I think that the member would admit that initially he was in favour of those changes, as proposed by the survey. If the member is honest, he would say yes. However, after the discussion was put, that was not —

Mr S.K. L'Estrange: Leader of the House, you are verballing me. You know we are debating an amendment. Get back to the amendment.

Mr D.A. Templeman: No, we are talking about the survey discussion. Therefore, there was a change. The logic of "everything that was included in the survey and everything that was recommended should be put to this place" is not happening because various reasons, discussions and debates can be put about the results of the survey. That is what has happened. The member has raised a number of issues around breastfeeding and bottle-feeding. It is true to say —

Point of Order

Mr S.K. L'Estrange: We are debating the amendment that has been put forward by me. We are not debating any other aspect of this motion other than the amendment.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms J.M. Freeman): Can I have a look at the amendment that is before us?

Mr D.A. Templeman: I am talking about amendments and how you interpret the survey. That is what we are pointing out. It is a point for the argument.

The ACTING SPEAKER: I have not made a decision about the point of order.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Excuse me, members. Sorry; I took a bit longer than I should have, but we did not need to have a bit of a cross-party discussion. Leader of the House, can you come back to the amendment, please. The amendment states —

To delete the words "alternate between government and opposition each week" and substitute —
be allocated to the opposition each week

Debate Resumed

Mr D.A. Templeman: The point I am making is that the basis of the argument as to why the support of this amendment is proposed is based upon the recommendations related to the survey.

Mr S.K. L'Estrange: That is one of the arguments put.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members, I am on my feet!

Dr Mike Nahan; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mr David Templeman; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Peter Rundle; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Dean Nalder; Dr Tony Buti

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: Therefore I am allowed to respond to it.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Goodness me! Can we not do this? When I am on my feet, can we be quiet? Can we not interject? I will call the next person who interjects.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: The Leader of the Opposition talked about agreement. The logic of his argument is that these things should be agreed to beforehand, because he refers to convention. There happens to be a difference of opinion here, particularly on two key matters. The logic to that is that we should not consider those two matters because we have not come to an agreement; that is the point I am trying to make. The member is saying to us that the Leader of the Opposition in his argument said, "The convention is that we should have an agreement before we come to this place to put these amendments." If that is the case, we should not be dealing with breastfeeding at all because there was no agreement on that matter. The second thing is that we should not be agreeing to the issue with regard to changing the grievances procedure because there is no agreement. That is the logic of the Leader of the Opposition in putting his argument, and the opposition. My point is that this process included or involved a survey, which included the issue around grievances, private members' statements and reducing time—right? That was part of the survey, but we have not presented to this place all the survey results as they were recorded. But the Leader of the Opposition's argument is that we should and that we should not make any decision unless, first, it is agreed to, and, second, all those matters have strong support. Again, I pointed out to the member—this is the point I am trying to make—on the first matter that there was strong support for changing the sitting times on Tuesday. Those of us who are regional members put a very strong case.

Point of Order

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: This has nothing to do with the amendment that was moved.

Mr D.A. Templeman: For Christ's sake!

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms J.M. Freeman): Members! Points of order are heard in silence.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: I have a point of order.

The ACTING SPEAKER: It is okay; there is no point of order. Leader of the House, you have the floor.

Debate Resumed

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: That is the point I make. If the logic of the argument of the Leader of the Opposition is that we cannot bring any proposal into this place unless it is agreed, the only items we seem to have agreement on do not include breastfeeding or grievance. That is the logic. I would offer to the leader of opposition business that if he does not like what we are proposing with grievances, we will go back to the status quo, in which the opposition will not get any extra grievances. Once we vote down this amendment, I am prepared to go back to that if that is what he wants. It relates to the logic of the opposition leader because there is no agreement. We do not agree with the opposition that we should give it more grievances without the government's consideration, but we also bear in mind the opposition's pattern of behaviour when it comes to every question time since last year's sittings. The point I need to make is this: when we were in opposition—I know this because I was the opposition Whip for eight and a half years—if a matter was raised as a result of question time, we would actually scribble out a suspension of standing orders and move it, or we would wait until later in the day and move it. This opposition comes into this place with a suspension order that has been concocted before question time and has already been printed out, knowing that it does not matter what the answer will be during question time; it will move a suspension order. That is the opposition's pattern of behaviour. Why would the government give it a second extra grievance every two weeks and then allow it to continue to abuse the conventions of the house and introduce a preconceived suspension of standing orders after every question time?

Mr S.K. L'Estrange interjected.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: You have it prepared—you know! You bring it to me. You go and make the indication over there. You walk behind there—you know! It is your pattern of behaviour.

Mr S.K. L'Estrange: You are wrong.

The ACTING SPEAKER: I did say I was going to call the next time. I understand that this is a passionate debate, but let one side put the passion and the other side will have the opportunity to respond. Please, minister, let us keep on the point. Thank you.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: Opposition members come in every question time with their six questions prepared and their suspension of standing orders piece of paper prepared, and almost by pattern —

Point of Order

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: Point of order.

Dr Mike Nahan; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mr David Templeman; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Peter Rundle; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Dean Nalder; Dr Tony Buti

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: You do not like it, do you, sunshine?

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms J.M. Freeman): Leader of the House! Points of order are heard in silence.

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: The Leader of the House is saying that every single question time we do a suspension of standing orders.

The ACTING SPEAKER: No—what is your point of order?

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: He is misleading the house. We do not bring in a suspension of standing orders after every single question time. Where is the proof?

The ACTING SPEAKER: Okay.

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: Where is the proof?

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Carine!

Mr A. Krsticevic: Sorry.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Thank you for saying sorry. That is not a point of order.

Debate Resumed

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: I will answer the member for Carine's question. Go and ask the bills and papers office to see what the suspension of standing orders is written on. It is typewritten, it is prepared, and it is after every question time. In fact, I get attacked regularly for turning away from the Speaker. I will tell members why I do it. Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Stop. Okay. Let us all take a big deep breath. Are we good? Please stop interjecting and bring it back to me, maybe.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: I will tell members why I turn away from the Speaker. I know the Speaker does not like this, but I usually turn away after the third question. I turn this way because I know that the manager of opposition business is going to scurry in behind the Chair. He stands over there behind you, Madam Acting Speaker, and gives me a nod. I try to avoid him because he is standing over there with his little bit of paper and says, "Oh, you know." We have a great conversation. I get on well with him. But he has his bit of paper so, member for Carine, it has already been prepared. The member for Carine, of course, does not perhaps have the political influence that he wants in the LOOP office. That is what happens. It is typed out. They say, "Right. What are we going to suspend on? We'll ask the question. We know if she's not going to give us the answer, we'll go with the suspension of standing orders". Invariably, we have said yes. My point is this: we invariably say yes. We try to beat it down. We have a bit of an auction about how much time. We know that he starts off at 20 minutes and I come back with 10, and invariably we meet in the middle at 15! I stand there and grit my teeth and say, "You people!" But then we agree.

Mr S.K. L'Estrange: This is not relevant.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: It is absolutely relevant. This is the pattern of behaviour. How thick would you be if you said, "Oh, yeah, we're going to give you another grievance, an extra one—10 of them a year now. We're going to let you abuse the procedures and conventions of the house by having suspensions."

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members!

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: In fact, what we should have done—this was not recommended in the survey or recommended by the Procedure and Privileges Committee—was make a recommendation that after every question time there be an immediate suspension of standing orders, because that is the pattern of behaviour of this opposition that we see. We do not trust the opposition! It is predictable—very predictable—but we do not trust it because it does it all the time. The member for Carine should go back and look at *Hansard* to see how much time we have spent on the suspension of standing orders after every question time. We did it again yesterday. The Nats did it yesterday. I do not whether their standing orders suspension was written out; I think it was, but I am not sure. Then we have the poor performance of the opposition in its matters of public importance. That is what matters of public importance are specifically for. But quite often the opposition does its matter of public importance on a Thursday or a Wednesday. Have a look at the pattern of us in opposition. Yes, member for Carine; our MPIs, but certainly our suspensions, were specific and as a result of —

Mr W.J. Johnston: Something that had happened that day.

Dr Mike Nahan; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mr David Templeman; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Peter Rundle; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Dean Nalder; Dr Tony Buti

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: Yes, or an answer that was not given. We did not come in prepared to interrupt the procedures of this house every single day after question time—every single question time—with a pre-prepared motion. That is the opposition's pattern of behaviour, yet it wants the government to trust it. Well, we do not.

I make the point again about this whole survey process. If the logic is that we have to take in and use selectively, as the opposition has done, the results of the survey, we would be moving changes to sitting times, and we are not because of the reasons we discussed with some members. Do not worry; there are lots of members who would, in seeing that initially, think yes; there is good reason to change the sitting hours because they are too long on a Tuesday or whatever.

Mr S.K. L'Estrange: There are two points of disagreement.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: Yes, there are two points of disagreement and therefore the logic, according to the Leader of the Opposition, is that the opposition cannot agree. The point I am making is that this survey has guided the response from the Procedure and Privileges Committee, but by no means does that mean that the chamber has to agree to it. The committee could make a range of recommendations. I respect all five members of the committee. As the member for Churchlands pointed out, three of them are elected Labor Party members. I respect that. But it does not mean that Parliament ultimately agrees with every single thing that is recommended, and that is the point I make. Who makes that decision? The Parliament, the chamber, makes that decision. The logic of the Leader of the Opposition is that if there is no agreement, it should not even be presented. I have presented it. I have presented those matters. The opposition does not agree and I accept that. But the opposition's logic is simple and based on the premise that everything said in the survey and everything said by the privileges committee should be agreed to by the Parliament. That is not the process. The process is that those matters are discussed and debated by this chamber. We have now had over four and a half hours of debate. Goodness gracious, while I am Leader of the House, I will never come back and do anything to change the standing orders because it is tortuous experience! There are some good proposals in the survey that have been influenced by initial surveys partaken by members of this place and enhanced, if you like, by recommendations of the committee itself, but the chamber will ultimately decide. At this time, there are two points of disagreement. I am saying to the opposition that if it wants to go as far as the Leader of the Opposition is saying—we will vote against the opposition's amendment—I am happy to go back to the status quo, which is two grievances for either side for the rest of the year. I am happy to do that. We do not agree with the agreement. The fact of the matter is that we do not agree with the opposition. That is our position. If the opposition wants to go back to nothing—to no change under the logic of the Leader of the Opposition—that is what we will do. We will have our little chat behind the Chair later.

Mr S.K. L'Estrange interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Churchlands, I will call you. You continue to do it. I have pointed it out to you and, for the purposes of putting this in *Hansard*, you continue to do it directly even though I, as the Acting Speaker, asked you to stop. Please stop. I call you for the first time.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: I am happy to do that. I do not think that is what the opposition wants because essentially, at the end of the day, it is going to get 10 extra grievances. We have not used the guillotine in two years, unlike what the Liberal Party did when it was in government. We have not used the guillotine for two years.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Carine, for the purposes of *Hansard*, I have asked you on repeated occasions to not interject, and you have decided to not take any notice of the Acting Speaker. I call you for the first time.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: The former Liberal government regularly used the guillotine. The Barnett government was happy to use the guillotine all the time. Have we used it in two years? No. I know the member for Churchlands gets very nervous and almost puckers up when he thinks that we are going to use the guillotine. I can see him getting a little —

Ms R. Saffioti: The former Premier was proud of it!

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: He was.

The member for Churchlands gets a bit of a tremor in his leg when he thinks I am going to move the guillotine; I have seen it!

They have done that consistently. We have not done that, member for Carine. We have not used the gag.

Dr Mike Nahan; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mr David Templeman; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Peter Rundle; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Dean Nalder; Dr Tony Buti

I will finish on this. My comment at the beginning of the debate yesterday was that we need to remember this: when we are talking about ourselves, the people out there do not really care. Just be aware of that. No-one is taking any notice of it; that is the reality.

We will not support this amendment. I am happy to talk to the manager of opposition business about going back to the status quo only if he wants that because we cannot agree, as per the Leader of the Opposition's argument. I am happy to do that, but I think the opposition will lose tremendously in that. We will expect the opposition's ongoing behaviour of preparing suspension of standing orders motions. I think there will probably be one today. Please surprise me. I think there might be one today. It might even be against me; I do not know!

MR J.E. McGRATH (South Perth) [11.30 am]: I am disappointed on a number of fronts in this debate. When I was elected to this place, I came in here not as a career politician but for proper standards in the Parliament, and I thought: a fair go for everyone, and do your best to get a good system. I heard the Leader of the House's speech, and there are some unanswered questions. One is that I do not know what sort of discussion was held between the opposition and the government over this fifth grievance. I really think the Procedure and Privileges Committee let us down a bit with its recommendations. The Procedure and Privileges Committee, in its overall coverage of all aspects of these changes, reported as follows —

Grievances

Question 7 of the survey proposed:

Five grievance debates (six minutes per speaker) with the extra grievance going to the Opposition.

This question received 32 'Yes' responses and 15 'No' responses.

I know some members on this side did not respond to the survey, which means more Labor members or more government members might have voted in favour of the extra grievance going to the opposition. But then, in the report summary, "Enhancing the Legislative Assembly's Procedures", under "Survey Results", the report reads —

The committee has decided to recommend a trial of those proposals which received overwhelming 'Yes' responses from members.

I understand what the Leader of the House said. It was a recommendation, and obviously the government has decided that it is not going to abide by all recommendations. Recommendation 146—this is where I think the committee let the Parliament down—reads —

At a time determined by the Speaker on each Thursday when the Address in Reply no longer has priority, the Speaker will call for grievances. Five members may speak on grievances and no member may speak more than once. A Minister or a member deputed will have the right to reply to each of the grievances.

Given that more people were in favour of the fifth grievance going to the opposition than otherwise, why in that recommendation did the committee not recommend that the fifth grievance should go to the opposition? We have committees for the reason of making recommendations. It made a recommendation that has been left open-ended and left to the government. The minister said that it was left to the Parliament, but, basically, as we see today, the government will make that decision.

I have a lot of time for the Premier, and I would have thought that if the Premier had won an election with a 40-seat majority, he would not be too worried about giving the extra grievance every week to the opposition. If I were a minister, I would have no problem answering a grievance. We give notice of grievances; the minister has plenty of opportunity to be prepared for it. I have never yet seen a minister get stumped by a grievance; they are well prepared. No government will ever be brought down by a grievance, because a really serious matter will be dealt with by the suspension of standing orders or something like that. You ministers get grievances from us all the time, and I think that we get pretty good responses on grievances. Grievances are important for members of Parliament. It carries a lot more weight if a member can say to their community that they have taken a grievance to the government as a speech in Parliament. For the same reason, I totally support the changes that the government is bringing in with this measure to give members more time to speak. If we can say to our constituents or a community group that we have raised their situation in a speech in Parliament, even if it is only for two minutes, it carries a lot more weight. I remember the Speaker, the member for Albany, whenever he gave a 90-second statement, he could name 50 constituents in 90 seconds, and they would all get a letter. That is what good politicians do. Good local members do that.

I am disappointed. The Premier could have said to the Leader of the House, "Give the opposition the fifth grievance", and I do not think it would have made any difference. It would have been more statesmanlike, because it would have been saying: we are very confident in our government; we believe the opposition should get a lot of

Dr Mike Nahan; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mr David Templeman; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Peter Rundle; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Dean Nalder; Dr Tony Buti

time to be able to challenge the government. On a lot of occasions, grievances are not even challenging the government; they are just asking the minister for some detail about a policy that she is implementing or seeking some assistance from a minister in getting a bus route changed or something for a member's electorate. It is pretty harmless stuff.

If the government says it needs more opportunity for its members to speak, there are plenty of opportunities for government backbench members, especially when there is private members' business. I know that when we were in government, when we had ministers out, sometimes our Whip would say to all our members, "We want people to speak on this. We have three hours of private members' business." Sometimes I wonder how we get through it, because it goes on and on. Really, it is an opportunity for government backbench members to speak.

My problem with this is that the government could have been a bit more considerate of what Parliament is like. When we were in government, Premier Barnett, the former member for Cottesloe, used to say to us during estimates, "Give the opposition time in estimates. Estimates should be for the opposition. We are in government. No dorothy dixers or you can throw one or two in if you like." When we were in opposition, I remember Bob Kucera was on the opposite backbench in the seat of Yokine. Bob was a master at throwing in dorothy dixers. One day, Rob Johnson, the former member for Hillarys, as the manager of opposition business, stormed out of the estimates committee. He was on the committee but he stormed out. He said, "If you want to keep on asking dorothy dixers, I'm out." Colin Barnett said to us that we had to give the opposition some opportunity. Opposition members cannot govern—no opposition has ever been able to govern—but they should be given every opportunity.

I do not know who makes these decisions. I do not even know whether it was run past the Premier. Years ago, David Brand might have been the Premier and John Tonkin, "Supertonk", might have been the Leader of the Opposition. They would get together on a lot of things, and they would say, "We have this issue. How are we going to sort it out?" The two leaders would sort these things out. I do not know what consultation has happened between the Leader of the House, the Premier, the Leader of the Opposition and the manager of opposition business. I do not know what has happened there, but there should have been a conversation.

I understand what the Leader of the House is saying. These recommendations were looked at by the Procedure and Privileges Committee, which put out the report "Enhancing the Legislative Assembly's Procedures". There should have been agreement or disagreement on these things before this motion came here.

I was hoping to speak before the Leader of the House because I wanted to ask him whether he could elaborate on what discussions have happened. We work well as a government and opposition. When I was away and I wanted to speak on a TAB bill, the Leader of the House arranged for it to be put back a day. A lot of those things happen, and we work together on a lot of things. We agree with most things. I agree with the breastfeeding; I have no problem with that. I am not sure about bottle-feeding, but I agree with the breastfeeding. I agree that there should be more time for members to make statements. I think that is very important, because a lot of backbenchers are like people in a cricket match who cannot bat or bowl very well. They do not get much action. They are there all day in the field working hard for their team, but they do not get much action. There will be more chance for those people to speak.

Mr P. Papalia: We're giving you a lot more than you ever gave us.

Mr J.E. McGRATH: I am not sure about that.

Mr P. Papalia: An extra grievance and all that extra time!

Mr J.E. McGRATH: I am not sure about that.

Mr P. Papalia: What did you give us? I don't remember you giving us anything.

Mr J.E. McGRATH: I think we did. I think we were pretty fair.

There is one question I want to ask, and this is something I need answers to. I was not involved in the discussions, but I am told that there was an agreement between the opposition and the government when the container deposit bill was going through that "If you guys get this through by five o'clock today—by the end of business" —

Mrs J.M.C. Stojkovski: It was four o'clock.

Mr J.E. McGRATH: I am told it was four o'clock. I do not know what the discussion was, but I think we should know whether it was "If you get this through, we will give you the fifth grievance." If the discussion took place, I think it is a very important part of this whole process. The minister did not talk about that. All our members have raised this.

Mr P. Papalia: I don't think he was there.

Dr Mike Nahan; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mr David Templeman; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Peter Rundle; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Dean Nalder; Dr Tony Buti

Mr J.E. McGRATH: If he was not there, he was not there. If it was a discussion that took place —
Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Churchlands and Minister for Tourism! The member for South Perth has the call.

Mr J.E. McGRATH: All I am saying, Minister for Racing and Gaming, is that I do not have an answer to this. I know that the two Whips work well together. We have respect for one another and we respect the government Whip. But if the conversation took place and we were led to believe we would get the fifth grievance, what happened? How did that happen? In closing, I have a lot of respect for the Premier. If I were Premier—I obviously am not—I would have said, “Give the opposition the fifth grievance. I have great confidence in my ministers. Bring them on from both ends and give them the fifth grievance.”

MR P.J. RUNDLE (Roe) [11.43 am]: I would like to speak as a member of the Procedure and Privileges Committee. I notice that until this time no other members have spoken. I will make a very brief contribution. Firstly, I agree with the comments about the “esteemed members of the committee”.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms J.M. Freeman): Member for Roe, because you are a new member, I want to make sure that you realise that you cannot speak on any considerations of the committee. You can speak only on the report.

Mr P.J. RUNDLE: I understand that. Thanks, Madam Acting Speaker.

I am proud to be a member of that committee. As other members have pointed out, it is made up of the members for Albany, Maylands and Geraldton, my good friend the member for Pilbara, and myself. I would like to emphasise the high quality of the committee staff, Dr Isla Macphail, Kirsten Robinson and Scott Nalder. We have taken good, serious advice from them and I hold them all in high regard.

What has been lost in this argument is that the committee was charged with looking at adapting to changing times and improving the running of this house. We put out a survey in good faith. Obviously, some members failed to fill that in, but a reasonable number of parliamentarians filled it in. Generally, we got about 66 per cent agreement on most of those items, which led us to make the various recommendations.

I disagree with the member for South Perth. He said that the Procedure and Privileges Committee has let them down. Question 7 of the survey proposed five grievance debates, with six minutes for each speaker, and the extra grievance going to the opposition. That was the question on the survey. That is the context that we were looking at.

Mr J.E. McGrath: But you didn't make it a recommendation.

Mr P.J. RUNDLE: I thought it would be agreed that that was the context of the recommendation. I hear what the member for South Perth is saying. I think he is being a little bit harsh in saying that we let him down, but I will take that on the chin.

The opposition has rare opportunities to get its point across and to hold ministers to account. That is what grievances are all about—the opportunity to ask a minister a question. We decided that the difference between seven minutes and six minutes is very small and that a member could get their grievance across in that time. The opportunity to have an extra grievance potentially gives the opposition the chance to bring that up in time to come.

I do not like the business of deals being done. It is all about integrity—the integrity of the PPC. I think the scenario of a deal being done—if a bill goes through by a certain time, the government will let the opposition have the extra grievance—takes away from the integrity of the Procedure and Privileges Committee recommendation. To be honest, I am slightly disappointed to see that things have deteriorated to that level. I point out to the chamber that this was to be a trial. In 12 months' time or so, we will reassess the situation. The way some of the contributions have deteriorated is disappointing. As far as I am concerned, the PPC has acted in good faith. Quite frankly, I am not interested in tit for tat or backroom deals. Backroom politics seems to be overriding the good intentions of the PPC's report. We were charged by the house to look at the matter. We put a survey out and tried to act in good faith. I am quite disappointed to see the way in which the debate has flowed and deteriorated.

MR Z.R.F. KIRKUP (Dawesville) [11.49 am]: I appreciate being given the opportunity to speak to the amendment moved by the member for Churchlands, which seeks to ensure that the opposition receives all grievances that were suggested by the Procedure and Privileges Committee. I take on board the member for Roe's contribution; I appreciate his services and that of all members who served on that esteemed committee. It is probably worth noting that the deal offered by the government was to ensure that legislation—a particular bill that I will get to—was passed by a certain time to expedite the legislative procedures in this place. That would ensure that we got a piece of legislation out of here—dealing with the second reading, consideration in detail and the third reading in an afternoon, effectively—and dispatched to the upper house. I believe that bill has since passed, having

Dr Mike Nahan; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mr David Templeman; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Peter Rundle; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Dean Nalder; Dr Tony Buti

received royal assent on Tuesday. That deal was initiated by the government. I appreciate the member for Roe's consideration and concern but that offer was certainly made by the government to the opposition. In the interests of transparency and accountability, the opposition absolutely jumped at it. We would fight hard anyway to support a committee recommendation that members from both sides worked on to ensure that all grievances went to the opposition. Undoubtedly, we were going to fight for that but when such a deal is offered to us, we would take that up in the interests of transparency and accountability and make sure that we serve our purpose in holding this government to account.

It is important to note that when all of us come into this place, we swear an oath of allegiance to faithfully serve the people of Western Australia. Some of us might choose to serve the crown and the people of Western Australia while some of us just choose to serve the people of Western Australia. I prefer to serve the monarch and our sovereign. In any case, when taking the oath of allegiance, we say that we will faithfully serve the people of Western Australia. The word "faithfully" is an important part of our practices and procedures in this place. That means that we should continue to act with integrity, good character and moral fibre. As all opposition members have pointed out, the government offered the opposition a deal in good faith to ensure that a bill was passed in this place in an afternoon. It was an important piece of legislation. We agreed to that. The government has since reneged on that deal. That is the underlying issue. I appreciate the member for Mandurah's contribution. He suggested that a range of recommendations made by the privileges committee were not taken up. But the reality is that we were told that the recommendation relating to grievances would be. The manager of opposition business, in consultation with the Leader of the House and the deputy leader, absolutely agreed to that. As the member for Scarborough pointed out—I remember this quite vividly—the member for Churchlands came into the office and said, "Can you believe this? They've offered this. They want to make sure we get this done. We have to jump at this and make sure we secure this deal because it is important to ensure that the privileges committee's recommendations are agreed to and all those grievances come to the opposition." The member for Churchlands did so in good faith as manager of opposition business, working with the Leader of the House.

To have the rug pulled out from under the opposition is incredibly disappointing. The reality is that at least one-third of Labor Party members—members of the government benches—indicated in the survey that they would be in favour of the opposition getting those grievances. Members of the Labor Party in the chamber now should look to their right and to their left.

Ms R. Saffioti: Where?

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: The minister indicated that she would support those additional grievances going to the opposition.

I cannot understand how government and backbench members, when they swear under oath to faithfully serve the people of Western Australia, do not think it is important to uphold their word and the bond given to the opposition to see this deal succeed, with the container deposit legislation being dispatched in an afternoon, very expeditiously. When it went through consideration in detail, led by the member for Cottesloe on this side, it was done in an expeditious manner so that these additional grievances would be wholly given to the opposition. It really disappoints me that there is a community expectation of all of us to act with moral integrity, and that has been broken at this point.

Mrs J.M.C. Stojkovski interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Kingsley!

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: We absolutely did not break it at all.

Mrs J.M.C. Stojkovski interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Kingsley.

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: I appreciate that the member for Kingsley is new to this place, as I am, but I have been an observer of this place —

Mrs J.M.C. Stojkovski interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms J.M. Freeman): Member for Kingsley. Three times I have called you from the chair. I have now had to stand up. If I call you again, I will put that on record.

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: I appreciate that the member for Kingsley and I were both elected at the same time. I observed this place for a number of years before arriving in this house.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Just come back to the point.

Dr Mike Nahan; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mr David Templeman; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Peter Rundle; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Dean Nalder; Dr Tony Buti

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: I will. The container deposit legislation was hundreds of pages long. We had to deal with two bills cognately. To get that done in such a fashion that it could be dispatched from this house took a very extreme effort from members of this side. I indicated that I was very keen to speak to that legislation and talk about groups in my community who look after the environment and the like. We all rushed through our speeches because all members on this side, as the member for South Perth quite rightly pointed out, wanted to continue to work in good faith with the government to ensure passage of important legislation. We were told that if we did that, we would ensure that those grievances would come to us, as per the committee's recommendation, which reflects at least one-third of the Labor Party's intent and desire for the opposition to continue to hold members opposite to account. That has simply not occurred. The government has reneged on that deal.

I challenge each and every member to show some moral fortitude, to show some spine, to show some character and to show the people of Western Australia that they absolutely believe that the opposition has a role in holding ministers to account. Moreover, government members should vote with the opposition on this motion if they believe that their ministers have the capability, and the ability in general, to accept additional grievances. If they vote against this motion, they are effectively saying that they do not believe that their ministers have the ability to repel additional grievances from the opposition. They would be saying that government members need to make sure that they coddle their ministers along and that ministers should not be tested. We believe that each and every grievance should go to our side. As the member for Scarborough pointed out, the opposition is split across two parties, and those grievances are usually split evenly. Although the government says that the Liberal Party will get 10 grievances, that will not be the case. We will split them, as we always do, with our regional members in the Nationals WA.

It is important once again for government members to show that they are not jellyfish and that they have some moral fortitude and vote with us on this amendment to ensure that all grievances go to the opposition.

MRS A.K. HAYDEN (Darling Range) [11.57 am]: I also rise to support the amendment moved by the manager of opposition business, the member for Churchlands. We are debating the amendment to the motion relating to the survey that has been discussed for some time. As most members are aware, I was not in Parliament when the survey was conducted and was not given an opportunity to participate in it. To see the result of the survey and the suggestions and recommendations put forward as a result of the work done by all those involved on the Procedure and Privileges Committee not honoured and respected in this place is why we are standing here today. It is a sad day for Parliament. I said this yesterday when talking about another amendment to these standing orders—we are seeing a decline in the way in which we conduct ourselves on the floor of the Legislative Assembly. We are part of the Westminster system. We are meant to be making sure that no matter what side of the chamber we sit, no matter what party we are elected to represent and no matter what seat and community we are elected to represent, every single member who walks on the floor of this chamber is equal to everyone else and that we have the ability and the right to stand up and voice the opinion of the people we are elected to represent.

When we see the erosion of the standing orders that this place operates under, it is not only a sad time, but it is also a scary time when we consider where we may end up. We all stand in this place and go to many events where we honour and respect the elders past and present but it seems that in this place we are not going to honour and respect the traditions developed over a very long time in this establishment—the traditions that have built the Westminster system and the standing orders under which we operate. We are standing here with this amendment because we have started to erode those standing orders for political gain and not enable every member on the floor to represent the community that they are elected to represent. We do not believe that the motion reflects the true standing orders of this place and how we are to operate. On top of that, the sad issue is with the Leader of the House. I have a lot of respect for him. He has a lot of experience. He performs extremely well and is quite often very entertaining. He gives us all a bit of light, refreshing entertainment during what can be a long day. He gave his word and made a gentleman's agreement, with a handshake, to give the additional grievance to the opposition and then he reneged on that agreement; he reneged on that handshake and on his word. That is what has upset and disappointed everyone on this side. We take government members at their word and we take the Leader of the House at his word. He said, "Please allow us to get this legislation through because it is urgent and we want to have it done in a timely manner", and we abided by that agreement and did the right thing. As the member for Vasse said, many of us wanted to talk on the container deposit scheme bill. It is an important piece of legislation, yet we deferred our opportunity in order to honour that agreement. When we make an agreement in good faith, we expect and demand that the agreement will be upheld. When the agreement is not upheld and taken away from us and then members opposite simply use their numbers in this place to push through their decisions, that is not showing respect to the standing orders under which we operate. Government members may have the numbers today but the changes to the standing orders that we make here today will operate across many years and under different governments. Members opposite

Dr Mike Nahan; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mr David Templeman; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Peter Rundle; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Dean Nalder; Dr Tony Buti

will be on this side and we will be on that side, and that will change for many members to come. The decisions that we make here today are about not only where members are sitting today, but also where members may be sitting in the future.

We should always make sure that every member in this chamber has equal opportunity—those in government as well as in opposition—to represent their community. Backbenchers in government have unfettered access to their ministers. They can stop and talk to them at any time. Ministers can have a coffee with them in Parliament, meet them in their office and go to backbenchers' electorates. They can write, email or have a chat at any time. In opposition, we are given a very small opportunity to represent our communities. It may be that the government does not want to give us the oxygen but it is not just about us as individuals and members of Parliament; it is about the community that we represent and making sure that everyone in the community across Western Australia has equal access and equal rights, no matter where their member sits on the floor of the chamber. That is why we are standing here today—to try to make sure that, firstly, we hold the government to its word and, secondly, that the people who are in our electorates in Western Australia are given the same opportunity, and a fair opportunity, to have their voices heard and their issues raised with ministers. A grievance is one of the best times for us to do that in opposition.

Sadly, I do not believe my grievance was heard today. I put on the record that the minister is on important business, and I understand that happens. I did hope that the parliamentary secretary would take my grievance seriously. Sadly, I do not think he did but I hope and trust that the minister will look at my grievance separately, regardless of the response I received from the parliamentary secretary. When we start eroding the way that we operate and our grievances are not heard properly, or our grievances are restricted and given to government members who have unfettered access to ministers, it is unfair and it is not the right thing to do. That is why we are standing here today. That is why we have put up this amendment asking the government to come good on its word and respect the community of Western Australia no matter who their elected member of Parliament is and no matter where they sit on the floor of this chamber, and enable the opposition to have a fair go to put their community's needs and issues, and raise them under the grievance system. I, along with all the members of the opposition, stand and support the amendment to make sure the additional grievance is given to the opposition and not shared amongst government backbenchers.

MR D.C. NALDER (Bateman) [12.05 pm]: I also stand to talk on this amendment. I think the government is considering this to be a small, innocuous issue but it really strikes at the heart of the integrity of the government because often it is how government members deliver on the little things that demonstrates what sort of government members want to be recognised as. The government approached the opposition with a deal to get a piece of legislation through on that day and, on that basis, it said that it would amend the standing orders to allow a fifth grievance, which would be given to the opposition. The opposition agreed with that deal and the legislation was completed that day, yet now we see that the changes to the standing orders do not include the tenets of that agreement. Although government members may say, "That's too bad. We're the government and we've got the numbers. We'll make what we want happen", it actually demonstrates this government's lack of integrity. If government members lack integrity on something that is a small, minor deal, how can they be trusted when we get to serious pieces of legislation for the broader community? How can we take this government seriously on ensuring that it will deliver the best outcomes for the people of Western Australia, because we certainly cannot take their word for it? I liken it to some of the election promises that were made by this government back at the end of 2016 and in early 2017. I would like to remind members of this chamber of some of the promises that were made by these government members whilst in opposition. One of them was that they would stop privatisation. They ran a whole heap of marketing material and made arguments that selling assets that generated income streams was totally wrong and that they would stop it. However, this government has started secretly selling down Synergy assets through what was at the time solely a Dutch equity fund. They have now added Cbus to it, an industrial superannuation fund. The government has started to sell the state's revenue-generating assets, which is against —

Point of Order

Dr A.D. BUTI: Mr Acting Speaker, I draw your attention to what relevance this has to the amendment that is being debated.

Mr D.C. NALDER: The point I am making is that a commitment was made by the government. It has broken that commitment and I am demonstrating that it is establishing a track record of all sorts of agreements in which the government made commitments and has broken its promises. It is aligned to the series of broken promises. It is just building up to the crescendo—the basis of the argument—that we cannot trust this government and that the

Dr Mike Nahan; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mr David Templeman; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Peter Rundle; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Dean Nalder; Dr Tony Buti

reason we are making this amendment is for legitimate purposes, which is for the government to uphold a promise it made to the opposition.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr R.S. Love): Just be mindful of the fact that you do have to be relevant to the amendment itself. Carry on, member.

Debate Resumed

Mr D.C. NALDER: Thank you for your guidance, Mr Acting Speaker.

Further to that point, government members also made a promise that there would be no increases to taxes and fees and charges, but what have we seen? We have seen increases in taxes and attempts to increase taxes on the gold industry. We have seen all sorts. Despite promising before the election that this was a bad thing for the gold industry, the government came out and did it. The government promised the opposition that if we got the legislation through, we could have an additional grievance, but the government has walked away from that promise. It is exactly the same thing that strikes at the heart of the integrity of this government. The failure to live up to this simple arrangement is a blight on this government, and there are other things. When I spoke about takeovers, we heard the Labor Party, whilst in opposition, talk about the sale of the TAB. We acknowledge that the Labor Party took it to the election, but that is not the only one. We are also now seeing the selldown of Landgate. Members opposite do not want to talk about it as a sale; they try to use some other language, but they are selling it off. Again, this continues to strike at the heart of a government that operates with a lack of integrity. This is what we are raising today and this is why we are continuing to mount the argument to the government and put it on notice that in future situations when members opposite come to us to ask for our agreement to try to get the simple passage of legislation through, we will not be in a position to trust the government to do that. That means that we are likely to take a lot longer to scrutinise things and we will ensure that we check every angle, because we can no longer trust what it puts to us, whether it be a verbal arrangement, or even what the government has put in the legislation. During the consideration in detail stage, ministers get up and explain to us the justification on a given point, but we are now at a point at which we cannot trust that. What can we trust that the government says to us? What can we trust in the legislation that it brings before this house? What can we trust in the work it has done to ensure that this is the best thing for Western Australia? Because if it breaks the promises on the little things, we cannot trust it on the big things. That is the key point that we are making today.

Mr P. Papalia: That is profound.

Mr D.C. Nalder: That is very profound, thank you. It is like the smokescreen and mirrors that we see from the government.

Ms R. Saffioti: How many keywords are you using today?

Mr D.C. NALDER: I am reminded by the interjections from the Minister for Transport about the claims she made in the house yesterday about how it is the government for regional roads and it is spending record amounts. I can tell the minister that whilst I was minister, over 60 per cent of capital funding for Main Roads was spent in regional Western Australia. We are talking on average \$2 billion a year and 60 per cent of that is \$1.2 billion a year. The Minister for Transport is walking out of the chamber all of a sudden because she does not want to hear the truth that the former government actually fixed up the Coalfields Highway, which was left undone, and the former shadow Minister for Transport Hon Ken Travers acknowledged in the *Collie Mail* that its government had dropped the ball when it came to the Coalfields Highway. The former government added eight additional overtaking lanes on Albany Highway. The former government actually added 15 overtaking —

Point of Order

Dr A.D. BUTI: Point of order on a matter of relevance.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr R.S. Love): Yes, member for Armadale, I take your point. I will ask the member for Bateman to come back to the matter of the amendment.

Mr D.C. NALDER: Thank you for your guidance, Mr Acting Speaker. The interjection from the Minister for Transport led me down that path, and I apologise if I digressed.

The ACTING SPEAKER: I am sure it was very interesting, but it is time to return to the issue.

Ms R. Saffioti interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Minister for Transport, thank you; I have asked the member to return to the matter.

Debate Resumed

Dr Mike Nahan; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mr David Templeman; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Peter Rundle; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Dean Nalder; Dr Tony Buti

Mr D.C. NALDER: My point was that a lot of comments were made by a government that is starting to be shown up as not being reliable. People cannot base a decision on it or take its information as fact. I was just demonstrating that some of the Minister for Transport's arguments are unfounded about the activity that the former government did in upgrading roads in regional Western Australia. I could speak on Bindi Bindi curves, but I promised the Acting Speaker that I would bring it back to the matter.

In summarising, we are finding out that we cannot trust this government and a lot of households out there are starting to find that they are in the same situation. We saw that through the fantastic outcome of the election of the new member for Darling Range. We found that very succinctly articulated by the people out there about how they were hurting.

Mr S.K. L'Estrange: She wanted to speak on the container bill, and could not.

Mr D.C. NALDER: She could not speak on the container bill?

Mr S.K. L'Estrange: She wanted to, but it was cut short because of the deal.

Mr D.C. NALDER: I will come back to that point.

The member for Darling Range's election was a result of a lack of trust that this government is pushing out onto the people of Western Australia. They are starting to find that they cannot trust it. They believed that when this government came in, it would not hurt their household charges so much. Some of the government's arguments are unfounded. Coming back to the amendment for this motion, the reason for the amendment was that the opposition honoured an agreement that it struck with the government. It honoured it and all we are doing is calling for the government to honour its side of the agreement. It is nothing more simple than that, and it is extremely disappointing that the government would walk away from such a simple agreement. It is embarrassing and somewhat shameful. I would be embarrassed if our side did that—if we shook hands and said, "This is it". I would expect us to honour that arrangement and I believe that everybody in this chamber should expect the government to honour the same arrangement.

Adjournment of Debate

DR A.D. BUTI (Armadale) [12.16 pm]: I move —

That the debate be adjourned until a later stage of today's sitting.

Division

Question put and a division taken, the Acting Speaker (Mr R.S. Love) casting his vote with the noes, with the following result —

Ayes (33)

Ms L.L. Baker	Mr W.J. Johnston	Mrs L.M. O'Malley	Mr D.A. Templeman
Dr A.D. Buti	Mr D.J. Kelly	Mr P. Papalia	Mr P.C. Tinley
Mr J.N. Carey	Mr F.M. Logan	Mr S.J. Price	Mr R.R. Whitby
Mrs R.M.J. Clarke	Mr M. McGowan	Mr J.R. Quigley	Ms S.E. Winton
Mr M.J. Folkard	Ms S.F. McGurk	Ms R. Saffioti	Mr B.S. Wyatt
Ms J.M. Freeman	Mr K.J.J. Michel	Ms A. Sanderson	Mr D.R. Michael (<i>Teller</i>)
Ms E.L. Hamilton	Mr S.A. Millman	Ms J.J. Shaw	
Mr T.J. Healy	Mr Y. Mubarakai	Mrs J.M.C. Stojkovski	
Mr M. Hughes	Mr M.P. Murray	Mr C.J. Tallentire	

Noes (15)

Mr V.A. Catania	Dr D.J. Honey	Mr S.K. L'Estrange	Mr D.T. Redman
Ms M.J. Davies	Mr P.A. Katsambanis	Mr R.S. Love	Mr P.J. Rundle
Mrs L.M. Harvey	Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup	Mr J.E. McGrath	Ms L. Mettam (<i>Teller</i>)
Mrs A.K. Hayden	Mr A. Krsticevic	Mr D.C. Nalder	

Pairs

Mr R.H. Cook	Mr K.M. O'Donnell
Mr D.T. Punch	Dr M.D. Nahan

Question thus passed.

Extract from *Hansard*

[ASSEMBLY — Thursday, 14 March 2019]

p1273c-1293a

Dr Mike Nahan; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mr David Templeman; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Peter Rundle; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Dean Nalder; Dr Tony Buti

Debate adjourned.