




Speech By
Hon. Yvette D'Ath

MEMBER FOR REDCLIFFE

Record of Proceedings, 15 February 2018

SUSPENSION OF STANDING AND SESSIONAL ORDERS

Suspension of Standing and Sessional Orders

 **Hon. YM D'ATH** (Redcliffe—ALP) (Leader of the House) (4.30 pm), by leave, without notice: I move—

That, notwithstanding anything contained in standing and sessional orders, I be permitted to move at 5 pm today the motion for which I gave notice earlier today for the adoption of sessional orders for the 56th Parliament, with time limits for speeches and debate as follows—

- five minutes for each member, and
- total debate time before question put: one hour.

The motion before us is to establish time frames around the debate we will have on the further sessional orders for the 56th Parliament. The moving and setting of time frames around a debate is not unusual and is certainly not new. When I was on the other side of this House I remember a number of times those opposite moved time frames around debates.

Mr Bleijie: Never!

Mrs D'ATH: I take that interjection. The Manager of Opposition Business actually did that with a straight face! The opposing of this motion by the opposition and a debate occurring around this matter will be further evidence of how much more efficient our parliament could be and should be. This debate will be an important debate, but it is also important that this House be given the opportunity to get on with the important business before it, including the introduction of bills and address-in-reply. There should be no fear in setting time frames for reasonable debates before this House. In fact, the whole purpose of moving this motion is so that we can move on to a debate that talks about setting reasonable hours for this House, and that is exactly what we seek to do with this debate itself. This motion sets a time frame for this debate of one hour. We believe that that is a reasonable and sensible length of time to debate issues around procedures of this House.

As I say, it is an important motion that we will be debating at five o'clock, but it is also a motion that can be quite easily articulated within a reasonable time frame without being completely repetitious about the actual substance of the debate. The fact is it will go to what changes we would seek to make to the sessional orders and what the opposition does or does not agree with in relation to that. I will assume that most of that debate will be very similar and we will not take issue with that in relation to repetition, but we have to acknowledge that there only needs to be so much repetition when seeking to put a debate around a particular issue, and that is exactly what will happen tonight. We have also sought a time frame of five minutes for each member so that we can get more members into this debate within that one-hour time frame, allowing six speakers on each side to debate the substantive motion when the time comes. This is about efficient government. This is about an efficient parliament.

An opposition member interjected.

Mrs D'ATH: There will be those on the other side who will call what we are seeking to do as gagging. What we are seeking to do is create efficiency in this parliament that I think is well and truly overdue.

Mr Bleijie: Abuse!

Mrs D'ATH: I take that interjection. I think the member for Kawana certainly understands the definition of abuse of the parliament, because he has certainly exercised that on many occasions in the past. This is a procedural motion that seeks to set a reasonable debate time to allow a number of speakers—12 speakers—to debate on behalf of government and non-government members the importance of sessional orders going forward for this parliament. We ask that all members of this parliament support this procedural motion.