



Speech By  
**Hon. Yvette D'Ath**

**MEMBER FOR REDCLIFFE**

---

Record of Proceedings, 25 October 2022

**MOTION**

**Business Program**



**Hon. YM D'ATH** (Redcliffe—ALP) (Leader of the House) (11.15 am): I move—

1. That the following business will be considered this sitting week, with the nominated maximum periods of time as specified:
  - (a) the Racing Integrity Amendment Bill, a maximum of three hours to complete all stages;
  - (b) the Public Health and Other Legislation (COVID-19 Management) Amendment Bill, a maximum of five hours to complete all stages;
  - (c) the Major Sports Facilities Amendment Bill, a maximum of three hours to complete all stages; and
  - (d) the Industrial Relations and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, to complete all stages by 12.25 pm on Friday, 28 October 2022.
2. The following time limits for the bills listed in 1. apply:
  - (a) the ministers to be called on in reply:
    - (i) for the Racing Integrity Amendment Bill by 30 minutes before the expiry of the maximum hours;
    - (ii) for the Public Health and Other Legislation (COVID-19 Management) Amendment Bill by 30 minutes before the expiry of the maximum hours;
    - (iii) for the Major Sports Facilities Amendment Bill by 30 minutes before the expiry of the maximum hours; and
    - (iv) for the Industrial Relations and Other Legislation Amendment Bill by 11.25 am on Friday, 28 October 2022.
3. If the nominated stage of each bill has not been completed by the allocated time specified in 2., or by 12.25 pm on Friday, 28 October 2022, Mr Speaker:
  - (a) shall call on a minister to table any explanatory notes to their circulated amendments, any statement of compatibility with human rights or any statement relating to an override declaration;
  - (b) shall put all remaining questions necessary to either pass that stage or pass the bill without further debate;
  - (c) may interrupt non-specified business or debate on a bill or motion to complete the requirements of the motion; and
  - (d) will complete all stages required by this motion notwithstanding anything contained in standing and sessional orders.

Members will note that there are four bills the subject of the motion before the House: the Racing Integrity Bill, on which debate will resume; the Public Health and Other Legislation (COVID-19 Management) Amendment Bill; the Major Sports Facilities Amendment Bill; and the Industrial Relations and Other Legislation Amendment Bill and I am very keen to hear what those opposite have to say about that bill. As we all know, due to the passing of Queen Elizabeth, we postponed the three-day sitting week as it fell during the official mourning period. Last sitting week, the House considered a motion to rearrange the timings for the remainder of the scheduled sitting weeks, meaning that this week will be a four-day sitting week with extended hours to allow for various non-government and government business to be made up.

Wasn't it interesting to listen to the debate and see the carry-on of those opposite during the last sitting when we debated the motion for the timings of the sitting week? I will put aside the fact that many of the speeches were completely misleading and that the Manager of Opposition Business knew that when claims were made, over and over again, that there was agreement on the sitting hours for the remaining sitting weeks when there had only ever been agreement on the first sitting week and the remainder were to be consulted on. Putting that aside, the Manager of Opposition Business, the former manager of opposition business and the wannabe manager of opposition business, the member for Maroochydore, all jumped up to protest the motion. They said all manner of things, including, 'The opposition will not be supporting this motion', 'We will not stand for it' and 'I stand with my colleagues in opposing the government's motion'. They argued strongly and vehemently that they would not support the motion.

About a minute after the conclusion of the contribution of the member for Maroochydore, the motion was put and guess what happened? Was a division called by the opposition? Was there even a peep out of them? No! There was nothing. The motion was put and the House agreed. It was unanimous. It seems that by Friday afternoon the opposition had run out of puff and could not even muster the strength to say a two-syllable word, 'divide'. You might ask why the members for Glass House, Kawana and Maroochydore all mislead the parliament potentially when they said they did not support the motion yet did not divide.

I have a theory. We have heard on the grapevine that some of the members of the opposition had already checked out of parliament for the afternoon. They had left the precinct. If the opposition had called for a division—and, in fact, later there was a division with fewer numbers—they would have exposed what we already knew: that, despite arguing strongly that they wanted to sit late every single Friday, they had already checked out. They were gone. They had had enough for the day. We do not even have to have our suspicions. We know for a fact, based on the later division, that there were fewer numbers in the parliamentary precinct. All we can say about those opposite is that they are the laziest, most ill-disciplined and hypocritical opposition in living memory. I commend the motion to the House.