



Speech by  
**Mr DENVER  
BEANLAND**

**MEMBER FOR INDOOROOPILLY**

---

Hansard 27 August 1998

**PRIVATE MEMBERS' BILLS**

**Mr BEANLAND** (Indooroopilly—LP) (1.32 a.m.): I move the following amendment—

"At line 2, *omit* 'ninety days', *insert* 'sixty days'.

Second sentence, *omit*, *insert*—

'The House will continue to sit on the following Wednesday and if the Bill has not been finalised, further consideration of the Bill will take precedence over Government business on subsequent sitting days until the Bill has been finalised.'."

In view of the lateness of the hour, I will not take too long in prosecuting the argument in relation to this amendment. However, a couple of points need to be made. This flows from a commitment given by the Premier, as the then Leader of the Opposition, to the member for Nicklin on 25 June of this year as a basis for forming this Labor Government. A proposal has now come forward from the Government in relation to private members' Bills. As we have said before in this place, without a kick-in mechanism this could very well end up as a Clayton's provision. If it is going to be meaningful, it needs that mechanism. That is exactly what the amendment does. It puts in place a provision to bring on debate, though not until after having first had an opportunity over some two and a half hours on the first Wednesday night and some two and a half hours on the second Wednesday night when the debate is allowed—some five hours.

For Bills that prove difficult or controversial—perhaps like the Bill we have just debated—we need a situation where there is a kick-in provision; otherwise, as I am sure will be the case with respect to the Citizens' Initiated Referenda Bill—lots of members probably wish to speak to it—it could mean that only one Bill is debated in six months or even longer. If all members make a contribution to the second-reading debate, combined with the debate on the clauses, it could mean that only one Bill is debated in 12 months.

There needs to be a kick-in provision to ensure that members have the opportunity to have those Bills debated. At the same time, the Government must get through its legislative program. That is the reason we have not brought it on more frequently than that—so there is an opportunity still for the Government to ensure that its legislative program is progressed while at the same time ensuring that private members also have the opportunity of putting forward private members' Bills and having them debated. The most important part is having them debated; otherwise they will simply gather dust. There is not much point in putting them forward in the first place if we do not have the opportunity to debate them.

Therefore, this is a terribly important amendment. It is all very well putting forward the proposal in the first place, but it has to be more than a Clayton's proposal. It has to be a proposal that will work, will be meaningful and will produce results for members in the House. This place has a vastly different composition of members from the previous Parliament and the one before that. That has to be taken into account. It is only by supporting the changes that we are making to the Government's motion this evening that we will have the opportunity to bring on for a debate the private members' Bills; otherwise we will certainly end up having a Clayton's provision that in reality means nothing at all. Therefore, I ask the House to give serious consideration to this amendment to the motion moved by the Government.