



Speech by  
**Mr DENVER  
BEANLAND**

**MEMBER FOR INDOORROOPILLY**

---

Hansard 5 October 2000

**MR SPEAKER'S RULING**

**Mr BEANLAND** (Indoorroopilly—LP) (9.43 p.m.): I rise to participate in this debate and say at the outset that it is interesting that the Premier could get only four Ministers and 12 backbenchers to support him this evening. About one third of his number were present in the Chamber to listen to him speak, and it is no wonder. What a shameful, weak excuse of a speech it was! No wonder they did not come in here this evening. They have heard what the Premier has been saying about them outside on the streets of Brisbane and in the media. It is little wonder that he can muster only one third of his total parliamentary numbers to come in here and listen to him. How ashamed they were!

I remind the Deputy Premier that the Premier was the one talking about standards. It was the Premier who this week called the Leader of the Opposition the "thief of public moneys". What standard does that set in Parliament when that is what the Premier—the person who holds himself up as the setter of standards—called the Leader of the Opposition? No doubt he goes with his tail between his legs. I hope he takes his dummy with him. He ought to go. What a shameful performance! I say to the Deputy Premier that those are the sorts of standards that we have seen this week from the Labor Party. Those are the sorts of standards that we are seeing in this disgusting battle on the Government side—the battle of the factions in the Labor Party.

Of course it was only on 4 October in this place that you, Mr Speaker, asked the Leader of the Opposition to withdraw a comment that he made by way of interjection. You indicated that he used the word "fraud", I think. In fact, the Leader of the Opposition simply said "AWU" and nothing else. But if you say that "AWU" equals "fraud", Mr Speaker, I am sure that members will agree. Members on the Government side agree, too. That is what the Leader of the Opposition said. I heard him distinctly. No other words at all were uttered.

So we have the situation in which the Deputy Premier comes into this Chamber this evening and tries to make out that this side of the Chamber is somehow making a sham of the sub judice ruling. Of course, sub judice relates to specific issues, and no amount of red herrings from the Deputy Premier in this Parliament will change that. What we are seeing, in fact, are the Premier's rulings. As you know, Mr Speaker, the Premier has been indicating the rulings. He has indicated that he will answer some questions and some questions have not been answered, regardless of how you feel or what rulings you wish to make. That is the sad situation. The Premier is running this Chamber from his own seat. That is exactly what has occurred all week.

I put a question on notice on 3 October. The question referred to the fact that the Premier had asked his staff to indicate whether there were any matters that might be the subject of a CJC inquiry. There was nothing at all in the question about specific issues. It was a simple, straightforward question in view of the fact that the matter had been widely reported in the Courier-Mail. The Premier asked his staff about this matter. I asked that question of the Minister for Families, Youth and Community Care and Minister for Disability Services and you, Mr Speaker, ruled it out of order. In order to try to encompass your concerns, I then changed the question around yesterday and again you ruled it out of order, even though it made no reference to the CJC inquiry. Quite clearly, Mr Speaker, this is an action by yourself on the directions of the Premier to save this desperate Government. It is all about saving the Government and trying to get around, and get out of, answering questions asked in this place. It is a case of "save the Government at any cost". We have seen the Premier's disgraceful performance in this Chamber again this evening.

Last night in this place during the Adjournment debate—I did not say anything, but I sat here and listened to it very closely—the member for Woodridge talked loudly about Labor Party preselection rules, as well he might. He went to great lengths to talk about a whole range of issues and apparently had the imprimatur of the Speaker to do so. He went on for a whole five minutes in great detail. There was no comment about the fact that this should have been ruled out of order. There was no talk about that at all. It was on the very issue of the CJC inquiry, the Shepherdson inquiry, which is all about branch stacking, preselection rules and so forth. This is the very thing that this inquiry is about.

We are seeing double standards being applied across the board. When the Labor Party talks of standards, it means one set of standards for its faction-ridden party—

**Mr Springborg:** And that's double standards.

**Mr BEANLAND:** And that is double standards—and another set of standards for the Opposition. This Labor Party Government will stoop to any lengths to survive in this place. The Beattie Government knows that failure to keep this matter at bay in this Parliament will mean that these will be its last days.

Time expired.

---