




Speech By  
**Leanne Linard**

**MEMBER FOR NUDGE**

---

Record of Proceedings, 25 February 2016

**MOTION: AMENDMENT TO STANDING RULES AND ORDERS**

 **Ms LINARD** (Nudgee—ALP) (6.08 pm): Here we are again speaking on a procedural matter rather than the big issues.

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Ms LINARD:** I wrote it myself, thank you. It will come as no great surprise to everyone in the House that I rise to speak against the motion moved by the member for Mermaid Beach. This matter could have been discussed at the CLA, but instead we are once again using the precious time of this House to debate another procedural motion. Just last week we debated the motion from my committee colleague—

**Mrs Frecklington** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Pause the clock. Member for Nanango, your interjections are not appropriate. I am having difficulty hearing the member for Nudgee's contribution. We listened in silence to the contribution of the member for Mermaid Beach. I would urge members to provide the same courtesy to other speakers.

**Ms LINARD:** Just last week we debated the motion moved by my committee colleague the member for Mudgeeraba about the amount of time committee members have to read draft reports. Today we have a motion that seeks to reduce the ability of committees and the House to consider all the potential policy options. As members on both sides of this House know, the committee system is one of the most important institutions of this parliament. It is fundamentally a system of review, enhancing the ability of this parliament and its members to provide vital input on bills and legislation before it.

Just last week the member for Mudgeeraba, who I know does respect the committee process, stood up in this House during debate on the motion and stated—

Circumventing or truncating the committee process does not provide for effective or efficient analysis of committee reports and in fact puts at risk an essential institution of our democracy.

I could not agree more. What we have before us is a motion to limit the deliberative processes of this House. The unintended consequence or, more likely, intended consequence of this motion is that a superior bill may not be able to succeed. A superior policy deserves to be given effect by a superior bill and the community deserves the very best outcomes. This motion is not in the public interest, so it is not in the interests of this House.

What is the opposition afraid of? Being outshone? Public policy should be driven by analysis of all available options. Proposals and evidence should be open to rigorous debate and, similarly, the community should be able to have the benefit of considering and commenting on the full spectrum of proposed approaches or solutions to an issue. This motion has the potential to limit that consideration. A practical example of this occurred recently in the former Health and Ambulance Services Committee

when we considered two bills dealing with tobacco. Two bills were introduced. There were proposals in common, but there were also significant additional provisions supported unanimously by the committee that we would not have had the benefit of considering under this motion nor, should I say, would Queenslanders have had the benefit of these additional significant provisions—as they now will—if this motion is to be successful. The committee's view with regard to those bills was that the alternate bill contained superior outcomes.

What I want to know—and I am having a moment of déjà vu from last week—is why we are having this discussion here tonight. Why are we talking about matters of a procedural nature? Is the opposition out of ideas? Is it because they have no plan? Is that why those opposite have suddenly become so preoccupied with procedure in this House? They certainly did not pay such attention to it last term. We on this side of the House want to talk about the big issues, the ones that affect Queenslanders on a daily basis. Just as a suggestion, we could talk about jobs. There is a lot to talk about jobs because there have been 71,700 new jobs across Queensland since we were elected. We could talk about economic data that shows Queensland's economy growing faster than the rest—

**Mr STEVENS:** Mr Speaker, I hate to interrupt the member, but I have a point of order. This motion has nothing to do with jobs in Queensland or anywhere else. That has no relevance to the matter at all. Please keep the member to the debate, which is about the motion.

**Mrs Frecklington** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Thank you, member for Mermaid Beach and thank you, member for Nanango.

**Ms LINARD:** We could talk about the economy. Even Prime Minister Malcolm Turnbull is happy to acknowledge in federal parliament that business confidence is highest in Queensland. I say well done to our colleague the Treasurer.

We have all been sent here to make Queensland a better place. What we on this side of the House can say to our electorates when we return tomorrow is that we have spent the last two days in this place working on their behalf to make our communities safer and healthier; we have acted to curb alcohol fuelled violence and protect our kids from passive smoking. What will the opposition tell their constituents? They acted to increase the time parliamentary committees have to consider draft reports and acted to reduce the quantity and quality of bills on which they can deliberate. It is not a record I would want. This motion is not in the public interest. Queenslanders deserve better.