




Speech By  
**Tarnya Smith**

**MEMBER FOR MOUNT OMMANEY**

---

Record of Proceedings, 17 February 2016

**MOTION: AMENDMENT TO STANDING ORDERS**

 **Mrs SMITH** (Mount Ommaney—LNP) (6.10 pm): I think this is a very fair and reasonable motion and so I rise to support my colleague. The committee system is such a vital part of parliamentary process. The ability of committee members to gather and examine the evidence—the views of all Queenslanders—is key to informed decision-making. The member for Nudgee asked why we are not talking about a range of things. That is exactly what we do in committee. This motion is about being able to properly consider the information.

People who go to the trouble of submitting or putting in a written submission or even attending the hearings must have the confidence that their input is carefully considered. I think that is just so important when people go onto the website, decide that there is a topic that we are discussing in the committee and they go to the trouble of putting in their submission. We would like to think that if they have gone to that trouble that we will give them due consideration. A lot of information obviously goes into the reports, and that is a very relevant point. I think that answers the queries of the member for Nudgee.

When unrealistic time frames are being applied, that jeopardises the whole credibility of this process.

**Government members** interjected.

**Mrs SMITH:** It is a very fair and reasonable suggestion. I do not know why everybody on the other side is getting upset when they do look at being fair and reasonable all the time—so they say. I make this point very clearly. This is certainly no reflection on the secretariat. They have been doing a marvellous job—and I can only speak of the secretariat of my committee; they have done a very good job. I am going to give a couple of examples which anybody who is fair and reasonable would agree with and if we do want to have well considered reports, this certainly goes to that.

We have had a number of inquiries such as the lemon laws. The date for adopting the report was a Friday and we received it on the Thursday afternoon. In relation to the improved representation bill, again, we received the report on Thursday afternoon to adopt it on the Friday at a teleconference. Transcripts from hearings such as in Townsville and on the Gold Coast were not received. They were then on the public website but we were waiting for them to peruse as part of our informed decision-making. Of course, there was the very important alcohol fuelled violence. That report was over a hundred pages and I received it at 5.48 on the Thursday night and had to be able to have a full, informed discussion about it at 11 o'clock on the Friday. As I said, when they are such important reports, when there are reams and reams of information—we received over 760 submissions. I think it is only a fair request to be able to listen to that information, dissect that information and to come in here and be well informed.

I again, therefore, say that it is extremely fair to ask for two days to digest and consider reports, look at the decisions we could be making and what we want to discuss and agree to. Anybody who is

saying that giving full consideration is not fair or reasonable is being flippant about the whole process. As I said, when documentation is missing, not only does that put pressure on our committee secretariat—and different secretariats obviously have different workloads, but they are very professional—it then puts them in a certain position. This would also go a long way to supporting our secretariat.

Again, this is a very fair and reasonable request. My colleague has put forward a very good motion that I certainly will be supporting. I would encourage anybody else who is fair-minded, who wants well considered, constructive reports to support this motion.