




Speech By
Jarrold Bleijie

MEMBER FOR KAWANA

Record of Proceedings, 22 October 2019

MOTION

Business Program

 **Mr BLEIJIE** (Kawana—LNP) (11.18 am): The Leader of the House may not want an urgency motion but, by her own motion—by moving that the bill will be debated this week and start and finish this week—essentially, she is moving the urgency motion without having an urgency motion with respect to certain bills we are debating.

The Leader of the House has indicated that the Summary Offences Bill has to be passed this week. We are on to the civil liability bill. There are time restraints that will be put on these bills. Effectively, we are again gagging and guillotining debate. If we look at the bills we debated last week, we had nine members who were not afforded the opportunity to speak to the police discipline bill. I table a copy of our records.

Tabled paper: Document, undated, speaking list titled 'Local Gov Bill' [1901](#).

We had 13 members who were not able to speak to the local government bill. In that particular situation the Leader of the House and I talked about ensuring there was maximum opportunity to debate the amendments. Who could forget that the minister had to move 170 amendments to his own bill, nearly beating the member for McConnel's record of 200 amendments to her racing bill. The member for McConnel will be the first to say, 'I wasn't the minister. I took it over as the racing minister.' That bill had over 200 amendments. The local government minister had 170 amendments and we needed to debate some of those amendments and we did not get the opportunity to because time ran down. I note the member for Noosa was on her feet and was not given the call to talk to the local government bill because the opposition and the government had discussed the opportunity to make sure there was enough time in consideration in detail. The crossbenchers missed out. I table our records showing 13 members, including yours truly, who were not given the opportunity to talk about the local government bill.

Tabled paper: Document, undated, speaking list titled 'Police Discipline Bill' [1902](#).

This is again another week of curtailing and abrogating the responsibilities of government because those opposite do not want to have the discussion. The Leader of the House did not talk about it, but I suspect at some time this week we are going to want to talk about the Ethics Committee report that has just found unanimously that the Premier is in contempt of parliament, for which she has just apologised. Where in the week are we going to be debating this report, or is the government thinking the apology given by the Premier is enough and that is all that is said on the matter? It is not enough.

At some stage during the week the Leader of the House should get up and move a motion pursuant to the Ethics Committee report, which has extraordinarily found the Premier in contempt of parliament and having an undue influence on other members of this House. When are we debating that report? When are we debating that important issue that has just come before this House? The Premier has just apologised, but I do not accept that that is the end of the matter. The report should be debated. I recognise that the crossbench will have something important to say on that particular report that has found the Premier in contempt of parliament.

I say to the members opposite: do not underestimate the seriousness of this Ethics Committee report and the findings and recommendations that have just been handed down against the Premier. It is not common for a Premier of the state—

Ms Simpson: When?

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the interjection from the former Speaker. It is not common for a Premier to be found in contempt of parliament. That is serious. I did not hear the Leader of the House in her contribution explain when this week we are going to be having this important debate on that Ethics Committee report, because we should, as the report indicates.

Again we see this week the Leader of the House moving a motion to curtail the debate on various bills and, as I have always said and I will continue to say, members should be afforded the opportunity to have their say on important matters. There were lots of members who missed out on speaking to the local government bill. I wanted to talk about my local Sunshine Coast councils for various reasons, but we were not given the opportunity because the government wanted to rush it through and in the process completely mucked it up by having to move 170 amendments to the minister's bill, which would be a record, other than that of the member for McConnel, who moved 200 amendments to her racing bill. This motion should be opposed.