




Speech By
Joseph Kelly

MEMBER FOR GREENSLOPES

Record of Proceedings, 1 December 2021

MOTION

Dissent from Speaker's Ruling

 **Mr KELLY** (Greenslopes—ALP) (6.46 pm): Mr Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise in relation to this debate to support your ruling and oppose the motion put forward by the member for South Brisbane. I have read the ruling again while preparing for this debate and read the various pieces of advice that were proffered. It took me back to my experience of being the chair of the Ethics Committee for three years, and there were a couple of key things that I learnt in that role. The first one was that you had to read widely, take a huge amount of advice and question, question, question again and take your time to reach decisions about matters of parliamentary practice. The second lesson I learnt was that we all have an obligation to look to the deeper principles of the parliament.

Mr Nicholls interjected.

Mr KELLY: I acknowledge the then deputy chair of the Ethics Committee. While there is very little we agree on, we definitely agree on that need to look to the broader principles of parliamentary democracy. Sadly, once again we find ourselves here in the chamber wasting our time and wasting the time of this parliament on a Greens political party vanity project primarily based on their ignorance of parliamentary democracy and practice both as individual MPs and as a party.

I certainly do not claim to be an expert on parliamentary democracy or its practice. In fact, like most people, I was fairly ignorant of how this place actually worked before I got here, but I did know what it did was important. I think Otto von Bismark talked about laws and sausages and not wanting to see either of them made. I have now seen laws made and I am not lining up for the sausages. I have come to this place many times since 1989—never inside, always outside and generally as part of a union—starting in 1989 protesting against the vestiges of the Bjelke-Petersen government and following on—

Mr BERKMAN: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The member for Greenslopes's union membership and the making of sausages in parliament bears no relevance to the procedural motion that we are debating. I would ask for your ruling on that.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, member. I will give some guidance here, and that is that, even when looking at long titles of bills and looking at bills for particular purposes in legislative debates, some allowances are made and I have allowed all members to get to their point and if they have not I have made sure I have pulled them up on that. I have tried to give that guidance. I would appreciate that you allow me to do my job in terms of ruling on relevance.

Mr KELLY: I protested against many and varied things: Kennett and Hewson's WorkChoices preamble, the Iraq War, and the Beattie, Bligh and Newman governments. I could have pitched a tent for the Newman government, though. Most recently I was pleased to be part of the Women's March 4 Justice. I will admit my ignorance for most of this time, but I will say that I was part of a movement that understood this place and how it could be used to truly change our society.

After seven years in this place, including time on committees, time as a committee chair, deputy chair of the PCCC, chair of the Ethics Committee and now being honoured to be the Deputy Speaker, I would still say that I am no expert, but I have learned enough to find that the ruling by the Speaker is one of the most important and fascinating that I have read—and I read them all. It goes right to the core of the important principles underpinning our Westminster parliamentary system of democracy.

The Greens political party are once again demonstrating their disdain for this parliament. Firstly, they brought a bill without seeking guidance or advice. Of course they have the right to bring bills without seeking guidance or advice, but perhaps they should be big enough that when they get that wrong they should accept the consequences of not seeking that advice. Secondly, they have challenged the decision of the Speaker. Again they have the right, but they should think long and carefully before challenging the decision of the Speaker and what it means for the practices of this parliament.

I do not believe for a second they do this through ignorance. The Greens political party do this so that they can go into the community and peddle their persecutionist fantasy that they are being shut down by the major parties. This is completely wrong. The truth is they are being shut down by a culmination of about a thousand years of parliamentary practice in our Westminster parliamentary system of democracy, one of the strongest, fairest, most stable and enduring systems of governance in the world. The real message from this ruling, the real message that should be taken to the community, is that the Greens political party will never achieve anything unless they become the government, and they will not become a government unless they do what Labor does—seek to govern fairly for all Queenslanders, seek to unite and elevate all Queenslanders.

Let us consider the first 50 years of parliamentary practice as related to both the Greens and the Labor Party. After 50 years, the Labor Party in Australia was forming a federal government and responding to the national emergency of World War II. It had a long track record of governance at every level of government. It had gotten rid of, and would do so again, even at great pains to itself, people who did not believe in parliamentary democracy. It comprised what I would like to call Laborites, people who believed in parliamentary democracy and practice and sought to use it. After 50 years, the Greens political party fumble around trying to grab a few votes on the edge of politics, making fundamental parliamentary practice mistakes—

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Greenslopes, I will ensure that you do come back. You are straying. Can I also use this opportunity to let the member for Maiwar know that waving your arms in the chamber is not acceptable to gain the attention of the Speaker. I wish to also let you know that regardless of the time you will be allowed to have your full quota of 10 minutes because this debate started late. I will use the discretion of the Speaker to ensure that this debate is concluded this evening to alleviate any concerns you may have ahead of time.

Mr KELLY: As I said, making fundamental parliamentary practice mistakes. I certainly do not support this motion. The ruling from the Speaker is sound. It preserves good parliamentary practice that underpins good governance and ultimately a good and fair society based on the rule of law, and all MPs on this side of the House support that.