



## Appendix B

### A sample of recent applications of the anticipation rule

Date	Issue	Outcome	Chair	Stage
19/02/2002	<i>Point of order from Opp. Member: answer anticipated debate on bill listed for that day.</i>	<i>Chair accepted Minister's assurance that answer did not anticipate any of the material covered in the bill.</i>	Andrews	Question Time
24/06/2003	<i>Govt Member mentioned forthcoming Private Members' bills during adj. deb.</i>	<i>Chair noted that Member would have anticipated debate if the bills had been on the notice paper.</i>	Andrews	Adj. Deb.
21/08/2003	<i>Point of order from Opp. Member – Minister's answer referred to Senate passing a bill today (and subject matter of bill) when Senate message due to be considered by House later in day.</i>	<i>Chair reminded Minister of anticipation rule but did not stop answer.</i>	Andrews	Question Time
9/09/2003	<i>Points of order from Opp. Member – Minister's answer referred to subject of a bill to be debated later in day.</i>	<i>Chair said occupiers of the Chair endeavour to ensure that provided the bill is not being reflected on the answer is in order.</i>	Andrews	Question Time
11/09/2003	<i>Point of order from Opp. Member – Minister's answer referred to subject of bill before the House.</i>	<i>Chair allowed Minister to refer to subject but not refer specifically to matters in bills before the House.</i>	Andrews	Question Time

1/12/2003	<i>During Grievance Deb. Member referred to Private Member's Bill he had presented earlier that day.</i>	<i>Chair reminded Member that he should not anticipate debate on the bill</i>	<i>Dep Speaker Causley</i>	<i>Grievance debate</i>
1/03/2004	<i>Points of order from Opp. Member – a question from a Govt Member anticipated debate on a Private Member's motion listed for later that day.</i>	<i>Chair eventually accepted the points of order – the answer should not anticipate debate on the Private Member's motion – test was whether the answer intrudes on what the debate may be and this not always easy to predict.</i>	<i>Andrews</i>	<i>Question Time</i>
2/03/2004				
9/03/2004	<i>Point of order from Govt. Member – question about a matter on the Notice Paper (but in fact – it was listed as the MPI subject.</i>	<i>Chair noted that anticipation rule did not apply to the MPI</i>	<i>Andrews</i>	<i>Question Time</i>
2/06/2004	<i>During debate on a bill a Member referred to another bill on the Notice Paper.</i>	<i>Chair thanked him for not pre-empting debate on the other bill.</i>	<i>A/g Dep. Speaker Jenkins</i>	<i>2<sup>nd</sup> reading debate</i>
1/12/2004	<i>Multiple points of order from Opp. Member about question from Govt Member on Govt policy which was subject of a bill listed for debate later that day.</i>	<i>Chair said the Minister can refer to the subject of the question but not the bill. Further point of order that standing order 100(f) referred to question not answer rejected. Further point of order that questions allowed on the process of a bill but wide ranging debate on subject matter not permitted was rejected.</i>	<i>Hawker</i>	<i>Question Time</i>
6/12/2004	<i>Speaker made a statement on the application of the anticipation rule.</i>	<i>Question Time a key period for House to exercise its function of ensuring accountability and subject matter should not be restricted lightly..</i>	<i>Hawker</i>	<i>Question Time</i>

