



Speech By
Robbie Katter

MEMBER FOR MOUNT ISA

MOTION: DISSENT FROM DEPUTY SPEAKER'S RULING

 **Mr KATTER** (Mount Isa—KAP) (12.21 pm): I rise to make a brief contribution to the debate on this motion, which states—

That this House dissent from a ruling by Madam Deputy Speaker on 22 May 2013, appearing at page 1737 of the *Record of Proceedings*, that the point of order raised by the member for Condamine requesting that the Attorney-General withdraw offensive words in reference to the member for Condamine was not a point of order.

I was present that night. I should state from the start that I agree with many of the points made by the Leader of the House; I think we should have immense respect for this House and the position that the Speaker holds. However, that is not all we are talking about here. The LNP government was given an overwhelming majority in this parliament and I say congratulations to it. The people of Queensland voted for it, and that is what we were left with. However, with this comes a responsibility for the government to act with fairness and equality, and that is very important. It behoves it to demonstrate to the public that it will do that and to signal to the public that it will govern with fairness and equality. I believe that words to that effect were delivered by the Premier after the election. The actions of the last sitting were in stark contrast to this intent. This was a demonstration of a large majority government using its numbers to be judge, jury and executioner in its approach—

Madam SPEAKER: Member for Mount Isa, I would draw you back to the specific motion before the House. This is not the time for a broad-ranging political debate but to address the issue of the motion.

Mr KATTER: The member for Condamine had every right to defend himself in the House after continued derogatory references to himself, his party and his colleagues. This opportunity is afforded to all members of parliament, but the government is saying it should not be afforded to the member for Condamine. I am perplexed as to why he cannot draw personal offence when the *Hansard* states—

While we are on incompetence when we are talking about the member for Condamine and the member for Gaven ...

I think that is pretty clear. If you cannot draw an inference of personal offence, I would have to question that. There is no disrespect meant to anyone; I think we are entitled to question any decision that goes against us. That takes me to the motion of dissent, which is about the House demonstrating fairness and equality in the order of its conduct. If passed, the motion will send a signal to the people of Queensland that the government is not going to use its large numbers to control the House and that its business will be conducted with fairness and equity. I urge the members of this House to support this motion.

The Leader of the House also talked about the 'ref's decision'. Casting my mind back, I played rugby league for 20 years and I had immense respect for referees on the field. They keep the games going and they do a wonderful job. However, I questioned their decisions many times, and I had that right. I had a wonderful relationship with refs and often received awards from them. I was entitled to question the decisions they made and their conduct and they probably appreciated that sometimes.

That is all we are talking about here: we are questioning a decision that was made. In the interests of fairness and equity, we should all be allowed to have our say in this House. I strongly urge all members to consider that and to send a signal to the Queensland public that we are about fairness and equity in the House. I support this motion.