




Speech By  
**Curtis Pitt**

**MEMBER FOR MULGRAVE**

---

Record of Proceedings, 22 May 2014

**MOTION: AMENDMENT TO STANDING ORDERS**

 **Mr PITT** (Mulgrave—ALP) (11.26 am): I know that I will cop the ire of the Deputy Premier and the Leader of the House, but I want them to hear me out. This matter was discussed in the CLA. I am not worried about saying that it was not opposed by the opposition members, because it is about the efficiency of the House and the running of the House. I think it has been put forward with all good intentions, but having heard the comments by the crossbenches today and understanding that the role of opposition members on the CLA is not only to represent the opposition but also to represent the views of those on the crossbenches including minor parties, I would respectfully ask that the motion be reconsidered based on that feedback.

I see much merit in the proposition that has been put forward, but I also see great merit in ensuring that those in the minor parties and the crossbenches have an opportunity to be directly consulted if they feel so strongly about it. That is the position of the opposition. As I say, I understand there will be cries of hypocrisy from those government members on the CLA. I ask that they take my comments in the way in which they are being given—that is, we have a duty as non-government members on the CLA to represent all of those members. The fact that they have not been properly consulted or have concerns that they have not been properly consulted I think is a fair point.

Due to the fact that this House is able to change these matters under the standing orders and is not required to make legislative change gives us the flexibility as a House, particularly given that this is a new system, to ensure that members are satisfied. This is not a political issue. This is about ensuring that people have a chance to put their voice forward. I am not suggesting that that is about people standing in their place and voting. What I mean by that is that they should be able to feel as though they have been properly consulted.

The CLA is meant to be an apolitical, bipartisan organisation for the entirety of this parliament. I think it functions that way almost all the time. I think that is a tribute to most of the people who are on that committee, but there is very strong feeling from those on the crossbenches and from those in the minor parties. I think they are valid concerns that they raise. I think this matter should be reconsidered by the CLA. The opportunity is there for the Leader of the House to withdraw this motion. That is not a failing of anyone on the government side. It is the wishes of the non-government members on the CLA at this point that we reconsider it. If that is not the case, we will vote against this today, and that is the position of the opposition.

I think this is getting blown out of all proportion. What we do know is that this is a matter about consultation. The crossbenches and minor parties feel as though they have not been properly consulted. If that is a direct result of opposition members not consulting with them appropriately, then I am happy to say that that is something I will take the wrap for, but I will not come in here and vote against their very strong wishes because clearly they are very passionate about this. I still support the principles behind why this motion has been put forward—that is, it is about efficiencies of the House—but, in doing that, we should not lose sight of the fact that the CLA is meant to be a representative body of all in this House, not just those on the government side.