



Speech By  
**Hon. Patrick Weir**


**MEMBER FOR CONDAMINE**

---

Record of Proceedings, 19 November 2025

**SPEAKER'S STATEMENT**

**Parliamentary Debates, Standards**

 **Mr SPEAKER:** Honourable members, today I want to talk about standards in the House and address what I see as a campaign to disrupt proceedings and, in doing so, ignore the rules and standards of the House. Speaker's rulings have long held that personal explanations are an opportunity for a member to explain their position, not to attack other members or debate issues. Yesterday, four members used the cover of personal explanations to attack others and in doing so were disorderly, despite numerous warnings. In reviewing yesterday's proceedings, it is clear to me that this was a coordinated effort to disrupt proceedings.

The issue at the crux of the complaint yesterday was a belief by members that other members referring to members not speaking in a debate was a breach of the rules or conventions. Let me be very clear: It has never been a rule or convention that members cannot refer to the fact that another member has not spoken to a matter or is not on the list to speak about a matter. It is not an extension of the rule about commenting on the absence of a member in the House. Indeed, in a ruling recently by Deputy Speaker O'Shea on 14 March 2025 it was made very clear that there is no convention regarding the mention of the lack of a member's contribution to a debate. Whether there should be such a rule is a matter for discussion for the relevant committee, but it is artifice to argue that such a rule exists.

My review of recent debates suggests that some members are being deliberately provocative and irrelevant in their contributions to a debate in an attempt to provoke action by the Speaker in the chair. For example, last sitting week one member was extremely provocative and absolutely irrelevant in a debate and sat themselves down twice, claiming they had been silenced when they clearly had not. Other members regularly use points of order to debate issues or restate questions where all that is required is to state the point of order. My patience with such conduct is at an end. I have instructed all deputy speakers to have less tolerance for such behaviours.