

20/9/13

Task Team on NA Rules

Notes for Mr Frolick re: Address to Task Team on the Review of Chapter 12 of the Assembly Rules

I wish to apologise to the Task Team for not being able to attend the meeting. I have however engaged with the relevant staff to ensure that meaningful input is made. I will attend as time allows.

I would like the Task Team to ensure that the revision takes account of the Oversight Model of Parliament as well as the Sector Oversight Model (as relevant) the Report of the Independent Panel Assessment of Parliament, the Public Participation Model currently in the final stages of development, as well as the provisions of the so called Money Act.

Naturally Parliament's new Governance Structure will remove the many Subcommittees that now fall under the Rules Committee and the functions of the Rules Committee will need to be adjusted.

In addition the document prepared by Ms F Chohan on "Reviewing the Legislative Process in Parliament" provides excellent proposals which need consideration for possible inclusion in the Rules.

I would like the Task Team to make suggestions on whether the Rules need to reflect that committees need to adopt minutes of their previous meeting before proceeding with a 'new' meeting. I make this request as some committees tend not to take seriously the need to adopt minutes of meetings which leads to follow up issues being lost.

I would also appreciate the Task Team considering how we can reinforce writing into the Rules that the final version (form) of a Bill to be put before the House is signed off by the Committee and that all amendments rejected by a committee is recorded in an amendment 'A' version of a Bill (see Rule 251 (3) (c)). This will assist in the application of Rule 254 – Amendments proposed by member before decision of 2nd Reading.

I would like the Task Team to focus particularly on Rule 152 – closed meetings and its

subsequent application in Rules 154 and 155 as we have had opinion from State counsel that this Rule is ambiguous and may not stand the test in a court.

In addition, in view of recent reports, the treatment of 'confidential' documentation may need to be looked at to ensure that we can stand the test in a Constitutional Democracy.

By last two comments:

- (1) Do we need a preamble to the Rules ~~book~~, maybe, around 48 and 57 of the Constitution?
- (2) Do we need an annotated set of Rules that will give detail in regard to rule application? This will not mean that every rule needs to be annotated. Such annotation will allow for, especially new members, having a better understanding of the application of the Rules.

C T Frolick, MP
House Chairperson
20 September 2013