




Speech By  
**Curtis Pitt**

**MEMBER FOR MULGRAVE**

---

**MOTION: AMENDMENT TO STANDING ORDERS**

 **Mr PITT** (Mulgrave—ALP) (10.01 am): I rise to speak regarding this matter. The opposition supports those entities included in schedule 7 as it stands and will not be voting against the motion. However, there is a noted omission from the schedule and that is the Queensland Treasury Corporation. I have written to Madam Speaker, as the chair of the Committee of the Legislative Assembly, to ask that the CLA give consideration to inclusion of the Queensland Treasury Corporation CEO for direct questioning at estimates. A meeting of the CLA is due to occur on Thursday. There is no material reason why this motion could not be considered on Friday after the CLA looks at this matter.

The Queensland Treasury Corporation is a statutory authority, just like those included in schedule 7, including the Motor Accident Insurance Commission/Nominal Defendant and, of course, the Queensland Future Growth Corporation. These are entities that are included in schedule 7. There is no reason why QTC cannot be included on the basis, in particular, that that entity has holdings of \$29.18 billion. It looks at the long-term debt and asset holdings of Queensland. It is a very important aspect in terms of looking at Queensland's finances.

The Manager of Government Business may not be aware that the Finance and Administration Committee met this morning to consider a proposal for inclusion of the Queensland Treasury Corporation in estimates this year. That committee resolved to write to the CLA for consideration of that matter which I would have thought would have been given the courtesy of actually having a hearing of the CLA. That is not to say that we knew what the outcome of that meeting would be. This is a question that should be put. Certainly it has been noted that the QTC was not included in direct CEO questioning in 2011 or 2012. As far as I am concerned an omission occurred in 2011. It should have been included. That happened under the former government. I am happy to stand here today and say that it should have been included. It was not included last year under the first term of the Newman government. That is why we have written to ask the question again. As I say, I have personally written to the CLA to request a hearing on this matter. It is of concern that I have not received any formal response and here we are in the parliament today with the Manager of Government Business moving this motion without this included. That is of concern to me. Of course, the government could not be aware that at the meeting this morning of the Finance and Administration Committee the committee had resolved to ask the CLA to consider this matter. This is a very genuine request and one, unfortunately, that has been knocked on the head before it has been given due consideration. Ultimately this motion could be put Friday. There is no reason why it needs to be put today. I am concerned that this has not been given the consideration it deserves by the CLA.