




Speech By
David Crisafulli

MEMBER FOR BROADWATER

Record of Proceedings, 28 February 2019

FISHERIES (SUSTAINABLE FISHERIES STRATEGY) AMENDMENT BILL

 **Mr CRISAFULLI** (Broadwater—LNP) (12.23 pm): In rising to make a contribution to the Fisheries (Sustainable Fisheries Strategy) Amendment Bill, I follow the member for Burdekin, who made an incredible contribution. Fisheries is an industry that means much to his part of the world. The member for Gympie also knows the importance of the industry.

I want to focus on the process that was used to get here today. Something that I believe I am qualified to speak on is the shambolic way that this parliament is operating at the moment. For a regulatory impact statement not to be done on this is not right. Whether or not we call it by its full name or by its abbreviated name, it is what allows us to look at the impacts that the decisions we make in this place have on the everyday lives of Queenslanders. If we cannot be bothered doing that, I question why we come into this place. This is not urgent legislation that is being rushed through the parliament. It went through the committee process, on which I will be commenting shortly, yet the government cannot be bothered to do a regulatory impact statement to look at what the legislation will mean for people who put everything on the line. People such as those represented by the member for Burdekin put everything into their vessels. They mortgage their homes and they live and die by the decisions that are made in this place, yet we do not have the decency to question, probe and ask about the impacts our decisions will have on them. That is not right.

I know that, following the committee process, recommendations can be made that ministers do not adopt. That is the right of the executive of the day. I understand that shadow ministers can put forward amendments, although more often than not they are knocked over. However, when a committee comes together and puts forward the kinds of recommendations that this committee did and then all of those recommendations are scrapped, I question the value of a robust committee process in a unicameral parliament. That is why we have the sort of committee system that we do.

One of the recommendations of the committee is that within 18 months the department reports back on the implementation of the legislation. Given that a regulatory impact statement has not been done, I think that that is one recommendation that the minister could have chosen to accept. Maybe that is the one recommendation on which he could have cut them a bit of slack. I reckon I know what happened. I reckon that the Labor members of the committee were read the riot act for putting forward something that did not pass through the ministerial office. The member for Mount Ommaney stood in this place and condemned one of the amendments put forward by the shadow minister. If the member had ticker, she would stand up and talk about the things that the committee wanted adopted. If she had ticker, she would stand up and talk about those changes that they believed in throughout the committee process: changes such as equity; changes such as the Public Service being held to the same level of accountability for breaches. However, no—the member comes in here and parrots the lines that they have.

I genuinely believe that the minister does want to review this, so why not put it into the legislation? Why wouldn't the minister ensure that the parliament receives a report within 18 months? This minister may no longer be the minister in 18 months. The minister may be given a promotion. He may be moved

out of agriculture, because he has done enough damage waging war against milk prices for dairy farmers. Why not adopt that recommendation by the committee? It is a fair and reasonable recommendation. I believe the amendments put forward by the shadow minister are very sensible and should be considered wholeheartedly. At the very least, I ask the minister to consider the recommendation of giving this House the right, before the next election, to review the impacts of this legislation.