



Speech By
David Crisafulli

MEMBER FOR BROADWATER

Record of Proceedings, 21 August 2019


APPROPRIATION (PARLIAMENT) BILL

APPROPRIATION BILL

Consideration in Detail (Cognate Debate)

Appropriation Bill

Innovation, Tourism Development and Environment Committee, Report

 **Mr CRISAFULLI** (Broadwater—LNP) (2.29 pm): I rise to make a contribution to the debate of the committee report on budget estimates. I will speak briefly about some of the topics raised, but in my contribution today I will talk about what I see are some improvements that can be made to the process of estimates. I hope that we can develop a system in which we are able to get answers to questions. In a unicameral parliament, the estimates process matters. It is only effective when people are able to ask a question and get a straight answer. I thank the chair of the committee, who I thought handled himself well in terms of allocating time. I thank the deputy chair and all of the staff.

I want to talk about two issues that I think highlight where the process can be improved. The member for Whitsunday spoke about the allocation of questions. I will let others talk about that. On two occasions I asked a question and was given an answer that, quite frankly, was not correct. I will highlight both of them. In doing so, I would like to get an answer to those questions.

I asked the minister for tourism if I could have a breakdown of the \$13.9 million that had been allocated for the global tourism hubs as well as ecotourism. Nowhere was it highlighted what portion was allocated to each of those things. Is it fifty-fifty? How much goes to Cairns and how much goes to the Gold Coast? I asked a straight question. The answer I got was that an answer had been provided to the question on notice. That is not the case. I again ask the minister to please provide an answer to that question. The answers provided in writing did not give that breakdown. I will continue to ask the question until I get that breakdown. That is fair and reasonable. If we are going to have estimates, straight answers to questions need to be given.

Likewise, I asked the Minister for Environment how many carbon credits the Land Restoration Fund had generated. I was pointed to a response that was given that did not provide an answer. I asked the minister: how many carbon credits has the Land Restoration Fund provided? I again point to the response that was given. Yes, we asked that question on notice, but the response did not provide an answer.

Finally, I want to make a comment about the conduct of the tourism minister. The minister interjected. The minister spoke over the top of people. The minister was very rude in her behaviour. I was not seeking to be provocative to the minister. I was asking questions of her staff.

Ms Jones interjected.

Mr CRISAFULLI: I did ask the minister a question, but the minister was not over her brief. The minister can again interject now—not quite in the manner she did on that day. Her conduct was hardly becoming of her position. It is a little better today, which is good. I asked the minister a question, but she was not over her brief. Of course I turned to people who could give me a straight answer because I had only an hour and a half. We did not have a lot of time and there were a lot of things I wanted to prosecute. For example, I wanted to find out when the Wangetti Trail is actually going to open. The member for Cook proudly talks about it, but I have seen about a half a dozen different dates. I would dearly like a straight answer on that. When I asked that question I was told to ask the environment minister.

For estimates to be effective, people need to be given answers to their questions. It is not acceptable for a minister to get away with not answering something, particularly when the minister is pointing to a written response that clearly shows that the minister is not answering a question. You cannot refer to something that does not clarify what you are saying.

(Time expired)