




Speech By
Robbie Katter

MEMBER FOR TRAEGER

Record of Proceedings, 22 October 2019

MOTION

Premier and Minister for Trade, Finding of Contempt

 **Mr KATTER** (Traeger—KAP) (11.58 am): I am grateful for the opportunity to speak in this debate and on what seems to be a heavily qualified apology. In response to the findings of the Ethics Committee, it is good that the Premier has acknowledged her wrongdoings. Then we heard the speech from the member for Redcliffe, and the sentiment that came across there was that there was this background of disgusting acts that justified the need for it. To me, it was a heavily qualified apology, and I made that point at the start.

There has been a hell of a lot of talk about what caused this and what brought us to this point, and that is fine. I am offended by a lot of things in this parliament, but I am not able to intimidate or bully people into a position by virtue of my position. When the Deputy Premier talks about Australian values, they are relative. If you find that abhorrent, that is fine; you are entitled to that view. We find a lot of views from that side of the House abhorrent as well, but I cannot try and force them to vote in a certain way because they will have their staff taken off them, which is what we are arguing about here and the purpose of this debate.

The substance of this debate is the Premier's actions, and that is what we should be talking about. If we want to flash our moral self-righteous credentials in here, I am happy to do that. I am offended by a lot of things that go on in this parliament as well. It is very nice to make the association between us—because it must be by imputation—and the Nazis. That is really kind. I take very serious offence to that. That has nothing to do with our position. By imputation—

Mrs D'ATH: Mr Speaker, I rise in relation to a matter of privilege suddenly arising. The member is claiming that I made certain statements. To be clear, I was simply quoting what Senator Anning had done.

Mr SPEAKER: There is no point of order.

Mr KATTER: I thank the Attorney-General for that commentary, but I think anyone who was listening would have made an assumption about what that imputation meant, and I take great offence to it.

We are talking about the implications of the Premier's actions. Let's dig into that, because that could have been Campbell Newman saying, 'I want you to vote for Strong Choices. Let's see how you vote for it. We might take some staff resources off you.' Despite what we think about Strong Choices, that is what we are arguing about. That is what was done, and that is what this parliament cannot abide. That is what we should be debating now. Yes, it is upsetting to hear those sorts of imputations coming from that side.

I think the Deputy Premier made a good point about the member for Warrego, who raised this in the first place. Everyone who thought it would be a bit of fun to try and pick on the KAP and get some benefit out of this is very much complicit in this whole initiative and perhaps even forced the Premier into a corner on that issue, so I think that was a valid point to make.

I am not sure there is too much more I can say. There has been a lot of discussion about this. The Ethics Committee report has taken a long time to come out. The implications would be very serious for anyone. I think it is really important for everyone in this House to stop and consider the implications. Regardless of our views, values or interpretation of any issue that comes before this parliament, how do we want to protect the democracy of this House? If people see that you can get away with threatening and bullying people by offering a simple apology it would set a precedent in this parliament. It has been said by people outside of parliament that prima facie this looks like a breach of the Criminal Code, which is a very serious matter. We want these things dealt with properly. We have received an apology backed up by sentiment in subsequent speeches saying there was good reason for it in the first place. That seems to me to be a qualification on the apology. That is an interesting point to raise.

We have just received this. This is our first visual of any of this. Without resources in the parliament we are trying to read through this so we can comment. Quite clearly, we do not have the resources in the parliament to do that, so we will do our best to get our head around this and make a judgement from there.