




Speech By
David Crisafulli

MEMBER FOR BROADWATER

Record of Proceedings, 4 February 2020

ELECTORAL LEGISLATION (POLITICAL DONATIONS) AMENDMENT BILL

 **Mr CRISAFULLI** (Broadwater—LNP) (6.41 pm): What an outstanding contribution from the member for Clayfield. In line with that outstanding contribution, may I also rise to oppose what is nothing more than a financial gerrymander by the Greens. They can dress it up in any manner they seek, but it is nothing more than a grubby attempt to make a play for a political advantage, it is a sob story to go back to their base in an attempt to say that they are somehow holier than thou. All it is doing is seeking a political advantage for a political party.

Is it any wonder the Greens have tried it when the government has done a very similar thing albeit on a smaller scope? The government has come in here and said that one sector of the community should not be able to make a donation, so is it any wonder the Greens are seeking to use that to their advantage to take it a step further?

Let me pick up a few things following the member for Clayfield. First and foremost, I want to say this. In the end, it is not whether or not you should start focusing on one section of the community. It is about declarations. It is about people being prepared and forced to declare if they are making a contribution to whatever side of politics. When that is done and when that is made, the public can form their own assessment on the validity of that donation and whether or not that donation sought to buy favours.

There are times when we might not like where our political opponents are receiving their money from—whether they are unions, whether they are individuals or whether, member for Maiwar, heaven forbid, they are a business that is employing people and paying taxes. We might not like the fact that they are making that donation, but in a democracy we should be prepared to accept that that is good for our democratic process.

I have had the privilege of serving my community at two levels of government, and I have never once had a single person, business or anybody who has made a donation to me seek to leave a favour on the back of that donation—not once. I have a theory that when people make a donation to the political process they are attempting to buy good government rather than buy a government. That is my view. I might not like where those opposite get their money from and I might not like some of the member for Maiwar's policies, but in a democratic society we have to accept that is part of the process.

There is an irony about the member for Maiwar taking this here. The member for Mermaid Beach raised this, and I was saving it but it was a great interjection. The irony that a political party which shuns corporate Australia and which hates everything about anyone who wants to have a go, to make a quid, to take a risk and to employ people would accept the second largest donation in Australian political history is never lost on me.

Mr Langbroek: \$1.6 million.

Mr CRISAFULLI: I will take the interjection from the member for Surfers Paradise. It was over \$1½ million. They are prepared to cop it. I am sure there will be those who say, 'But it was made by an individual.' I am quietly confident that Mr Wood did not make his money at the local council. I do not think he made the \$1½ million he donated by pumping petrol at the local servo or going to work for a corporate person. He made it by taking a risk and, you know what, good on him.

I might not like the policies of the Greens—and I will touch on those soon—and I might not like that in relation to someone who has made a really good living because people have taken a risk and built a hotel, people have taken a risk and gone to work there and made all the challenges that come with a business venture, but I respect it and I will defend his right to give it every day of the week. For the member for Maiwar to come in here and somehow say that one form of money is dirty because it happens to come from risk-takers is offensive.

Do members know what else is offensive? This is a political party that is warped in looniness. When we see the policies that they espouse, is it any wonder that anyone who takes a risk would want to donate to the Greens? This is a political party that wanted to put lifetime leases on properties, reintroduce death duties and abolish any form of grant to anyone who might want to buy a home for themselves. This is a political party that despises the rule of law. This is a political party that does not believe a police officer should be able to carry a taser. What should they have, member for Maiwar? A microwaved lettuce leaf? What is it that they need?

An opposition member: A flyswatter.

Mr CRISAFULLI: A flyswatter? What is it that they need? Why does the member for Maiwar's political party believe that somehow it should be open season on all sorts of drug users? Why is it that the Greens political party refuses to acknowledge that dams are an important part of agriculture and that regional Queensland can have a voice?

Government members interjected.

Mr CRISAFULLI: When those opposite chime in, I can only shake my head because that is the political party which relies on the preferences of this mob to stay alive. They know that their base is under siege.

Mr Whiting interjected.

Mr CRISAFULLI: The member for Bancroft can chime in from the sideline and chirp all he likes. He knows full well what would happen without the Greens, without the march of the left, without the support from these people who prop up their vote. There are seats that the LNP win on primary votes, but because of compulsory preferential voting, because of dodgy deals, we have people like the member for Maiwar swapping and trading preferences. Those opposite run spooky scare campaigns, yet quietly they sit there and they harvest these preferences more often than not at a rate of 80 per cent.

No other preferences flow that way. We know they will come in here and say that somehow there are deals between other minor parties, but I do not see any other minor parties' preferences that flood 80-20 to a major political party. I do not see that. I look through the figures and I do not see that. I do not see the member for Maiwar winning on primary votes. No! In fact, if my memory serves me correctly I would suggest the incumbent LNP member nearly won on first past the post; he was so close, but the grubby deal existed. Those opposite will come in and they will seek to condemn this motion. However, they laid the foundation with their own attack—

Mr Dick: Why are you preferencing them in South Brisbane if they are so bad? Why are you preferencing them in South Brisbane?

Mr CRISAFULLI:—and still the interjections come. When it is close to the bone that is when it hurts the most. Still the interjections come. Do honourable members know why? Because they know full well that without the support of the member for Maiwar and his political kind they will not have a chance of winning an election. They know that full well.

I return to where I was when I was interjected upon by the member for Woodridge. They laid the groundwork for this. They laid it when they started with an attack on one section of the community. They might not like where that section of the community directs most of its contributions, but in a free and democratic society they should accept that. They should accept that if there are adequate donation and declaration laws, that is the best and fairest system. Above all, whichever side of politics they like, Queenslanders like a fair go. They want to know that when there is a fight, it is a fair fight. There is a reason two boxers get categorised around the same weight and a 100 kilo person does not fight a 60 kilo person. It is because you want a fair fight, and what the member for Maiwar is proposing is anything but fair. It should be opposed.