



Speech By  
**David Crisafulli**

**MEMBER FOR BROADWATER**

---

Record of Proceedings, 23 February 2021

**APPROPRIATION (PARLIAMENT) (2020-2021) BILL**

**APPROPRIATION (2020-2021) BILL**

**Consideration in Detail (Cognate Debate)**

**Appropriation (2020-2021) Bill**

**Economics and Governance Committee, Report**

 **Mr CRISAFULLI** (Broadwater—LNP) (Leader of the Opposition) (11.47 am): I also wish to make a contribution in relation to the report of the Economics and Governance Committee. Unlike the Premier, I will not use the first minute of my contribution to comment on a government that will have been 10 years concluded at the time of the next election, because this side of the House wishes to look forward and chart an economic future for this state. It is a shame that a third-term government still has not found what its economic narrative is. It is disappointing when the Premier comes into this House and chooses to make the issue about the member for Mermaid Beach. That is a great shame.

I will take this opportunity to comment on the process of estimates. First I want to touch on the economic narrative. What we saw in this budget was the biggest broken promise we have seen since the asset sales of 2009. The government went to an election promising an increased debt figure. They said to the public that they were asking for a mandate for \$4 billion but a moment later whacked \$28 billion on the credit card. That broken promise would have been bad enough. It would have been bad enough if they had said, 'And these are the infrastructure projects that we are going to kickstart.' Instead—

**Mr Power** interjected.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Ms Bush): Member for Logan.

**Mr CRISAFULLI:** Madam Deputy Speaker, I am not taking interjections. I am happy to continue. Instead, what we have is a government that borrowed simply to keep the lights on. That is plain and simple when we see the value to the state and compare that to other jurisdictions that borrowed to build infrastructure. The implications of that will be felt in the years to come.

If members want to see the greatest barometer of the government's level of pessimism in terms of what it is going to achieve, look no further than the unemployment level. The government's own prediction, no matter how rosy it looks, still has it as the worst in the country. That is not the sort of Queensland we want. We want a Queensland that dreams about being the best because we are the best. We have been given the best hand. We have been dealt the best hand with our natural beauty. We have been dealt the best hand when it comes to mining. We have been dealt the best hand when it comes to the quality of our agriculture. We should be the best. To have a government that does not have that aspiration—I am sorry, I will not stand for it. I will not sit by while a third-term Premier, tired of ideas, comes in here and cannot sell the vision for the state.

The Premier mentioned the estimates process. I am not going to defend the processes of parliaments gone by—and certainly not one that will be 10 years in the wilderness by the time of the next election. I will tell members a little something about the estimates process we just went through. It was a sham. It was not what committees were set up for. This place has one house. As a result of having one house the government has the right to come in and put its legislation forward and it does not have to pass an upper house. We accept that.

We accept that that is the system of government we have in Queensland. If we are going to have an estimates process, at the very least ministers should be asked to answer questions. What we had from the chairs of these committees was nothing more than a protection racket. There were deliberate stalling tactics where people were called to answer multiple times to wind down the clock.

**Mr POWER:** Madam Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. As the chair of the committee—the report of which we are debating—I find those comments personally and grossly offensive and I ask the member to withdraw.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** Madam Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. For one to take personal offence they have to be named in the chamber and the member was not. He may assume anything he wants, but the reality is that the standing orders do not allow him to assume. The reality is that you have to be named. He was not named.

**Mrs D'ATH:** Madam Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The Leader of the Opposition specifically made accusations about the chair of the committee and the chair of committee is here and takes personal offence. The chairs are the chairs. They are not unknown individuals. He says that the chairs engaged in a particular action or activity. They are all identifiable whether he names them or not. Consequently, they should be able to take personal offence and ask that comments be withdrawn.

I also raise the issue, as the member for Kawana and Manager of Opposition Business did in the previous debate, and ask you to rule in relation to the comments being made by the Leader of the Opposition. I believe they go to the processes of the parliament which we have just debated. The debate on the CLA and the estimates process has concluded. This is the debate on the Economics and Governance Committee report. If the Leader of the Opposition wanted to debate the estimates process he should have done that during the previous debate.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** Madam Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The Premier just spoke about the estimates process. When one speaks about a process one is able to debate it because we are actually in a debate. The Premier has opened that gate. Members are, respectfully in my view, able to communicate on that and respond to the Premier who talked quite a lot about the estimates process.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I have heard many points of order. I am going to take some advice. Member for Broadwater, the member for Logan has taken personal offence to your comment and I ask you to withdraw.

**Mr CRISAFULLI:** I withdraw. I do wish to follow in the vein of the Premier and talk about the estimates process. I can assure you that I am going to be talking about it to improve it into the future rather than talk about processes from a decade gone by. I intend to chart a course for the future.

The estimates process must be fixed. We will put forward our positive suggestions on the best way to do it. As a starting point, I will be asking the committee to consider having the Speaker, the Deputy Speaker and perhaps a member of the opposition act as chairs for estimates. At the very least we need to set up a system where ministers must answer questions otherwise it is all a sham. This place deserves more than that. We will be writing to the committee to ensure that this process is improved.