




Speech By
David Crisafulli

MEMBER FOR BROADWATER

Record of Proceedings, 7 March 2024

MOTION

Liberal National Party, Ipswich West By-Election

 **Mr CRISAFULLI** (Broadwater—LNP) (Leader of the Opposition) (11.32 am): I move the following amendment—

Delete all words and insert—

‘That this House supports optional preferential voting.’

If we had optional preferential voting, the opposition would not be in the situation where we had to choose between the pot-smoking party, the party responsible for destroying services in this state or the ‘please explain’ party, because they are the only options on the table. Under our solution, it would be very simple—

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

Mr CRISAFULLI: We would urge people to ‘just vote 1’!

Honourable members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Kelly): Leader of the Opposition, you clearly knew I was on my feet. You continued. I would ask you not to do that in future. Leader of the House, what is the point of order?

Mr de BRENNI: It is ordinary practice in this place for members to seek to amend motions, but it is a requirement that the amendment be related to the substance of the motion itself.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I will hear the point of order in silence.

Mr de BRENNI: The amendment proposed is not in accordance with that requirement.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will have to take some advice in relation to that.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will take that advice in silence and I will warn anybody who breaks that silence.

Deputy Speaker’s Ruling, Amendment Out of Order

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Kelly): I am going to uphold that point of order and rule the amendment out of order because it does not relate to the motion as put; however, I will note that there is an opportunity to bring further amendments that may be relevant to the motion that has been put.

Mr CRISAFULLI: I move the following amendment—

After paragraph 3. insert—

‘4. supports optional preferential voting.’

Far be it from me to give the Labor Party advice—

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The House will come to order!

Ms Fentiman interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Waterford, you are warned under the standing orders. Leader of the House, what is your point of order?

Mr de BRENNI: Standing order 67 is quite clear in relation to this. You have just ruled on this. This amendment is identical in its intent and in fact in its words to the previous amendment which you have just ruled on.

Mr NICHOLLS: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will take some advice on that point of order.

Mr NICHOLLS: To that point of order, if I may, Mr Deputy Speaker?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: If it is to that point of order.

Mr NICHOLLS: It has been the longstanding practice in this House where motions have been moved by governments and oppositions that the motion in effect is totally negated by deleting all words after 'That' and replacing them with something totally contrary to the intent of the original motion when it was put forward. It has been the longstanding practice that has occurred where amendments have been made that bear no relevance to the motion that has been moved by doing so. In this case, standing order 94—which I accept—states—

Every amendment must be relevant to the question which it is proposed to amend.

This is a question about voting. It is about preferences. My point of order is that it is particularly relevant to those matters about how people vote and cast their preferences which the Deputy Premier has raised. My point of order is that this amendment is totally in order with the motion.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Clayfield. We are getting to the outer reaches of the standing orders here. It is important to note that sessional order No. 9 does not apply in this situation. However, there is no point of order in this particular instance because by including the amendment as an additional dot point in the motion it becomes relevant to the motion. I call the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr CRISAFULLI: Today the government has come in here and moved this motion, but with the stroke of a pen it can make this all go away. With the stroke of a pen today, with one vote we are able to just vote 1. What a golden opportunity! The irony is that this disgraceful law went through here in the middle of the night, with 18 minutes notice—

Mr Miles interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Premier, I would ask you to withdraw that unparliamentary language.

Mr MILES: I withdraw.

Mr CRISAFULLI: This can all go away and we can go back to the days when Mr Fitzgerald rightly said that people should have the right to choose—and they should have the right to choose. What it would look like is, if somebody wanted to vote for just one candidate as No. 1, they could; or they could vote 1 and 2; or, if they like, they could preference the lot; or, in this case, where there is no-one worth preferencing, they could just vote 1, and that would be allowable.

Today, with what the government has done, it is the greatest own goal you have seen from a Premier who is not up to it and from a Leader of the House who does not have the intellectual rigour to do the job. Far be it for me to give advice to the government, but this is the fifth time they have tried one of these motions and every time the egg has come back on their face. This is a government rotting before the eyes of Queenslanders. This is a government that sees everything through the prism of politics. This is a government that is just worried about its own survival. This is a government that is seeing frontline services deteriorate in front of it.

That is why they are concerned about preferences. I will explain it and, unlike those opposite, I will use every second of the five minutes, I can assure you, Mr Deputy Speaker. The reason this government is concerned is that in the seat that they hold on primary votes they know they need preferences. They need the people piping—smoking pot—to get them over the line. They will need One Nation preferences to get them over the line. Ipswich West has a primary vote of nearly 51 per cent. They should not even be worried about this. The preferences should not flow. Inala has a primary vote of 67 per cent; preferences have no bearing.

To have a government come into this place and be concerned about preferences in Labor Party heartland shows us everything we need to know, and I will tell you why. This by-election gives a once-in-a-generation opportunity to two proud regions to say something. Firstly, they can say that, when it comes to the youth crime crisis, the health crisis, the housing crisis and the cost-of-living crisis, things have deteriorated over the last decade. That is the first thing they will be able to say. The second message they can say is, 'We've had enough of being treated like doormats. We've had enough of electing people who just don't care about us. We've had enough of people who have walked away from the little guy. We've had enough of a government that does not have a plan. We've had enough of a government that is always about the politics, that will always make an announcement and that will always scurry away.'

Nothing would give me more pleasure than to say to the good people of Inala, 'Just vote 1 Trang Yen.' Nothing would give me more pleasure than to say to the good people of Ipswich West, 'Just vote 1 Darren Zanow.' Today, because of the greatest own goal ever delivered by a government, in less than a minute those Queenslanders will be able to do that and just vote 1 when the amendment that this House supports optional preferential voting gets installed in legislation.