

Practices and procedures relating to question time

Procedures around question time are no doubt historical but I am much more interested in the practices around QT.

From an actively politically engaged and interested member of the public point of view, compared to the UK for example (even at the present time), Australia's QT, is a giant waste of time.

Questions put to the government by its own members (Dorothy Dixers), at present just seem to be an inefficient way of discussing their own actions (and in the most empty facile way possible) and get the boot into the opposition.

Questions asked by the opposition seem rarely to be answered fully, often evaded or responded to off subject and it seems to be the view of the government that the purpose of QT is to provide another opportunity to put the boot into the opposition. There is plenty of evasion and obfuscation.

Comparing Australia's QT with watching QT in the UK 2 years ago, Australia's QT seems puerile, pointless and time could be spent better elsewhere, if our Parliament has no desire to improve the situation, which is what I strongly suspect.

It is little wonder the public is disengaged and has no trust in our Federal Democracy. I will no longer watch QT anymore as it only makes me cringe, angry and furious at the lack of honesty from the government. Those in government seem to have lost sight of what they are there to do. Those on the cross bench, especially, seem far more focused on what needs to be done, and it is apparent they actually make an effort to read what is under debate, unlike many MPs in the government. The matter was brought into obvious focus last year, when the LNP voted on Pauline Hansen's "It's OK to be white" motion, plainly unaware of what they were voting on, and simply did what they were told. It was absolutely apparent they had read nothing and there is consequently no reason to believe they read anything or wish to inform themselves properly. It is just a travesty.

QT needs to be informative, truthful, substantive, non evasive, and non attacking of the opposition. The public is not interesting in petty backbiting – they want to see policy and good government. And good government means actually planning policies and outcomes, being informative, truthful and non evasive.