




Speech By
Curtis Pitt

MEMBER FOR MULGRAVE

**TRANSPORT (RAIL SAFETY) AMENDMENT REGULATION (NO. 3):
DISALLOWANCE OF STATUTORY INSTRUMENT**

 **Mr PITT** (Mulgrave—ALP) (9.06 pm): I rise to make a very brief contribution in support of this disallowance motion.

Government members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Watts): Order! Can the House please respect the person on their feet who has the call?

Mr PITT: Obviously the bar has not opened yet or something.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! If you have private conversations that you wish to continue, please take them outside.

Mr PITT: I rise to make a very brief contribution in support of the disallowance motion for the Transport (Rail Safety) Amendment Regulation (No. 3) 2012. When the former Labor government made the Transport (Rail Safety) Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2012, which set out the prescribed hours of work and rest that have been repealed by the LNP's regulation, it was done on the basis of firm scientific evidence and consultation with the rail industry and unions including the Rail, Tram and Bus Union. I want to read a paragraph from the explanatory notes from the Labor government's regulation in early 2012. It states—

The Department of Transport and Main Roads consulted relevant stakeholders, including rail industry, unions, and key agencies on mandated train driver hours in November 2010. Unions have been supportive of standard work hours and rest periods for drivers.

Unfortunately, that level of consideration and care does not appear to have been followed by the LNP in formulating the regulation that repeals the prescribed hours of work and rest. By way of contrast, the explanatory notes from the LNP government's regulation with respect to consultation, which they clearly know nothing about, state—

Key industry stakeholders have been consulted and support the amendments.

The difference here is stark.

Mr Seeney interjected.

Mr PITT: Obviously we are getting under the Deputy Premier's skin because he cannot help himself. The difference here is stark. If you only ask to hear one side of the argument, as the LNP government appears to have done, is it any wonder that the response you get back is unanimous? Unfortunately, if you do not consult properly—again, form for this LNP government—you might be misled into thinking there is strong support for your proposed actions. Of course, I am giving the minister the benefit of the doubt here by thinking he would have wanted to hold a proper consultation process about the proposed repeal of the prescribed hours of work and rest. In fact, it is more likely that he did not want to know what the unions and train drivers thought about fatigue management and prescribed hours of work and rest. The fact is that they support prescribed hours of work and rest

because they protect drivers and the public. I will say that again: they protect drivers and the public. That is what Labor governments are all about. That is what the union movement and the broader labour movement are all about. Perhaps the real reason the LNP is getting rid of prescribed hours of work and rest is that they are supported by unions. The question is: does the LNP have such a pathological dislike of unions that it would be willing to dismiss out of hand anything that the unions remotely supported? The fact that we are here tonight debating this disallowance motion and we had to move it in the first place means that the answer is surely yes.

Labor strongly believes that no worker should ever be forced to do something at work that puts their safety and the safety of others at risk. The research clearly shows that operating a train whilst fatigued increases the crash risk, particularly after eight or nine hours at the controls. Forcing a driver to operate a train when they are fatigued puts the life of the driver and the lives of others at risk.

Prescribing hours of work and rest for train drivers provides a safety net to ensure that no driver is forced to work when they are fatigued. It is as simple as that. I said that my contribution was going to be brief because, to be honest, I am not sure how many other ways we can possibly say that this is an absolutely ridiculous reason for us to move a disallowance motion. This is the sort of thing we have come to expect from this LNP government. It is driven by ideology. It has forced Queenslanders into making a decision at the last election. They thought they were getting one thing and they got a hell of a surprise when they got something else. Queenslanders are bitterly disappointed in this government. Anyone who has anything to do with safety and the rights of workers in this state is absolutely disgusted in this LNP government, and so they should be. That is the sort of thing we have come to expect from it and I do not imagine this will be the last time we will have to have this debate here in the House. I commend to the House the motion moved by the shadow minister for transport.