




Speech By  
**Deb Frecklington**

**MEMBER FOR NANANGO**

---

Record of Proceedings, 30 November 2016

**REVENUE AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL**

 **Mrs FRECKLINGTON** (Nanango—LNP) (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (1.43 am): The speaker I follow was planning to be very exciting when he started—

**Mr Minnikin:** He sort of faded, didn't he?

**Mrs FRECKLINGTON:** He did. He faded. I think he forgot that he was being so critical of one of our speakers. It is interesting. I will touch on one thing that the previous speaker just spoke about. That is in relation to the choice of fund and his criticisms. If he knew about this topic, researched it and maybe spoke to the Treasurer he would know that it actually was the LNP treasurer who approved the introduction of portability for QSuper accumulation members. This allowed members to annually transfer the accrued balance of their QSuper account into a fund of their choice. That was a key step forward in terms of the introduction of choice in Queensland. It would be good if speakers in this House did not just come in here and make things up on the run.

It is incredible that we are standing here in the House at 1.44 in the morning debating a bill that was introduced into this House on 16 June. That was during budget week. As has been alluded to, it was introduced two days after the budget was introduced. This is a bill that was introduced into this House on 16 June. The date today is 1 December.

Members would have to ask: how many sitting weeks have we had since then? The committee reported on the bill on 19 August. From 19 August until today we have had five sitting weeks—not five sitting days; but five sitting weeks. We would have to ask the question: what has this Treasurer been doing? If, as members on the other side of the House have been talking about, there is nothing to see in this bill—that is, it is just administrative—then why has this incompetent, lazy Palaszczuk government been sitting on this bill from 19 August to 1 December? They will sneak it in at 1.45 in the morning.

We all know that there are reasons for doing this in the dark of the night. We did not do it during the last five sitting weeks. The Leader of Opposition Business has had it sitting on his agenda. Each week we come here and are very excited to be debating the ROLA Bill, we are all geed up and ready to go, and where is it on the list? It gets bumped off. We would have to ask why it is bumped off. Maybe it is because this Treasurer has an issue with the bill and is not able to get it through.

This bill was reported on by Amy Remeikis in the *Brisbane Times* on 23 August. We miss Amy Remeikis in this House. She has gone to the big house—the federal parliament.

**Government members** interjected.

**Mrs FRECKLINGTON:** They are still awake. On 23 August the lovely Amy Remeikis wrote—

Mr Pitt did not speak on the amendment when introducing the bill. On Tuesday, while attempting to hose down the controversy, he said it was “absolutely absurd to suggest you would go through every clause at the introduction stage of the bill”.

We wonder why. We turn to page 2 of Amy Remeikis's article. It is because we have an ally on this side of House in relation to this issue. That ally would be the Together union's Mr Scott. He said that he was planning to lobby for the amendment to be dropped. These are his words—

"We are very opposed to this element of the bill ...

"We are not worried about its impact, because we think it is very minor. We are worried about the concept that it would introduce.

I wonder where Mr Scott is now at 1.48 in the morning when the Treasurer is having this bill brought into the House. The five previous weeks we have been sitting waiting anxiously to debate the bill. I know the member for Condamine is waiting anxiously to speak to this bill. He has been waiting to speak on this for the last five sitting weeks. He is so keen. He has his lectern ready and is waiting to go. He has been waiting to have his voice heard in relation to this bill. There is absolutely no reason for this bill not being on the agenda before tonight. We know that the guts of this bill is all about raids. It is in Labor's DNA to just raid. It is in Labor's DNA to try to find money where it simply is not.

Let us not forget the \$80 billion worth of debt that we had when we came into government. It was left by those opposite, many of whom were cabinet ministers at the time. The Leader of Government Business was a cabinet minister. The now Treasurer was a cabinet minister. The Minister for Health was a cabinet minister. I name them because they happen to be sitting here in the chamber. They were cabinet ministers and they left the state of Queensland with \$80 billion worth of debt. What are they doing now? What have they found to raid now?

**Government members** interjected.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Ms Farmer): Order! I know we are having a lot of fun with this, but the interjections are getting quite loud, particularly from the Treasurer. Could we keep it a little measured, please, so we can hear the member for Nanango?

**Mrs FRECKLINGTON:** Thank you very much for your protection, Madam Deputy Speaker. Getting back to the bill, as I said, we all know that it is in Labor's DNA to raid, to spend other people's money. That is called 'Labornomics'. We know in this Treasurer's first budget he shifted \$4 billion debt to the government owned corporations and increased their dividend payout to 100 per cent to fund his election commitments. This is something that the Treasurer did not go and talk to the general public about during the election. That was certainly not something that members in this House knew that he planned to do.

He also raided \$3.4 billion from the long service leave funding pool. What a short-sighted raid for the long-term benefit of all Queenslanders. It did not stop there. He stopped making contributions to the fund. He does not even seem to understand that you cannot stop making contributions to the fund because what happens when people decide to leave the fund and they actually want to get their money out? That was just the first budget. Let us move to the second budget.

**Ms Fentiman** interjected.

**Mrs FRECKLINGTON:** I would love to take that interjection. This is the interjection I heard for the benefit of Hansard: 'The people who can add up have said it's fine.' The State Actuary said that it was fine to take—help me out; was it \$2 billion? They said it was fine to take \$2 billion, so the people who can add up took \$4 billion! Last night I stood in this House and I said Christmas is coming and sometimes there are gifts. Sometimes the gifts just keep on coming, and now the Minister for Child Safety has just said that the Treasurer cannot add up. My goodness me, the gifts just keep coming. It is incredible.

Like I say, this is all about raids. Honestly, when we are talking about the Actuary's advice, it was interesting because we know—and it is on record—that the Treasurer ignored the Actuary's advice and ended up, like I say, taking twice the amount. I was getting to that point. The Treasurer took twice the amount that he was recommended to take. We must remember that the Treasurer then wrote to the State Actuary and moved the goalposts on the State Actuary—changed the rules, moved the guidelines—to enable the Actuary to come up with a number big enough to satisfy this Treasurer's thirst for other people's money. Like the shadow Treasurer said, we will be opposing section 68 of this bill, as many people have requested that we do, not limited to the Together union's Alex Scott.

*(Time expired)*