




Speech By
Linus Power
MEMBER FOR LOGAN

Record of Proceedings, 15 June 2016

TRANSPORT (FEES) AMENDMENT REGULATION (NO. 1)

Disallowance of Statutory Instrument

 **Mr POWER** (Logan—ALP) (8.11 pm): I rise not so much to speak against this motion from the member for Glass House.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr POWER: I rise not so much to speak against it—though I will. I speak in defence of the former treasurer and now, at least briefly, the Leader of the Opposition. I speak in defence of his economic legacy. This motion is a direct attack by the member for Glass House on the new opposition leader—his policy, his treasurership, his economic credentials. This is the moment when the economic credibility of the alternative LNP government is trashed. They surrender any pretence that they could run the economy of this state.

What is worse is that this is not the first time they have put into this House an attack on the Leader of the Opposition. Many may be thinking that this is a 'Libs up the front and Nats up the back' attack, but there are further divisions on show tonight. We know that in the last budget of the Newman-Nicholls government—or should we say Nicholls-Newman government, because we know that the member for Clayfield was behind so many of the disasters of the previous government—they put this budget initiative in place. We know that the entire frontbench voted for it. We know that all who are speaking on it today voted for it. We know that it was contained in the member for Clayfield's final midyear economic review. With this evidence in hand, we know this must be an attack on the member for Clayfield himself—and, frankly, I will not stand for this dastardly attack by the member for Glass House.

I said I would not stand for it and the reasons for this motion. I will not stand for attacks on this basis when they are so hypocritical and when we know there are so many more good reasons why we should be attacking the economic credibility of the Leader of the Opposition, the member for Clayfield. Let us give the ambitious members of the opposition frontbench—who know about the member for Clayfield's failed economic legacy—some more cutting criticisms. Perhaps they could use this in further motions of this sort designed to undermine their own leader. They could undermine his continuing plan to sell assets, which definitely was included in his last budget, which is something that they are again attacking today. We could say his sacking of people, which we know is what the member for Clayfield is most famous for—

Ms LEAHY: Madam Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I ask you to rule on relevance. I am not too sure that sacking public servants is relevant to a registration debate.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Miss Barton): I remind the member for Logan that this is a specific motion with respect to one particular regulation. I ask him to contain his comments to that particular motion.

Mr POWER: We could say that they could look at the way he made all of these economic disasters—not just this one. In this case, we see that the Liberal National Party went to the last election with a failed economic plan to sell off \$30 billion of Queensland assets, but now they have junked that. This is an act of economic vandalism of their own budget. Indeed it is only matched by the vandalism of the assets of Queensland that the LNP took to the last election.

I rose to speak on this motion, as the member for Glass House said, last time. Honestly, it is like groundhog day. We come into this place, the alarm buzzes and the only certainty when the light comes on as the alarm buzzes is the hypocrisy of the—

Mr Watts interjected.

Mr POWER: Trevor, it is the hypocrisy—

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I remind the member for Logan, firstly, to refer to members by their proper title. Also, 'hypocrisy' is an unparliamentary term and I would ask that you withdraw.

Mr Cripps: Is it?

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: That ruling has been made by other Deputy Speakers, member for Hinchinbrook. I would ask that you withdraw the unparliamentary term.

Mr POWER: Member for Hinchinbrook? You said—

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Logan, I have told you that you have used an unparliamentary term, and I would ask that you withdraw it.

Mr POWER: My apologies, Madam Deputy Speaker. You said 'member for Hinchinbrook', but I am happy to withdraw. Your ruling said 'member for Hinchinbrook'.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have asked you to withdraw. Please do so unqualified. Withdraw and continue with your contribution.

Mr POWER: I withdraw. You instructed the member for Hinchinbrook to withdraw. I withdraw.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Logan, I have asked you to withdraw unqualified.

Mr POWER: I have withdrawn unconditionally.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Now I would ask that you continue with your contribution. You have strayed very, very close to reflecting on the chair. I would ask that you continue with your contribution.

Mr POWER: I merely said that you said 'member for Hinchinbrook'.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Logan! I now warn you under standing order 253A. I would ask that you continue with your contribution.

Mr POWER: They went to the election pretending they had a plan for growth. I said this last time because it is groundhog day. We have now found that in the last quarter of the member for Clayfield's dictatorship of the Queensland economy we had reduced growth. We now know that their pretence of growing the economy has been junked too.

As members of parliament, we keenly feel that we wish to provide the services and the infrastructure that the people of the state need, especially the road funding that Queensland drivers rely on. I know on this side we are also keenly aware of the cost that Queenslanders face in the household budget. It is difficult that we must balance the two, and that is our challenge in this place. However, if we cynically attack any measure that raises the revenue needed to provide essential services—and we do so when we know that it was put into their own budget—then we would fail the very Queenslanders who have entrusted us to be here. The public is more and more cynical of those who seek to represent them, and this disallowance motion would further feed into the cynicism that Queenslanders feel about politicians—especially the LNP members opposite who are so cynically seeking to mislead the public through this disallowance motion. They are cynically misleading because they themselves—and we cannot run a counterfactual—put it in their budget to take to the election.

We have heard in this place that the LNP made it clear through their budget, through their campaign, that they had no intention and had not budgeted for anything else other than the same increase. The cynicism of this action is simply breathtaking. Firstly, we all agree that motorised vehicles that travel on Queensland roads should be registered and that the cost of registration should be used to contribute to the cost of those roads that the cars travel upon and for the safety measures that keep car drivers safe. This is the principle that is accepted in all Australian states, so it is worth comparing

the most common types of cars that appear on Australian roads. For instance, for the registration of a four-cylinder car, such as the Mazda2, Queensland is the fourth cheapest state. For a popular selling medium four-cylinder car, such as the Toyota Corolla, Queensland is the second cheapest state. These are cars that many of my constituents drive. I know they feel the burden of the cost of registration, but I also know that they value good roads.

We all live in a huge state and we are rightfully proud of the work needed to connect the whole state through our network of 33,000 kilometres of roads. We recognise that the cost of building these roads increases each year. We know the cost of plant and equipment increases each year, as does the cost of concrete and reinforcing steel bars to build these bridges and flyovers, the cost of traffic light installation and the cost of wages for workers. I know those on the other side have worked hard to make the wages of ordinary workers lower and lower through their attacks on the rights and conditions of workers.

Ms LEAHY: I rise to a point of order in relation to relevance. The cost of wages is not necessarily relevant to the cost of registration.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Miss Barton): Order! Thank you, member for Warrego. Member for Logan, this is the second time that I am asking you to be relevant to the motion that we are debating tonight. It is a very specific motion with respect to part 15 of the regulation. If you do not remain relevant I will have no choice but to ask you to resume your seat. Please continue your contribution.

Mr POWER: As I said, the cost of plant and equipment and the cost of concrete and reinforcing steel bars to build those bridges and, to make it clear for the member for Warrego, the cost of wages for those workers involved in the construction of roads also increases each year. I was interrupted before I could get to that point. I know that those on the other side have worked hard to make the wages of ordinary workers lower and lower through attacks on their rights and conditions. These workers who build our roads endure the danger of fast-moving traffic to build the roads that some—but not on this side of the House—take for granted. We know that being a traffic controller on road sites is one of the most dangerous jobs in Queensland. I say to the member for Warrego that we know that every road, every bridge and every intersection is built by hardworking Queensland workers who support their families, pay their taxes and build their communities.

I represent outer growing suburbs of the western part of Logan. We know that the Wembley Road overpass over the Logan Motorway, the Mount Lindesay Highway, Camp Cable Road, Teviot Road and so many other roads are very important so that people can get home to their families and so they can get to hospitals such as the Logan Hospital, which I know has had increases to the size of the car park that every Logan member values. These are vital for Logan residents to get to work, to shopping, to sport and to visit friends.

We must maintain budget measures. We cannot cynically attack them. I ask the House not to allow this disallowance motion.