




Speech By  
**Nikki Boyd**

**MEMBER FOR PINE RIVERS**

---

Record of Proceedings, 26 May 2021

### **DEBT REDUCTION AND SAVINGS BILL**

 **Ms BOYD** (Pine Rivers—ALP) (6.51 pm): It is a pleasure to rise this evening to support the Debt Reduction and Savings Bill. I am left through the course of this debate to wonder whether there is anything that those opposite could derive any source of happiness from, because time after time we are struggling to see any happiness coming from those opposite. You would think that when we are talking about debt reduction and savings—the very thing that those opposite bang on about at every given opportunity in their economic jargon—they would be pleased to see a bill such as this come before the House. In fact, we have not—

**Mr Bleijie:** How much is the debt reduced by?

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Ms Lui): Order! Member for Kawana, please cease all interjections.

**Ms BOYD:** I hear the interjections from the member for Kawana—the very member who stands up in this chamber most Tuesdays of a sitting week and debates a business motion about how members—

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Nanango, you have been warned. I will now ask you to leave the chamber.

*Whereupon the honourable member for Nanango withdrew from the chamber at 6.52 pm.*

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Kawana, you were cautioned, I ask you to cease all interjections.

**Ms BOYD:** We come into this place most Tuesdays to debate the business motion and those opposite—namely, the member for Kawana—will tell us how unhappy they are with designated time frames for bills. They tell us how critical they are of government that they all do not have an opportunity to speak on behalf of their communities—

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Pause the clock. The member for Nanango was not formally warned under the standing orders, so she is allowed back in the chamber. Member for Nanango, welcome back. Now you are warned under the standing orders. Member for Pine Rivers, you have the call.

**Ms BOYD:** Perhaps someone should start the stopwatch on that one. They come in here and they argue sitting week after sitting week about how opposition members need more opportunity to speak on bills, yet this evening we find ourselves here in this very strange predicament where opposition members are not taking any opportunity to speak on behalf of their communities on this very important legislation. One is left to wonder if it is just filibustering from the member for Kawana each time we debate the business motion here in the House.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** Madam Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I fail to see how the Business Committee motion debate, of which we have not had for three sitting weeks, is relevant to the debate on the Debt Reduction and Savings Bill. We have not had a Business Committee motion debate because there is nothing on the *Notice Paper* to debate, but I do not think it is relevant to the bill.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Pine Rivers, could you please come back to the long title of the bill?

**Ms BOYD:** Certainly, Madam Deputy Speaker. The point I was getting to is: reflecting on the debate this bill, I am certainly left to wonder whether the opposition have already run out of puff. Certainly that would seem to be the case. I think this bill on debt reduction and savings is particularly perplexing to those opposite. They have been stumped on a number of questions including: why are we finding efficiencies rather than cutting and how is it that we are making savings without cutting workers? I do not think that those opposite can get their head around those two points.

We have seen from their record in government that the LNP hate sensible savings. We know that they simply cannot do it. When we have a look at the track record of the LNP, we have seen 14,000 Queensland workers sacked—4,400 of those were health workers, including 1,800 nurses and midwives.

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Ms BOYD:** I hear the groans and the complaints of those opposite. They do not like their record. Certainly they would be keen to walk away from it. The contributions of those opposite so far in this debate have been about returning a AAA credit rating and what the LNP would do in government.

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The member on her feet has the call. Can we please let her speak?

**Ms BOYD:** I thought I would have more time to research my contribution than I did given that members opposite are no longer talking on this bill and no longer making any contribution and are allowing all the government members to take up the speaking spots. I started some googling, as one does—

**Opposition members:** Googling!

**Ms BOYD:** Googling—yes, absolutely. It is a search engine on the interweb. I suggest members opposite check it out. I came across an interesting read in the *Brisbane Times*—‘LNP unanimously endorses 99-year asset lease plan’. The article talked about how the LNP MPs were called back to Brisbane on Tuesday to vote on the plan. Then premier Mr Newman said that the plan was unanimously endorsed, to every ‘last man and woman’, by the LNP party room.

**Mr Powell** interjected.

**Ms BOYD:** I hear the interjections—

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! Pause the clock. Member for Glass House, you are now warned.

**Ms BOYD:** They talked about how the assets would be leased so they were able to deal with Labor’s debt; how they would create up to 25,000 new jobs—despite the fact that they had just put 14,000 people out of work; how they would deliver \$8.6 billion worth of infrastructure—despite the fact their only infrastructure legacy is the ‘tower of power’ at 1 William Street; and how they would provide \$3.4 billion worth of cost-of-living relief.

What we saw through the asset sell-off plan was that energy assets were included. We know that power prices only go one way when they are privatised, and that is up. This article also talks about how then treasurer Tim Nicholls, the member for Clayfield, travelled 20,000 kilometres around the state while consulting on the plan, so it is little wonder that the member for Clayfield was so salty during this debate. He is that salty that when the sun comes up tomorrow we should roll him out the front and start mining salt from him.

**Mr Saunders** interjected.

**Ms BOYD:** I take that interjection from the member for Maryborough. He is even criticising the member for Maryborough’s footwear.