



Speech By
Andrew Powell

MEMBER FOR GLASS HOUSE

Record of Proceedings, 10 October 2023

MOTION

Business Program

 **Mr POWELL** (Glass House—LNP) (11.21 am): Far be it from me to disappoint the member for Sandgate and not oppose this motion. In doing so, I want to reflect on some of the comments made by the member for Sandgate around this motion being straightforward. It well may be, but that does not then correlate with it necessarily being sensible. Nor does it correlate with it being appropriate, and nor does it correlate with it being good management. I want to use a couple of examples here. Yes, there is no doubt and I suspect that it will be Labor members themselves who will be guillotined when we conclude the debate on the Criminal Code (Serious Vilification and Hate Crimes) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill at 5.25 pm on Thursday. It will be members of the Labor government, whom I suspect will be wanting to speak extensively on that bill, who will be guillotined.

Let me point out a couple of other things here. What we are seeing in this motion is something we have not seen in previous motions. Regardless of whether an opposition is opposing or supporting a piece of legislation, the opposition should have the opportunity to put questions to a minister on the clauses during consideration in detail of a bill. What we are seeing with the Gas Supply and Other Legislation (Hydrogen Industry Development) Amendment Bill is a maximum of four hours, during which we pull up stumps just 20 minutes before the expiry of that time, only allowing the minister himself to respond and basically negating any consideration in detail whatsoever. Again, I reiterate, the opposition may well support that legislation, but that does not mean the opposition does not have questions on specific clauses that need to be raised with the minister. What that means then is—

Mr Hinchliffe: In committee you had a chance to say these things and you did not.

Mr POWELL: I take that interjection. The suggestion that because questions were not raised in committee that questions do not subsequently get raised in consideration in detail is a very foolish suggestion and a very non-democratic suggestion. Again, allowing the opposition and the crossbenchers to put questions in consideration in detail should be part of any business program motion that is put before this House. I also want to point out the ability to negotiate outcomes in terms of this business program motion as the Manager of Opposition Business.

We have as part of the motion here today a revocation. Yes, it is rare for those in the opposition to oppose a revocation. We all know the importance of our national parks. We also all know the benefits of sometimes having to revoke parts of a national park. This one, though, is considerable. If I recall correctly, it is some 17 pages of maps and detail across some 20 different state forests and national parks which impact on a broad number of members here in this chamber. The original proposal put to me as Manager of Opposition Business was 40 minutes. I suggested a sensible allowance of maybe an hour. The negotiated outcome was 50 minutes—50 minutes to consider significant revocations of national parks around the state. I suspect the Leader of the House, rather than the Acting Leader of the House, may have been far more generous if she had been present. I noticed a tiredness from the Acting Leader of the House that is not normally present in those meetings.

I do acknowledge—and again it points out that I think we will be finding our debate on these pieces of legislation significantly curtailed—that there are going to be many introductions this week. Again, that is because those opposite have an inability to manage the *Notice Paper*. It would not take a rocket scientist to look at the *Notice Paper* and realise that we are going to run out of bills before the end of this parliamentary year and that the government does need to quickly rush in a number of pieces of legislation and that is not even considering what we would be debating when we return in 2024. Again, why they are stacking a sitting week with all of these introductions, rather than pacing them out over a number of sitting weeks, is beyond me. That does not suggest good management. That suggests mismanagement.

I do also acknowledge that there is a condolence motion for former premier Mike Ahern, a member who represented the area that I now represent as the member for Glass House. I accept and rightly understand that that condolence motion will take considerable time. Again, I anticipate that there will be members on both sides of this chamber and the crossbench who, because of the guillotine, will not be able to make contributions come 5.25 pm on Thursday afternoon whilst we are still in the middle of the serious vilification and hate crimes legislation. The opposition cannot and will not support this motion.