




Speech By
Linus Power
MEMBER FOR LOGAN

Record of Proceedings, 19 February 2025

REVENUE LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

 **Mr POWER** (Logan—ALP) (5.26 pm): I must declare that I am not a registered medical professional—unlike the previous speaker—but I can diagnose someone who is not telling the truth to this parliament just as easily as anyone else. The good doctor is misleading the House in saying that we did not listen to GPs because we made it absolutely clear when we were the first in the country to put in place the amnesty—

An opposition member interjected.

Mr POWER: This is an interesting interjection; I will get to it. I will come to a press release from the RACGP that says we were the first to actually put that in place. When we put that in place, the RACGP ‘applauded the Queensland government for acting to help keep essential general practice care affordable’. He did not quote that press release! It said the RACGP applauded the government’s decision on this ruling—the ruling that those opposite at that point wanted to eradicate. The press release went on to say—

RACGP Queensland Chair Dr Bruce Willett thanked the Queensland Government for listening to GPs.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I remind everybody on a warning that they are still on a warning.

Mr POWER: I repeat—

RACGP Queensland Chair Dr Bruce Willett thanked the Queensland government for listening to GPs.


We understand that during a campaign campaigners might want to mislead the people of Queensland—cynically. We also understand that they wanted to put forward a talking head who was a doctor but who was willing to mislead the people of Queensland and go against these press releases from their own professional bodies. They were willing to do that to get votes—cynically. What is disappointing is that they have come back into this place and continued to mislead the people of Queensland when it is absolutely on the record that it was the opposite. We put the amnesty in place. We looked for mechanisms to get rid of this. We then said that we would find any other mechanism, including supporting this motion or a motion like it. We are clearly on the record. Those opposite can recognise that they misled people and that the professional bodies of the GPs said the exact opposite at the time—the good doctor knows this but he is willing to, once again, mislead Queenslanders—

Dr ROWAN: I take personal offence and I ask the member for Logan to withdraw.

Mr SPEAKER: The member has taken personal offence. I ask you to withdraw.

Mr POWER: I withdraw. It is very important that we put the truth of this press release on the record. There is only one GP tax that has ever been put forward in Australia and that was Peter Dutton’s GP tax. What did he do? He asked for a \$7 co-payment to be paid to the government—a GP tax on bulk-billing, a GP tax directly on each person who went to the doctor. What did those opposite do when Peter Dutton put forward the GP tax, the real GP tax, not this fake one that is misleading the people of

Queensland? What did they do? There was absolute silence. For seven years after that, Peter Dutton put on a GP tax by stealth by freezing GP payments, effectively forcing bulk-billing out of the system. One person has put forward a GP tax on the people of Queensland: Peter Dutton. Those opposite absolutely know this. If anyone has any doubts, they should come and get the press releases from the AMA and the Royal College of General Practitioners from that time to see the facts.

 **Mr POWER** (Logan—ALP) (7.30 pm), continuing: We heard before how 'Dr Misleading' over there completely distorted the story. He should be referred to the Ethics Committee. He should apologise in this House for being misleading. For the next person who takes on this misleading story, I am going to table two documents which show that the Royal Australian College of General Practitioners and the AMA knew that we were promising to do this and that we had already taken enormous steps to get rid of this tax.

Tabled paper: Article from NewsGP, dated 9 October 2024, titled 'Queensland to abolish GP payroll tax' [110](#).

Tabled paper: Article from NewsGP, dated 14 September 2023, titled 'Payroll tax lifeline for Queensland general practice' [111](#).

This is the story before the election. Royal Australian College of General Practitioners said—

The State Government will permanently ditch its tax grab following years of outcry from GPs, as pressure mounts on other states to follow suit.

Queensland has become the first jurisdiction to permanently exempt GPs from payroll tax.

This is under the former premier, Steven Miles. They continue—

The announcement has led to widespread celebration among the state's GPs ...

Members should read those two documents I have tabled. What anyone else says is completely misleading. The member for Moggill knew this. He knows that he lies and distorts for political advantage.

Dr ROWAN: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order on unparliamentary language. I take personal offence and ask the member to withdraw.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Furner): Member for Logan, the member has taken personal offence.

Mr POWER: I was overcome with emotion. I apologise and withdraw for both. The member for Moggill—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hang on. I have not called you.

Mr Stevens: Withdraw.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Unreservedly.

Mr POWER: I have unreservedly apologised. I never did anything else.

Mr Stevens: Withdraw.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Withdraw.

Mr POWER: Sorry. I withdraw.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you.

Mr POWER: The other option is that he was so ignorant of health policy that he had no idea what he was talking about. Those are the two options we have before us. It is in black and white and I have tabled both documents.

Dr ROWAN: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order again. I take personal offence. The member for Logan continues to flagrantly disregard your direction. I take personal offence and I ask him to withdraw.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Furner): I did not take any understanding that the personal offence was made to you directly.

Mr POWER: I do withdraw. There could have been something that he could have taken personal offence to. I did make a reference to him directly.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: You have withdrawn.

Mr POWER: I want to go on to other distortions. My job is to represent the people of Logan. I have had more growth in the last two years—and with this I include the electorate of Coomera—with new young families moving into the electorate of Logan than any other area of the state.

Mr Crandon: Not true—based on percentages, yes, not based on actual numbers. Get your figures right.

Mr POWER: We will have to settle this dispute later, member for Coomera.

Mr Crandon: Just look at the numbers. When you come from a lower percentage, what are you going to find?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Coomera, there will not be any cross-chamber dialogue on this.

Mr POWER: It is a pretty harmless point of view anyway. First home ownership is really important. We know that there has been a reduction in home ownership, especially for younger people. We know that it is about later family formation, about lower supply, about larger average houses but especially about the cost of younger people getting into home ownership. This is only for homes over \$750,000. In its totality it is only about new builds over \$800,000. There are very few houses in Logan that young people are moving into. Extraordinary claims are being made, not least of which by the member for Moggill, about the effect this would have on the supply of housing. Indeed, he claimed that this would have an enormous effect on supply of housing. As a matter of logic, are people who already have the money to buy a \$750,000 house unlikely to ever move into a house or are they just going to move into perhaps a slightly bigger house? I do not begrudge them that. I think that is a good thing. If we are talking about getting more people in housing, I want to have a look at that.

The statistics in table 1 show that in 1996 we had 65 per cent of our population in home ownership. Then it dipped down in 2016, after the period the LNP were in government, to 62.2 per cent. There was a small but encouraging increase in 2021 to 63.5 per cent. I note that in a press release from the Minister for Housing, the member for Bonney claims that at the end of 2024 it had gone up to 64 per cent. During that period of Labor—that is, from the failings of the LNP government in 2016 to 2024—there had been an encouraging increase of over two per cent. This is a small thing and we want to get it back up to 65 per cent. As I have said, are those people who already have \$750,000 going to buy a house for even more or are they unlikely to be buying a house as a first home? Those opposite know the logical answer to that. I do not want them to make those outlandish claims.

What modelling did they use? The REIQ said they would be 'interested to understand if the government has modelling in relation to this'. We know that they did not bother to model it. The LNP made outlandish claims about the level of public housing and then did no modelling to see whether this policy would be effective. That is exactly what the LNP are about—big talk, big promises. It is a policy that at first blush is not going to contribute to the goal they set. All of their fancy rhetoric about how it was going to explode the number of people in housing and increase the number of people who own their own home of course is completely false. The logic is that anyone who can buy a \$750,000 house and has extra money to pay more than that is going to move into a house regardless.

It is true that in the last 10 years we were one of the few states that saw an increase in the number of people aged 25 to 29 in housing, from 34 per cent to 35.2 per cent. We saw an increase in the number of people aged 30 to 34 in housing, from 47.8 per cent to 48.6 per cent. Again, we saw an increase in the number of people aged 35 to 39 in housing, from 55 per cent to 57.7 per cent. I know that the previous housing minister is unsatisfied with that. She wants to continue to fight for young Queenslanders to get into housing. She also knows that, while it is not bad to provide some relief—and that is why we are supporting this—the overblown rhetoric about changing the percentage of Queenslanders who own their own home is at first blush completely false. Those opposite know this.

(Time expired)