



# RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Hansard Home Page: <http://www.parliament.qld.gov.au/work-of-assembly/hansard>  
 Email: [hansard@parliament.qld.gov.au](mailto:hansard@parliament.qld.gov.au)  
 Phone (07) 3406 7314 Fax (07) 3210 0182

## FIRST SESSION OF THE FIFTY-FOURTH PARLIAMENT

### Thursday, 22 May 2014

Subject	Page
<b>ASSENT TO BILLS</b> .....	<b>1761</b>
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, dated 21 May 2014, from Her Excellency the Governor to the Speaker advising of assent to bills on 21 May 2014.....	
	1761
<b>PETITIONS</b> .....	<b>1762</b>
<b>TABLED PAPERS</b> .....	<b>1762</b>
<b>MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS</b> .....	<b>1764</b>
<b>G20 Cultural Celebrations</b> .....	<b>1764</b>
<b>Federal Budget</b> .....	<b>1765</b>
<b>Royalties for the Regions</b> .....	<b>1766</b>
<b>Queensland Economy</b> .....	<b>1767</b>
<b>Parliamentary Inquiry, Crime</b> .....	<b>1767</b>
<b>Education Accord</b> .....	<b>1768</b>
<b>Mental Health</b> .....	<b>1768</b>
<b>Active Kids</b> .....	<b>1769</b>
<b>MOTION</b> .....	<b>1770</b>
<b>Referral to the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee</b> .....	<b>1770</b>
<b>MOTION</b> .....	<b>1771</b>
<b>Referral to the Transport, Housing and Local Government Committee</b> .....	<b>1771</b>
<b>QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE</b> .....	<b>1772</b>
<b>Boot Camps</b> .....	<b>1772</b>
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Department of Justice and Attorney-General Briefs for Decision [RTI 140695], dated 16 July 2013 and 10 July 2013, regarding Fraser Coast/Sunshine Coast Early Intervention Youth Boot Camp Procurement process.....	
	1772
<b>Government Tender Process</b> .....	<b>1772</b>
<b>Overseas Investment</b> .....	<b>1773</b>

Table of Contents – Thursday, 22 May 2014

<b>Boot Camps</b> .....	<b>1774</b>
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Media release, dated 21 August 2013, from the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice, Hon. Jarrod Bleijie, titled 'Boot camps ready to roll out' .....	
	1774
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Article from the <i>Courier-Mail</i> , dated 22 May 2014, titled 'Six million reasons to say sorry: From Mein Kampf to mine camp, Labor MP stands for stupidity' .....	
	1775
<b>Regional Queensland, Economic Growth</b> .....	<b>1775</b>
<b>Member for Stafford</b> .....	<b>1775</b>
<b>Trade Initiatives</b> .....	<b>1776</b>
<b>Sale of Public Assets</b> .....	<b>1777</b>
<b>Workers Compensation</b> .....	<b>1778</b>
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Article, dated 20 May 2014, by member for Mulgrave, Mr Curtis Pitt MP, titled 'Desperate LNP take credit for Labor's Workcover premium decrease: Pitt' .....	
	1778
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, dated 21 May 2014, from Mr Glen Ferguson, Chair, WorkCover Queensland to Attorney-General and Minister for Justice, Hon. Jarrod Bleijie, regarding WorkCover Queensland premium announcement for 2014/15. ....	
	1778
<b>Federal Budget</b> .....	<b>1779</b>
<b>Tourism, Palm Island</b> .....	<b>1779</b>
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Palm Island Open Day 16 April 2014—Final Report by Allison Rossetto and Tony O'Connor. ....	
	1780
<b>Moranbah, Fly-In Fly-Out</b> .....	<b>1780</b>
<b>Road Safety, Motorcyclists</b> .....	<b>1781</b>
<b>Goods and Services Tax</b> .....	<b>1781</b>
<b>Police Service</b> .....	<b>1782</b>
<b>Health Services</b> .....	<b>1783</b>
<b>SPEAKER'S STATEMENT</b> .....	<b>1783</b>
<b>School Group Tours</b> .....	<b>1783</b>
<b>STATE DEVELOPMENT, INFRASTRUCTURE AND INDUSTRY COMMITTEE</b> .....	<b>1784</b>
<b>Report No. 38, Motion to Take Note</b> .....	<b>1784</b>
<b>HEALTH AND COMMUNITY SERVICES COMMITTEE</b> .....	<b>1784</b>
<b>Report No. 49, Motion to Take Note</b> .....	<b>1784</b>
<b>MOTION</b> .....	<b>1784</b>
<b>Amendment to Standing Orders</b> .....	<b>1784</b>
Division: Question put—That the motion be agreed to. ....	
	1792
Resolved in the affirmative. ....	
	1792
<b>MOTIONS</b> .....	<b>1792</b>
<b>Suspension of Standing and Sessional Orders</b> .....	<b>1792</b>
<b>Member for Bundamba</b> .....	<b>1792</b>
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Photograph of the Premier posted on twitter. ....	
	1801
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Bundle of photographs. ....	
	1801
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Article from www.smh.com.au, dated 9 May 2014, titled 'Union apologies for Tony Abbott 'Nazi' portrayal'. ....	
	1802
Division: Question put—That the Leader of the Opposition's amendment be agreed to. ....	
	1803
Resolved in the negative. ....	
	1803
Division: Question put—That the motion be agreed to. ....	
	1803
Resolved in the affirmative. ....	
	1803
<b>ETHICS COMMITTEE</b> .....	<b>1803</b>
<b>Report</b> .....	<b>1803</b>
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Ethics Committee: Report No. 147—Matter of privilege referred by the Speaker on 12 February 2014 relating to an alleged failure of a member to declare an interest to the House. ....	
	1803
<b>DOMESTIC AND FAMILY VIOLENCE PROTECTION AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL</b> .....	<b>1803</b>
<b>Introduction</b> .....	<b>1803</b>
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2014. ....	
	1803
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2014, explanatory notes. ....	
	1803
<b>First Reading</b> .....	<b>1804</b>
<b>Referral to the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee</b> .....	<b>1804</b>
<b>WEAPONS (DIGITAL 3D AND PRINTED FIREARMS) AMENDMENT BILL</b> .....	<b>1804</b>
<b>Introduction</b> .....	<b>1804</b>
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Weapons (Digital 3D and Printed Firearms) Amendment Bill 2014. ....	
	1804
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Weapons (Digital 3D and Printed Firearms) Amendment Bill 2014, explanatory notes. ....	
	1804
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Queensland Parliamentary Library research brief, dated 30 April 2104, regarding 3D Printed Guns. ....	
	1805
<b>First Reading</b> .....	<b>1805</b>
<b>Referral to the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee</b> .....	<b>1805</b>
<b>MEMBERS' STATEMENTS</b> .....	<b>1805</b>
<b>Merrimac State High School</b> .....	<b>1805</b>
<b>Bundaberg Electorate, Disaster Recovery</b> .....	<b>1806</b>
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Non-conforming petition regarding flood funding for flood mitigation regarding the Burnett River and tributaries. ....	
	1806

Table of Contents – Thursday, 22 May 2014

<b>Mundingburra Electorate, Malayali Association .....</b>	<b>1806</b>
<b>Currumbin Electorate, Events; Neighbourhood Watch .....</b>	<b>1807</b>
<b>Fibrodysplasia Ossificans Progressiva .....</b>	<b>1808</b>
<b>Drug Abuse; Mount Crosby, Speed Limit .....</b>	<b>1808</b>
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Non-conforming petition regarding the memorial for Allison Baden-Clay and the speed limit on Mount Crosby Road. ....	1809
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Non-conforming petition regarding the speed limit on Mount Crosby Road at Ugly Gully. ....	1809
<b>Australian Tourism Exchange.....</b>	<b>1809</b>
<b>Construction Industry, Member for Cairns.....</b>	<b>1809</b>
<b>Emerald, St Brigid's Primary School .....</b>	<b>1810</b>
<b>Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Month .....</b>	<b>1811</b>
<b>Burdekin Electorate, Achievements.....</b>	<b>1811</b>
<b>Tinaroo Falls Dam, Redclaw .....</b>	<b>1812</b>
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Non-conforming petition regarding the re-stocking of redclaw in Lake Tinaroo. ....	1812
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Bundle of submissions regarding the decline of Redclaw in Lake Tinaroo. ....	1812
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Article from the <i>Tablelander</i> , dated 18 March 2014, titled 'Redclaw be dammed'. ....	1812
<b>Pacific Golf Club .....</b>	<b>1813</b>
<b>Palm Island Open Day.....</b>	<b>1813</b>
<b>Glass House Volunteer Awards 2014.....</b>	<b>1814</b>
<b>Stretton Electorate, Small Business .....</b>	<b>1815</b>
<b>State Forests and National Parks.....</b>	<b>1815</b>
<b>Algerie Electorate, Community Events.....</b>	<b>1816</b>
<b>Uranium Mining, Townsville Public Forum.....</b>	<b>1816</b>
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Non-conforming petition regarding uranium mining in Queensland.....	1817
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Bundle of media articles from the <i>Townsville Bulletin</i> regarding uranium mining. ....	1817
<b>Sunnybank Electorate, Cathay Community Association.....</b>	<b>1817</b>
<b>Mount Coot-tha Electorate, Initiatives; Milton, Volunteers Week.....</b>	<b>1818</b>
<b>Volunteers Week .....</b>	<b>1818</b>
<b>Chappy Week .....</b>	<b>1819</b>
<b>Volunteers Week .....</b>	<b>1820</b>
<b>Murrumba Electorate, Events; Anzac Day .....</b>	<b>1820</b>
<b>Acton, Mr G.....</b>	<b>1821</b>
<b>Labor Party .....</b>	<b>1821</b>
<b>Redlands Electorate, Events; Dooley, Mr DH .....</b>	<b>1822</b>
<b>PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERS AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL.....</b>	<b>1823</b>
<b>Message from Governor .....</b>	<b>1823</b>
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Message, dated 21 May 2014, from Her Excellency the Governor, recommending the Professional Engineers and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2014. ....	1823
<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>1823</b>
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Professional Engineers and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2014. ....	1823
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Professional Engineers and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2014, explanatory notes. ....	1823
<b>First Reading .....</b>	<b>1825</b>
<b>Referral to the Transport, Housing and Local Government Committee .....</b>	<b>1825</b>
<b>Portfolio Committee, Reporting Date .....</b>	<b>1825</b>
<b>COMMITTEE OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY .....</b>	<b>1825</b>
<b>Portfolio Committee, Reporting Date .....</b>	<b>1825</b>
<b>ELECTORAL REFORM AMENDMENT BILL .....</b>	<b>1825</b>
<b>Second Reading .....</b>	<b>1825</b>
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Electoral Reform Amendment Bill 2013, explanatory notes to Mrs Liz Cunningham's amendments. ....	1832
Division: Question put—That the bill be now read a second time. ....	1852
Resolved in the affirmative.....	1852
<b>Consideration in Detail .....</b>	<b>1852</b>
Clauses 1 to 3, as read, agreed to. ....	1852
Clause 4— .....	1852
Non-government amendment (Mrs Cunningham) negated. ....	1852
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Electoral Reform Amendment Bill 2013, explanatory notes to Hon. Jarrod Bleijie's amendments.....	1853
Clause 4, as amended, agreed to. ....	1853
Clause 5— .....	1853
Division: Question put—That clause 5, as amended, be agreed to. ....	1853
Resolved in the affirmative.....	1853
Clause 5, as amended, agreed to. ....	1853
Insertion of new clause— .....	1853
Non-government amendment (Mrs Cunningham) negated. ....	1853
Clauses 6 to 8, as read, agreed to. ....	1853
Clause 9— .....	1853
Division: Question put—That clause 9, as read, be agreed to. ....	1854
Resolved in the affirmative.....	1854
Clause 9, as read, agreed to.....	1855

## Table of Contents – Thursday, 22 May 2014

Clauses 10 and 11, as read, agreed to .....	1855
Clause 12—.....	1855
Clause 12, as amended, agreed to .....	1855
Clauses 13 and 14, as read, agreed to .....	1855
Clause 15—.....	1855
Clause 15, as amended, agreed to .....	1855
Clause 16—.....	1855
Division: Question put—That the member for Gladstone’s amendments be agreed to .....	1856
Resolved in the negative.....	1856
Non-government amendments (Mrs Cunningham) negatived.....	1856
Clause 16, as read, agreed to.....	1856
Clauses 17 to 23, as read, agreed to .....	1856
Clause 24—.....	1856
Division: Question put—That the Attorney-General’s amendment be agreed to .....	1856
Resolved in the affirmative.....	1856
Division: Question put—That clause 24, as amended, stand part of the bill.....	1857
Resolved in the affirmative.....	1857
Clause 24, as amended, agreed to .....	1857
Clauses 25 to 35, as read, agreed to .....	1857
Clause 36—.....	1857
Division: Question put—That clause 36, as amended, stand part of the bill.....	1857
Resolved in the affirmative.....	1857
Clause 36, as amended, agreed to .....	1857
Clause 37—.....	1858
Clause 37, as amended, agreed to .....	1858
Clause 38—.....	1858
Division: Question put—That the member for Gladstone’s amendment No. 6 be agreed to.....	1858
Resolved in the negative.....	1858
Non-government amendment (Mrs Cunningham) negatived .....	1858
Clause 38, as amended, agreed to .....	1859
Clauses 39 to 48, as read, agreed to .....	1859
Clause 49—.....	1859
Division: Question put—That the member for Gladstone’s amendment Nos 7 to 18 be agreed to ..	1860
Resolved in the negative.....	1860
Non-government amendments (Mrs Cunningham) negatived.....	1860
Division: Question put—That clause 49, as amended, stand part of the bill.....	1861
Resolved in the affirmative .....	1861
Clause 49, as amended, agreed to .....	1861
Clauses 50 and 51, as read, agreed to .....	1861
Clause 52—.....	1861
Division: Question put—That the Attorney’s amendments 11 and 12 be agreed to .....	1861
Resolved in the affirmative.....	1861
Division: Question put—That clause 52, as amended, stand part of the bill.....	1864
Resolved in the affirmative.....	1864
Clause 52, as amended, agreed to .....	1864
Clause 53—.....	1864
Division: Question put—That clause 53, as amended, stand part of the bill.....	1864
Resolved in the affirmative.....	1865
Clause 53, as amended, agreed to .....	1865
Clause 54—.....	1865
Division: Question put—That clause 54, as amended, stand part of the bill.....	1865
Resolved in the affirmative.....	1865
Clause 54, as amended, agreed to .....	1865
Clause 55—.....	1865
Division: Question put—That clause 55, as amended, be agreed to.....	1865
Resolved in the affirmative.....	1865
Clause 55, as amended, agreed to .....	1866
Clause 56—.....	1866
Division: Question put—That clause 56, as amended, be agreed to.....	1866
Resolved in the affirmative.....	1866
Clause 56, as amended, agreed to .....	1866
Clause 57—.....	1866
Division: Question put—That clause 57, as amended, be agreed to.....	1866
Resolved in the affirmative.....	1866
Clause 57, as amended, agreed to .....	1866
Clause 58—.....	1867
Division: Question put—That clause 58, as amended, be agreed to.....	1867
Resolved in the affirmative.....	1867
Clause 58, as amended, agreed to .....	1867
Clause 59—.....	1867
Division: Question put—That clause 59, as read, be agreed to .....	1868
Resolved in the affirmative.....	1868
Clause 59, as read, agreed to.....	1868

Table of Contents – Thursday, 22 May 2014

Clauses 60 to 78—	1868
Division: Question put—That clauses 60 to 78, as amended, be agreed to	1869
Resolved in the affirmative	1869
Clauses 60 to 78, as amended, agreed to	1869
<b>Third Reading</b>	<b>1870</b>
Division: Question put—That the bill, as amended, be now read a third time	1870
Resolved in the affirmative	1870
<b>Long Title</b>	<b>1870</b>
<b>ENVIRONMENTAL OFFSETS BILL</b>	<b>1870</b>
<b>Second Reading</b>	<b>1870</b>
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Agriculture, Resources and Environment Committee: Report No. 40—	
Environmental Offsets Bill 2014, government response	1871
Division: Question put—That the bill be now read a second time	1887
Resolved in the affirmative	1887
<b>Consideration in Detail</b>	<b>1887</b>
Clauses 1 to 147—	1887
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Environmental Offsets Bill 2014, explanatory notes to Hon. Andrew Powell's	
amendments	1894
Clauses 1 to 147, as amended, agreed to	1894
Schedules 1 and 2—	1894
Schedules 1 and 2, as amended, agreed to	1894
<b>Third Reading</b>	<b>1894</b>
<b>Long Title</b>	<b>1895</b>
<b>MINISTERIAL STATEMENT</b>	<b>1895</b>
<b>Error in Answer to Question</b>	<b>1895</b>
<b>SPECIAL ADJOURNMENT</b>	<b>1895</b>
<b>ADJOURNMENT</b>	<b>1895</b>
<b>Cultural Precinct Master Plan</b>	<b>1895</b>
<b>Pine Rivers Electorate, Schools</b>	<b>1896</b>
<b>Campbell, Mr G</b>	<b>1896</b>
<b>Ipswich Show</b>	<b>1897</b>
<b>Racing Queensland</b>	<b>1897</b>
<b>Gimblett, Ms G, OAM; Boonah Show; Marburg Show</b>	<b>1898</b>
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Queensland Country Life article, dated 8 May 2014, page 87, regarding the	
Marburg show	1898
<b>Lengyel, Ms O; Holocaust Remembrance Day</b>	<b>1899</b>
<b>Nicklín Electorate, Community Services</b>	<b>1899</b>
<b>Crows Nest Show; Justices of the Peace</b>	<b>1900</b>
<b>ATTENDANCE</b>	<b>1900</b>

## THURSDAY, 22 MAY 2014

---



The Legislative Assembly met at 9.30 am.

Madam Speaker (Hon. Fiona Simpson, Maroochydore) read prayers and took the chair.

### ASSENT TO BILLS

**Madam SPEAKER:** Honourable members, I have to report that I have received from Her Excellency the Governor a letter in respect of assent to certain bills, the contents of which will be incorporated in the *Record of Proceedings*. I table the letter for the information of members.

The Honourable F. Simpson MP  
Speaker of the Legislative Assembly  
Parliament House  
George Street  
BRISBANE QLD 4000

I hereby acquaint the Legislative Assembly that the following Bills, having been passed by the Legislative Assembly and having been presented for the Royal Assent, were assented to in the name of Her Majesty The Queen on the date shown:

Date of assent: 21 May 2014

"A Bill for an Act to establish the Public Safety Business Agency and for related purposes, to amend this Act, the Disaster Management Act 2003, the Fire and Rescue Service Act 1990, the Drugs Misuse Act 1986, the Evidence Act 1977, the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act 2000, the Police Service Administration Act 1990, the Police Service Administration Regulation 1990, the Prostitution Act 1999 and the Public Service Act 2008 for particular purposes and to make consequential and minor amendments of other legislation as stated in schedule 1 for purposes related to those particular purposes"

"A Bill for An Act to provide for the administration of trust accounts held by agents regulated under the Debt Collectors (Field Agents and Collection Agents) Act 2014, the Motor Dealers and Chattel Auctioneers Act 2014 and the Property Occupations Act 2014, to establish a claim fund to compensate persons in particular circumstances for financial loss arising from dealings with agents, and for related purposes"

"A Bill for An Act to comprehensively provide for the regulation of the activities and conduct of debt collectors and subagents and to protect consumers against particular undesirable practices, and to make minor and consequential amendments of this Act, the Fire and Rescue Service Act 1990 and the State Penalties Enforcement Act 1999 for particular purposes"

"A Bill for An Act to provide comprehensively for the regulation of the activities, licensing and conduct of motor dealers and chattel auctioneers and their employees, to protect consumers against particular undesirable practices, and to make minor and consequential amendments of this Act, the Criminal Organisation Act 2009, the Duties Act 2001, the Forestry Act 1959, the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act 2000, the Public Trustee Act 1978, the Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal Act 2009, the Second-hand Dealers and Pawnbrokers Act 2003 and the Transport Operations (Road Use Management) Act 1995"

"A Bill for An Act to provide for the regulation of the activities, licensing and conduct of property agents and resident letting agents and their employees and to protect consumers against particular undesirable practices, to amend the Body Corporate and Community Management Act 1997 and the Youth Justice Act 1992 for particular purposes, and to make minor and consequential amendments of the Acts stated in schedule 2 for particular purposes"

"A Bill for An Act to amend the Crime and Misconduct Act 2001, the Public Service Act 2008 and the Public Service Regulation 2008 for particular purposes, and to make minor and consequential amendments to the legislation mentioned in schedule 2"

"A Bill for An Act about the management of State-owned training assets for the provision of vocational education and training, in accordance with sound commercial principles, and for related purposes"

"A Bill for An Act to amend the TAFE Queensland Act 2013 to provide for the establishment and regulation of dual sector entities and to amend the Central Queensland University Act 1998 for related purposes"

"A Bill for An Act to streamline the regulation of apprenticeships and traineeships, to establish a robust and modern legislative framework for training and to make minor and consequential amendments to other legislation as stated in schedule 1"

These Bills are hereby transmitted to the Legislative Assembly, to be numbered and forwarded to the proper Officer for enrolment, in the manner required by law.

Yours sincerely

Governor

21 May 2014

*Tabled paper:* Letter, dated 21 May 2014, from Her Excellency the Governor to the Speaker advising of assent to bills on 21 May 2014 [\[5157\]](#).

## PETITIONS

The Clerk presented the following paper and e-petition, lodged and sponsored by the honourable member indicated—

### Gladstone Ports Corporation Ltd

**Hon. Palaszczuk**, from 615 petitioners, requesting the House to reject any plans to privatise the Gladstone Ports Corporation Ltd through a 99-year lease over the port and its operations [[5158](#), [5159](#)].

The Clerk presented the following paper and e-petition, sponsored and lodged by the Clerk in accordance with Standing Orders 119(3) and (4)—

### Brisbane, Public Safety

From 767 petitioners, requesting the House to review public safety in Brisbane by reviewing police coverage, public path lighting, closed circuit television, evening public transport timetables and other initiatives [[5160](#), [5161](#)].

The Clerk presented the following e-petition, sponsored by the honourable member indicated—

### Kallangur State School

**Mrs Miller**, from 141 petitioners, requesting the House to immediately remove Kallangur State School land from the Partial Schools Disposals list and commit to never subdividing and selling the play area the children use during lunch breaks [[5162](#)].

Petitions received.

## TABLED PAPERS

### MINISTERIAL PAPER TABLED BY THE CLERK

The following ministerial paper was tabled by the Clerk—

Attorney-General and Minister for Justice (Mr Bleijie)—

[5163](#) Response from the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice (Mr Bleijie) to an ePetition (2181-13) sponsored by Mrs Cunningham from 2,763 petitioners, requesting the House to remove the more than 5% permanent impairment threshold contained in the newly amended section 237 of the Workers' Compensation and Rehabilitation Act 2003

### REPORT TABLED BY THE CLERK

The following report was tabled by the Clerk—

[5164](#) Report pursuant to Standing Order 165 (Clerical errors or formal changes to any Bill) detailing amendments to certain Bills, made by the Clerk, prior to assent by Her Excellency the Governor, viz—

#### Agents Financial Administration Bill 2013

Amendments made to Bill

##### Short title and consequential references to short title—

*Omit—*

Agents Financial Administration Act 2013

*Insert—*

Agents Financial Administration Act 2014

##### Long title and consequential references to short titles of related legislation\*—

*Omit—*

Debt Collectors (Field Agents and Collection Agents) Act 2013

*Insert—*

Debt Collectors (Field Agents and Collection Agents) Act 2014

*Omit—*

Motor Dealers and Chattel Auctioneers Act 2013

*Insert—*

Motor Dealers and Chattel Auctioneers Act 2014

*Omit—*

Property Occupations Act 2013

*Insert—*

Property Occupations Act 2014

**Consequential references to short titles of related legislation\*—***Omit—*

Fair Trading Inspectors Act 2013

*Insert—*

Fair Trading Inspectors Act 2014

**Debt Collectors (Field Agents and Collection Agents) Bill 2013**

Amendments made to Bill

**Short title and consequential references to short title—***Omit—*

Debt Collectors (Field Agents and Collection Agents) Act 2013

*Insert—*

Debt Collectors (Field Agents and Collection Agents) Act 2014

**Consequential references to short titles of related legislation\*—***Omit—*

Agents Financial Administration Act 2013

*Insert—*

Agents Financial Administration Act 2014

*Omit—*

Fair Trading Inspectors Act 2013

*Insert—*

Fair Trading Inspectors Act 2014

*Omit—*

Motor Dealers and Chattel Auctioneers Act 2013

*Insert—*

Motor Dealers and Chattel Auctioneers Act 2014

*Omit—*

Property Occupations Act 2013

*Insert—*

Property Occupations Act 2014

**Motor Dealers and Chattel Auctioneers Bill 2013**

Amendments made to Bill

**Short title and consequential references to short title—***Omit—*

Motor Dealers and Chattel Auctioneers Act 2013

*Insert—*

Motor Dealers and Chattel Auctioneers Act 2014

**Consequential references to short titles of related legislation\*—***Omit—*

Agents Financial Administration Act 2013

*Insert—*

Agents Financial Administration Act 2014

*Omit—*

Debt Collectors (Field Agents and Collection Agents) Act 2013

*Insert—*

Debt Collectors (Field Agents and Collection Agents) Act 2014

*Omit—*

Fair Trading Inspectors Act 2013

*Insert—*

Fair Trading Inspectors Act 2014

*Omit—*

Property Occupations Act 2013

*Insert—*

Property Occupations Act 2014

### **Property Occupations Bill 2013**

Amendments made to Bill

#### **Short title and consequential references to short title—**

*Omit—*

Property Occupations Act 2013

*Insert—*

Property Occupations Act 2014

#### **Consequential references to short titles of related legislation\*—**

*Omit—*

Agents Financial Administration Act 2013

*Insert—*

Agents Financial Administration Act 2014

*Omit—*

Debt Collectors (Field Agents and Collection Agents) Act 2013

*Insert—*

Debt Collectors (Field Agents and Collection Agents) Act 2014

*Omit—*

Fair Trading Inspectors Act 2013

*Insert—*

Fair Trading Inspectors Act 2014

*Omit—*

Motor Dealers and Chattel Auctioneers Act 2013


*Insert—*

Motor Dealers and Chattel Auctioneers Act 2014

\* Bills introduced in 2013 and passed in 2014.

## **MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS**

### **G20 Cultural Celebrations**


 **Hon. CKT NEWMAN** (Ashgrove—LNP) (Premier) (9.32 am): It is of note this morning that on 22 May 1860 the Queensland parliament met for the very first time here in the City of Brisbane and that was after the act of separation in 1859, the arrival of the first Governor, Sir George Bowen, and elections that were held around March-April 1860. So today is an auspicious date for this parliament.

Brisbane will be up in lights in the lead-up to the G20 Leaders Summit in November—and Queenslanders will play a big part. A major interactive lighting and projection project will beam over iconic buildings across the city, allowing the display to be changed with the touch of a button, showing off Brisbane to the world. Creative director Jono Perry, who has given us so many spectacular displays as part of the Brisbane Festival, will bring this project to life. This afternoon I will be with some year 1 students as we get a sneak peek of what is to come.

A project of this magnitude takes a lot of planning and will create jobs for people in the creative industries and across the community. This lighting display is just part of a wider cultural celebration, giving Queensland the chance to show off as the eyes of the world are on us—and giving Queenslanders an opportunity to share in the occasion. They will do that by celebrating with community based activities which will not cost anything. They are free events throughout the suburbs of Brisbane and there will be also be signature events in the CBD. Whether it is a Latin dance extravaganza, music programs in venues all over Brisbane, the interactive lighting and projection display or a community-driven project, there will be a lot of ways that different people can be involved. The project will have something for everyone and will go over several weeks in the lead-up to the summit.

We have been working hard to foster our local talent and the G20 Cultural Celebrations will allow us to show them to a global audience. The G20 Cultural Celebrations demonstrates our commitment to delivering on our Arts for All Queenslanders policy. Whether you are a local or some of the many thousands of international visitors arriving before the leaders summit, you will take away a memorable experience from the G20 Cultural Celebrations.

### Federal Budget

 **Hon. CKT NEWMAN** (Ashgrove—LNP) (Premier) (9.35 am): Turning to another issue this morning, I have been somewhat surprised that some people—commentators and political figures—still seem to be a little unclear as to why premiers and first ministers are concerned about aspects of the federal budget. So I thought this morning that I should very quickly provide just a bit of detail about some of the budgetary impacts that will occur in the immediate next financial year. The particular concern in that area is the unilateral termination of national partnership agreements, signed between the Commonwealth and the states, that had two or three years to run.

A quick summary is as follows: preventive health funding has been cut from 1 July 2014—so that is the National Partnership Agreement on Preventive Health. To give you a feel, these are just some of the organisations that we have back-to-back arrangements with who are working in this space: for example, QUT for the TRIM Kids Program. We heard only yesterday about concerns of childhood obesity and a lack of participation in sport and exercise. QUT were undertaking work for the Queensland government funded by this NPA and this NPA is terminated from 1 July. But QUT were expecting to receive another \$2.43 million between 1 July and 30 October 2016.

Another QUT funded program within this NPA is the Healthy Eating and Physical Activity in Early Childhood program, which would see another \$1.26 million going to them up to 30 June 2016. These are real issues. This is a real program. The government now has the dilemma about how we deal with the termination of federal funding.

Let's go to some other organisations. The Diabetic Association of Queensland was expecting \$154,000. The Queensland Association of School Tuckshops was expecting \$154,000. The Playgroup Association was expecting \$385,000. The Queensland Children's Activities Network was expecting \$161,000. When I say 'expecting', they had every reason to expect that funding. So I say to federal members and senators from Queensland: 'Have a look at the budget. Have a look at the detail of the budget. These are issues that you need to confront head on.'

If I turn to some other areas, there are cuts to the program that allows us and other states and territories to fund discounts to seniors and pensioners. Let me tell you about that. In the state budget for this financial year \$486 million goes directly to certain concessions, but of that about 10 per cent has been received from the federal government to support the program. This will impact on pensioner and senior concessions in electricity, rates, water, natural gas, motor vehicles and public transport.


There is also a termination of a national partnership that provides concessions for visiting seniors from other states. There are the issues over the NRAS scheme. There is the termination of a funding program which is known as the aged care payroll tax supplement, where aged-care facilities are provided with some financial support from the Commonwealth to help meet their payroll tax

obligations to state and territory governments. Local governments in Queensland are losing out because of the freezing of the federal assistance grants funding escalation. It is believed that the cuts to health are equivalent to 1,200 subacute beds right across this nation.

I say again today that there are real cuts from 1 July that all federal members and senators in Queensland and other states should be having a close look at. That is what the Premiers and first ministers are about. That is what we are saying, and that is why people need to stand up and be counted, particularly the Senate which is the states house.

Before I conclude I have one thing to say and that is in relation to high insurance premiums in North and Far North Queensland. This is a very big issue, but who regulates the insurance industry? That is right: the federal government. It is the federal government that needs to provide solutions. The state has already indicated the things that we are prepared to do, but it is time for action from the federal government. The member for Leichhardt and the member for Kennedy in particular need to stand up and be counted in the federal parliament. That is where the action is on this issue. That is where the regulation is for the insurance industry. It is time for an end to the hollow words. We need real action from those individuals.

### **Royalties for the Regions**

 **Hon. JW SEENEY** (Callide—LNP) (Deputy Premier and Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning) (9.40 am): Today I am pleased to announce some details of another successful round of our government's Royalties for the Regions program, an essential part of our strong plan to provide a brighter future for regional Queensland. For me, this program symbolises the vast difference in approach between our government and the former Labor administration when it comes to country towns and country people. Within months of our election we delivered on our promise to make it our priority to invest in critical infrastructure in Queensland's regions, and the vehicle we have used to do that is our Royalties for the Regions program. Regional Queensland is critically important in our government's determination to grow the four pillars of our economy, especially tourism, agriculture and the resources pillars.


Our LNP government has a strong plan to support the growth of our regions. We committed to spend \$495 million over four years in upgrading roads, bridges and airports, improving water and sewage infrastructure and community facilities. At the start of round 3, the Royalties for the Regions program had already delivered \$250 million in funding to more than 39 councils across Queensland supporting 235 kilometres of road upgrades, community infrastructure and flood mitigation projects.

By this weekend the Queensland government will have announced that 19 regional councils have additionally been successful in securing round 3 Royalties for the Regions funding for a further 23 projects. Yet again this round will help councils deliver a mix of infrastructure projects including road and airport upgrades and even a new natural history museum at Eromanga. In the past month I have thoroughly enjoyed travelling across country Queensland to announce successful round 3 funding applications in Carpentaria, Cloncurry, Flinders, Livingstone, Mount Isa and North Burnett councils, but the highlight was when I visited the tiny Gulf town of Karumba to tell the kids of Karumba that they were finally going to get a swimming pool. They do not have to swim with the crocodiles any longer. They were finally going to get a swimming pool, because the state government was able to provide a million dollars to match dollar for dollar the money the council had available to ensure that the kids of Karumba had a swimming pool like most other kids in Queensland. Other Queensland government ministers had announced a further six councils—Barcaldine, Blackall, Tambo, Boulia, Goondiwindi and Mackay—that have also shared in round 3 funding.

Today I would like to announce another six regional councils that have been successful in this round. Burdekin Shire Council will receive \$650,000 to extend the Burdekin community centre. Maranoa Regional Council will receive \$300,000 to upgrade Injune's sewage treatment plant. Diamantina Shire Council will receive \$432,000 to reseal the Birdsville Airport's runway. Quilpie Shire Council will receive \$500,000 to build stage 1 of the natural history museum at Eromanga. Tablelands Regional Council will receive \$440,000 for an important local road upgrade. In most cases we are matching dollar for dollar investment by councils, while elsewhere resource companies are also contributing to delivering these vital infrastructure upgrades.

These new 22 infrastructure projects funded in round 3 of Royalties for the Regions will provide lasting benefits to our state's regional communities and deliver a welcome economic boost during construction. With interest in Royalties for the Regions running strong, I look forward to the continued success of this program that plays such an important part in creating a brighter future for country towns and country people.


## Queensland Economy

 **Hon. TJ NICHOLLS** (Clayfield—LNP) (Treasurer and Minister for Trade) (9.44 am): This can-do government went to the last election with a clear set of promises and a clear plan to build this state. Undoubtedly, one of our biggest and most important promises was to grow a four-pillar economy and to sustain it by sorting out the mess in our public finances left to us by Labor. We are delivering on that promise. Our economy continues to outperform the rest of Australia. We continue to be Australia's jobs powerhouse. Consumer sentiment is up, as shown by yesterday's Westpac-Melbourne Institute survey results. Monthly retail turnover is now almost \$430 million more than it was in March 2012, and building approvals have increased by almost 35 per cent since this government's election.

We are also restoring the state's finances to a sustainable position. Gone are the profligate days under Labor. By 2015-16 Queensland will once again be living within its means for the first time in a decade. Now we face up to the next big challenge: dealing with the \$80 billion worth of Labor debt. This debt is Labor's legacy. Labor's debt currently adds up to almost \$15,000 for every man, woman and child in Queensland, and economic modelling suggests this debt will only continue to grow unless we act to stop it. The government is currently considering its response to the unprecedented debt problem bequeathed to us by the former Labor government in a considered and methodical way. Once we have finalised our strategy, we will be releasing it to the public for consultation as part of the budget process. We will not hide our intentions from the electorate like those opposite. Every Queenslanders will have the chance to see and comment on our plan before it is finalised. The electorate will also have the chance to pass judgement on any final plan we may present.

It is imperative that we act to address this debt and reduce the almost \$4 billion a year interest bill. Only if we remain resolute in this course of action will we be able to invest in the schools our children deserve, the hospitals patients want and the infrastructure this growing state needs. It is clear that Labor has not learnt from the past. They have no policies, no plan and they are intent on bringing back the same old team that put Queensland in the position we are currently in today. Make no mistake about it: Queensland's future is in jeopardy if we go back to the same failed policies of the last government. A brighter future for Queensland is there for the taking but only under an LNP state government.

## Parliamentary Inquiry, Crime

 **Hon. JP BLEIJIE** (Kawana—LNP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice) (9.46 am): I am pleased to advise the House today that the Leader of the House will move a motion to establish a parliamentary inquiry that will shine the light on crime in Queensland. This government went to the election with a strong plan to revitalise front-line services for families, rebalance the scales of justice and to make sure Queensland is the safest place to raise a family. We have already delivered significantly on this commitment by cracking down on criminal gangs, expanding unexplained wealth laws and increasing penalties for many offences including murder, drug trafficking, serious assaults on police and weapons offences. We have also provided an additional \$2 million to groups that support victims of crime. I recently announced \$65 million of funding for Legal Aid Queensland over the next year and a further \$30 million for community legal centres over the next three years.


The Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee will be tasked with travelling the state and hearing from victims of crime and others via public and private submissions in order to determine what can be done to combat crime in Queensland. The committee will be tasked with reporting by 31 October 2014 on strategies to prevent and reduce criminal activity, with the aim of building a stronger and safer community.

The trends and types of criminal activity will be examined as well as the social and economic contributors to crime, the impacts of criminal activity, the effectiveness of crime prevention strategies and the experience of Queenslanders with regard to the criminal justice system. The inquiry will also look interstate and overseas at what other jurisdictions are doing and how we compare.

In developing the terms of reference for this inquiry, I received input from the Queensland Law Society, Caxton Legal Centre, the Queensland Association of Independent Legal Services and the Women's Legal Service, and I wish to thank those organisations for their great assistance. The Women's Legal Service advocated for an examination of the causes and responses to sexual and domestic violence, and I am pleased to advise that the inquiry will look specifically at these issues. Twenty years of Labor government in Queensland meant that victims were ignored and the rights of the offender were prioritised.

In terms of criminal law policy, the current Labor team have no plan and the only thing they are consistent about is their inconsistency. This inquiry is about listening to victims, listening to Queenslanders, examining the evidence, and the results will assist and develop Queensland's crime-fighting future. This inquiry is part of the government's strong plan for a bright future, and it will continue the work we have already done to make Queensland the safest place to raise a family.

### Education Accord


 **Hon. JH LANGBROEK** (Surfers Paradise—LNP) (Minister for Education, Training and Employment) (9.49 am): I am delighted to be able to update the House today on the Education Accord and the excitement that this has generated around Queensland about this government's vision for the future. On Tuesday morning I sat down with our key stakeholders in education in Queensland to let them know about our strong plan for the Education Accord. They included our school principal association leaders, representatives of the Queensland Teachers Union and parent bodies, and of course our partners in the Catholic and independent schooling sectors. I assured them that, like everything this government does in education, we would be engaging in extensive consultation across Queensland.

Since then, I have been very pleased by the overwhelmingly positive response that we have received from these stakeholders. They have been out and about since the announcement telling Queenslanders that they too see the Education Accord as an historic opportunity to move forward on a bipartisan basis. Mike Byrne from the Queensland Catholic Education Commission said, 'We welcome this "whole of state" initiative and look forward to opportunities to engage closely with the process.' David Robertson from Independent Schools Queensland said, 'We are all keen to contribute to developing a long-term plan for education that maximises the opportunities for all our children.' The CEO of the Queensland P&C association, Kevan Goodworth, applauded the initiative, saying that this 'kind of wide-ranging consultation can only be positive'. And I am heartened to say that Kevin Bates from the Queensland Teachers Union told ABC Radio that the QTU 'welcome this decision by the government ... to bring together stakeholders from right across the state to look at what we might do in education over the next 30 years. That's something that will help us break away from the election cycle.'

So as you can see, Madam Speaker, there has been praise far and wide from leaders in the Queensland education sector. They can see that this government does have a vision for a brighter future and that when it comes to our children's schools we want this to be a shared vision. They know that this requires a plan that is about more than the last budget, about more than the last election and about more than short-term politics. Indeed, in light of this, those on the other side of the House have been conspicuous by their silence on the Education Accord. This is despite the fact that some of the most emulated and envied education systems in the world are those built on bipartisan agreement. They do not seem to be interested in building a shared vision for the future of education. They still do not have a plan. They still are not showing leadership. They do not have the intestinal fortitude required to reach across the political aisle.

I hope this will change because on 25 September when we gather together at the Education Accord summit I look forward to sitting down with all Queensland MPs and hearing from them about what they want to see included in the draft accord. But what I am most looking forward to is the opportunity that the summit will give us to sit down with mums and dads, principals and teachers from local communities all over Queensland so that their hands-on, grassroots experience can inform the development of the accord. We will hear from some of the most respected and renowned thinkers in education in this country, including: John Daley, the CEO of the Grattan Institute; Dr Stefan Hajkovicz of CSIRO Futures, whose core work is predicting and studying future trends; Professor Peter Coaldrake, the Vice-Chancellor at our own Queensland University of Technology; and Dr Ben Jensen, the CEO of Learning First. We will work together to develop the historic Education Accord. A brighter future for education in Queensland is ours for the taking but only under an LNP government with a strong plan for a brighter future.

### Mental Health

 **Hon. LJ SPRINGBORG** (Southern Downs—LNP) (Minister for Health) (9.52 am): Almost one in two Queenslanders aged 16 to 85 will experience mental illness at some time in their lives. For carers, families and communities, it is an enormous concern. For all but 20 years, mental health was


an issue forgotten by the former Labor government, but once again it is the LNP that has a strong plan for progress in this key area. Our recent review of the Mental Health Act of the former Labor government revealed it to be overly complex and inconsistent and difficult to understand and administer. More than 200 improvements were recommended—so many that this ad hoc act will be repealed. Later today I will release a discussion paper so that Queenslanders can have their say about the replacement legislation.

For the sake of all affected by mental health issues—those personally affected, their families and carers—we must get it right. Already, this government has created Queensland's first ever Mental Health Commission, delivering a key election commitment and clearing the way to reform. The commission is building a strategic plan for a more integrated response to mental health issues and substance misuse. Another change is to ensure that essential mental health resources are used in the most effective and efficient way. During its tenure, Labor lost control of almost \$1 billion allocated each year to grants right across the Health portfolio. This fundamental failure of administration spawned the infamous case of the fake Tahitian prince.

By contrast, this week in the sensitive area of community mental health, I have approved targeted allocations of more than \$60 million in service agreements over the next three years. These contracts are determined by tender so that the most effective services are directed to those most in need. Not all applicants were successful, but in those cases the relevant services will be supplied by others. Where appropriate, transition funding will also be provided to support the unsuccessful party. Through these and other efforts, we are making significant progress.

The Queensland Alliance for Mental Health, our peak body for mental health, has reported 'a profound leap forward in the relationship between Queensland Health and the community mental health sector'. They said, 'Our relationship with Queensland Health couldn't be better.' And it is not just peak bodies which have noticed the difference. Recently, I received the third mental health report into consumer perceptions of care. Unlike previous editions, this report will be released for public consumption. Asked in detail for their views on Queensland's public mental health services, our mental health patients reported positive perceptions about the care that they received. The majority of respondents rated their experience as 'moderate' to 'commendable'. Viewed against the backdrop of recent developments—the new commission, our mental health service agreements and results from our Mental Health Act review—this positive endorsement is encouraging news. This can-do government has a strong plan to deliver the highest quality public mental health services to Queenslanders. This plan has our government's absolute commitment.


### Active Kids

 **Hon. SL DICKSON** (Buderim—LNP) (Minister for National Parks, Recreation, Sport and Racing) (9.56 am): I refer to an article in yesterday's *Courier-Mail* which reported on findings of a new study in which Australian kids have been given a D-minus for inactive behaviour relating to screen time. This is behind New Zealand, England, Mexico and many other countries. The article claims that Australian parents are raising a generation of couch potatoes, with four out of five kids aged five to 17 not meeting the physical guidelines of at least 60 minutes exercise a day. The author says that we need to be looking at the future ways to keep kids active if they are not on the sports field.

The Newman government has a strong plan as we are investing in a bright future for our children through our flagship Get in the Game initiative and also our rollout of Nature Play. We are delivering great outcomes. We are giving our children the opportunity to become physically fit and active. This rolls off the Premier's statement before about the lack of funding we are getting from the federal government. We are making a difference. We are delivering great outcomes. Our young people are out on the paddock. We have got young kids out there now who are doing the things that we did when we were young people. They are out there building cubbyhouses, surfing and getting onto the field. We need them to be physically active because, as we know, they are losing that core muscle strength—so much so that they cannot write with a biro and they are becoming obese. It is up to us as a society to make the difference—not just the coaches, not just the physically active people, but all of us, every member of this chamber, every mum and dad. The Newman government has a very strong plan and we are delivering that through Get in the Game and through Nature Play. Unlike those opposite, we care about the future of our children. We are making a difference. We are putting our money where our mouth is.

## MOTION

### Referral to the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee

 **Mr STEVENS** (Mermaid Beach—LNP) (Leader of the House) (9.58 am), by leave, without notice: I move—

That the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee (the Committee) conduct an inquiry on strategies to prevent and reduce criminal activity, by examining:


- the trends and type of criminal activity in Queensland, having regard to available crime statistics and issues in relation to unreported crime;
- the social and economic contributors to crime;
- the impacts of this criminal activity on the community and individuals, including the social and economic impacts;
- the effectiveness (including the cost effectiveness) of crime prevention strategies, including imprisonment, justice reinvestment, early intervention, alternative dispute resolution, and other models used in national and international jurisdictions; and
- the experiences of Queenslanders with regard to the criminal justice system, including the experiences of victims of sexual violence and/or domestic violence including their interactions with the Queensland Police Service, the courts, prosecuting authorities, legal and support services and compensation processes;
- possible strategies to increase collaboration and co-operation between various participants in the criminal justice system.

Further, the Committee is to recommend measures to curb criminal activity, reduce rates of recidivism, and build a safer community.

In undertaking the inquiry the Committee is to:

- hold public and private hearings across Queensland;
- ensure such hearings include an examination of available crime statistics for the relevant area or region; and
- take public and private submissions.

Further, that the Committee report by 31 October 2014

 **Mr BYRNE** (Rockhampton—ALP) (10.00 am): I rise to speak to the motion. The opposition will not oppose it. I speak to this motion with a sense of satisfaction. That satisfaction is tainted by a feeling of embarrassment for the government that forces me to choke back some tears of laughter. This was my reaction to what I considered to be a manipulative diversion perpetrated by the government on 1 December 2013. The funny thing about this timing is that it coincided with very substantial anti-VLAD law protests outside this House. The reason I found it so funny is that I was reading the press release on 1 December 2013. It stated—

“We have already taken strong action over the past 18 months with a range of law and order reforms and increased law enforcement resources, but we want to know what else can be done ...

That was part of the press release. Of course, my spin detector/interpreter translated that to mean, ‘We’ve been asleep at the wheel for nearly two years. All the stats at that point were going south and we don’t know what we’re going to do at this point or go any further.’

**Honourable members** interjected.

**Madam SPEAKER:** Order, members!

**Mr BYRNE:** Of course, now that there are more favourable trends coming out in some of the statistics due entirely to the efforts of the Queensland Police Service, the government is willing to engage on this issue. It is an old political trick to divert an issue to a committee or inquiry when the government of the day is in trouble. This is a double-barrelled diversion, a diversion deliberately intended to take some of the heat out of the government’s present mishandling of the justice system across this state—anything to divert from the Attorney-General’s failures. The government needs an inquiry to provide a road map because it has not got a clue. It has never had any idea of what needs to be done. Further, the media release from last year was couched in political and excessive language that prejudices the objectivity of the committee’s work. The Attorney-General simply could not help himself.

What about the nonsense regarding the terms of reference being drafted with a view to starting in early 2014? I suppose that depends on what ‘early 2014’ means to the Attorney-General. He seems to be late and indecisive on a regular basis these days. I can tell honourable members one thing: nothing can be commenced until there is a motion before this House, and we finally see it today, more than six months later. Here we are today, well over six months since that press release of

1 December and nothing has lawfully commenced. The parliamentary committee is not the plaything of the executive or the ministers opposite. Ministers do not decide to conduct parliamentary committee inquiries. Any such inquiry reflects the sentiment of this parliament and not that of the Premier or his cabinet sycophants.

**Honourable members** interjected.

**Madam SPEAKER:** Order, members!

**Mr BYRNE:** I have not even had a chance to see the terms of reference, but I notice I did not hear anything about the CMC. One would think that a crime inquiry conducted by a parliamentary committee would be looking at the CMC. I find it a bit rich for the government to talk about promises made to the people of Queensland considering its press release. As far as I can see, this government has no problem breaking promises left, right and centre. It seems to be a particularly tory attribute, as witnessed last year with Christopher Pyne.

**Honourable members** interjected.

**Madam SPEAKER:** Order, members!

**Mr BYRNE:** Of course, the Premier is in the House this morning bleating about the Prime Minister's budget. In this sense, the inquiry is two years too late.

**Honourable members** interjected.

**Madam SPEAKER:** Order, members!

**Mr BYRNE:** The Attorney-General and the police minister sit on their hands playing games and twiddling thumbs while Rome burns. All of that said about the context of this charade, the opposition will participate in this inquiry in good faith. We want to see a Queensland where Queenslanders are safe in their homes and their work, where criminals are brought to justice and the citizens can go about their lives in peace and harmony without the intrusion of the state or rogue criminal elements. It is clear that the intention of the inquiry is self-serving for the government. I hope that the inquiry listens to the expert opinion that will be provided rather than taking its leave from the right-wing rednecks who approach talkback radio. I will make this single comment: the opposition will support fair, just, balanced proposals underwritten with a respect for civil society and the rights of citizens.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

## MOTION

### Referral to the Transport, Housing and Local Government Committee



**Mr STEVENS** (Mermaid Beach—LNP) (Leader of the House) (10.04 am), by leave, without notice: I move—

That the Transport, Housing and Local Government Committee undertake an inquiry to consider the effect of coastal shipping policy on the development of an efficient and productive multi-modal freight network, taking into account issues such as regional development, supply chain security, road safety impacts and contestability between coastal shipping and other transport modes.

That, in undertaking this inquiry, the Committee should:

- consider what benefits arise from a scheduled 'weekly' coastal shipping service, in terms of reducing road and rail congestion and managing future freight demand;
- consider what impact coastal shipping would have on competition in the Queensland freight transport sector;
- consider the implications of coastal shipping policy for defence support, disaster management, maritime safety, community amenity, environmental sustainability and tourism;
- investigate cross-jurisdictional differences that exist between the states in regulating trading vessels on intrastate voyages that might impact on competition and increase costs within the coastal shipping industry;
- review the policy and regulatory arrangements of the Coastal Trading (Revitalising Australian Shipping) Act 2012 including the impacts of the 3 tier licensing system on establishing an intra-state coastal shipping trade in Queensland waters; and
- investigate whether Queensland benefits from the uniform regulation of these vessels under existing Commonwealth legislation, and make recommendations where necessary for proposed amendments.


Further, that the committee report to the Legislative Assembly by 1 December 2014.

I look forward to the comments from the member for Rockhampton in relation to this referral.  
 Question put—That the motion be agreed to.  
 Motion agreed to.

## QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

**Madam SPEAKER:** Question time will finish at 11.07 am. I call the Leader of the Opposition.

### Boot Camps

 **Ms PALASZCZUK** (10.07 am): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier confirm that a second boot camp tender for the Hervey Bay operation was awarded to a contractor that was not the top ranked recommendation of the selection panel? I table the documents.

*Tabled paper:* Department of Justice and Attorney-General Briefs for Decision [RTI 140695], dated 16 July 2013 and 10 July 2013, regarding Fraser Coast/Sunshine Coast Early Intervention Youth Boot Camp Procurement process [5165].

**Mr NEWMAN:** I thank the Leader of the Opposition for her question. I point out that information has been released under RTI. If she wants to further elaborate on that or get further commentary, she can ask the AG. That is not what the Leader of the Opposition really needs to deal with in this place today. What the Leader of the Opposition needs to deal with is this.

**Ms Palaszczuk:** Answer the question.

**Mr NEWMAN:** No, I have answered the question. This is what needs to be dealt with. It is now the second day since these utterly inappropriate comments were made by the member for Bundamba. We saw yesterday the member for Bundamba loudly interjecting while we saw stony silence from the Leader of the Opposition. The interjections from the member for Bundamba were that she stood by the comments, that they were right. We know that she has been totally unrepentant, but this is not so much about the member for Bundamba—

**Ms Palaszczuk:** So you won't talk about the tender?

**Mr NEWMAN:**—it is about the person interjecting now—

**Ms Palaszczuk:** So you're not going to talk about the tender?

**Mr NEWMAN:**—the Leader of the Opposition, who needs to show—no—

**Ms Palaszczuk:** No, you answer the question.

**Mr NEWMAN:** The Leader of the Opposition needs to show leadership. Leadership is more than confected outrage. Leadership is more than confected outrage at your opponent's problems. Leadership is about taking a stand when people in your own team do utterly and totally the wrong thing. At the moment we are seeing that the Labor Party have no plan for this state; they have no policies; they have no teamwork. They are not a team, anyway; they are a rabble with no position, with a leader who has no leadership qualities and no intestinal fortitude.

It is time for the Leader of the Opposition to take a stand. Back in 2005 her father took a stand on the same issue. Her father took a stand on a matter of principle. He showed ticker. He saw somebody do something inappropriate which mocked the historical outrage of the holocaust and he acted. He did something about it, and the Leader of the Opposition needs to do something now.

**Ms Palaszczuk:** Let's talk about your family then!

**Mr NEWMAN:** If Queenslanders could hear the interjections now from the opposition, they would know that these people are not fit to govern. They have no leadership, no policies and no plans. They have absolutely nothing to offer Queensland. If you want to lead Queensland you have to show leadership on your own team, and there is no leadership opposite.

### Government Tender Process

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** My question is to the Minister for Housing and Public Works. Will the minister explain how the government's tender process operates, and has he ever chosen to award a tender in his department contrary to departmental advice?

**Mr MANDER:** I thank the opposition leader for her question. This is a great opportunity for me to talk about the procurement transformation process that is taking place in our department. We have brought in the biggest reforms in procurement that the state of Queensland has ever seen. We had a

system that was so bureaucratic, so proscriptive, so time-consuming and so costly, that it was incredibly difficult for businesses to deal with government. What we have tried to do in the period of time that we have been in government is to totally transform that process.

We have done that in a number of ways. We want to be a government that business can engage with very, very easily. We have reduced the procurement policy from 36 pages down to two. We are determined to ensure that, no matter which department you deal with in government, you will have a consistent approach so that, when you are dealing with the department of transport, it is the same as dealing with the Department of Health; if you are dealing with the Department of Health, it is the same as dealing with the department of education. In the past it was like dealing with different organisations and it was totally and utterly ridiculous.

We have also endeavoured to make sure that we engage with business at a far earlier stage than we have in the past. Let's not be so proscriptive about things. Let's let business—who have innovative ideas to bring about solutions—make suggestions and let's ensure that our program fits with that outcome. We have been going through a whole range of processes.

With this procurement transformation process, our aim is to save the Queensland taxpayers \$1.3 billion over the next four or five years by bringing these practices in, and we are already seeing some incredible savings with wave 1 of this process. Business is saying that they have already noticed how much easier it is to deal with government now than it was in the past. Not only are we doing that, but we are making sure that small business in regional towns can have a pipeline of work, understanding that they will be able to employ people so that over the next 12 to 18 months they see there is work coming their way.

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Mr MANDER:** There is transparency so that people understand that they can make a decision on whether they will actually tender for work now or wait—

**Madam SPEAKER:** Pause the clock. Order, members! I am sorry to interrupt the minister. The minister was asked to explain the tender process and I am trying listening to the minister's answer, but the interjections from my left are out of line and I ask members to cease their interjections. I call the minister.

**Mr MANDER:** The changes that have been brought about through the procurement transformation process are some of the biggest reforms in government and they will not only benefit businesses who want to deal with government but also benefit the taxpayers of Queensland.

### Overseas Investment

**Mr SHUTTLEWORTH:** My question without notice is to the Premier. Can the Premier outline how important overseas exporting and investment is to Queensland's economy and jobs market, and what is the government doing to support Queensland companies doing business overseas?

**Mr NEWMAN:** I thank the honourable member for the question. It just demonstrates that this team is about getting the economy going, reforming government, energising front-line services and getting on with the job. Instead we have an opposition with no plans, no teamwork and hatred amongst themselves and certainly, as we have seen today, absolutely no leadership. If you want to take this state forward and if you want to lead Queensland, you have to show leadership. A leadership test has been failed in front of our eyes today, but not on this side of the chamber because last financial year Queensland's overseas goods and exports alone were valued at \$53 billion. Export industries support jobs, attract new projects and new ideas, increase diversity in the economy and improve technology.

The G20 will showcase to the world what Queensland has to offer and it will build more export opportunities for this state. Yesterday I was privileged to meet His Excellency the Ambassador for the People's Republic of China, and we talked about how we will showcase Queensland to interested parties from China. He particularly pointed out the journalists that will be coming out prior to the G20, and he himself identified it as a great opportunity for us to showcase Queensland. I promised His Excellency the Ambassador that we will work with him to do just that.

I have led trade missions to India, Papua New Guinea, China, the United Arab Emirates and our long-term trade partners in Japan and the USA. Most recently I joined the Prime Minister on his trade visit to Korea. It was going to be to China and Japan, but of course I came back to be in Queensland where I was needed because of Tropical Cyclone Ita. But what did the Leader of the Opposition do—the leader of no position with no policies and no plans? When they were in government they said that you should encourage trade, but now when they are in opposition they flip-flop. That is right; the Leader of the Opposition said that I have been overseas too often.

I will continue to go overseas to promote this state because these missions are about growing business, and a number of Queensland firms have secured new business deals as a result of these trade missions, including: two rail related training contracts in the Middle East, an international first for this particular company; a \$1.5 million architectural design contract in New Zealand; and a \$4.5 million resource exploration investment stemming from the memorandum of understanding I signed with JOGMEC while in Japan. These are real dollars and real jobs being created in Queensland. But what if that mob opposite were returned to office? No leadership, no policies, no plans, no guts, no intestinal fortitude and no real vision to take this state forward to a bright future.

**Honourable members** interjected.

**Mr Wellington:** No morals!

**Madam SPEAKER:** Order, members! I warn the member for Nicklin. I call the member for South Brisbane.

### Boot Camps

**Ms TRAD:** My question is to the Premier. I table the media statement from August last year publicly announcing the successful tenderers for the government's boot camp.

*Tabled paper:* Media release, dated 21 August 2013, from the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice, Hon. Jarrod Bleijie, titled 'Boot camps ready to roll out' [\[5166\]](#).

I now refer to the email advice from the Director-General of JAG tabled on Tuesday by the Attorney-General and relied upon in this House by the Premier yesterday during question time, and I ask: will the Premier confirm that the email advice was sent just three hours before the public announcement of the successful tenderer was made in Hervey Bay, clearly after the Attorney-General had already intervened in the decision?

**Mr NEWMAN:** I am delighted to provide some further comment, because yesterday those opposite came into this House and selectively quoted from Director-General John Sosso in relation to his testimony to the estimates committee. What they failed to provide in terms of quotes from his testimony was that he actually said that under departmental rules the minister made the call. I can provide that document to the House later on today or even now if someone has it to hand. That is what he said: it is the minister's call. I would just point out a few Labor—

**Ms TRAD:** What was he going to ensure?

**Mr NEWMAN:** The member for South Brisbane is like an empty vessel which makes a lot of noise. I think it would have been a good idea for the then minister for transport to intervene in the contract which decided on the new trains for QR. Then maybe the trains would have fit through the tunnels with the air-conditioning! What about a bit of ministerial intervention to provide some seats for trains? They are only optional extras!

We are elected here to make a difference. We are elected here to actually drive reform and change and sometimes the frank and fearless advice needs to be challenged, and I will back any minister in this place for doing that. The director-general has shown through the document I tabled that he supported 100 per cent the call that the minister had made. Let me go back to the issue of the day—that is, the need for the Leader of the Opposition to provide some leadership, and I table the *Courier-Mail's* front page. Instead of those opposite bleating about personal attacks—

**Ms Trad:** The director-general's advice—

**Mr NEWMAN:** The member for South Brisbane: the absolute architect of personal attacks; the person who has never apologised for any personal attacks of three years ago!

**Honourable members** interjected.

**Madam SPEAKER:** Order, members! Premier, I will just pause the clock. There are too many interjections across the chamber. I appreciate that those interjections are provoking more, but I will call the Premier, who has the call, to speak with regard to this question. I call the Premier.

**Mr NEWMAN:** I want to talk more fulsomely about 16 January 2005 and the headline 'Nazi gaffe hits personal note with minister'. It was the Leader of the Opposition's father.

**Ms Palaszczuk:** So you're having a go at my father now?

**Mr NEWMAN:** This is not a personal—

**Ms Palaszczuk:** Attacking my father?

**Mr NEWMAN:** What is the Leader of the Opposition saying about personal attacks? I am not having a go at her father; I am saying he took a principled stand. He was right, yet the Leader of the Opposition will not even comment on the outrageous comments from the member for Bundamba. The

member for Bundamba has said the most outrageous things—the most outrageous, disgraceful things—and it is time for leadership. You cannot lead Queensland if you cannot lead your own team. You cannot lead the state if you have no plans or policies. You cannot lead Queensland if you do not have the ticker to discipline your own team.

*Tabled paper:* Article from the *Courier-Mail*, dated 22 May 2014, titled 'Six million reasons to say sorry: From Mein Kampf to mine camp, Labor MP stands for stupidity' [5167].

**Government members** interjected.

**Madam SPEAKER:** Order, members!

### Regional Queensland, Economic Growth

**Mr YOUNG:** My question without notice is to the Deputy Premier and Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning. Can the Deputy Premier explain how this government continues to drive economic growth and provide jobs for regional Queensland?

**Mr SEENEY:** I thank the member for the question. He, like me, is interested in the future of regional Queensland and what our government is doing there. We are certainly ensuring that the resources industry can continue to grow in regional Queensland and that people from all over Queensland can travel to work in the resources industry and can live in some of the great accommodation that the mining industry provides for those workers. That illustrates the complete absurdity and the total inappropriateness of the comments that were made by the member for Bundamba yesterday. The fact that the member for Bundamba has not withdrawn those comments or apologised for them is adding to the outrage that those comments have caused, not just in the Jewish community but in the mining community as well.

I take the point that the Premier made: that it is also an issue of leadership. As the Premier indicated, in 2005 the then primary industries minister, Mr Henry Palaszczuk, made some comments about this. For newer members of this House, Henry Palaszczuk was a man of principle. He was well respected in this House. He was one of the few Labor politicians that I actually respected. He was a man of integrity. The opposition leader has shown today that she lacks the integrity that was displayed back in 2005. Mr Palaszczuk said that his father, who died last year, was in a labour camp during World War II, so the then member for Inala had every reason to be outraged. He said that there was absolutely no excuse for Prince Harry to do what he did, because the incident involved Prince Harry dressing in a Nazi uniform. He said that there was—

... absolutely no excuse. He understands perfectly well what the Nazis did ...

He also said—

My father suffered enormously at the hands of the Nazis and the stories he told me were horrific.

So it is no wonder that the then minister for primary industries demanded an apology, and he asked that his oath to the Crown be withdrawn such was the outrage that he felt. That is the outrage that is being felt by so many people across Queensland today.

**Ms TRAD:** I rise to a point of order. What is the relevance of this to the question that was asked?

**Madam SPEAKER:** I ask the Deputy Premier to answer the question. I did listen to the context of the question and I believe that that was actually in the question. I call the Deputy Premier.

**Mr SEENEY:** Absolutely, Madam Speaker. That is the outrage that is being felt by people across Queensland—people who travel to work in the resources industry who have been compared to the victims of the holocaust. Six million people died in the holocaust and so many hundreds of millions of others were affected forever. The people who travel to work in the resources industry in my electorate do it because they choose to do it. They choose a high-paid job to make a better lifestyle for themselves and they live in great accommodation with great facilities, and the member for Bundamba should be eternally ashamed of the comments she has made.

*(Time expired)*

### Member for Stafford

**Mr JUDGE:** My question without notice is to the Attorney-General. I remind the Attorney-General of the Premier's recent decision to sack the member for Stafford from the role of assistant health minister, and I ask: did the member for Stafford at any time raise with the Attorney-General, either personally or in writing, his concerns about commercial influences on the Newman government and/or political donation reforms?

**Madam SPEAKER:** Before calling the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice, I remind members asking the question and those answering it that ministers are to answer in accordance with matters in their portfolio whilst also not anticipating issues that may be referred to in legislation that is still before the House. I call the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** Thank you, Madam Speaker, and I thank the honourable member for the question, because the answer is quite simple: no—and I repeat, no—on any of the issues the member has just raised. But if we are talking about leadership and if we are talking about strong plans and alternative views, let us have the opposition leader show a bit of leadership today on the issue of the day.

I had the unfortunate displeasure of listening to the member for Bundamba on 4BC this morning about this article that appeared on the front page—still defending the indefensible. The member for Bundamba should have apologised. Not only should the member for Bundamba apologise; the opposition leader should have phoned the member for Bundamba last night and said, 'Either tonight or first thing in the morning you should apologise.' There is a lack of leadership in the opposition—a total lack of leadership. I want to raise an issue—

**Madam SPEAKER:** Attorney-General and Minister for Justice, I will remind you, as I will members of the House, that in asking the question that was pertaining to your portfolio I would also ask that in responding to the question you relate to your portfolio.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. My grandfather, for a short period of time, was in a concentration camp in Indonesia. His Dutch family spent a period of time in World War II in a concentration camp and I am offended by what I read and the comments in the last 48 hours from the member for Bundamba. That is why the opposition leader should, on behalf of the opposition, force the member for Bundamba to apologise. If the opposition leader cannot achieve that on behalf of the millions of people who have been offended by the commentary in the last 48 hours, then the opposition leader should not be the opposition leader.

They have no plan. This is about leadership. A year ago I raised this issue in the House. This was another article that appeared in the *Courier-Mail*. It was a full-page ad, sponsored and paid for by the ETU, mentioning Martin Luther King, Hitler, the Nazis, the holocaust and the people who died. At the time, I raised this issue because the member for Bundamba in a speech praised the ETU and all that the ETU did. When I pushed the member for Bundamba on this particular issue, she defended the right for the ETU to run that sort of rot in our newspapers.

There is a consistent approach to this issue. There is also a consistent lack of leadership shown by the opposition leader. The opposition leader should have forced her member to speak out publicly. That member is a shadow minister. That member wishes to serve in cabinet in this state. That member should know that what she did was wrong.

Queenslanders understand that, for a brighter future, you have to have a strong plan, you have to have leadership. They are going to get that under this government. They are not going to get that sort of leadership under that opposition leader who has failed in her duty to hold a member of her party accountable.

### Trade Initiatives

**Mr DILLAWAY:** My question without notice is to the Treasurer and Minister for Trade. Can the Treasurer update the House on any trade measures currently being taken to promote our vision of Queensland to the world?

**Mr NICHOLLS:** I thank the member for Bulimba for his question. He is vitally interested in foreign trade and the activities of our trade exporters. In fact, I think for some considerable time he was involved in the industry as an exporter. I also acknowledge that today is a good day for the member to be asking the question, because today we launch the Premier of Queensland's Export Awards. Also in the member's electorate are the 2012 winners of the Premier of Queensland's Export Awards: NOJA Power, led by Neil O'Sullivan, who has also participated in a number of promotions to support Trade and Investment Queensland's activities. Like the Premier, I know just how important trade is to Queensland. These awards are a great way to highlight the important contribution that Queensland businesses make to our state's economy through job creation and prosperity.

It is the case that, under the former Labor government, Trade and Investment Queensland was almost seen as a prize. It moved from department to department as each prizewinner had their chance. But under the LNP, Trade and Investment Queensland has been given the stability that it

deserves. We have freed Trade and Investment Queensland from the confines of departmental process. We have allowed the organisation to focus on its core role of assisting Queensland businesses and attracting investment.

The international education and training sector is a particularly important driver of Queensland's global economy, generating more than \$2.2 billion in foreign exchange earnings and providing full-time employment for about 20,000 people. As part of the government's ongoing support, Trade and Investment Queensland is currently running a fantastic international education initiative, the Ultimate Gap Year competition. This competition is the first of its kind in Queensland. Students from Brazil, Colombia, Japan, Korea and Taiwan are using social media channels and applying to win once-in-a-lifetime chances to live, work and study here in Queensland. The Ultimate Gap Year has captured the imagination of students, with more than 160 applications already received.

Five winners will be appointed as Queensland international student ambassadors, enabling them to establish and maintain positive industry relationships between their home country and Queensland. Those five students will enjoy a 12-month gap year experience in Queensland, which will include air fares, accommodation, tuition, work internships and holiday experiences. There are also 10 positions for the runners-up. They include prizes such as language tuition, accommodation and work internships.

The Ultimate Gap Year competition can be found at [www.queenslandgapyear.com](http://www.queenslandgapyear.com) and it closes at the end of this month. The Premier and I look forward to announcing the winners in early July. It is a tremendous competition. It is a tremendous example of the way in which, under this government, Trade and Investment Queensland is providing a bright future for Queensland.

### Sale of Public Assets

**Mr PITT:** My question without notice is to the Premier. I refer specifically to asset sale costs being shielded from right to information laws through investment banks being hired through Queensland Treasury Corporation. Will the Premier tell Queenslanders how many millions are being spent in secret on scoping studies without a mandate to get assets ready for sale while the Queensland government pretends to consult with Queenslanders?

**Mr NEWMAN:** I hear that 'mandate' word. I ask rhetorically the member for Mulgrave about his mandate to do what Labor did. Come on! One thing that I will say about Labor's asset sale process, which had no mandate, which was based on a fabric of lies, was that it did not actually get good value for the assets.

**An honourable member** interjected.

**Mr NEWMAN:** No, they did not. It is very clear. In fact, if you look at what has happened to Aurizon's share price over the last few years since they gave a whole lot of it away, it is very clear that they did not get strong advice.

This is a team that is competent and is working hard. If we should take to the next election a proposal to sell or sell a lease on assets, we will make sure that we have worked out what the true value is and we will get the best value for Queenslanders, because that is what they expect.

**Mr Pitt** interjected.

**Mr NEWMAN:** Unlike the member for Mulgrave, who is bleating away today—

**Mr Pitt** interjected.

**Mr NEWMAN:** I am happy to take that interjection. We deal with facts. The member for Mulgrave deals with hot air, political spin, nonsense, confected outrage and mythbusters. I do not know how the member for Mulgrave even comes in here. I do not know how he does it. I do not know how he asks these questions without a smile on his face. I do not know how he looks at himself in the mirror in the morning. After today, I do not know how any of them can look at themselves in the mirror and say that they have any sort of standards, because today is about leadership—

**Mr PITT:** I rise to a point of order. Mr Deputy Speaker, I have been waiting for your ruling on the Premier referring to 'lies' before, which is unparliamentary. If the opposition wish to use the term 'lies', when it comes to this Premier we would use it in every single question. I would ask you to rule on his unparliamentary language.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Dr Robinson): Order! In general terms, the word 'lies' is unparliamentary and there is an expectation in the House that the term not be used. I allowed it, because I felt that it was being used just as a very broad corporate term as opposed to being applied specifically to someone in general terms. It is unparliamentary, but the Premier has the call.

**Mr NEWMAN:** If it helps the House, I will withdraw and replace it with 'untruths'. But I will move on.

Today is about the lack of leadership opposite. The confected outrage is all very well, but if you are going to lead Queensland you need to have high standards and no standards of such height exist over there. It is very clear for the Leader of the Opposition: either she gets action with the member for Bundamba or, at the end of today, she should go. I call on the Leader of the Opposition to resign today if she cannot force change. If she cannot discipline the member for Bundamba after this outrageous slur, then the Leader of the Opposition has to go. Today, the Leader of the Opposition is failing in front of our eyes. This is the end of someone's personal leadership ambitions, because if you cannot have a strong plan, if you cannot show discipline, if you cannot show strong leadership, you are not fit to govern Queensland.

### Workers Compensation

**Mr CAVALLUCCI:** My question without notice is to the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice. Can the Attorney-General update the House on the benefits from the changes to the workers compensation scheme last year and is he aware of any alternative views?

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I thank the honourable member for Brisbane Central for the question, because we know on this side of the House that the member for Brisbane Central is a passionate supporter of small business in his electorate and that he does everything he can to advocate for the four pillars of the economy in the state of Queensland. The member for Brisbane Central is part of a team with a strong plan that will always ensure a brighter future for Queenslanders.

I thank the member for the question, because, as I said, growing a four-pillar economy means that ministers have to make all of these sorts of decisions in terms of small businesses and the benefits of small business. I am pleased to advise the House that the government's commitment and changes to workers compensation will mean that business can thrive in Queensland and we will still have a fair system for workers in this state.

The average premium is reducing by over 17 per cent from the \$1.45 average premium to \$1.20 per \$100 of wages. On top of that, 93 per cent of the 150,000 businesses who insure with WorkCover will have their claims history wiped cleaned through a simpler premium model and policy holders will have greater flexibility to pay their premium in instalments. Workers will still be entitled to journey claims. Workers will still have the best statutory scheme. We will have the best scheme in Australia.

The honourable Treasurer might want to help me out here in terms of mythbusters. The member for Mulgrave is always going on about mythbusters. I must admit that I do not know what he said in his 'Mythbusters' about workers compensation, but he put out a press release a couple of days ago about workers compensation. It reads 'Desperate LNP government take credit for Labor's WorkCover premium decrease'. I table a copy of the press release.

*Tabled paper:* Article, dated 20 May 2014, by member for Mulgrave, Mr Curtis Pitt MP, titled 'Desperate LNP take credit for Labor's Workcover premium decrease: Pitt' [\[5168\]](#).

**Mr Rickuss** interjected.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I take the interjection from the member for Lockyer. Despite the fact that last year those opposite opposed the bill on workers compensation they are now claiming credit for the reduction in workers compensation. Can I correct the record once and for all. I am going to table a letter that I have received from WorkCover which states—

I note recent media statements regarding the announcement. The legislative amendments in 2010 provided a period of premium stability—

In 2013 it was \$1.45. Here is the crux of the letter from the chairman of WorkCover—

During this period, WorkCover also received very positive investment returns.

...

However, it is important to note that without the 2013 legislative amendments, WorkCover would not have been able to reduce the average premium rate to the extent that it has for 2014-15, that is \$1.20. This rate has been determined by the WorkCover board, following independent actuarial advice, such that the WorkCover continues to offer a stable and viable fund for Queensland employers and their workers.

I table a copy of that letter.

*Tabled paper:* Letter, dated 21 May 2014, from Mr Glen Ferguson, Chair, WorkCover Queensland to Attorney-General and Minister for Justice, Hon. Jarrod Bleijie, regarding WorkCover Queensland premium announcement for 2014/15 [\[5169\]](#).

That is a mythbuster. We have a strong plan for a brighter future for all businesses in this state.

### Federal Budget

**Ms D'ATH:** My question is to the Premier. I refer to the Premier's comments reported in August last year when he urged Tony Abbott to follow his lead in making cuts to federal spending, especially in the areas of education and health, and I ask: will the Premier now admit his confected outrage at the federal budget is designed entirely to distract from his own cuts—

**Mr PUCCI:** I rise to a point of order.

**Madam SPEAKER:** I will take the point of order, but I remind members that it is easier to rule when we have heard the full question. What is your point of order, member for Logan?

**Mr PUCCI:** The question contains inferences and subjective feelings. It says that the Premier told him to make health cuts, and he did not.

**Madam SPEAKER:** Please take your seat. I am going to allow the member to finish asking the question and then I will rule.

**Ms D'ATH:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is to the Premier. I refer to the Premier's comments reported in August last year when he urged Tony Abbott to follow his lead in making cuts to federal spending, especially in the areas of education and health, and I ask: will the Premier now admit his confected outrage at the federal budget is designed entirely to distract from his own cuts to jobs and front-line services and his failure to create jobs?

**Madam SPEAKER:** Before I call the Premier, I remind members that the standing orders do rule against imputations. The member in asking the question has stated certain things as being a fact. It is up to the person answering the question to refute or agree with those alleged statements of fact. I call the Premier.

**Mr NEWMAN:** They are not bad in the Australian Labor Party, are they? They are all cut from the same block of cheddar cheese and it is a pretty mouldy old block. We have heard the member for Rockhampton talk about Tories and class warfare. Well, where was the member—now member for Redcliffe—when \$22 million was cut out of metro north by the government that she was a member of? Nowhere whatsoever. I reject the assertion in her question that I was somehow encouraging Tony Abbott to make cuts last year. I ask her to table the document or come in here later on today and withdraw that outrageous statement and apologise to the House.

This is the difference between us and the Labor Party: we have taken a stand on issues of cuts. Even today I have come into this place and continued to prosecute the case, because I will always stand up for Queensland. In contrast, those opposite never said boo against Wayne Swan, Julia Gillard or Kevin Rudd cutting funding to Queensland. They would not say a thing. The member for Redcliffe was happy to impose higher costs of living which continue to hurt people today in her electorate. This upcoming financial year electricity costs would only go up 5.4 per cent if the carbon tax had gone, but the member for Redcliffe is quite happy to sit in this place and continue to support a carbon tax. It is the height of hypocrisy. We might have another motion and give them another go and see if they want to reduce the cost of living. I do not think those breathtaking bunch of hypocrites over there would be prepared even now to vote to get rid of the carbon tax, because that is the way we provide cost-of-living relief.

This government is a strong government with a strong plan. It has revitalised front-line services. Contrary to the inference, we have come in here day after day over the last few months and demonstrated that emergency departments are doing better, that elective surgery waiting times have dropped and that we have the best waiting times in the nation for elective surgery. We have seen better response times for ambulances, we have seen a huge reduction in people on the public health dental waiting list, and the member for Redcliffe, in a totally dishonest question, makes these outrageous assertions. I reckon the Leader of the Opposition should show some leadership with her as well. She should get the member for Redcliffe aside and say, 'If you are going to ask a question, tell the truth.' I go back to the member for Bundamba. It is time for the member for Inala to actually show some leadership or she will be that—the member for Inala.

### Tourism, Palm Island

**Mr HATHAWAY:** My question without notice is to the Minister for Tourism, Major Events, Small Business and the Commonwealth Games. Can the minister update the House on how the government's support for tourism is benefiting the community, especially in my electorate of Townsville?

**Mrs STUCKEY:** I thank the honourable member for the question. Indigenous tourism is recorded as a very high-priority experience by many of our international and domestic visitors. In order to achieve our long-term goals for tourism, we must maximise our experiences by exploring the vast untapped potential of places such as historic and breathtakingly beautiful Palm Island. To this end, the Newman government is working closely with the Palm Island Economic Development and Transport Committee to pursue small-scale tourism development. I congratulate the honourable member for Townsville for his diligent leadership of this committee. Since becoming the state member in 2012, John Hathaway has been a tireless advocate for his electorate and a vocal advocate for tourism across the region.

On 16 April this year, as part of a series of open days across North Queensland, some 210 visitors eagerly participated in Palm Island Open Day. Visitors were greeted with a traditional Indigenous welcome and experienced the unique history of the island and its rich, unique art and culture. I am advised that the day was a resounding success with a report compiled on the outcome of this very significant event. In Townsville last week I was presented with a copy of this report and, as I am sure the House would be interested, I now table a copy of this report.

*Tabled paper:* Palm Island Open Day 16 April 2014—Final Report by Allison Rossetto and Tony O'Connor [\[5170\]](#).

The report shows that visitors provided an extensive list when asked to describe the best thing about the open day. The opportunity to visit Palm Island and to learn about its history in the exhibition and on tours was a highlight for many. Palm Island locals were commended for their warm welcome and friendly nature. Importantly, the Palm Island locals also reported that they loved the opportunity to meet new people and that visitors to the island could see the place for what it really is, rather than through the eyes of the media.

I wish to congratulate Mayor Alf Lacey, Councillor Mislam Sam and the Palm Island Aboriginal Shire Council, Townsville Enterprise and local Townsville operators, especially SeaLink, for their sterling efforts to make this day possible. Support also came from numerous government agencies, including my own Department of Tourism, Major Events, Small Business and the Commonwealth Games, and also the Department of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander and Multicultural Affairs and the Department of State Development, Infrastructure and Planning. There is now an opportunity to build on the success of the April open day project, with an aim to build the confidence of local participants and develop preliminary skills in event planning, guiding and interpretation. We will continue to work closely together with the honourable member for Townsville. Tourism will form part of a very strong plan for a brighter future for the people of Palm Island, and we are committed to ensuring that they share in the economic and social prosperity of our great state.

### **Moranbah, Fly-In Fly-Out**

**Mr KNUTH:** My question without notice is to the Deputy Premier. Yesterday, the Deputy Premier said, in reference to the member for Nicklin, that he was happy to discuss with him anything that might provide some benefits to his community. I ask: will the Deputy Premier travel to Moranbah and discuss with the Moranbah community the serious impact 100 per cent fly-in fly-out has on that community?

**Mr SEENEY:** I do sincerely thank the member for Dalrymple for this question. I thank him very much. At the outset, I can say that I have travelled to Moranbah to discuss this issue with the council and the mayor a number of times. I can also say that I will not be discussing it with them further until they change their entrenched position. What the Isaac Regional Council wants to do is profiteer. What it wants to do is what it was able to do under the previous Labor government. The previous Labor government imposed conditions on mining companies whereby they had to build a certain number of houses in Moranbah, but the market was cornered by the Isaac Regional Council. It did very well out of it over a period. It did so well out of it that the rents in Moranbah rose to about \$2,500 to \$3,000 a week for houses.

**Mr Johnson:** And you didn't get much of a house.

**Mr SEENEY:** It was not much of a house; that is exactly right. When we came to government, we said to the Isaac Regional Council that we were prepared to fund some infrastructure that made more land available in Moranbah, that made it possible for a major subdivision to take place in Moranbah, which would make more houses available and reduce the cost of housing in Moranbah so that people could live there and it could be a proper community. There was only one condition: the council had to provide the land at cost and not make a huge profit out of it. The state was not going to try to make a profit out of it. We were going to provide \$10 million. That was on the table so that the council could develop the land that it had. We wanted it to do it at cost, rather than to profiteer. The

offer is still on the table. We are still waiting for the Isaac Regional Council to understand that its role is not as a land developer; its role is to administer its community in a way that makes it an attractive place for people to live.

The other thing that people should know about the Isaac Regional Council is that it is, let us say, influenced by the CFMEU—that is, the same group that funds the member for Bundamba. The CFMEU is running a campaign against fly-in fly-out workers because it wants to go back to the old days when it had everybody in mining towns captivated and it exerted its influence on people at work and in the supermarket, at schools and in the sporting clubs. The intimidation that the union thugs used to undertake in those mining towns is a thing of the past and it should stay a thing of the past.

### **Road Safety, Motorcyclists**

**Mr DAVIES:** My question without notice is to the Minister for Transport and Main Roads. How is the government consulting with Queenslanders to make our vision for safer roads for motorcycle riders a reality?

**Mr EMERSON:** I thank the member for Capalaba for the question and I note he takes an abiding interest in this issue. He will welcome what we have announced today, which is a discussion paper that will go out for the next six weeks to look at sensible changes to the rules on our roads pertaining to motorcyclists. For many years under governments of all persuasions motorcyclists have called for this.

There are three areas detailed in the discussion paper. The first is lane filtering, which is legal in Queensland but the laws need some clarification, particularly in terms of changing lanes and signalling. Again, that is something that we see on our roads now. Lane filtering is about motorcyclists weaving through traffic that is stationary or moving at under 30 kilometres per hour. It does not refer to lane splitting, which is moving through traffic at high speeds. The second aspect of the discussion paper is the ability to purchase helmets made overseas that meet Australian standards but that are not available in Queensland at the moment. The third issue is being able to remove your feet from the footrests on motorcycles.

**Mr Ruthenberg:** Hear, hear!

**Mr EMERSON:** I know that the member for Kallangur understands that point and I take the interjection from the member for Kallangur, Trevor Ruthenberg, who is also a great enthusiast for this change. The reality is that it is not safe not to be able to stretch your legs on a long trip. Also, the absurdity is that under the current rules you cannot take your feet off the footrests to reverse park your motorcycle. That is a ridiculous situation to be in.

Those three sensible changes will go out to be discussed with the public over the next six weeks and they reflect calls from the motorcycling community to look at changing those laws. It fits into what we have been doing since we came to office two years ago. We have looked at changes in terms of the Q-Safe program for young drivers transitioning from learners to P-plates, laws concerning older drivers and laws in terms of getting a motorcycle licence. As a government, we have our record \$350 million Road Safety Action Plan. Again, I congratulate Queenslanders. At the beginning of this week, our road toll is 40 below where it was this time last year and 12 below the record year. The reality is that with our better planning, with changes to appropriate laws and with our record Road Safety Action Plan we are delivering for Queensland. We are doing the proper planning.

I urge people to get involved in this discussion paper. They can go to the Get Involved website. The discussion will be open for six weeks. This morning on ABC radio I spoke on Spencer Howson's program. Afterwards, they asked for people to call in with their views. I think that 5½ out of six callers gave the thumb's up for lane filtering. Let us see where we go with this. As a government, we have a strong plan for a brighter future for Queensland.

### **Goods and Services Tax**

**Mrs CUNNINGHAM:** My question without notice is to the Premier. With continued emphasis on the need for healthy living and healthy food choices, will the Premier support Queenslanders by ruling out any support on his part for the extension of the GST to fresh fruit, vegetables, meats, fish and dairy products?

**Mr NEWMAN:** I thank the member for Gladstone for the question without notice. I draw her attention to comments I have made in the media on multiple occasions in recent days. I have said that I do not support the GST being raised or being broadened—end of story. I have said that. Unlike those opposite—and sadly I see the member for Gladstone voting with them so often these days—I

do not believe that the answer to the problems of this nation in terms of governments funding services is a knee-jerk reaction to increase taxes. I get quite distressed when the immediate reaction is for governments to start talking about increased taxes. I even get distressed when I see journalists obsessed with wanting to talk about increasing taxes.

People have every right to demand that governments do better with the money they are already getting. That has been a hallmark of this government. We have been very reluctant to increase taxes that impact directly on people's costs of living. What have we done? We took thousands of tax dollars off buying one's own home, we froze family car rego for this entire term, we froze the traffic improvement levy for the entire term and we halved the current Leader of the Opposition's increases in public transport fares. We also brought in an after nine journeys in a week concession on the TransLink go card to help take the pressure off people's commuting costs. We have provided a one-off \$80 rebate. In the first year, we froze electricity price increases and we are trying very hard to see them level off. The minister has been speaking about that in recent days. That is what we are all about. I think I have answered the question.

To return to the issue of the day, we saw the Deputy Premier bring it altogether. We have a CFMEU campaign against fly-in fly-out. We have the CFMEU and ETU, brothers in arms, with their outrageous assertions relating to the Third Reich and Hitler. We have the CFMEU funding the member for Bundamba out of three mysterious companies in Sydney on the one day. Why are they splitting donations? And then they come in here—

**Ms Trad** interjected.

**Mr NEWMAN:** An interjection from the member for South Brisbane who still has not declared what the Obeid money was for. What was it for? What did you talk to Anna Bligh about? What did the member for South Brisbane say? Did the member for South Brisbane ring up Mike Keiser and say, 'Eddie needs a meeting with the Premier.' We do not know what happened because the former Premier's diary has disappeared.

We have seen a very interesting lack of leadership from the ALP today. We have seen confected outrage. The only people who have strong leadership and a strong plan for Queensland are the LNP team.

### **Police Service**

**Mr CRANDON:** My question without notice is to the Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Services. Can the minister please detail how the Newman government is delivering better for the future of our front-line services through developments such as QLITE technology which assists our hardworking police to keep our community safe?

**Mr DEMPSEY:** The government has a strong plan for a brighter future for the people of Queensland. At the last election we made a promise to revitalise front-line services. With this vision, the Newman government is getting on with the job and delivering on its commitment to make Queensland one of the safest places to live and raise a family.

Our innovative approach to mobile technology is taking officers from behind their desks, and back out patrolling our streets. There are now more than 500 police with access to iPhones and iPads, with another 1,250 devices to come in time for the G20 summit in November this year. These devices provide a platform to numerous operational tools and functions for the front line and on the front line.

Police can now access the QLITE application—technology designed to give officers the ability to capture intelligence in the field straightaway, saving an average of 30 minutes of data entry per shift. That is thousands of hours redirected back into proactive policing. QLITE gives police access to useful information from QPRIME, CrimTrac and Transport and Main Roads's databases—such as access to people's images and vehicle records. This is information that officers previously could only access from the station or access through the radio network.

With these efficiencies, police have seen a reduction in everyday administrative duties, allowing officers to continue to focus on proactive policing and keeping our communities even safer. But it is not just QLITE making policing efficient, effective and safer. Police now have access to Zebedee's to help create 3D crime scenes in a matter of minutes. This is a world first for Queensland and something that we should all be proud of.

Police are only as good as the information they receive. The Queensland community is keeping up to date with what is happening in their community via our newly created MyPolice blogs which have had approximately 27 million hits to date. As well there are the state-wide Neighbourhood Watch

blogs. They are another tool to engage with the community. Our open data website has also received millions of hits. These numbers show just how the community is embracing and engaging in proactive policing activities.

By sticking to our strong plan of revitalising front-line services, new technology, like mobile devices, is making our streets even safer. After years of Labor neglect from those opposite, who have no plan and no position, our police and emergency services are now better equipped than ever before. It is part of our vision for the future of Queensland as not only a great state, but a safe state not just for the children we have with us here today but for generations to come.

### Health Services

**Mr BYRNE:** My question is to the Minister for Health. What steps has the minister taken to direct Queensland Health to assess the impacts the Abbott government's GP tax will have on emergency departments in Queensland hospitals, and if he has done this will he reveal the results?

**Mr SPRINGBORG:** I thank the honourable member for Rockhampton for his question. I do not know what sort of rock the honourable member for Rockhampton has been living under in the last week or so, but the Premier has been leading other state Premiers and first ministers from around Australia in actually addressing the negative impacts from the Commonwealth government's proposed changes to the funding arrangements. That stands in stark contrast—

**Mr Newman:** No confected outrage there. No outrage at all. Nothing at all.

**Mr SPRINGBORG:** Nothing at all. There is no confected outrage. There is absolutely nothing, as you said, Mr Premier.

The Premier's very direct action on this stands in stark contrast to what we saw from the honourable member for Rockhampton last year or the year before when Wayne Swan and Julia Gillard cut \$4.8 million out of the Central Queensland Hospital and Health Service budget at the same time as the Newman government was actually increasing it. The member for Rockhampton was nowhere to be seen at that time. Indeed, when there was a motion moved in this parliament for us to stand up for Queensland against the former Labor government's cuts, the member for Rockhampton was not even prepared to support Queensland.

So today he has finally whipped himself into action. We have seen him stand up in here and receive three sucker punches from his leadership team over the last two weeks. He is probably the dark horse coming through. He is the only one who has been trying to make a little bit of sense, but we have seen him wither on the vine in the last few days.

As the Premier has said, we are concerned about this. That is why we have been in discussions with the Commonwealth around the national partnership agreement changes which would impact us by around \$11 million or \$12 million. That is far less than we saw from the previous Labor government—they took \$103 million, \$42 million of which was retrospectively applied and the best part of \$60 million which had already been spent in the financial year was taken away.

What the Commonwealth government is proposing, and we still have concerns, is prospective changes. We still believe that that is not in the spirit of the agreement that they entered into and we will fight that and continue to fight that with no support whatsoever from those honourable members opposite.

When it comes to the issue of co-payments, let us look at what the former government in Queensland actually did. The opposition shadow minister, who has actually been keeping her head down for whatever reason, actually commissioned a report in 2005 to bring in co-payments in Queensland hospitals, something which this government has absolutely repudiated.

*(Time expired)*

**Madam SPEAKER:** The time for questions has expired.

## SPEAKER'S STATEMENT

### School Group Tours

**Madam SPEAKER:** I wish to acknowledge the schools visiting today. We have visiting from the electorate of Lytton Guardian Angels Catholic Primary School in Wynnum. We welcome all other schools present in the gallery today.

## STATE DEVELOPMENT, INFRASTRUCTURE AND INDUSTRY COMMITTEE

### Report No. 38, Motion to Take Note

**Madam SPEAKER:** There being no mover, the notice of motion lapses in accordance with standing order 71.


## HEALTH AND COMMUNITY SERVICES COMMITTEE

### Report No. 49, Motion to Take Note

**Madam SPEAKER:** There being no mover, the notice of motion lapses in accordance with standing order 71.

## MOTION

### Amendment to Standing Orders

 **Mr STEVENS** (Mermaid Beach—LNP) (Leader of the House) (11.09 am), by leave, without notice: I move—

That the Standing Rules and Orders of the Legislative Assembly be amended in accordance with the amendment circulated in my name with an effective date of 2 June 2014.


#### Amendment to Standing Orders to be moved by the Leader of the House

##### 1. CHAPTER 19 (DIVISIONS)—

*Omit Standing Order 106, Insert—*

##### “106. Procedure for a party vote

- (1) When the bars have been closed, the Speaker shall state the question to the House.
- (2) To cast their votes, members must sit in their allocated places in the Chamber. Unless they have advised their Whip that they intend to cast a contrary vote, each member of the parties that make up the government or official opposition are deemed to be voting to support the response of their party members given at the time the Speaker originally put the question.
- (3) Members of the parties that make up the government or official opposition that intend casting a contrary vote must advise their Whip. These Members must then also advise the Clerk of their intention to cast a contrary vote and indicate whether they are voting for the “Ayes” or “Noes”.
- (4) Members of minor parties, recognised parties or independents must sign a tally sheet provided by the Clerk indicating whether they are voting for the “Ayes” or “Noes”.
- (5) The Government Whip, Opposition Whip and Clerk will report the number of “Ayes” or “Noes”. The report must only relate to votes cast by members present in the Chamber and every member present must vote. The votes will be reported in the following order:
  - (i) The Speaker asks the Government Whip, to report the government party’s votes;
  - (ii) The Speaker asks the Opposition Whip, to report the official opposition party’s vote.
  - (iii) The Speaker asks the Clerk, to report the votes of other members that have reported to the Clerk in accordance with (3) or (4) above. The Clerk will report the votes by party or electorate.
- (6) Any Member may before the result of the vote is announced by the Speaker, challenge the report of votes reported by the Government Whip, Opposition Whip or the Clerk. If a report is challenged, the Speaker may direct that the report stand, be corrected or that the matter be resolved by a personal vote.
- (7) The Speaker announces the result to the House.
- (8) The Government Whip and Opposition Whip will immediately provide the Clerk the names of those members of their party that were not present for the vote.
- (9) The Clerk will record the result of the vote and the names of those members voting “Aye” and “No” and publish those details in the Record of Proceedings.
- (10) If fewer than five members vote with either the “Ayes” or the “Noes”, the Clerk will record whether the question was agreed to or not in the Record of Proceedings but the result of the vote and the names of members voting will not be recorded in accordance with (9) above.
- (11) If an error occurs in any record of result, the error shall be reported to the House by the Speaker at the earliest practical time and the Record of Proceeding altered.
- (12) In this Standing Order a reference to Government Whip, Opposition Whip or the Clerk includes a reference to their delegates.”

 **Mr WELLINGTON** (Nicklin—Ind) (11.08 am): I rise to speak against this motion. The Clerk of the Parliament has explained to me how this proposed change will work, and the simple effect is that it will stop representatives from the Katter party and the Palmer party and the member for Gladstone and me from standing in parliament and saying publicly whether we will vote for or against the motion before the House. The government does not want to hear representatives from the Katter party or the Palmer party or Liz Cunningham or me stand up and say yes or no. We see them shudder over there when we stand up and say how we are going to vote. This is simply petty politics—petty politics at the lowest scale.

We have seen continual attacks on the minor parties, and this is simply another extension of this. One of the justifications put to us as to the reason for this change is that it will improve the efficiency of the operation of parliament. It will speed up the counting of votes. Can I say that that is simply a sham. Under the new proposal it will take just as long to count the votes from the crossbenches, and that is what we are. We are the crossbenches—the Katter party, the Palmer party, Liz and me. We represent the crossbenches.

**Madam SPEAKER:** Order! Member, I remind you that the standing orders are that you refer to members by their correct titles, which is their electorates.

**Mr WELLINGTON:** Sorry, the member for Gladstone and me. This is another example of why members of the crossbench need to have a specific representative on the Committee of the Legislative Assembly.

**Mr Seeney:** Like hell.

**Mr WELLINGTON:** I just heard the Deputy Premier say, 'Like hell.' I would like to respond to that response from the Deputy Premier. This is another example of why we need to have a representative from the crossbenches sitting around that table when important decisions are made about what happens in parliament.

We were not informed about this decision until a few minutes before we came into the chamber. We were not informed. I do not know whose fault that was, but the simple fact is that it is not working, and we have a right, like every other member of parliament, to know what is happening at this important meeting where they are discussing procedure and what is happening in parliament. I think that is fair and reasonable. If the government wanted to do the right thing and not play petty politics at this level, they would invite a representative from the crossbenches to sit in on that meeting. What harm are we going to do?

**Mr Cox:** It won't do any good.

**Mr WELLINGTON:** I take that interjection from the member sitting in front of me: 'It won't do any good.' Again, that shows the arrogance of this government. They do not want to include members from the crossbench in the decision making of important matters that affect parliament.

Can I also say that, while I have no illusions about the agenda from the government, I am disappointed that the Labor Party, who had their representative at this meeting, for whatever reason, if I can be generous, did not understand the implications for the members of the crossbench, have agreed to this. But that is history. We now have a chance to set the record straight. We now have a chance to do the right thing—and the right thing to do is, instead of playing petty politics, invite a representative from the crossbenches to sit in on that meeting and participate.

I give a commitment to Queenslanders that if I am fortunate and privileged to get re-elected at the next state election, whenever the Premier chooses to call it, I will do whatever I can to ensure that members of the crossbench—the Independents and the minor parties—will be able to sit around that table at the next sitting of parliament. And who knows how many from the LNP will be there. I think Howard Hobbs, the member for Warrego, certainly will. He certainly will.

**A government member:** You're okay, Howard. You can relax.


**Mr WELLINGTON:** Good on you, Howard.

**Madam SPEAKER:** Order, member for Nicklin!

**Mr WELLINGTON:** Sorry, member for Warrego.

**Madam SPEAKER:** Order! Member for Nicklin, I remind you of the motion before the House and ask you to address the motion before the House.

**Mr WELLINGTON:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. All I can say to the government backbenchers, the moderate government backbenchers—I understand how the government is driven by the leadership team—look through what this is simply about. It is about petty politics. They do not like to see the members of the crossbench take a couple of seconds to stand up here and say yes or no as to how they are going to vote. They are paranoid. It is simply petty politics at its worst.

 **Mrs CUNNINGHAM** (Gladstone—Ind) (11.13 am): I also rise to oppose the motion. I oppose it on a number of fronts. I agree with the former Speaker. I appreciate the fact that the Leader of the House advised me that these changes were to be considered by this parliament. It was explained to me that there would be a time saving. When I stepped through in my own mind the process that was to be adopted, that the Clerk would then come and seek the numbers from each of us that sit on the crossbenches, there is no time to be saved. The Clerk will report the votes by party or electorate to the House—which is exactly what happens now. On the basis of time saving, there is no time saving to be made.

I hold the view that every single person in this chamber is important. We are privileged for the period that we are elected to represent our electorates and we have a right to have a voice. We have a right to reflect the views of our electorates. There are times when things are very controversial and we vote according to our conscience or according to our world view, our faith view. We are answerable to our community on that basis, not to this chamber. We are answerable to our community.

Whilst the easy argument is that prior to the changes we did not rise and speak either—that is true; the votes were tallied by the two whips—this new change was brought in and we have adopted that new change. What the Leader of the House is proposing does not advance or benefit that change. It is a backward step in terms of representation.

The second issue that I wish to raise is that of a standing order that has been in place for a long time but one about which I have had concerns. Point (10) says—

If fewer than five members vote with either the “Ayes” or the “Noes”, the Clerk will record whether the question was agreed to or not in the Record of Proceedings but the result of the vote and the names of members voting will not be recorded in accordance with (9) above.


Mr Deputy Speaker, can I say that that has always disappointed me and this is an opportunity for me to speak against that. I reiterate that every single person in this place is important. Every single vote in this place is important. At the moment there is a preponderance of members who choose to be members of the LNP and a smaller number of members who choose to be members of the ALP. There are members who choose to in the Palmer United Party or the Katter’s Australian Party or Independents. Each of those groups represent their electorates. Each of those members represent their electorate. Whether there is one person voting against or for a bill—and I have been in that position—that vote deserves to be recorded and held for posterity. Otherwise it is a very vague record of this place. We deal so often with accuracy. We deal so often with ensuring that the business of this place is appropriately recorded, yet we have this part of the motion. I again acknowledge it has been longstanding, but I again say it is wrong. It does not reflect an accurate recording of the procedures in this place.

The final issue that I wish to address is that of the membership of the CLA—and it is one about which I have spoken before; I spoke against it when the CLA was formed—that the CLA does not—

**Mr STEVENS:** I rise to a point of order. There is nothing in this motion that I have moved, Mr Deputy Speaker, in relation to membership of the CLA. It has no relevance, it has no effect on the motion and it is not part of the discussion.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Dr Robinson): Order! Member for Gladstone, I am going to allow a little bit of latitude, but I just ask you to stay close to the motion.

**Mrs CUNNINGHAM:** Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. The standing orders are about the orderly operation of this House. The orderly operation of this House in part has been changed. The standing orders have been changed to reflect the make-up of this chamber. We have had committees restructured. The CLA considers the way that this chamber operates. It does not reflect the make-up of this chamber, and it should. I hold very strongly to that and did so when the CLA was formed. It is not a new opinion. I do not believe that the changes contained in this motion will benefit the people of Queensland, nor will they enhance the running of this chamber, and I oppose them.

 **Mr HOPPER** (Condamine—KAP) (11.19 am): Part 4 of this motion reads—

Members of minor parties, recognised parties or Independents must sign a tally sheet provided by the Clerk indicating whether they are voting for the “Ayes” or “Noes”.

Why have we been separated from the two major parties? It is a trend that this LNP government has brought forward since coming to government, and we see this trend continuing. I will give a few examples of this trend. At the very last sitting of 2012 the LNP legislated to take away from the Katter’s Australian Party their staff. They legislated to take away our recognised party status so we would lose our five staff that Bob Quinn, Joan Sheldon and David Watson were awarded when they had three members of parliament.

**Mr Wellington:** Three members!


**Mr HOPPER:** Three members of parliament. We see another motion being moved to isolate the crossbenches from the two major parties. This is just another bullying tactic by the LNP. What was the very first thing the LNP did? I sat in opposition with the LNP and the resources over there were immense. There were massive meeting rooms, there was a big party meeting room, the Leader of the Opposition had a massive office and the deputy leader had a massive office. What did they do to the opposition? They put them up on level 9 in all those tiny offices. It is just another bullying tactic, as we see in this amendment today by the LNP.

We see the legislation that is currently before this House which I cannot speak on. We see the massive pay rises they have and the promotions to all the backbenchers so they would be part of it. It is just more bullying tactics by the LNP. Everyone in this institution goes to the people of Queensland to be elected members of this institution. Only 89 members can be elected to this institution and all members should be treated equally. All members should have the same right when entering this institution. This is an absolute slur on this institution once again today.

These are fat cats looking after fat mates. This is petty storeroom stuff. It is the same pettiness I experienced when I joined the KAP and they put me in a store room for an office. They then put me in a bedroom which is the noisiest bedroom in Parliament House. It is just another tactic against the crossbenches. This is exactly what we see from the bullying, thuggish government that we have. They make Hitler look like an angel.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! Member for Condamine, that language is unparliamentary. I ask you to withdraw it.

**Mr HOPPER:** I withdraw.

 **Mr KNUTH** (Dalrymple—KAP) (11.22 am): I oppose this motion. When we look at this motion and ask ourselves what it is about, we find it is supposedly about time saving. If we have a good look at it and there is no time saving, the question has to be asked: why was the motion moved in the first place? It is not about efficiency. It is not about time saving. The extra work that the Clerk will do, and likewise the crossbenches, means that there will be no time saving at all. It is more a waste of time. We have to weigh up what on earth is going on and why they are doing it. They have introduced legislation into the House to reduce minor parties' electoral return funding.

As the member for Condamine just said, in the beginning the KAP had three members and in the last hours of the end of parliament they moved legislation in the House to take away that funding. Oppositions are supposed to be there to hold governments to account. That is the proper process of government, and that is the reason every member of parliament is elected in Queensland. The hierarchy of the LNP has been receiving a lot of feedback from government backbenchers that there is a tidal wave coming and we are not doing very well in our electorates.

**Mr STEVENS:** Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. Nowhere in my motion did I mention tidal waves or any matter—

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! Are you raising relevance?

**Mr STEVENS:** Relevance. Please keep the member relevant to the motion.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! Member for Dalrymple, I ask you to stay relevant to the motion.

**Mr KNUTH:** This is a vendetta against the minor parties. The motion states—

(4) Members of minor parties, recognised parties or Independents must sign a tally sheet provided by the Clerk indicating whether they are voting for the "Ayes" or "Noes".

(5) The Government Whip, Opposition Whip and Clerk will report the number of "Ayes" or "Noes". The report must only relate to votes cast by members present in the Chamber and every member present must vote. The votes will be reported in the following order:

- (i) The Speaker asks the Government Whip, to report the government party's votes;
- (ii) The Speaker asks the Opposition Whip, to report the official opposition party's vote.


However, this is something different—

- (iii) The Speaker asks the Clerk, to report the votes of other members that have reported to the Clerk in accordance with (3) or (4) above. The Clerk will report the votes by party or electorate.

The whole issue is that the government is going down. The government is going down, down, down. 'Legislate against the opposition. Don't worry, backbenchers, we will look after you. We will find whatever means and ways possible to legislate any opposition out of existence,' but the people of Queensland are not fools. There is a tidal wave coming.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! Member for Dalrymple, I have asked you to return to the motion and you used almost the exact same wording after I had asked you to return to it. I ask you to return to the motion and remain relevant to it.

**Mr KNUTH:** I oppose this motion. It is a bad motion. It is a very dictatorial motion. It is not what the institution of parliament should be about.


 **Mr PITT** (Mulgrave—ALP) (11.26 am): I know that I will cop the ire of the Deputy Premier and the Leader of the House, but I want them to hear me out. This matter was discussed in the CLA. I am not worried about saying that it was not opposed by the opposition members, because it is about the efficiency of the House and the running of the House. I think it has been put forward with all good intentions, but having heard the comments by the crossbenches today and understanding that the role of opposition members on the CLA is not only to represent the opposition but also to represent the views of those on the crossbenches including minor parties, I would respectfully ask that the motion be reconsidered based on that feedback.

I see much merit in the proposition that has been put forward, but I also see great merit in ensuring that those in the minor parties and the crossbenches have an opportunity to be directly consulted if they feel so strongly about it. That is the position of the opposition. As I say, I understand there will be cries of hypocrisy from those government members on the CLA. I ask that they take my comments in the way in which they are being given—that is, we have a duty as non-government members on the CLA to represent all of those members. The fact that they have not been properly consulted or have concerns that they have not been properly consulted I think is a fair point.

Due to the fact that this House is able to change these matters under the standing orders and is not required to make legislative change gives us the flexibility as a House, particularly given that this is a new system, to ensure that members are satisfied. This is not a political issue. This is about ensuring that people have a chance to put their voice forward. I am not suggesting that that is about people standing in their place and voting. What I mean by that is that they should be able to feel as though they have been properly consulted.

The CLA is meant to be an apolitical, bipartisan organisation for the entirety of this parliament. I think it functions that way almost all the time. I think that is a tribute to most of the people who are on that committee, but there is very strong feeling from those on the crossbenches and from those in the minor parties. I think they are valid concerns that they raise. I think this matter should be reconsidered by the CLA. The opportunity is there for the Leader of the House to withdraw this motion. That is not a failing of anyone on the government side. It is the wishes of the non-government members on the CLA at this point that we reconsider it. If that is not the case, we will vote against this today, and that is the position of the opposition.

I think this is getting blown out of all proportion. What we do know is that this is a matter about consultation. The crossbenches and minor parties feel as though they have not been properly consulted. If that is a direct result of opposition members not consulting with them appropriately, then I am happy to say that that is something I will take the wrap for, but I will not come in here and vote against their very strong wishes because clearly they are very passionate about this. I still support the principles behind why this motion has been put forward—that is, it is about efficiencies of the House—but, in doing that, we should not lose sight of the fact that the CLA is meant to be a representative body of all in this House, not just those on the government side.

 **Hon. JW SEENEY** (Callide—LNP) (Deputy Premier and Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning) (11.30 am): Can I first recognise the abject cowardice and weak-kneed—

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Mr SEENEY:** Can I first recognise the abject cowardice of the opposition and the Manager of Opposition Business.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Dr Robinson): Order! Deputy Premier, I find that unparliamentary. I ask you to withdraw.

**Mr SEENEY:** Okay, I withdraw. Mr Deputy Speaker, we have heard some confected outrage from the crossbenches in this House today and I think it is important that the facts are placed on the record. The CLA recognised the extraordinary amount of time that was taken up by this House in the traditional division process that we used—where the number of divisions and the time it took to count them added up to an extraordinary amount of time over a parliamentary year. We looked at other voting systems and we decided to undertake a trial of a voting system that was aimed at making the operation of the House more efficient. At the end of that trial, we considered how the trial had worked,

and it was agreed by everybody on the CLA who considered it that the trial had demonstrated that there was still an extraordinary amount of time being taken up because of the number of people who had to stand up and call out their vote. It was also apparent that some of those members were using that moment as an opportunity to grandstand, particularly the member for Nicklin. He would use that opportunity to grandstand on particular issues.

**Mr WELLINGTON:** I rise to a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. I find those comments offensive. He has indicated that I have used that opportunity to grandstand. I find those comments offensive. They are untrue and I ask that they be withdrawn.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The member has asked that they be withdrawn.

**Mr SEENEY:** I withdraw. The arguments that have been advanced—that somehow or other the crossbenches are being disadvantaged and that they are being denied something that is available to all other members of the House—are quite clearly not true. The opposite is the case. Under the voting system that we introduced as a trial, I as the member for Callide do not get an opportunity to stand and call my vote but the member for Nicklin does and the member for Gladstone does. Mr Deputy Speaker, if you took the argument that has been advanced by both of those members, then you would be putting forward a case for the whole 89 members of this parliament to stand and call their vote. Every member of the House would stand up each time there was a division and they would have the opportunity to do what the member for Nicklin does. That is clearly and patently ridiculous, but that is the argument that is being advanced by the member for Nicklin—

**Mr WELLINGTON:** I rise to a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. Those comments are untrue and they are offensive, and I ask that they be withdrawn. That is not the argument I have put and that the *Hansard* record will show. I ask that those comments be withdrawn. They are offensive and they are wrong.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The member has taken offence. Would the Deputy Premier withdraw?

**Mr SEENEY:** I withdraw.


**Mr Wellington:** It shows how petty they are.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Nicklin, you raised a point of order. You took offence and the Deputy Premier has withdrawn. That is the end of it.

**Mr SEENEY:** Mr Deputy Speaker, can I put it another way. If the argument that is being advanced is that any particular member should have a right to stand and call their vote, then that right should extend to every member of the House, but of course it cannot. There are a number of statutory positions in this parliament, as there are in every parliament, and the statutory positions that are important in this particular case are the Government Whip and the Opposition Whip. Those statutory officers have a responsibility to report to the parliament because they are officers of the parliament and part of their role is to ensure the division is conducted properly and the result is recorded. That is part of their role, and the Clerk or the Clerk's representative also has a role in the parliament. Those roles are reflected in the changes that are being suggested in the motion that has been moved by the Leader of the House.

The motion that has been moved by the Leader of the House in no way takes away any right or privilege that any member of this House has or has had. I repeat: it does not take away any right or privilege that any member has. For many, many years nobody got to do what the members opposing this motion are arguing they should be able to continue to do—nobody got to do that. We all came here and stood along the walls and the whips had to count us. Nobody had the right to do that. So it is a confected argument that is being mounted against this motion and it is important that the facts are put on the record.


The CLA undertook a suggestion to reform the way divisions are conducted in this place. We introduced a trial and we examined that trial as it developed. We then took a decision to introduce a final voting system, and that final voting system is being formalised by the motion that the Leader of the House has moved. That motion should be supported by every member of the House.

 **Mr JUDGE** (Yeerongpilly—PUP) (11.37 am): I acknowledge the contribution made by the other members of the crossbenches as well as the explanation by the member for Gladstone of the mechanics of what occurs here in parliament. Today we had schoolchildren sitting up in the gallery. When people are in the gallery, they see and hear the representatives from each party and the Independents casting their vote. That is an important process. The parliament is an open parliament

for a particular reason. It enables people to see democracy occurring and it enables people to hear democracy occurring. In previous divisions when we used to move to the relevant side of the chamber to express which way we were voting, the people in the gallery could witness that. This is about silencing the crossbench and it is a very unhealthy move to take. This is about excluding the crossbench from participation in parliament—nothing more and nothing less.

Our courts are open to the public so people can see justice being done and the parliament is open to the public so people can see democracy being done, and that should not be watered down. We have seen the media removed from this parliament in that they cannot film footage and that impacted on people's participation in Queensland's parliament. This motion also removes the people's observations of our parliament. This is an offensive motion by an offensive government. Queenslanders are rightly waiting to express their views at the next election, and we saw what people think of this government at the Redcliffe election. The motion to damage our state's democracy demonstrates that the Newman government still does not get it and it is still not listening.

This is a motion of malice and of small-mindedness. If any member of the Newman government has an ounce of respect for democracy in Queensland, they will vote against it. Only the weak will support it and only those who lack the courage to protect our democracy will support it. I will oppose it.

 **Dr DOUGLAS** (Gaven—PUP) (11.39 am): I, too, oppose this motion. I endorse all the previous speakers' statements with the exception of the Deputy Premier. I find his comments particularly offensive because I have heard the opposite argument from him in this House and in the party room previously. Everything he said this morning is the opposite of what he has stated over many years.

This amendment to the standing rules and orders of the Legislative Assembly presented here today is unacceptable for many reasons. The intention is clearly to prevent the public seeing the legislative voting process visually—and that is live on television or via the internet, as many people do; they follow those deliberations. It is clearly to stop members of the crossbenches and minor parties having their votes transparently displayed so everyone can see them. It is nothing to do with one individual member of parliament, as indicated by the Deputy Premier, or even two; it is about everyone, and all members must be treated equally.

Certainly those votes are collected and announced by the Speaker at the conclusion of the individual votes and are later presented. However, under this change to the rule, there is no capacity in real time to identify who has voted and in what specific numbers. It is not transparent, it is not democratic, it is an abuse of process and it must be utterly rejected. All members on the other side of the House need to remember that circumstances change, as I have indicated before, over time. Do you think that this will not happen to you in future? The Deputy Premier will not be here.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Dr Robinson): Order! The member for Gaven will speak through the chair.


**Dr DOUGLAS:** Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker, for your advice. This must be rejected. The introduction of the current system was a reasonable attempt to resolve the older system whereby members had to actually leave their seats and stand on either side to represent the ayes and noes on each vote, and that was stated by the Deputy Premier. What he did not say is that, while the new model is not a truly progressive model as in other parliaments—certainly in New Zealand and Australia they have moved, in some cases, to elect via secure electronic voting where members can stay in the parliamentary precinct—this current model was at least a step forward and addressed the critical issue of transparency of the voting process to the members, to the electorate and to the wider public. The worst aspect of this motion is that it has the potential to close down the public's right to see exactly how members voted, especially in the case of the most repugnant legislation that currently comes before parliament repeatedly.


At a time when there is widespread trouble in parliaments across Australia—and critically here in Queensland and New South Wales—this parliament, rather than taking a step forward, is taking two steps backwards. Arguably, this Campbell Newman government are doing this because they are afraid of the public outrage over what they are prepared to do and every other political adviser in Australia says they must do the opposite.

If anyone needed further clues, this decision is just another nail in the coffin of both the Premier and the LNP government. The Premier spent much of this morning's debate trying to claim the high moral ground. Let him prove it. If he wants greater transparency, he must deliver it. This proposal to change the voting process is an attempt to not just cloud but deny transparency, which is not what parliaments are all about. Parliaments are about open, free and frank discussion. In fact, it should be

about true debate, as the Deputy Premier would often tell everyone. He would say that we should come in here and debate what people are saying rather than sometimes what you have written down, what you have thought or what people want you to say. On this occasion, this amendment is an attempt to disguise the true intention of the outcome that is desired and why it is so necessary. It is a manifest declaration of those lacking integrity seeking the refuge of scoundrels. That is what this is.

All government backbenchers should oppose this motion. It is exactly what the Deputy Premier said for years and years he would never do, but here he is doing it. It does not matter a bit that he has said that he went to the CLA and did it because he dominates that committee. You should not vote for it. In fact, the motion should be withdrawn by the Leader of the House and he should have the courage to do that.

 **Mr SORENSEN** (Hervey Bay—LNP) (11.44 am): I have heard some rubbish here today. I have served as both an opposition whip and a government whip in this place. In the past there were the whips who recorded the votes for the motion and the whips who recorded the votes against the motion and they were the only records. The numbers would be taken and then we would give them to the Clerk. Members opposite stand up here and say these things. However, members of the opposition have a lot more privilege today than they had under the last government. Now we see 'ALP, six; KAP, two'—and it is all documented in there. It never used to be like that. The only thing that used to be documented were the ones who were voting for the motion and the ones who were voting against the motion. That is all that was ever done. So what we have heard here today is absolute rubbish.

 **Mr STEVENS** (Mermaid Beach—LNP) (Leader of the House) (11.45 am): I am extremely disappointed at the debate on this matter that was manifestly canvassed at the CLA—and all views were taken on board at the CLA. Even members who claim to represent the interests of minor parties and individuals were at the CLA; they were aware of all matters in relation to this issue. We have been evolving the voting system of this parliament for quite some time. It was of concern that we lost almost two days of parliament out of a 42-day sitting year on the divisions within this parliament. That is why we moved to a new system that is part of this government's resolve to provide a better treatment of legislation, in this case, a better outcome. It also provides more opportunities for members to speak in the parliament. We were even looking at matters in terms of electronic voting to get a better system of voting, and that may well be a case for further investigation—

**Honourable members** interjected.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Dr Robinson): Order, members.

**Mr STEVENS**:—as we further evolve the process of 21st century voting in the parliament of Queensland. We are leading the way in this parliament. The CLA plays an important part and has an important role to play in that case and all avenues should be explored. As part of that system, quite a deal of time and exercise was taken in relation to the process that we first came up with, which was on a trial basis to see how it would affect things. I think most members would agree that the new voting system in this parliament has been very effective. I think it has been a great step forward. However, that is not to say that that system was—

**Mr Johnson**: It saved about two days of the year.

**Mr STEVENS**: Yes, two days of the year. However, it was not 100 per cent perfect from the day we introduced it into the House. As a responsible CLA would do, we considered matters to improve the effectiveness and the delivery of the voting system in this parliament. It has always been that the Government Whip delivers the notice of the voting intentions of the government and the Opposition Whip delivers the intentions of all those who are opposed to the government's position, and that has been the case for 150 years. Nothing we have done there would at all disadvantage Independents or minor parties. What we have done is look at those matters and provide a more effective and efficient way to have the minor parties, the Independents and the other—I will not say rats and mice down the back—people down the back involved in the official record regarding how their vote is counted in this parliament. So the recommendation agreed to unanimously in the CLA was to have an official record signed off by the Independents and the members of minor parties to make sure they do not flip-flop on some of their decisions to embarrass the Clerk and his office at a later date.

In other words, you will sign off on the way you have voted to make sure that there is no change—which we have seen in this parliament on occasions late at night, but I am not mentioning names. I will not go there. The fact of the matter is that you will have your vote officially recorded.

**Honourable members** interjected.

**Mr STEVENS:** I hear some clamouring down the back in relation to, 'I want to stand up and be famous!' 'I want to be counted!' 'I want to be seen!' 'I want to be relevant!' That is all about self-indulgence and self-importance—

**Mr JUDGE:** I rise to a point of order.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Dr Robinson):** Order! What is your point of order?

**Mr JUDGE:** That is an offensive remark. This is about disproportionate representation—

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Yeerongpilly, I did not hear that as being applied to you personally, but as a broader general statement. I do not believe that there was personal innuendo and offence directly made. The Leader of the House has the call.

**Mr STEVENS:** When comments are made across a broad spectrum of people and some people take exception on a personal basis, it obviously indicates their own personal guilt in the circumstances—

**Mr JUDGE:** I rise to a point of order.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** What is the point of order?

**Mr JUDGE:** That is offensive. I ask him to withdraw it.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Again I did not interpret that as personally being offensive to any one individual, but another general statement. The Leader of the House has the call.

**Mr STEVENS:** Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. I will continue with my general statements, which obviously involve certain members in the crossbenches, the minor parties and the individual members in this House. The fact of the matter is that their votes will be signed off on and they will be recorded. It is in no way to their detriment. Quite clearly it will protect the Clerk's position in the recording of the votes, and it will make sure that this evolving system of voting in the Queensland parliament is set not only for today, but for many, many years to come.

Division: Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

**AYES, 58:**

**LNP, 58—**Bates, Bennett, Berry, Bleijie, Boothman, Cavallucci, Costigan, Cox, Crandon, Cripps, Crisafulli, Davies, C Davis, T Davis, Dickson, Dillaway, Dowling, Flegg, France, Grant, Grimwade, Gulley, Hart, Hathaway, Hobbs, Holswich, Johnson, Kaye, Kempton, Krause, Langbroek, Latter, Maddern, Malone, Mander, McArdle, McVeigh, Menkens, Minnikin, Molhoek, Powell, Pucci, Rice, Rickuss, Ruthenberg, Seeney, Shorten, Shuttleworth, Smith, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stewart, Stuckey, Symes, Trout, Watts, Young.

**NOES, 13:**

**ALP, 6—**Byrne, D'Ath, Miller, Palaszczuk, Pitt, Trad.

**KAP, 3—**Hopper, Katter, Knuth.

**PUP, 2—**Douglas, Judge.

**INDEPENDENTS, 2—**Cunningham, Wellington.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Motion agreed to.

## MOTIONS

### Suspension of Standing and Sessional Orders



**Mr STEVENS (Mermaid Beach—LNP) (Leader of the House) (11.58 am),** by leave, without notice: I move—

That notwithstanding anything contained in standing and sessional orders, Minister Cripps be permitted to immediately move a motion without notice regarding comments by the member for Bundamba about fly-in fly-out workers with time limits for speeches and debate of the motion as follows: a maximum of 10 minutes for each member; total debate time before question put, one hour.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

### Member for Bundamba



**Hon. AP CRIPPS (Hinchinbrook—LNP) (Minister for Natural Resources and Mines) (12.00 pm):** I move—

That this House condemns the comments of the member for Bundamba comparing mining camps for fly-in fly-out workers to World War II concentration camps; and in the absence of an apology from the member herself or the Leader of the Opposition, that the House apologises to Queenslanders offended by the member's remarks.

We move now in this parliament from a debate about the semantics of how members' votes will be recorded for the purposes of making decisions about legislation and recording the opinion of this parliament, to a debate about what is being said in this parliament. This is a much more important debate, to my mind, about how members use this parliament to articulate their ideas and views about public discourse and issues in Queensland.

The member for Bundamba's speech on Tuesday night during the adjournment debate was an extremely inappropriate forum in which to express the views that she did, comparing, as she did, the circumstances of Jewish people in concentration camps during World War II to the conditions of workers in the resources sector when working on site in regional areas in Queensland. There has been widespread offence taken to the comments by the member for Bundamba to such an inappropriate comparison being drawn not only amongst members of the Jewish community, who have rightly expressed their disconcertion and outrage but also amongst many other Queenslanders. In particular, people who work in the resources sector have also called the member for Bundamba out in terms of her disconnection to the realities of modern life and circumstances for people working in the resources sector in regional and rural communities.

In the first instance, the analogy is inappropriate and it does not reflect the reality on the ground of resource projects in the regions. As the Minister for Mines I have visited a number of work camps associated with resource projects across this state and the comparison that is made by the member for Bundamba is just straight out false, and that puts the untruth to the type of comment that she made in this parliament on Tuesday evening during the adjournment debate. Employers in the resources sector are always striving to improve the circumstances of their employees on projects in the regions to be able to attract the skilled workers they need not only to ensure the productivity of their projects but also to make sure they are undertaken in a safe environment and they can retain them in the industry.

One of the most important points I want to make is that you cannot be in public life in Queensland or in Australia or, for that matter, anywhere else around the world without understanding the sensitivities that remain real and present in the consciousness of the Jewish community about the issues which happened during the holocaust during the Second World War which makes the member for Bundamba's comments so intolerable. You cannot be in public life and not understand the sensitivities of that community. It is politics 101 and the only conclusion that can be drawn in that regard is that the member for Bundamba is unable to make a coherent argument in any other way. Increasingly, the member for Bundamba has had to resort to exaggeration, hyperbole and hysteria to make herself relevant to the public debate. Regardless of what the issue is, this is the modus operandi of the member for Bundamba both inside and outside this House—to escalate her comments to the point of ridiculousness simply to make herself relevant to the debate.

This morning on 4BC the arrogant member for Bundamba not once, twice or thrice but on four occasions point-blank refused to offer an apology for her disgraceful comments in the House on Tuesday evening during the adjournment debate. The member for Bundamba is thumbing her nose at the public, she is thumbing her nose at common decency and she is thumbing her nose not only to the Jewish community but the many thousands of Queenslanders who take offence at her ridiculous and inappropriate comments. This goes to the very sorry circus that is the ALP—that is, that it is completely irrelevant to the public debate and discourse on public policy that it frequently resorts, as I said earlier, to exaggeration, hyperbole and hysteria to try to make a point. It cannot make a legitimate point; it cannot make a coherent point, so it makes ridiculous points—points that verge on nonsense simply to get itself an opportunity to appear on the media.

We ask ourselves: what lurks behind this outrageous effort by the member for Bundamba? As was pointed out this morning by the Premier and the Deputy Premier, there is a political and an industrial campaign behind these comments made by the member for Bundamba. If you look at the transcript of what the member for Bundamba said on Tuesday night during the adjournment debate, she mentioned her good friend and Labor candidate for Mirani, Jim Pearce—a former member of this House who has reinvented himself as a community advocate sponsored by the CFMEU to get out there and ferment anger and concern in local communities where these resource projects are taking place. I note that in the chamber is the member for Mirani, who has dispatched the CFMEU in Mirani on more than one occasion now. This is the real and insidious political and industrial campaign that lies just underneath the surface of the ridiculous and offensive comments made by the member for Bundamba. I ask Jim Pearce: does he stand next to the member for Bundamba in relation to her comments comparing work camps in resource projects to concentration camps in Nazi Germany? That is a question for Jim Pearce. Is he going to start his campaign by standing next to the member for Bundamba?


Earlier today the Deputy Premier made a good point about the culture of fear and intimidation that the CFMEU has for decades tried to impose on members of its unions in these local communities associated with resource projects—influencing their opinions not only in terms of their circumstances at work but their political circumstances and opinions and the circumstances and concerns that they have about their local communities, and that is what is sitting insidiously underneath the comments made by the member for Bundamba.

The member for Bundamba drew the member for Dalrymple and the Katter party into this issue this morning on 4BC by saying that her concerns were the same concerns that the member for Dalrymple and the Katter party had about fly-in fly-out and drive-in drive-out workers. There is a question now for the member for Dalrymple: does he agree and stand by the member for Bundamba in relation to her ridiculous and offensive comments in the parliament on Tuesday night? Does he agree and does his party agree that this is the most appropriate way to describe the circumstances of accommodation for workers in the resources sector, comparing them to the circumstances faced by the Jewish people in concentration camps during World War II?

Today this becomes a problem not for the member for Bundamba so much, because her credibility is shot to pieces; this becomes a problem for the Leader of the Opposition. Today the Leader of the Opposition, if she takes no action to condemn and discipline the member for Bundamba, has a political problem, because it is a test of her leadership. For the last two years the Leader of the Opposition has been very fond of offering advice to the Premier about his leadership, but when the test comes to be applied to her own actions she is, to this point in time, failing miserably.

It is to her professional embarrassment that she is unable to ensure that members of her team uphold standards of common decency when representing the community and making comments on her behalf. This is rank hypocrisy from the Leader of the Opposition, because she sits there mute and absurd while the member for Bundamba refuses completely to apologise for her ridiculous and offensive comments.

They stand for nothing. They have no policies. They have no plans let alone for the resources sector but for the state of Queensland. I urge all members of this House to support this motion, because, in lieu of an apology from the member for Bundamba and in lieu of an apology from the Leader of the Opposition, this House should apologise to clean up their mess.

 **Hon. JW SEENEY** (Callide—LNP) (Deputy Premier and Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning) (12.10 pm): I rise to second the motion that has been moved by the member for Hinchinbrook and Minister for Natural Resources and Mines. I think that the address that the Minister for Natural Resources and Mines gave has very well covered the issue and very well expressed the feelings of so many people not just in this parliament today but right across the resources sector and certainly right across some of the ethnic communities that have a particular sensitivity to the comments that were made by the member for Bundamba.

I think it is important that everybody who is not familiar with the resources sector pay close attention to the comments that were made by the Minister for Natural Resources and Mines with regard to the extent to which the comments that were made by the member for Bundamba are demonstrably untrue in fact. This morning, I heard a number of calls for the member for Bundamba to visit the mining regions of Queensland and visit some of the accommodation camps that are provided there. I would be wasting my time urging the member for Bundamba to do that, but I would suggest that any member of this House who has the opportunity to do that should take up this opportunity, because there are some great examples of accommodation being provided. There are companies that have specialised in providing that sort of accommodation and providing the services that are needed for that accommodation. In particular, I refer to the MAC camps. But they are only one company that I would mention as being great providers of those services.

That accommodation has allowed people from all over Queensland to participate in the resources industry—to have access to a well-paid job in a situation that allows them to better their life elsewhere. That is no more so than in my own electorate. My electorate is made up of not just people who work in the resources industry but a whole range of communities in a whole range of districts that are characterised by what you would probably call subeconomic agricultural enterprises—places where farms struggle because they are too small. The subdivisions were done many years ago. Many of those agricultural people have taken the opportunity to supplement their income for periods of time that suit them by working in the resources industry. They have adopted that lifestyle. Similarly, there are so many families who have made the choice that they are better off living along the coast, the Capricorn Coast particularly—1770, Agnes Water, Airlie Beach, the Whitsundays; places where better

opportunities are available for families, for young people, for kids, where employment opportunities are available for partners that are not available in the mining towns. So that is a choice that those families have made.

We have always recognised the sensitivity of the issue for regional communities, for businesses in mining towns that want to see their communities grow. When we came to government we made it very clear that our approach to the issue was to ensure that workers had choice, that families had choice, that communities in those regions were able to develop in a way that provided that choice to people. That is what we have done. We have made sure that there is every opportunity for regional communities, mining communities, to grow, to offer opportunities for people to live there and for people who choose to live there. It can be a great lifestyle in those small communities.

But we are not going to allow the member for Bundamba and her sponsors in the CFMEU to be successful in what is a political or an industrial campaign that is more about union power and union domination than it is about country towns or mining towns. Traditionally, when I was a teenager the CFMEU ran the mining towns that were part of Central Queensland—towns such as Moura and Blackwater—with an iron fist. They ran the footy club. You could not go in the pub if you were not a member. People were spat on in shopping centres—

**Mr Costigan** interjected.

**Mr SEENEY:** Absolutely. Those mining towns were run by the CFMEU to a point at which they dominated people's lives. The whole culture of unionisation extended into people's lives. That is what the CFMEU wants to return to. That is their dream. They yearn for the old days where they can build that sort of heavily unionised community that gives them the power base. But that sort of community and that sort of lifestyle would seriously curtail the number of people who would be able to take up the opportunity to work in the resources industry. When we consider this question and the comments that were made by the member for Bundamba, it is important that we understand where the driving force is. We are about building regional communities—proper communities, communities that can operate and function properly. The member for Bundamba and her CFMEU mates are about centralising union power. They are about building the numbers of people that the union seeks to control. I believe that for some time it certainly has been a feature of the fly-in fly-out debate.

That is not to say that there are not people who are genuinely concerned about how we strike that balance between regional communities and people who fly-in fly-out. It is not to say for a moment that there are not people who are genuinely concerned about some of the problems that that fly-in fly-out lifestyle brings. But it is an individual choice as to how that fly-in fly-out lifestyle is addressed and adopted by each particular worker or each particular family.

The other issue that I would like to raise is one that the member for Hinchinbrook touched on as well and that is the complete and abject failure of the Leader of the Opposition. I will repeat quite genuinely what I said in this place earlier today: that Henry Palaszczuk was one of the most decent blokes I had ever met in this place. We did then and we still do retain a warm friendship. In 2005, he was rightfully offended by a similar transgression, if you like, when Prince Harry was photographed in a Nazi uniform at a fancy dress party. But at least Prince Harry apologised. He realised what offence he had caused and he apologised. But at the time Henry Palaszczuk said that there was absolutely no excuse. I refer to a newspaper article in which he is quoted as saying—

No, absolutely no excuse. He understands perfectly well what the Nazis did ... My father suffered enormously at the hands of the Nazis and the stories he told me were horrific.

It beggars belief that the current Leader of the Opposition does not know those stories, does not know the offence that her father took at those stories. Of course she does. She does not have the leadership skills, she does not have the wherewithal, to ensure that the member for Bundamba is disciplined in the way that Henry Palaszczuk, and every other person who shares the same principles as the former member for Inala, the former primary industries minister as he was in this place, would require her to be.

**Mr Stevens:** Good, too.

**Mr SEENEY:** He was indeed, Leader of the House. What has happened this morning is a clear demonstration that the Leader of the Opposition has completely lost any authority. She herself, the Leader of the Opposition, has completely lost credibility. This is an issue not just for the member for Bundamba but for the Labor Party and for the leader of the Labor Party in this place. The Leader of the Opposition has failed that test in the most miserable way.



**Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Leader of the Opposition) (12.20 pm): I move—

That all the words after 'the House' be deleted and the following words inserted—

- notes previous comments made by the member for Gympie: 'Queensland—beautiful one day, a concentration camp the next.'; and
- notes the reference by the Leader of the House to the member for South Brisbane as 'Jihad Jackie'.

We all knew that the government was going to plan this motion today. On behalf of the opposition, if there is any offence to anybody in Queensland caused by the comments made I apologise. But will the Premier do the same and apologise for the comments that the member for Gympie, David Gibson, made? Let us be very clear about what the member for Gympie, David Gibson, said. He was talking about the issues on Fraser Island and he stated—

Animal behaviourist Robert Appleby has spent thousands of hours filming dingoes and he has found that there is no question about the fact that dingoes are resourceful. So how do we know that these fences actually work? We do not. Now *Time* magazine is reporting to its worldwide readership the reverse zoo that exists on Fraser Island and describes it like a concentration camp. Indeed, residents have described it as like living in Guantanamo Bay.

David Gibson continues—

This is the tourism message that is now being sent out to the world by this Labor government: 'Queensland—beautiful one day, a concentration camp the next'.

People in glass houses should not throw stones. Let us go back to the Leader of the House, the member for Mermaid Beach, Ray Stevens. What did he call the member for South Brisbane who is of Lebanese heritage? 'Jihad Jackie'. It was during a heated public debate in relation to job cuts.

**Mr Stevens** interjected.

**Ms TRAD:** I rise to a point of order. I take personal offence at that interjection and I ask that the Leader of the House withdraw it.

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** What did he say?

**Ms TRAD:** That I am running a terrorist campaign against the Leader of the Opposition. I ask that it be withdrawn.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Dr Robinson): The member will take her seat.

**Mr STEVENS:** I withdraw.

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** People in glass houses should not throw stones. Let me talk briefly about the issue in context. The member for Bundamba is passionate about mining communities. She is so passionate that she spent a whole week up there visiting those mining towns, something that I think all honourable members could learn a lot from. People were conveying to her their sentiments about how they felt about where they were living. Her comments that were made in the House may have been regrettable.

**Government members** interjected.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order, members!

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** But she was merely conveying the thoughts and views of people on the ground. I have no problem with apologising to anyone who has taken offence. As the Deputy Premier rightly pointed out, I am of Polish decent and, yes, my grandfather spent seven years in a Polish work camp. They were very, very tough days. I do not like recalling that history because it was a very, very sad time in his life and one in which he almost lost his life. But this debate is not about that. This debate is not about the emotions of something that was done in the past, this debate today is clearly about people in glass houses not throwing stones. We need to put these emotional arguments aside and concentrate on the issues at hand.

I also want to draw to the attention of the House a current staff member who works for the Minister for Health. If those opposite want to talk about Nazis and other issues, what did he say when he was the Young Nationals newsletter editor in the 1990s? This is a current staff member of the Newman government. What is he on record as saying? He said the Nazis were very admirable people. These were the people who almost killed my grandfather. I just cannot believe that people on that side of the House talk about Nazis being admirable people, a current staff member, and they can come in here and throw mud which is completely a diversion from the issues that they do not want Queenslanders to know about—that is, the fact that this Attorney-General can award a contract on his own without going through proper due process with an email from his director-general.

**Mr STEVENS:** I rise to a point of order. Contracts in relation to boot camps have no relevance to this motion whatsoever. You should call the member to account otherwise she should sit down.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The Leader of the Opposition has by and large been addressing the motion and I ask her to further address the motion.

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** Thank you very much, Mr Deputy Speaker. We are also debating this week in this House the biggest changes to electoral reform that we have ever seen in this state, something that I know the *Courier-Mail* supported the former Labor government about at length. This is when we should be debating this issue.

**Mr STEVENS:** I rise to a point of order. In terms of the debate that we are having, this motion quite clearly is about the apology that is required by this House. The matters that the member is raising should be in government business in the later part of the day when she will have her opportunity to raise such matters. If she cannot stay relevant to the motion please move on to the next speaker.

**Mr PITT:** I rise to a point of order. We have heard the Leader of the House jump to his feet to talk about relevance. We have seen plenty of irrelevance. I ask you to consider that the reasons behind a motion being put in this House are just as relevant to that motion as is the content within that motion.

**Government members** interjected.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order, members, I will make my own ruling. I actually agree with the general thrust of what the Leader of the House is saying, that the Leader of the Opposition is starting to move off the motion, and I would simply ask the Leader of the Opposition to return to the motion.

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** Thank you very much, Mr Deputy Speaker. The second part of the amendment that I moved is for the Leader of the House to apologise for the disgraceful comments that he made about the member for South Brisbane.

**Mr Stevens:** That they made.

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** A disgraceful comment. Have you apologised for that? No, you have not apologised for that. Is the health minister going to apologise for the comments that his chief of staff made about Nazis? I want to hear an apology about that. Is the Premier going to apologise for yesterday calling people living in Logan bogans? Is the Premier going to apologise for that? No, I doubt he will have the courage or the ticker to come in here and show some leadership and apologise for that. In the mining communities there are real issues about fly-in fly-out that this government is failing to address.

**Mr Johnson:** Who created them?

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** You have been in government for two years. This government has been in office for two years and has failed to address the issue.

**Government members** interjected.

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** They can dish it out, but they cannot take it.


**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Dr Robinson): Order! Leader of the Opposition, please hold for a moment. There is too much crossfire across the chamber. I cannot hear the Leader of the Opposition.

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** If we want to go back in history, I also did some research. Former tourism minister Bruce Davidson was asked whether he would put the Nazi Party before the ALP on a ballot paper and he said, 'I will always put Labor last'. That is the history of the LNP in this state. That is the history of what the LNP thinks about these issues. What I want to see today is your apology about what was said about the member for South Brisbane in reference to terrorist attacks. That is disgusting. That is outrageous. I would not expect anything less from you as the Leader of the House, because you have no dignity and you have no integrity. The Attorney-General, who is sitting behind you, does not know how a government tender process operates.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! Leader of the Opposition please direct your comments through the chair.

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** We have a government that wants to hide the electoral law debate until later on tonight, because it does not want Queenslanders to know the truth, which is that it is lifting the caps so that it can hide its secret donations. That is what it is about. It is about hiding secret donations. This is a diversion for the government, because it does not want Queenslanders to know the truth. It is a disgraceful government. At the next election Queenslanders will have a very clear

choice: do you want this incompetent, arrogant, out-of-touch government or do you want someone who will stand up and do the right thing by the mining communities, by the union workers and by the people and the families, each and every day. That is going to be the real choice for Queenslanders. I challenge the Premier to come in here and apologise for those comments made by the member for Gympie, who clearly said inappropriate things.


 **Mrs CUNNINGHAM** (Gladstone—Ind) (12.32 pm): I rise to speak in this debate as a representative of a community that has a number of workers camps in the electorate. At this point in time I am going to deal with the substantive motion. We have the MAC camp at Calliope and the MAC camps have already been commented upon—Homeground and three camps on the island. I want to deal with this part of the motion initially. The advertisement for Homeground Gladstone states—

Homeground Gladstone boasts 1392 spacious rooms, making booking workplace accommodation easy, convenient and affordable. Your workforce can rest and recharge with four star recreational facilities including swimming pool, tennis court, basketball court, gym, onsite personal trainers, recreation centre, theatre room, licensed tavern and games room.

I have not personally had complaints about what is available at these working camps. Certainly there are difficulties for communities with fly-in fly-out and the economic impact it has on the community. It differs depending on where the camp is and how big the camp is. Having said that, I am sure that there are people who reside in those camps who feel constrained, depending on where the camp is and what the camp's rules and regulations are. I am sure that there are people who are very happy with their lodgings, there are those who would have concerns and there are those who perhaps would be very unhappy with what they are offered and the rules and regulations surrounding that.

Having said that, I have great respect for the belief that everybody in this chamber has a right to represent their feelings, to represent their communities and to speak on behalf of those whom they represent. However, I think any of us who try to equate living conditions in Australia with those faced by people who were involved particularly in the first and second world wars, but also any subsequent conflict, fails to have an understanding of exactly what those people faced. Whether it is a concentration camp or whether it is a frontier of war, unless you have been there you do not understand what those men and women faced. Any of us who use those comparisons have to do so with a great deal of sensitivity and thought, not only for making our point politically but also for bringing back to memory for those who have been involved in those conflicts the very things that they have experienced and the memories and the horrors that they have to carry every day as they try to work for their families and their employers.

An amendment has been moved to this motion. I will not support the amendment, not because there is a problem and not because what the Leader of the Opposition has said is not true. She will have the *Hansard* and the comments to prove that what she said is true. I believe it is more important to deal with the substantive issue, which is that a member—and I think regrettably—compared mining camps to concentration camps. Not only is that a poor comparison; it is a wrong comparison. It fails to take into account the trauma and the tragedy that those people experienced, the cost of war and the price of our freedom.

 **Ms TRAD** (South Brisbane—ALP) (12.36 pm): I rise to support the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition. From the outset, I endorse wholeheartedly all of the comments that she has made in relation to this issue. I start by going to the substantive issue that the member for Gladstone articulated prior to my rising. The substantive issue is the issue of offence caused by members of this House. The substantive issue is about offence caused by statements made by members of this House. I join with the Leader of the Opposition and articulate or apologise for any offence that may have been taken—

**Mr Davies:** Is Jo going to?

**Ms TRAD:** The member for Capalaba can add his name to the speaking list if he wants to make a contribution, otherwise he should stop squawking from the cheap seats and listen to the contribution. I was a new member in this House in September 2012 when the Leader of the House referred to me as 'Jihad Jackie'. He did not apologise at the time. When the Leader of the Opposition suggested that the Premier should apologise, the Premier's response was that I should just harden up. That was the Premier's response.

Let me talk about the issue of offence. Today, earlier in this debate, the Leader of the House compounded that offence by claiming that I was conducting terrorist activists against the Leader of the Opposition. Let me be very clear to the Leader of the House and also to those members in the House who are listening to my contribution: I am of Lebanese Maronite descent.

**Mr Stevens:** So is the Premier's wife.

**Ms TRAD:** Mr Deputy Speaker, I do find the contributions and the interjections from the Leader of the House offensive. I ask that you call him to account and ask him to stop making—

**A government member:** You can give it but you can't take it.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I did not hear specifically what the Leader of the House said.

**Ms TRAD:** You quite like using family members when it suits your purpose, don't you?

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Dr Robinson): Order! Members, the House will come to order. Member for South Brisbane, it does not help when I am in the middle of trying to make a ruling that you add further comment. I heard nothing personally applied that was offensive. The member has had the opportunity to withdraw should there have been something. There is insufficient information for me to rule on that. I would ask you to continue.

**Ms TRAD:** I am of a Lebanese Maronite background. The Maronite faith is part of the Roman Catholic Church. My parents fled Lebanon during an era of poverty. During the civil war we returned as a family. During that time I witnessed firsthand the effects or the impacts that terrorist organisations had had on my parents' homeland. I witnessed firsthand what it was like to be in a war zone, what it was like to be in a state where you could not move around freely without having to pass through checkpoints, where army officers looked through everything that you owned, where freedom, where liberty was not yours because of the outbreak of terrorism in that country.

I found the Leader of the House's inferences both in September 2012 and today very disturbing, incredibly racist and very offensive. I am still waiting for an apology. The issue here is the issue of offence. The substantive issue here is the issue of offence. I find it incredibly hypocritical that those members opposite—

**Mr Stevens** interjected.

**Ms TRAD:** I will take that interjection from the Leader of the House who, despite his many years in this House, does show a complete lack of maturity and insight. At the time that the remarks were made there was a call not just from members of the Labor Party and the Labor opposition but from ethnic community organisations out in the electorate for the Leader of the House to withdraw his comments and to apologise. That apology has yet to be made. Let me be very clear for the Leader of the House. The request was made at the time of the offence. Those members opposite declined to respond in a way that was honourable and in a way that was respectful.

It has been further compounded today by the Leader of the House's interjections. I want it noted for the record that the Leader of the House once again—

**Government members** interjected.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! Members! The member for South Brisbane has the call.

**Ms TRAD:** Let me make it very clear, it is all—

**Ms Palaszczuk** interjected.

**Ms TRAD:** I will take that interjection from the Leader of the Opposition. It is all just a joke for those members opposite.

**A government member:** It is not a joke.

**Ms TRAD:** It is a joke.

**Government members** interjected.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! Members will cease interjecting. The member for South Brisbane has the call.


**Ms TRAD:** The Leader of the Opposition has brought to the attention of the House comments made by the member for Gympie in relation to comments about Queensland tourism. He said 'Queensland—beautiful one day, a concentration camp the next'. If the comments made by the member for Bundamba are offensive then so are these.

The Leader of the Opposition also raised the issue of the comments made by the health minister's chief of staff in a publication some time ago. He claimed that—

The *Australian* reported on Thursday that as editor of the Young Nationals newspaper in the early 1990s, Mr Smith wrote that in some ways Nazis were "very admirable people", that Aborigines and single mothers were "great parasites" on the public purse, and that apartheid was the only way to "solve the Aboriginal question".

If you want offence, that is pretty offensive. Those comments, those inferences are pretty offensive. I think it would be incredibly important for this House and for the reputation of this House for the Minister for Health to come into this place and clarify whether or not his chief of staff still holds these views and whether or not these are views that are not just held by his chief of staff but held by other members opposite. These are outrageous statements. These are outrageous beliefs.

Let me conclude on this, I have known the member for Bundamba, Jo-Ann Miller, for a very long time. I have seen her calibre in estimates hearings, in this chamber, in party forums and out in the community. One thing that people will never say about the member for Bundamba is that she does not go in to fight for her community. She is a passionate advocate for those who are disadvantaged. She is a passionate advocate for workers in this state. The one thing that people opposite do not appreciate about the member for Bundamba is that she has a spine and she has guts. Every single day of the week she will stand up to the massive majority opposite to make sure that the people in this state have a strong voice in opposition.

 **Hon. JP BLEIJIE** (Kawana—LNP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice) (12.46 pm): I can understand why the Leader of the Opposition and those members of the opposition who have spoken today want to slide this matter under the carpet. What frustrates me and what is questionable in this debate is how this is somehow the government's diversion. Usually when one wants to divert something they create the diversion. We did not make these comments. The member for Bundamba made these comments two days ago. It may be the member for Bundamba's diversion, from what I do not know.

I refer to a newspaper article today and the comments from the Queensland Jewish Board of Deputies spokesman Jason Steinberg. He stated—

... condemned the original comments, saying they were "not acceptable" to either Jewish or wider community.

"Any reference to concentration camps and the Nazi regime in this kind of context is totally inappropriate," he said.

"Concentration camps housed six million Jews, Gypsies and homosexuals to be led to their slaughter."

They are comments from the Jewish Board of Deputies. We have afforded the member for Bundamba the opportunity to come in here today and wholeheartedly apologise. As the Hon. Minister for Natural Resources indicated, the member for Bundamba was on 4BC this morning. Mr Condren on 4BC gave the member for Bundamba a whole host of opportunities to apologise and she refused to apologise. She kept digging and digging which is concerning because it means she believes what she said two days ago. She cannot come into this place and accept the fact that she got it wrong and that she has insulted millions of people. She cannot accept that fact. Those opposite have to come in here and defend her. The honourable thing for the opposition leader to have done today would have been to make her member apologise to the people of Queensland and make her member apologise for the comments she made.

I wish to address one of the issues the opposition leader raised in the personal attack on the Premier. She referred to the Premier's comment in the House yesterday about bogans in Logan. Hansard reflects yesterday's question time when that issue was raised. The member for Gaven, the leader of the PUP party, called his own constituents bogans. That was never meant to be made public but of course it was made public. The Premier and the Treasurer were interjecting at the time because they were the comments made at the time by the member for Gaven. The member for Gaven was the one saying that his constituents were bogans. So I reject entirely what the opposition leader said about the Premier's comments because, if you read it in the context to which the fiery debate was happening yesterday, it was clear that the Premier was referring to interjections between the member for Gaven, the Premier and the Treasurer. So that was wrong.

How is this anyone else's issue today other than the member for Bundamba's? I know the opposition leader has tried to bring in all these things. I find it completely astonishing that the member for South Brisbane of all people would come in here and talk about family attacks because the Deputy Premier raised the issue of the opposition leader's father. We did not raise the issue of Mr Henry Palaszczuk as an attack on Mr Henry Palaszczuk. We were congratulating Mr Palaszczuk. There was no attack on an individual. There was no attack on a family member. We were congratulating Mr Palaszczuk. That is what the Deputy Premier was doing this morning and also in his contribution to this debate.

I think we are seeing sinister things at play here. As I indicated this morning, they have form in this regard. They have form with the union associations. I have talked to the member for Gregory about this and he has told me about the thuggery, the fear and the intimidation of unions on these mine sites right around Queensland. We are trying to create communities, positive family communities in these environments. Families were run out of town by the unions.

**Mr Costigan:** Standover tactics.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** Standover tactics—they were run out of town. What I find objectionable as well, getting over the fact that the member for Bundamba still has not apologised—it is now nearly 1 pm and she still has not apologised for the offence that she has caused—is that she sends the leader of her party in here to defend her, defending the indefensible.

The opposition leader talks about staff members. I understand that the member for Bundamba has a staff member working for her—and I am not sure if this is his real name—Steve Axe from Twitter, the ‘DaAxeman’. I understand—I will be corrected if I am wrong—that he works for the member for Bundamba. He has been tweeting today. In light of all this debate we have been having, he has been tweeting today. He took a snapshot of the honourable Premier—

**Mr Stevens:** In the parliament?

**Mr BLEIJIE:** A photo of the honourable Premier in parliament gesturing to members over there like we do from time to time and now calling the Premier a Nazi because he raised his hand in parliament. They should hang their head in shame. The opposition leader should hang her head in shame. I table a copy of that.

*Tabled paper:* Photograph of the Premier posted on twitter [\[5171\]](#).

If she is going to talk about staff members, then what I want clarified is: does this member with this Twitter account work for the opposition leader? Does he work for the member for Bundamba? If so, then he should be sacked by the end of the day by the Leader of the Opposition. The Leader of the Opposition should show leadership.

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Dr Robinson): Order! Members will cease interjecting.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** The Leader of the Opposition has to show leadership on this issue. It is unjustifiable for her to walk into this place and defend the actions of the member for Bundamba. Those actions cannot be defended. As I said earlier today, the member for Bundamba has been a strong supporter of the ETU in Queensland—the Electrical Trades Union, who know all about thuggery and intimidation on sites. Here is the article where the ETU were calling all sorts of people Hitler and Nazi. We then have, as I said, a staff member—I suspect he works for the member for Bundamba—indicating Nazi and Hitler against the Premier, which I tabled a photo of. So we have a pattern here: the ETU, supported by the member for Bundamba, and a photo being tweeted from someone who works in the member for Bundamba’s office. But it gets worse.

I am now going to table a photograph of the honourable opposition leader some time ago where she proudly displays on her Facebook site a little gathering of the ETU and the opposition leader at Parliament House. So let’s draw the lines again—an ad about Nazi Germany, a staff member of the opposition tweeting a photo about Nazi Germany, the opposition leader associating with the people who are paying for those types of terrible ads which were condemned by the Jewish community at the time. Not only that; we then have on the balcony Mrs Jo-Ann Miller—and I will table a photograph of this—getting a happy snap with CFMEU and ETU members. These are the unions that are preaching this rot in our communities, backed up by the member for Bundamba, backed up by the member for Bundamba two days ago by saying mining camps are concentration camps in Queensland. I table copies of those two photos.


*Tabled paper:* Bundle of photographs [\[5172\]](#).

I have one more example. Just recently the ETU was forced to apologise because they put out an ad with Tony Abbott and the line ‘the Abbott crimes’ and dressed him as a Nazi. We have a serious pattern here of Labor Party fear, intimidation and union connections. We know why now Bill Shorten is trying to distance the Labor Party from the union connections. It came to a stumbling block, I read, last week. Do honourable members know what the stumbling block was? The Queensland

division of the Labor Party. That is who is stopping this disassociation with the unions. I remember the former member for Keppel, Mr Hoolihan, saying some time ago that the Labor Party is the political arm of the union movement. He said that. They keep condoning this rot that they keep running in our communities.

*Tabled paper:* Article from [www.smh.com.au](http://www.smh.com.au), dated 9 May 2014, titled 'Union apologies for Tony Abbott 'Nazi' portrayal' [5173].

It is time for the opposition leader to stand up today and not only apologise but force her member to apologise, and if the member cannot apologise she should resign. People in concentration camps were starved, they were whipped and they were lucky to survive. Six million people around the world died because of these concentration camps. We have seen a complete lack of understanding of the issue from the opposition leader and a complete lack of leadership. This is the opportunity for the opposition leader to stand up for Queenslanders, to stand against this rot that the unions and the member for Bundamba keep peddling in our communities. I say to the opposition leader: draw a line in the sand today and show leadership.

 **Mr KNUTH** (Dalrymple—KAP) (12.56 pm): I support the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! You have four minutes on the clock.

**Mr KNUTH:** This is a massive beat-up. The comments are completely taken out of context.

**Government members** interjected.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! Members will cease interjecting.

**Mr KNUTH:** I believe that this has been deeply taken out of context. The member for Bundamba was at Moranbah. I am not supporting the comments that she has made, but I believe that they have been taken completely out of context. If you look at Moranbah in general, the council has been working very, very hard in regard to the camps and likewise the houses. I am not referring to what the member for Bundamba said.

**Mr Cripps:** Yes, you are.

**Mr KNUTH:** I am not referring to that. What I am saying is that some of those camps and houses—and this is what we have been trying to argue—look like something out of *Star Wars* or from Mars.

I have been the member for parliament there for 10 years. I have seen all of this happen. I have seen the passion that is there in regard to 100 per cent fly-in fly-out. The Premier went there and saw the situation and said that this was unacceptable and promised, 'We will do something.' I will just read what I said when I delivered my speech on Tuesday. I said—

There are 320 vacant homes in the Moranbah-Dysart area. Numerous businesses are closing. Recently, Leading Edge Computers, Ma's Larder and Leading Edge Telecoms have closed down. Motels are running at 10 per cent to 20 per cent occupancy while the mining companies are—

and listen to this, Mr Deputy Speaker—

forcing contractors to keep out of motels and stay in camps or no contract is offered.

There are camps everywhere, and this is what the member for Bundamba was referring to. There are camps everywhere, and these areas are losing the integrity of being a family orientated community. In my speech on Tuesday I gave an example—and this is just one example—of a person who has lived in Moranbah with their partner for many years. This person flies from Moranbah to Brisbane before their rostered shift; then flies back to Moranbah and lives in the camp for their rostered shift; then, after their rostered shift, flies to Brisbane before flying back to Moranbah for their days off. The mine is a 20-minute drive from her home in Moranbah. This is happening every day of the week. I do not support the comments of the member for Bundamba but I support her passion.

**Government members** interjected.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! Members will cease interjecting.

**Mr KNUTH:** Another person went for an interview for a job at the mine. He was told that, if he was successful with his application, there were some things that he needed to comply with. He could not leave the camp after work. He could not go to Coles or McDonald's and, if he did, he would be fired. He must reside in Brisbane or Cairns to be employed at Moranbah. He must take the plane to Brisbane—

*(Time expired)*

Division: Question put—That the Leader of the Opposition's amendment be agreed to.

**AYES, 11:**

**ALP, 6**—Byrne, D'Ath, Miller, Palaszczuk, Pitt, Trad.

**KAP, 2**—Hopper, Knuth.

**PUP, 2**—Douglas, Judge.

**INDEPENDENTS, 1**—Wellington.

**NOES, 64:**

**LNP, 63**—Bates, Bennett, Berry, Bleijie, Boothman, Cavallucci, Choat, Costigan, Cox, Crandon, Cripps, Crisafulli, Davies, C Davis, T Davis, Dempsey, Dickson, Dillaway, Dowling, Emerson, Flegg, France, Grant, Grimwade, Gulley, Hart, Hathaway, Hobbs, Holswich, Johnson, Kaye, Kempton, Krause, Langbroek, Latter, Maddern, Malone, Mander, McArdle, Menkens, Minnikin, Molhoek, Newman, Nicholls, Powell, Pucci, Rice, Rickuss, Ruthenberg, Seeney, Shorten, Shuttleworth, Smith, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stewart, Stuckey, Symes, Trout, Walker, Watts, Young.

**INDEPENDENTS, 1**—Cunningham.

Resolved in the negative.

Division: Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** A division has been called. Ring the bells for one minute.

**AYES, 64:**

**LNP, 63**—Bates, Bennett, Berry, Bleijie, Boothman, Cavallucci, Choat, Costigan, Cox, Crandon, Cripps, Crisafulli, Davies, C Davis, T Davis, Dempsey, Dickson, Dillaway, Dowling, Emerson, Flegg, France, Grant, Grimwade, Gulley, Hart, Hathaway, Hobbs, Holswich, Johnson, Kaye, Kempton, Krause, Langbroek, Latter, Maddern, Malone, Mander, McArdle, Menkens, Minnikin, Molhoek, Newman, Nicholls, Powell, Pucci, Rice, Rickuss, Ruthenberg, Seeney, Shorten, Shuttleworth, Smith, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stewart, Stuckey, Symes, Trout, Walker, Watts, Young.

**INDEPENDENTS, 1**—Cunningham.

**NOES, 11:**

**ALP, 6**—Byrne, D'Ath, Miller, Palaszczuk, Pitt, Trad.

**KAP, 2**—Hopper, Knuth.

**PUP, 2**—Douglas, Judge.

**INDEPENDENTS, 1**—Wellington.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Sitting suspended from 1.10 pm to 2.30 pm.

## ETHICS COMMITTEE

### Report


**Mr CRANDON** (Coomera—LNP) (2.30 pm), by leave, without notice: I table Ethics Committee report No. 147 titled *Matter of privilege referred by the Speaker on 12 February 2014 relating to an alleged failure of a member to declare an interest to the House*.

*Tabled paper:* Ethics Committee: Report No. 147—Matter of privilege referred by the Speaker on 12 February 2014 relating to an alleged failure of a member to declare an interest to the House [\[5174\]](#).

I commend the report and the committee's recommendations to the House.

## DOMESTIC AND FAMILY VIOLENCE PROTECTION AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

### Introduction

 **Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Leader of the Opposition) (2.31 pm): I present a bill for an act to amend the Domestic and Family Violence Protection Act 2012, the Evidence Act 1977, the Penalties and Sentences Act 1992 and the Victims of Crime Assistance Act 2009 for particular purposes. I table the bill and the explanatory notes. I nominate the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee to consider the bill.

*Tabled paper:* Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2014 [\[5175\]](#).

*Tabled paper:* Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2014, explanatory notes [\[5176\]](#).

This bill sends a clear message both to perpetrators and the wider community that domestic and family violence is not acceptable. People who attack their spouses and partners will face increased punishments. It will send a message that those relationships come with a special duty.

The bill achieves three main objectives. It changes the sentencing guidelines to provide that where offences involve domestic or family violence this is considered an aggravating factor at sentencing. It also increases the penalties for offenders who breach domestic violence orders. Finally, it will ensure victims of domestic violence can get better support through the victims of crime assistance scheme.

May is Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Month. By introducing this bill, the Labor opposition affirms an historic commitment to see domestic and family violence treated as among the most serious of offences as well as it being a longstanding commitment to reducing these crimes. As a community, domestic violence is one of the most widespread and insidious crimes we face. Let us be clear: this is an issue for men and women, and the impact it has on children and the wider family members. It is an issue that can permeate through entire families, often engulfing generation after generation.

Domestic violence can have long-term psychological and emotional trauma. Some children who witness this horror never recover. Domestic violence does not discriminate by class, wealth, race, age or sexual preference, and we must acknowledge the extent of this problem. The sad fact is that every week in this country a woman is killed by a partner. While these tragedies are occurring each week, the ABS says the rate of victims reporting is less than 20 per cent. The horrific rate of this crime is estimated to cost our economy \$14.6 billion per year. As a community, each and every one of us must accept responsibility to support families in crisis, provide assistance for offenders and victims, and take a stand against violence.

Last month the opposition revealed that police applications for domestic violence increased by 9.5 per cent last year. At the same time breaches of domestic violence orders increased by 11 per cent. This was at the same time the LNP cut funding across the domestic violence sector, and further cuts have been announced by the Abbott government. The Labor Party will continue to build on its previous reforms and will go to the next election with policies to reduce domestic violence and improve people's lives by making additional counselling available for women and children and courses for perpetrators. Women, men, children and families in Queensland should no longer live under the black cloud of fear and violence in their homes.

### First Reading

**Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Leader of the Opposition) (2.33 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a first time.

Question put—That the bill be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to.


Bill read a first time.

### Referral to the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! In accordance with standing order 131, the bill is now referred to the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee.

## WEAPONS (DIGITAL 3D AND PRINTED FIREARMS) AMENDMENT BILL

### Introduction

 **Mr JUDGE** (Yeerongpilly—PUP) (2.34 pm): I present a bill for an act to amend the Weapons Act 1990 for particular purposes. I table the bill and the explanatory notes. I nominate the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee to consider the bill.

*Tabled paper:* Weapons (Digital 3D and Printed Firearms) Amendment Bill 2014 [\[5177\]](#).

*Tabled paper:* Weapons (Digital 3D and Printed Firearms) Amendment Bill 2014, explanatory notes [\[5178\]](#).

Briefly, the policy objectives of the bill are to create a licensing scheme for persons who make, acquire, possess and/or distribute digital 3D firearms as well as for persons involved in the manufacturing of firearms using an additive manufacturing process; to provide transitional provisions

for the licensing scheme; to create offences and punishment provisions for persons who unlawfully make, acquire, possess and/or distribute digital 3D firearms; and to amend the Weapons Act 1990 to include new definitions as necessary.

The bill has been developed in response to technology advancements enabling firearms to be printed using additive manufacturing processes. I table a research brief titled '3D Printed Guns' that has been prepared by the Queensland Parliamentary Library.

*Tabled paper:* Queensland Parliamentary Library research brief, dated 30 April 2014, regarding 3D Printed Guns [\[5179\]](#).

The research brief reveals a very real and increasingly significant risk to our community. We must be cognisant of technology advancements that may, and indeed can, be applied for criminal purposes. Our laws must keep pace with technology to effectively protect our community and all citizens alike.

### First Reading

**Mr JUDGE** (Yeerongpilly—PUP) (2.36 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a first time.

Question put—That the bill be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to.


Bill read a first time.

### Referral to the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! In accordance with standing order 131, the bill is now referred to the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee.

## MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

### Merrimac State High School

 **Mr STEVENS** (Mermaid Beach—LNP) (2.36 pm): I rise in the House today to report on an exciting event that I attended at the Merrimac State High School in my electorate of Mermaid Beach. It was a great honour to officially be involved in the ceremony to hand over the keys to the exciting new year 7 building that will accommodate those students from 2015 onwards. This state-of-the-art \$4.7 million year 7 building is part of the larger \$7.3 million upgrade of the Merrimac State High School facilities. As of 2015, the year 7 building will have its first intake of 240 students. This brings Merrimac in line with the infrastructure needed for the change of year 7s into high school. It was a fantastic opportunity to represent my good friend and colleague the Hon. John-Paul Langbroek, the Minister for Education, Training and Employment and member for Surfers Paradise, who I know is doing a fantastic job and shows true dedication to the very important education sector in Queensland.


Merrimac State High School is one of the largest schools on the Gold Coast and has a current enrolment of close to 1,300 students representing 44 different nationalities. This building and the overall upgrade will be a great boost for the school community. The final furnishings will happen soon and will be completed on time and on budget and ready over the coming weeks. Year 12s are running in the building this year to test for any flaws and remedial actions that may need to be taken before 2015.

The LNP government is committed to supporting schools achieve a move of year 7 into high school, and this is a great example of this. Children are our future, and the education for our children and young people is first and foremost in the minds and the policy strategy of the LNP government. Good education is the key to success and Merrimac State High School is a fine example of this. It combines all aspects of educational learning that develops the area that the student is talented in and exposes them to new areas that they have not been exposed to previously and would like to explore. I would like to congratulate the principal, Mr Chris Tobin, and his team for all the hard work in fostering the development of the school community by bringing together all areas and creating a teaching and learning environment that is conducive to high-level achievement and excellence in education.

I would also like to congratulate all builders, architects, P&Cs and everyone involved in the development of this wonderful project. It has been a fantastic outcome for the Merrimac State High School. Principle Chris Tobin is an exemplary principal in our first-class Queensland education system and leads by example with a very hands-on approach to students, teachers and parents alike

at Merrimac High. I thank him for his continued dedication and application to successful outcomes for the students under his stewardship and support wholeheartedly any directions he wishes to pursue for the school in the future.

### **Bundaberg Electorate, Disaster Recovery**

 **Hon. JM DEMPSEY** (Bundaberg—LNP) (Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Services) (2.39 pm): The devastation of ex-Tropical Cyclone Oswald over the Australia Day long weekend in 2013 has left a mark on the Bundaberg regional community which will not be forgotten but will be remembered for generations to come. With no part of the community untouched by the destruction and devastation, small slivers of light began to shine through as friends, neighbours and strangers pulled together to ensure that everybody was safe. The emergency and community response was remarkable, with 7,500 people evacuated from more than 2,000 homes—they all had a dry place to stay either at an evacuation centre or with friends or relatives.

For months after the event, community groups and strangers continued to pull together to help slowly rebuild the town. The efforts, time and enthusiasm displayed through the community, especially from the young people involved in the recovery effort, were inspiring. It certainly gives us a lot of confidence in our future, as these young people and young leaders will no doubt represent Queensland here in parliament in years to come.

Bundaberg now has one of the state's most sophisticated and resilient early warning systems to prepare residents for future floods, delivering on the government's election promise to provide better infrastructure and planning. A network of 30 river and rain gauges now crisscross the Burnett River, linking it to state-of-the-art computer programs so homeowners can see exactly how rising floodwaters would affect their homes. The alert gauges, together with detailed flood studies and mapping of the lower Burnett River, provide a clear picture of what happens as river levels rise. Flood mitigation works include a local government flood response subsidy, cyclone and flood warning systems, natural disaster resilience programs and disaster preparedness. I would like to take the time to thank all police, emergency workers and volunteers for their outstanding effort to assist the Bundaberg community.


This afternoon I will table a non-conforming petition by approximately 6,000 Bundaberg residents. These citizens deserve to live without fear. They are not just looking at a short-term fix; they want long-term solutions for their community. I table this petition and I thank all those who have organised this petition and put their names to its pages.

*Tabled paper:* Non-conforming petition regarding flood funding for flood mitigation regarding the Burnett River and tributaries [\[5180\]](#).

Even though it is a non-conforming petition, I have also provided a copy to the Minister for Local Government, Community Recovery and Resilience for his attention. I thank him and his department for the great work they have already done to get Bundaberg back on its feet so its residents can have that peace of mind and security going forward.

*(Time expired)*

### **Mundingburra Electorate, Malayali Association**

 **Hon. DF CRISAFULLI** (Mundingburra—LNP) (Minister for Local Government, Community Recovery and Resilience) (2.42 pm): Today I want to speak about a dynamic group in my community of Townsville. When I rise in this place, I use it as an opportunity as a call to arms to try to create something special for Townsville. The group I refer to is the Malayali Association. I had the great honour the other day of going with that group to celebrate Indian new year as well as Easter, and what a dynamic group of people they are. To see them celebrate all that is special about their culture was truly humbling and to be a part of it was fantastic. The food was great, the entertainment was brilliant and the friendship is something I will cherish for many years to come. This group holds movies, it holds dances and it promotes sporting opportunities, particularly in the area of cricket, which is their great passion and it is one they share with me.

Madam Deputy Speaker, may I read to you their mission, which sums up why I am so passionate about this group. Their mission is to 'integrate the best of Kerala traditions with Australian lifestyle'. There you have it. That is what a group can do when they come into a new country—they seek to remember where they come from but they also wish to be a part of that new society. This group have done it so well. I have many people from the Indian community living in the electorate I

represent, particularly in suburbs like Douglas, Annandale and Aitkenvale. They have become part of our community and we love having them there. They have brought a dynamic nature to what is a fantastic part of our city.


Today I issue a call to arms, and the call to arms is one I issued on that night. One thing that Townsville does better than anywhere else is put on a celebration. We have a very successful Cultural Fest and we have a great Greek Fest. Further up the road in my hometown of Ingham we have an Italian festival. What I want to see is the Townsville community celebrate all that is Indian. I would love to see an Indian festival.

**Mr Hathaway:** I love curry.

**Mr CRISAFULLI:** That is the call to arms I issued on that night; that is the call that I will issue today. I offer my support—and indeed the support of the member for Townsville and the member for Thuringowa—to make this happen. The group have already met to discuss it after I issued that call to arms, and I am going to discuss it further with them on 21 June when they have their curry night. Let me assure the House that I will enjoy every moment of that—not just the fellowship but the fantastic food as well.

There is a golden opportunity to combine the great Townsville lifestyle with the can-do attitude of our city—where we get off our backsides and do things and celebrate a wonderful community that has become a part of my home city. They have embraced all that makes them special from the past and all that will make them special in the future. The challenge is set. Let us rise to the occasion.

### **Currumbin Electorate, Events; Neighbourhood Watch**

 **Hon. JA STUCKEY** (Currumbin—LNP) (Minister for Tourism, Major Events, Small Business and the Commonwealth Games) (2.45 pm): The Currumbin electorate now has nine active Neighbourhood Watch groups providing an invaluable service to our local community. It is worth noting that three of these groups have formed since August 2013. In fact, I was at the launch of Palm Beach 16 last Friday evening. I acknowledge the work of the police minister in moving Neighbourhood Watch groups to the online sphere and in turn providing unprecedented levels of access. This, coupled with a \$500,000 funding commitment from the Newman government, has no doubt contributed to the increased interest in Currumbin.

As people's lives get busier, it becomes increasingly difficult to attend community meetings, which is why this strong online focus is timely. I am sure honourable members would all agree that local residents are best placed to work with the police to report crime and graffiti, and it is local Neighbourhood Watch groups that provide the driving force behind community participation. Recently, I hosted an afternoon tea in my electorate to thank all of these individuals for the invaluable work they carry out. A number of local police were in attendance, demonstrating their high regard for the work undertaken by these groups. I would like to add my appreciation for and admiration of these community volunteers who assist in making our neighbourhood safer.


Today I would also like to acknowledge a number of community groups in my electorate which have been the deserving recipients of recent state government funding. Six groups shared in over \$205,000 through the Gambling Community Benefit Fund and the Jupiters Casino Community Benefit Fund. Earlier in the year, two local clubs were fortunate enough to be awarded Get Playing grants through Minister Dickson's very successful Get in the Game initiative. The Palm Beach Currumbin Sports Club received \$100,000 to construct a new amenity block, and the Tweed Heads and Coolangatta Surf Life Saving Club received \$100,000 to construct a gymnasium and training room.

Over the weekend of 9, 10 and 11 May, thousands of people were treated to an ambitious venture by Opera Australia to conduct three performances of Mozart's *Magic Flute* literally on the beach at Greenmount in Coolangatta. Nothing of this scale has ever been done before and the results were absolutely magnificent. The set was breathtaking, the weather was fine, the cast was sensational. The script was in English and it was personalised for our Aussie location. I commend everyone involved in this spectacular production which was embraced by opera lovers and novices alike. Special mention goes to Louise Bezzina and Connecting Southern Gold Coast for their bold dream. The government was proud to partner with the Gold Coast City Council as a major sponsor for this landmark event.

I am very excited to inform the House that a southern Gold Coast beach has once again taken out the title of Queensland's cleanest beach. Congratulations to Rainbow Bay for receiving this well-deserved award. I acknowledge the stellar efforts of residents and local stakeholder groups, in

particular Friends of Rainbow Bay. As this is the first year of a new star-rating system, this makes it even more special. We all know that Currumbin is the current cleanest beach in not only Queensland but Australia.

### **Fibrodysplasia Ossificans Progressiva**

 **Mr DILLAWAY** (Bulimba—LNP) (2.48 pm): I rise this afternoon to talk about Jarvis, a fun-loving, active two-year-old boy who is just full of life and who has the most amazing infectious smile. Sadly, little Jarvis was recently diagnosed with a rare genetic condition called fibrodysplasia ossificans progressiva, or FOP for short, and sometimes known as stone man syndrome.

With an incidence rate of one in two million, FOP is one of the rarest, most disabling genetic conditions known to medicine. It has often been referred to as one of the most horrific conditions that can affect humans. There are only 800 confirmed cases across the globe, with just 13 of these being in Australasia. FOP causes bone to form in muscles, tendons, ligaments and other connective tissues. Bridges of extra bone develop across joints, progressively restricting movement and forming a second skeleton that, sadly, imprisons the body in bone. The majority of FOP sufferers are eventually confined to a wheelchair as their bodies gradually lose mobility.

One of the early signs of FOP is that the patient will be born with malformed toes. The patient can also potentially be born with lumps on their head or body, or the lumps may appear after a trauma, such as a fall. This is what happened with little Jarvis. He had a fall and a permanent bump is now bone. In fact, even catching the flu can cause bone to be left behind. A FOP patient cannot even have surgery unless it is an emergency, because it will stimulate new bone growth. Therefore, Jarvis's future holds a lifetime of physical challenges.


Currently, there is research happening in the US and the UK that can save people like Jarvis. Whilst there are some doctors in Australia contributing to research, the experts are all overseas. At the moment there is no cure for FOP, but researchers feel that they are close, with an expectation that a clinical trial for treatment is not too far down the track.

Little Jarvis's extended family including his grandparents, Alton and Edith Budd, have for a long time been part of the Bulimba community. They are no strangers to raising money, as they have been fundraisers for other causes in our local community for more than 12 years, including raising funds for Ovarian Cancer Australia and The Kids' Cancer Project. Over the past several months they, too, have embarked on a campaign to raise money for little Jarvis's trip to the UK. Not only was I fortunate enough to provide some raffle prizes for the various lunches and morning teas, I also had the great pleasure of dropping in and congratulating all of the donors personally.

Since October 2013, the support and generosity for raising awareness and funds for little Jarvis have been staggering. Over \$53,000 has been donated. This money enabled Jarvis, his mum, Lara, and his dad, Damien, to attend the FOP conference just last week and to undertake a one-on-one patient meeting in the UK with six experts from around the world specialising in this disorder. There is no doubt that this experience will better arm the family and Jarvis for the many challenges that lie ahead. But with the community behind the family, little Jarvis is no doubt in very good care.

I urge all members to make their communities aware of the Hope for Jarvis—Help find a cure for FOP appeal. Let's make a real difference to this fun-loving, active little boy with the infectious smile.

### **Drug Abuse; Mount Crosby, Speed Limit**

 **Dr FLEGG** (Moggill—LNP) (2.52 pm): I rise to add something further to my recent comments about prescription drugs. During that speech I described alcohol fuelled violence as more often being drug fuelled violence. I discussed the abuse of oxycodone, Endone and benzodiazepines. I have written to the federal health minister about those concerns. I recently spoke to a police officer in charge of a custodial facility. As part of his risk management he said to me, 'I've become a pharmacist,' and described how frightening it was to see a person detained with a cocktail of ice, marijuana, oxycodone and benzodiazepines in a watch-house.

I certainly support the enforcement of laws in relation to marijuana, in particular. I certainly support education in relation to drugs and marijuana. I am addressing these remarks particularly towards marijuana. However, neither of these has proved successful in stopping this trend. What we really need to see is a social change and a social change in attitudes. I think people should forget about the so-called medical use of marijuana. They need look no further than a 300 per cent increase in prescriptions for oxycodone and extensive trafficking of that drug to see what would happen if marijuana were used for medical purposes.

Marijuana has a significant effect on the mental health of patients, the employability of patients and on crime and violence. I have seen personally some of these effects that are quite horrific. I draw the House's attention to the fact that figures show that 18 per cent of 15- to 24-year-olds have smoked marijuana. The teenage brain is not equipped to deal with this drug. It is estimated that around eight per cent to 14 per cent of all schizophrenia is induced by marijuana. The impact on driving is very significant due to its effect on reaction times, attention, decision making, distance perception, short-term memory et cetera. In relation to this noxious drug, we have a long way to go. I sincerely hope that we have not given up the struggle to try to protect our community from its effects.


While I am on my feet I table a non-performing petition from many residents of Moggill calling for a more sensible speed limit in the rural area of Mount Crosby near Kholo Creek.

*Tabled paper:* Non-conforming petition regarding the memorial for Allison Baden-Clay and the speed limit on Mount Crosby Road [5181].

*Tabled paper:* Non-conforming petition regarding the speed limit on Mount Crosby Road at Ugly Gully [5182].

*(Time expired)*

### Australian Tourism Exchange


 **Mr KING** (Cairns—LNP) (2.55 pm): I rise today to talk about the greatest tourism show in the Southern Hemisphere that occurred last week in Cairns, the Australian Tourism Exchange. This event, ATE, is the absolute signature event of the tourism industry in the calendar year. It brings together in the one place 1,800 buyers and sellers from right around the world to do business, to write contracts, to network and to grow tourism. For the first time in ATE's 35-year history, this event was held in a regional city in my beautiful electorate of Cairns. This event has transformed the way ATE will be run from now on. Every single delegate to whom I spoke over the course of seven or eight days was absolutely blown away by the way the Cairns community and the Cairns tourism industry hosted this most significant industry event.

We had visits from our tourism minister, which was fantastic of her. Twice over the course of the week our tourism minister visited Cairns for that event. We also had a visit from the federal minister Andrew Robb, who joined the Queensland minister and me on a tour on the Monday morning. It featured around 80 international and national journalists, bloggers and travel writers who were absolutely enthralled with the region. They were absolutely blown away by the way that the entire community embraced this most significant event.

It is estimated that ATE pumped around \$10 million into the Cairns economy over the course of the week, but the real benefits are the medium- and long-term impacts of hosting ATE: tens and tens of millions of dollars of business will be driven into Queensland over the next one, two and three years. I think that Cairns deserves all credit for putting on what the Tourism Australia managing director described as a 9.95 out of 10 score for Cairns's hosting of this most special and significant tourism event. It is also worth putting on record that over the course of those seven or eight days I do not recall seeing anyone from the Labor Party attend or even acknowledge the significance of this tourism event for Cairns, which is not surprising given their treatment of tourism when they were in government. I will conclude by thanking the Cairns community for putting on such a fantastic ATE.

*(Time expired)*

### Construction Industry, Member for Cairns

 **Mr PITT** (Mulgrave—ALP) (2.58 pm): It is great to follow the member for Cairns because my contribution to the House is all about his contribution to the House during the Private Member's Motion on Tuesday. He made a claim that Labor had killed the construction industry when, in fact, it was only because of government projects like the Cairns Hospital redevelopment and the expansion of Lotus Glen prison that there was any significant work at all. He did not once mention the GFC and there was no mention of finance drying up for private borrowers. By boasting about the returned tourism numbers, he basically tried to single-handedly take credit for the falling Australian dollar, which has had more impact on tourism than he has. However, it was on employment figures that he was most disingenuous.


Just like the Treasurer, he failed to mention the state's unemployment rate of 6.3 per cent, a higher unemployment rate than during the GFC. Instead the member for Cairns continued with simplistic and misleading language claiming that 'Cairns has its mojo back'. In the Cairns ABS statistical area the youth unemployment rate has nearly doubled, from 11 per cent in March 2012 to 21.8 per cent in April 2014.

Talking up confidence in the far north is critical to our region's economic recovery, and I am all in favour of that, but the member for Cairns continues to bury his head in the sand. With his words, the member for Cairns simply ignored the young people in Cairns who are out of work. Does he simply not care, or is it that there is no plan for young unemployed people from his party? Unlike this Newman LNP government, the Labor Party has a plan to assist the unemployed back into work through our Ready for Work policy. Previously, the member for Cairns has been highly critical of original ABS figures, saying that they are 'typically volatile' and that people should refer to the yearly average figures. On this we agree, but what did the member for Cairns refer to in parliament this week? Well, of course he cherry picked the original figure for April to try and claim that unemployment in Cairns had fallen under the Newman government. Those 'typically volatile' figures were again used to deny the reality of unemployment in Cairns.

For the benefit of the member for Cairns, the year ending unemployment rate in April 2014 is 8.1 per cent, up from 7.9 per cent in March 2012. But the LNP never lets facts get in the way of good spin. By presenting these figures this way, and knowing that they are volatile, he is cheating the people of Cairns. As teachers say to students at school who cheat, in the end the only person who has been cheated by the member for Cairns is the member for Cairns himself. He will cheat himself out of his own seat at the next election.

While he is in denial about the reality of youth unemployment in the Cairns region, people out there are hurting. This denial is an insult to the young people in Cairns who are trying to find work. So too is it an insult to ignore the plight of unemployed people under 30, some of whom now face surviving for six months with no income because of Tony Abbott's budget of broken promises. What we have very clearly seen is that the facts do not seem to matter and, when it comes to the LNP, Campbell Newman and Tony Abbott are two peas in a pod. It seems that if there was room for an extra pea in that pod, it would include the member for Cairns. The only party in Queensland that has policies to help young unemployed people back into work is the Australian Labor Party.

### **Emerald, St Brigid's Primary School**

 **Mr JOHNSON** (Gregory—LNP) (3.01 pm): I want to tell the parliament about a good news story. Just recently on 24 April I was present at the opening of the new St Brigid's Catholic primary school in Emerald, which was opened by the Very Reverend John F Grace in conjunction with our own Minister for Education, Training and Employment, the Hon. John-Paul Langbroek. This was a very special occasion, and it brings the total number of schools in Emerald to 10. With that number of schools it just goes to show what a great place Emerald is to be, what a great place it is in which to live and the opportunities that are there. We know that there has been a downturn in primary industries and the mining sector, but at the end of the day the capital investment in Emerald and the surrounding area only goes to prove that, with these types of educational facilities, things are only going to be better.

The afternoon was officiated over by the Very Reverend John Grace in conjunction with our own minister John-Paul Langbroek and Father Stephen Hanly, parish priest at St Patrick's Catholic Church in Emerald. The emcee was Mr Ross Jones, who is the assistant to the director of western schools. Also present was Sister Janette Marsh from the congregation of the Brigidine Sisters. The Brigidine Sisters, like the Sisters of Mercy and Josephites, over many years have brought education to remote rural and regional Queensland, and it is a fitting tribute to these pioneering women of the past—and also men, but more so the women—who brought Christian education to many schools in remote areas.

One of the forerunners to the day was the Aboriginal dance that was performed by Jarli Russell, his brother Jakory and another little friend Jesi Blanco and conducted by the Russell boys' dad. If I can say so, Madam Deputy Speaker, it was a real fun day. I suppose the most embarrassing thing was when the education minister John-Paul tried to perform an Aboriginal dance and he planted his feet a few times. I do not want him to respond and tell you how I went, because I was a damn site worse!


**A government member:** Twinkle toes, they call you!

**Mr JOHNSON:** Twinkle toes all right! I think the beautiful thing is that we saw Aboriginal culture there, we saw European culture there, and we saw just what a multicultural society Emerald is today. We have all denominations there at Emerald and it is a much interwoven community. I say to people

who want to visit Emerald that the Central Highlands is a great place to live and it is a great place to bring up a family. Thanks to the Catholic Church for having the vision to continue with rural education—

*(Time expired)*

### Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Month


 **Mr GRIMWADE** (Morayfield—LNP) (3.04 pm): I rise today to speak about Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Month, which of course is held every year in May to raise awareness of how Queenslanders can stay safe from this heinous crime. This year's theme and message is 'Don't let concern become regret—make the call to DVConnect'. Domestic and family violence is a significant public health issue and can include non-physical abuse as well as physical abuse. The purpose of this campaign was to encourage Queenslanders to make the call to DVConnect if they suspect abuse is occurring in a domestic or family relationship of their friends, family members, colleagues or, of course, a neighbour.

As a community, we need to realise that non-physical abuse is serious and can escalate to physical abuse. Together we need to demonstrate that domestic and family violence will not be tolerated in our local communities. In Queensland, 44 per cent of the homicides which occurred between 2006 and 2012 have been linked to domestic and family violence, with women dying at almost four times the rate of their male counterparts. This is the second year the Newman government has run the Make the Call campaign, which has generated real and positive community action to prevent this heinous crime. This year we are saying to Queenslanders: 'Don't let concern become regret—make the call to DVConnect', highlighting the non-physical abuse and behaviour associated with this crime.

This year I took a very keen interest with regard to this campaign and did a number of things locally to ensure that my community understood what the campaign was about, the awareness it raised and how they could get involved to make that call and stop domestic violence in our local community. I joined up with our local police officer in charge at Burpengary and launched the campaign at the beginning of May. We invited local media agencies to launch the project at the local police station, and of course most of them helped us in that regard and ran stories to tell people what the campaign was all about. We also made a decision to tie white ribbons to the front of all the police cars in the local area—and my political car as well—on that day to raise awareness of the issue.

We also ran some community awareness stalls in the Burpengary and Morayfield shopping centres, and I want to put on record my thanks to the following people: Russell, from community policing; Megan, from the police crime prevention team; Nadia, a victim of domestic violence herself who came and helped us on one of the stands; Lisa, for offering her time as a volunteer; and Estrella, from the Caboolture Regional Domestic Violence Service, to which this government has contributed \$2.5 million in funding to run those services. I want to thank everyone else who helped throughout the campaign to make this a reality. Together we can stamp out domestic and family violence in our community.

### Burdekin Electorate, Achievements


 **Mrs MENKENS** (Burdekin—LNP) (3.07 pm): I too, like the member for Gregory, have a good news story, because on 1 July we will see the movement of the department of transport services from the Ayr Police Station to the Ayr courthouse. A dedicated department of transport office in the Burdekin has been something I fought for for the people of my electorate for many years. Whilst in opposition I wrote to numerous ministers since 2005 requesting a dedicated office in the Burdekin, and I was knocked back on every occasion. This included the Leader of the Opposition when she was transport minister in 2011 and the transport minister Rachel Nolan in 2009, who oversaw the sale of QR National and then, as arts minister, turned around and spent \$680,000 on the egg sculpture.

The Leader of the Opposition and her Labor cohort Craig Wallace, who claimed he was a Burdekin boy—he still seems to claim that he is living in Home Hill, but everyone is still saying 'Where's Wally?'—simply did not care about providing services in regional areas like the Burdekin. For years the Burdekin people had to wait to get licence appointments because departmental officers only visited once a week. Burdekin farmers desperate for haul-out drivers were being held to ransom by an inept Labor government which refused to recognise their dire needs. There was a five-week waiting period, which was simply unacceptable, for those wishing to obtain harvest operator and haul-out driver's licences for the sugar crushing season.

We had the data to back up the call for a local office, but Labor simply did not want to know. Burdekin had the highest number of licence transactions and new registrations, vastly outnumbering other areas with already dedicated offices. The workload was there to justify an office. Under Labor, people were waiting 23 days to get an appointment and this waiting period was exacerbated during the sugarcane crushing season, some waiting up to three months to get an appointment to get a driver's licence. In August 2012 I presented two petitions to parliament from over 1,400 petitioners requesting the House to establish a Department of Transport and Main Roads office situated in Ayr and Home Hill. Unlike previous Labor ministers, transport minister Scott Emerson listened—thank you, transport minister—and there have been positive steps forward ever since, starting with the appointment of a dedicated transport officer in the Burdekin. I would particularly commend that young lass, because she has done a magnificent job. Burdekin residents will no longer have to wait in queues at the Ayr Police Station and a better service will be delivered at the Ayr courthouse from 1 July. The move from the police station will free up what has been a divided front counter, with one line dedicated for policing matters and the other for transport matters. As I understand, this had become confusing at times. This is an excellent move and—

*(Time expired)*

### Tinaroo Falls Dam, Redclaw

 **Mr KNUTH** (Dalrymple—KAP) (3.10 pm): I table a petition of more than 1,555 signatures from residents from the Atherton Tablelands and surrounding districts on behalf of the Tableland Fish Stocking Association calling on the department of fisheries and the state government for a permit to stock redclaw in Tinaroo Falls Dam.

*Tabled paper:* Non-conforming petition regarding the re-stocking of redclaw in Lake Tinaroo [\[5183\]](#).

This call comes after the permit to stock was withdrawn in 2005 after the then department of primary industries had stocked the dam for nearly 30 years. The stocking of redclaw has benefitted the region significantly for decades as a wonderful recreational, family and tourism spin-off that supported local business. This is about bringing recreational tourism and jobs and giving children the opportunity to throw in a yabbie pot and enjoy the Australian way of life. Since the department withdrew the stocking of redclaw, the numbers have dropped significantly. Withdrawal came about after the department believed that the redclaw was not a native and may impact on local crayfish. However, the reality is that there are many introduced fish species in Lake Tinaroo and while there is less redclaw every other species of fish target the native crayfish. The notion of redclaw not being a native to the Barron River is also questionable. A submission from the Tableland Fish Stocking Association states—

The assumption that redclaw are not in their natural range in Lake Tinaroo is incorrect and should be revisited. Redclaw are a native to the Mitchell River which is the headwater at Mareeba. Mareeba sits astride both the Mitchell and the Barron catchments. The Barron and Mitchell are separated by the width of the road just north of Mareeba and this area is very flat. During the floods in both catchments the anecdotal evidence is that redclaw moved freely naturally in the Barron catchment during the wet times.

I say to the minister that the dam is stocked with many non-native fish species and we need not get into the extreme science as the Mitchell and Barron meet and intertwine during massive floods, allowing redclaw to migrate to and from the Barron and the Mitchell River. So it is natural for redclaw to move in the Barron that makes it a native to the Barron. Another submission states—

Over the last few years we have noticed a decline in redclaw numbers to the extent that the Tableland Fish Stocking Association would like to purchase more redclaw and restock the dam. The redclaw fishery in Tinaroo has played a huge part in the number of visitors coming to the lake and staying at our park. Our numbers are dropping, with many visitors commenting on the lack of redclaw. After speaking with other caravan parks nearby and the bait and tackle shop, all have confirmed they are all suffering through this decline in visitors.

That submission was from Peter and Faith Buchanan. I table the submissions I just read from.


*Tabled paper:* Bundle of submissions regarding the decline of Redclaw in Lake Tinaroo [\[5184\]](#).

On behalf of the residents of the Atherton Tablelands and surrounding districts, we seriously ask the minister to take into consideration stocking the dam with redclaw.

*Tabled paper:* Article from the *Tablelander*, dated 18 March 2014, titled 'Redclaw be dammed' [\[5185\]](#).

*(Time expired)*


### Pacific Golf Club

 **Mr MINNIKIN** (Chatsworth—LNP) (3.13 pm): I rise to share with the House a true icon within the Chatsworth area—the famous Pacific Golf Club. The Pacific Golf Club has a proud history spanning almost 80 years. Initially the brainchild of Leo McIntyre and Maisie Derrick, the club began life as a modest nine-hole course located at the corner of Kessels and Logan roads in Upper Mount Gravatt. The club's beginnings could best be described as humble. There was no fancy clubhouse or motorised buggies. Indeed, the green was cleared by hand by Leo and his faithful horse, with an old timber building on the site serving as the clubhouse. However, it had one invaluable asset—a dedicated group of people committed to bringing the vision to life. Over time the club's popularity began to swell and, driven by the popularity of golf during the 1960s, it relocated to its present site on Pine Mountain Road in Carindale in 1964. Indeed, the golfing boom in the sixties really helped the club to gain further momentum and it has gone from strength to strength.

On the greens the club has produced a number of world-class golfers. The club's junior division 1 Pennant Team has also dominated the competition over the past decade and remains a force to be reckoned with. In addition to its outstanding reputation on the fairways, the club is also renowned for its outstanding facilities and friendly, helpful staff. The clubhouse boasts an impressive range of function rooms and a restaurant set against the idyllic view, stretching down the fairway to the Belmont Hills nature reserve. I have had the pleasure to host many community events at the club over the past two years and can attest to the wonderful facilities, convivial atmosphere and professional staff who have contributed to the club's reputation as an outstanding sporting and recreation facility.

However, while the full car park at 7 am attests to the club's popularity, it has also received formal accolades acknowledging its exceptional efforts. In 2005, 2006 and 2009 the Pacific Golf Club was named the best golf club at the Clubs Queensland achievement awards—an auspicious and well deserved honour. While the club continues to excel as a commercial enterprise, we must not forget the spirit of volunteerism which the club was founded upon and which is alive and well today. Members continue to generously donate their time to assist with improvements to the clubhouse and surroundings. This is the reason the Pacific Golf Club is a true icon in the Chatsworth electorate. I congratulate the club on reaching 50 years at its current site and commend the club's general manager, Cameron Harvey; Chairman of the Board of Directors, Mr Ian Gale; members of the board, both past and present; and staff and volunteers for their tireless efforts. You can have the best fairways and club facilities that money can buy, but you cannot buy club spirit. We are incredibly fortunate to have this wonderful facility in the local Chatsworth area and I am pleased to commend the work of the Pacific Golf Club to the House. Happy 50th birthday!

### Palm Island Open Day

 **Mr HATHAWAY** (Townsville—LNP) (3.16 pm): I rise to speak about the Palm Island tourism open day. I want to firstly draw attention to the report tabled this morning by Minister Stuckey and then present a few of my own observations from the day. Townsville Enterprise held a series of open days across our region to support the local tourism industry and encourage residents to be ambassadors for North Queensland. The campaign theme was 'tourism is everyone's business'. The Palm Island open day was held during school holidays, enabling greater participation by visitors and the Palm community alike. That Wednesday's weather can only be described as average—an average 26 or 27 degrees, sunny, scattered cloud, a slight breeze, low humidity and—to my liking—slight seas. All in all, it was just a really average North Queensland autumn day. Jealousy is a curse, my southern colleagues! The report details the success of the day, and I do recommend its reading by honourable members. A full ferry of visitors set out from Townsville and the intrigue and anticipation of the passengers was in strong measure. Tickets for the trip sold out a full week prior. Indeed, SeaLink received upwards of 200 further booking requests that were unable to be accommodated. There truly is a viable market for the North Queensland treasure that is Palm Island.

We answered Mayor Lacey's call of 'come over'. I note also that the Australian Festival of Chamber Music reported that its 5 August Palm Island gig sold out in the first few days of the chamber festival's tickets going on sale. En route we were treated to an informative and deeply personal history from two elders who grew up on Palm Island. Their tales and reflections heightened our desire to step ashore on Palm, and we were not disappointed. Arriving, we were treated to a vibrant, festive community spirit, traditional dance and a welcome to country and smoking ceremonies. Mayor Alf Lacey provided a moving welcome outlining his community's desire to move to a sound economy of opportunity—a desire that this government is actively supporting. There was a choice of market and food stalls, the Dust and Ochre Experience—a dance and art experience—the

Footsteps in the Sand historical tour, art and historical exhibitions, yarning circles and entertainment. The Palm council and community are keen to develop niche tourism and business opportunities on the island, and this event was a first step of many in that direction. The report recognises Palm's potential as an emerging and unique tourism destination which in the future can provide local residents the opportunity to develop small businesses. Like all first forays, the report does outline things that can be done better. We know that. However, for a first hit out, it was an outstanding success.

At the risk of missing some, I mention the mayor of Palm Island and councillors, council staff, the open day committee, the report authors and mentors, Allison Rossetto and Tony O'Connor, and all the community members who gave up their time to plan and conduct the open day. I also thank and recognise representatives of Townsville Enterprise and SeaLink, who gave generously their time and resources to support the open day. A closing comment from a Palm community member was—


Keep tourists coming over to Palm. It's a good thing.

One visitor commented—

Thanks for the day! I felt welcome and valued. I appreciate everyone's generosity and openness.

*(Time expired)*

### Glass House Volunteer Awards 2014

 **Hon. AC POWELL** (Glass House—LNP) (Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection) (3.19 pm): It was with much pleasure that last Wednesday I not only hosted yet another annual Glass House Volunteers Awards but also hosted the Minister for Communities, Child Safety and Disability Services, the Hon. Tracy Davis. It was great to have the minister there to recognise the fantastic efforts of volunteers in the electorate of Glass House.


I want to mention those who received appreciation from their community for what they do. There was Clarke Alexander. Clarke could have worn any number of hats—representing the Lions Club of Maleny-Blackall Range or the Old Witta School Community. He does a great job. There was the wonderful Mrs Cynthia Anning from the Peachester History Committee. I will not tell members what she said to me as she received her certificate. Helen Baker from the Witta Recreational Club does a great job out there at Witta. There was Eve Beaman, along with her tireless ladies, of the Maleny Soldiers Memorial Hospital Auxiliary. Regine Deubner of the 5th Light Horse Regiment at Maleny turned up in her full regalia and, as usual, stole the show, particularly with those plumes in her slouch hat.

Penny Edwards also wears many hats, but on this occasion she was representing the Maleny District Sport and Recreation Club. Russell Eggins of the Maleny Swimming Club has done a great job as the club's president for the past two years. Jill Forster of the Glasshouse Mountains Sports Club has been involved in that cricket club for so long running raffles and assisting in the canteen. Although we know that Vicki Heading is involved with Quota International of Maleny, she was nominated for her work through the Glasshouse Country Chamber of Commerce. I think two communities in the electorate tried to claim her that day.

There was Glennis Manning from the Maleny Grove Village. She is a wonderful lady. Helen Manson is the de facto mayor of Beerburrum and was nominated by the Beerburrum School of Arts Association. She is always a cheeky one. Noel McEwan was nominated by Wamuran State School. Noel does a fantastic job with the nashos. He runs the school's Anzac Day and Remembrance Day services every year. Cristelle Nipperess was nominated by Elimbah State School P&C. I did not know that there were still school student banking coordinators, but now I am informed of that. Cristelle does a great job down there at Elimbah. Lottie Nisbett gives everyone a nice hard time at the Sunshine Girls, but she also knits some wonderful scarves for our homeless people. It was great to see Ingrid O'Shea of Lavally Lodge.

There was June and Peter Rawson from Wamuran Park Home. There was also Robert and Loma Spender from the Blackall Range Care Group. Helen Spry is a volunteer at the Caboolture Montessori School. There was Gavin Stewart of the Glass House Mountains Rural Fire Brigade. I thank Gavin. Ryan Thomas is our youngest volunteer and he is from the Australian Narrow Gauge Railway Museum Society. Joanne Titheradge of Maleny Little Athletics is a real tower of strength. There was Alan Flemington of the Barung Landcare Association, Chris Atkin from the Eudlo Rural Fire Brigade and Shirley Marsh from the Maleny Historical Society. I take my hat off to all of them. Our state would not be what it is and our community would not be what it is without the tireless efforts of our wonderful volunteers.

### Stretton Electorate, Small Business

 **Mrs OSTAPOVITCH** (Stretton—LNP) (3.22 pm): At my request the Minister for Tourism, Major Events, Small Business and the Commonwealth Games, the Hon. Jann Stuckey, generously dedicated two hours out of her incredibly hectic schedule to engage with small business owners in the Stretton electorate. Contrary to what has been written by the media, the minister offered an incredible amount of advice and support to businesses in my local area. We spent 10 minutes in a women's boutique during which we spoke about business and had a light-hearted conversation with the manager. It was a morning of positive interaction. We also had a lovely conversation with the owners of the Gloria Jean's coffee shop. We would have loved to have had time to stay and have a coffee. However, the centre manager had arranged for us to visit a number of other stores and it would have been quite inappropriate for us to take a coffee and cake with us to those other stores. It is a shame when the media report carelessly. Both of these businesses assured me that they appreciated the minister's visit. This minister is highly respected by her colleagues, because she has done more for Queensland tourism than anyone has since Paul Hogan put a prawn on the barbie.


Prior to the walk through the shopping centre, Minister Stuckey spent time with 24 local business owners at my office explaining what the government is doing to help them, which was greatly appreciated. There is a reason that more jobs are created in Queensland than in any other state in Australia and why, according to ABS data, we have achieved 4.1 per cent economic growth compared to 1.9 per cent for the rest of Australia. The government has got out of the way of small business by slashing red tape, as it promised to do before the election. There is no doubt that business is doing is tough, but the department has run many campaigns and initiatives to help. We have a dozen brochures about aids for small business available at my office.

Personally, I well understand the plight of small business, having started and built up a school and sports photography business to be the second largest based in Queensland then almost losing it before building it up again. I certainly understand the risk and hard work that is required for both survival and success. Therefore, I am passionate in my desire to help businesses in my local area to be successful. I work closely with the shopping centre managers, the hotel owners and the business community in my electorate to raise their profile. I have developed a page on my website to help promote restaurants and businesses in my local area and encourage others to call my office if they wish to be profiled on it. I hold a not-for-profit monthly breakfast club to help businesses and the community connect with each other. My staff and I eat lunch at great-value restaurants in my area. If there is anything else that I can do to help businesses, then I certainly want to know.

However, we can all do more to help by buying local wherever possible. I find it extraordinary that the Chinese spend more to buy Australian products because of our quality and—

*(Time expired)*

### State Forests and National Parks

 **Mrs MADDERN** (Maryborough—LNP) (3.25 pm): Earlier this month I had the honour to represent the Minister for National Parks, Recreation, Sport and Racing to open a mountain bike trail network in the Vernon State Forest at Toogoom. The opening of the trail network is one more step in honouring our election commitment to make state forests and national parks more accessible to the general public for sporting and recreational purposes.

The exciting part of this project was the collaboration between the members of the Fraser Coast Mountain Bike Club and the staff of the Queensland Parks and Wildlife Service. That collaboration was very obvious on the day of the opening, as there was much camaraderie between the two groups. The trail network is a series of individual trails, designed for beginners through to advanced riders, allowing for social riding and mountain bike events. It is believed to be the first formal mountain biking facility in the Fraser Coast region. I understand that the trails have been constructed to national standards, allowing local and visiting bike riders to assess their levels of capability against the national standards. The Queensland Parks and Wildlife Service has spent \$20,900 on formalising the trails, installing signage and interpretative materials, whilst Sport and Recreation Services provided around \$18,000 for a trail head, shelter and interpretative displays through the Get Playing program.

It is my understanding that the Fraser Coast Mountain Bike Club has only fairly recently been formed from a group of social riders. This group has contributed in the order of \$17,000 of in-kind work in the preparation of the bike trail. In addition, the club has received a grant of around \$18,000 in funding through the Get in the Game program for the provision of a trail head and shelter. The club

also received \$9,000 under the Get Going program to buy a trailer and bikes, pay for first aid training and to help the club promote their sport, engage the public and encourage people to try mountain biking.

I am thankful to see that an emphasis has been placed on first aid training. When my son was in boarding school his mates took great pleasure in showing me a video of my son sailing over the handlebars of the bike on a downhill trail on the Toowoomba range. Thankfully, he was not hurt. However, the situation could have been very different. First aid training is an important tool in safety.

A large number of bike riders and their supporters, all decked out in their bike gear, were there for the opening of the bike trail, the morning tea and sausage sizzle and a social ride afterwards. The highlight of the morning was the sight of two little boys decked out in helmets and bike gear sitting on their miniature bikes waiting for dad to take them for a ride on the beginner's trail. I congratulate all involved. I look forward to the construction of a series of motorbike trails in the state forest.

### **Algester Electorate, Community Events**



**Mr SHORTEN** (Algester—LNP) (3.28 pm): I rise to speak about the wonderful suburb of Forest Lake and the great community of Forest Lake located in the wonderful electorate of Algester. I begin by congratulating the Lions Club of Forest Lake on organising and supervising the Walk with the Lions fundraising event, which I attended on Sunday, 18 May, in support of the Leukaemia Foundation.

I joined about 80 members of the community to walk around the lake twice—which is a very small token of our appreciation of what people go through—in support of families and individuals who are suffering the horrible disease of leukaemia. I am told that on the day \$5,473.25 was raised in support of the Leukaemia Foundation, which is a great amount of money for a first-time event.

I would also like to congratulate the Lions Club of Forest Lake on their 20th year of service to the Forest Lake community. Members past and present need to be commended on the many projects and programs that they have engaged in over the last 20 years to improve our community and the lives of the residents of Forest Lake.

I have also been very privileged in the last couple of weeks to be able to join with another well-known community organisation which this year celebrates 20 years of service to the Forest Lake community. That organisation is the Baptist Church of Forest Lake. I attended their Sunday morning service held on the banks of the lake at Forest Lake. Its 20th year celebration service drew a huge crowd. I give my thanks and congratulations to the current pastor, Mark Mackay, and the members of the church. They have given such wonderful service to the community in that area. I wish them every success for the next 20 years.

I would also like to announce that Grand Avenue State School, which is a fantastic school in my electorate, has been awarded well over \$28,000 through the Gambling Community Benefit Fund to support its music program. This significant investment will go a long way to buying new instruments, song books and stands for their music students. I have had the privilege to attend many of their music nights over the last two years. There are such talented young musicians coming through. I give praise and encourage the school and students to continue on with their wonderful program.

I would also like to invite any member who is available on 1 June to attend the Algester Queensland Day Festival held in the wonderful electorate of Algester. It will be a great day and I welcome anyone who would like to come.

### **Uranium Mining, Townsville Public Forum**



**Ms TRAD** (South Brisbane—ALP) (3.31 pm): On 28 April I attended a public forum in Townsville. It was a forum that was conducted to apprise the local Townsville community of the Newman government's plans in relation to the recommencement of uranium mining in Queensland. One hundred and twenty people showed up. In stark contrast to the myth promulgated by those opposite, these were mums and dads, young people and children who turned up to voice their concerns about the recommencement of uranium mining in Queensland. They were not green extremists, they were ordinary, everyday regional people wanting to express their concerns about the recommencement of uranium mining throughout Queensland and what it may mean for their community.

I put on the record my thanks to Senator Claire Moore who hosted the event; Wendy Tubman, Director of the North Queensland Conservation Council, for coordinating and emceeing the event; the key presenters, Dr Bill Williams, President of the International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons; Mr Dave Sweeney, the nuclear-free campaigner for the Australian Conservation Foundation; Councillor Vern Veitch; and Mark Bailey, who is the Queensland campaigner against nuclear power and also the Labor candidate for the seat of Yeerongpilly, someone who has worked extensively on this issue. I take my hat off to all of those people.


It was an informative meeting. We discussed how the economics of uranium did not stack up. We talked about the environmental risks, the transportation risks and the risks to public health and safety. A resolution was passed at the Townsville meeting to (1) oppose uranium mining at Ben Lomond in the Hervey Range; (2) call on the Newman government to prohibit a uranium mine at Ben Lomond in the Hervey Range; (3) call on the Newman government to ban the export of uranium past Townsville houses and schools and across the Barrier Reef; (4) call on the federal member for Herbert, Ewen Jones, to oppose the transfer of the sole power of approval for uranium mines to the Newman government; and (5) call on state MPs in the Townsville region, particularly Mr Crisafulli, Mr Cox and Mr Hathaway, to support (1) to (3).

I table for the benefit of the House a petition of Queenslanders received at that meeting. Many people are outraged at the government's broken promise in relation to uranium mining. It was a promise that was given on a number of occasions before the announcement was made. I also table for the benefit of the House clips from the regional media around that period which basically call on the Newman government to ensure that regional communities have a say in the decision making process which is not going to happen if Townsville LNP members do not turn up to listen to their constituents.

*Tabled paper:* Non-conforming petition regarding uranium mining in Queensland [\[5186\]](#).

*Tabled paper:* Bundle of media articles from the *Townsville Bulletin* regarding uranium mining [\[5187\]](#).

### Sunnybank Electorate, Cathay Community Association

 **Mr STEWART** (Sunnybank—LNP) (3.34 pm): I rise to draw the attention of the House to the wonderful work that Ken Cheung and the Cathay Community Association is doing in my electorate of Sunnybank. It has been a very busy time for Cathay, having moved from Fortitude Valley to its new specially built premises. It was my privilege to officially open the new Cathay Community Centre in Coopers Plains on 27 April 2014. The day was a great success with all the ingredients for a great time: food, music, dance, over 200 people and the opportunity to share ideas and build a stronger community. I recently introduced the Minister for Communities, Child Safety and Disability Services, the Hon. Tracy Davis, to Mr Ken Cheung and the great people at Cathay. I know the minister was very impressed with the new facilities and also with the quality and quantity of services provided to members of the Sunnybank and greater Brisbane community.


Through the commitment and dedication of its members and volunteers, Cathay has grown to become one of the biggest and most active community organisations in Brisbane. It is great that seniors in my electorate have access to a newly renovated building in which to socialise, interact and, above all, to be treated with respect. I think that it is really important that we recognise that seniors, people with disability and those who feel socially isolated due to language barriers should have the opportunity to contribute to community life. That is why I commend Ken and the Cathay Community Association for their commitment to creating a barrier-free environment in their new community centre. As a society we have an ageing population. The demand for activities, facilities and social opportunities that cater to the needs of our ageing population is greater than ever. I thank Cathay for its efforts in meeting this demand.

The state government, through initiatives such as Seniors Week, is also encouraging the continued participation and involvement in our over-sixties community life. Every day the state government is helping seniors through the business discount scheme with discounts offered by more than 7,000 businesses to our over-sixties. We all know someone senior, be it a parent, grandparent or a friend that is important to us, and it is important for us to take the opportunity to acknowledge the valuable role they play in our families and our communities.

It was a privilege to open Cathay's new community centre in Coopers Plains and to be given the opportunity to acknowledge Cathay's years of exceptional community service since its official establishment in 1981. I am looking forward to continuing my proud association with Cathay and assisting in its main purpose of providing care for seniors, especially those from the many

multicultural communities in Sunnybank and surrounds. I would like to take this opportunity to acknowledge the work of Tom Seeto and Peter Low for the original work of setting up and establishing the Cathay Community Association.

### **Mount Coot-tha Electorate, Initiatives; Milton, Volunteers Week**


 **Mrs RICE** (Mount Coot-tha—LNP) (3.37 pm): The LNP is the party of small business and values the significant contribution of small business to the Queensland economy. I am delighted, as are many businesses and residents in my electorate, that this government has delivered on another of our election commitments—the commitment of \$300,000 for the reinvigoration of Rosalie Village and Park Road at Milton. This commitment was about supporting our local communities and our local economies. It recognised that they had been doing it tough, particularly following the 2011 flood, and it was designed to assist in reinvigorating these iconic areas and bringing business back to their doors.

Following extensive consultation with local residents and businesses, my local community designed their own reinvigoration project specific to the needs of Rosalie Village and around Park Road in Milton. Of particular importance to my local area, and something that exists in rich supply, is our deep history. As a point of difference, to attract visitors to the wonderful suburbs of Brisbane's inner west, we worked in partnership with Brisbane City Council to design heritage trails around Rosalie and Milton. Milton's colonial past stretches back to the mid-19th century when the North Brisbane Burial Grounds were situated on the current site of Suncorp Stadium and the area was dotted with houses, churches and shops. The Milton Heritage Trail has a plethora of historically significant sites to see, including Brisbane's first alfresco dining precinct Savoir Faire, a World War II air-raid shelter, the famous XXXX Brewery and a range of unique heritage buildings.

Similarly, Rosalie has a rich history spanning from the early 1860s when the area's first European landowners settled through to recent times when the suburb was hit hard by the 2011 flood. The plaques along the trail depict important local history, including stories about the Rosalie School of Arts, which was built as a war memorial to commemorate soldiers from the district, and the Marist Brothers monastery, which was opened in 1929. I encourage everyone to experience the Rosalie and Milton heritage trails at their own pace and enjoy the wonderful hospitality of the cafes and restaurants along the way. Other aspects of the reinvigoration project for Rosalie include upgraded street lighting, new banners and flood markers. For Milton, the project included upgraded street lighting, new community signage, new custom bike racks, street furniture and landscaping at Smiddy Park. This project is all part of this government's support for small business and our local communities.

Finally, I acknowledge that last week was national Volunteer Week, Australia's largest celebration of volunteers and volunteerism. Once again I was delighted to host, with my colleague the Minister for Communities, Child Safety and Disability Services, the Mount Coot-tha Volunteer Awards to acknowledge and thank the volunteers who contribute so much to the community that I represent. Last Wednesday, volunteers and representatives from a range of local organisations gathered at the Broncos Leagues Club, together with their colleagues, family members and friends, for a wonderful celebration over morning tea. Those amazing people were recognised because they are givers; they are givers of their time, their skills and their wisdom. Often they fly under the radar, but their work goes a long way in building a stronger community for everyone. We sincerely thank them for it.

### **Volunteers Week**

 **Mr WELLINGTON** (Nicklin—Ind) (3.40 pm): I have good news from the Nicklin electorate. Last Thursday, I hosted another annual morning tea to recognise some of the Nicklin community's unsung volunteer heroes. We had more than 130 people packed into the hall of the Nambour Country Women's Association to recognise the service of 10 community groups and 28 individuals. The awards ceremony is my way of saying thank you to the many people who give so much to others without expecting anything in return. It is an opportunity to let people know that their efforts are appreciated and that our community is much better placed because of them.

While I appreciate the dedication and commitment of every one of our award recipients, this afternoon time does not allow me to speak on each individual, so I have singled out a few of the volunteers. Sylvia Whiting is a founding member of the Wildlife Volunteers Association on the Sunshine Coast. She devotes an enormous amount of time to helping our local wildlife. She is the epitome of a quiet achiever. She is one of those people who just gets things done, a person who does not expect accolades and a person who simply gets on with the next job.

Peter Goodrich was another recipient. He is a local who was born and bred in Nambour. Many locals would recognise Peter. His volunteering engagements include service for the Neighbourhood Aid shop since 2011, Hamburgers for Homeless since 2008 and working with Equity Works for the past eight years. He is also an accomplished athlete and an active fundraiser in the Sunshine Coast Special Olympics team.


Evie Hurley was nominated by the Maroochy River Rowing Club committee. She is described as the loveliest girl imaginable. She started rowing at the age of 16 and very quickly stood out as a club member. She helps all rowers. She is the last to go home and she is always helping her club mates. She excels as an athlete, but her willingness to forgo her own needs to help others is remarkable.

Edgewater Crafters is made up of committed residents of the Edgewater Village at Bli Bli and has just celebrated its seventh birthday. The average age of the crafters—mainly women and a few men—is 85 years young. They sell their items and the money they raise they donate to local charities and people in need in our community. Over the past seven years, they have assisted 21 local and interstate charities. For this group, doing something for other people less fortunate gives them a purpose for their lives to continue and to be of benefit. Through their craft commitments and dedication, Edgewater Crafters enhances our wonderful Nicklin community.

The Nambour Red Cross Singers have been entertaining residents in our Sunshine Coast hospitals and nursing homes for the past 30 years. The initial group was made up of Barry Woods, the late Therese Woods and Roger and Diane Dagger. It did not take long for the group to expand and now they entertain, free of charge, at eight regular venues every month. Well done and thank you to our Nambour Red Cross Singers.

Those are just some of the outstanding people who were recognised at the awards ceremony. They are indicative of the wonderful people we have volunteering their services to the Nicklin community all the time. I thank each and every one of our volunteers for their wonderful service. Congratulations and well done.

### Chappy Week

 **Dr ROBINSON** (Cleveland—LNP) (3.43 pm): I rise to highlight in the parliament that this week is Chappy Week and to acknowledge the great work that chaplains do in the schools of the Cleveland electorate. This week, 18 to 25 May, is Chappy Week. Chappy Week is an opportunity for us as a community to thank and acknowledge our chaplains for the hard work that they do in our schools. Chappy Week is an awareness week run by Scripture Union Queensland. The role of chaplains in our schools should never be undervalued. Chaplains provide support, pastoral care and assistance to young people and at-risk children who are often most in need. In short, chaplains are helping professionals who are at the front line of providing assistance to young people.


I am proud of the fact that it was a conservative government, the Howard Liberal National government, that introduced this visionary and caring program. Again we see that compassionate conservatives often lead the way when it comes to education reforms and caring for our children and families. The good work of chappies is highly valued by principals, teachers, staff, parents and students. The huge majority of Queenslanders believe that chappies are good for their children and worth the investment of taxpayer funds by governments. Chappies are viewed positively by 97 per cent of all principals, both non-religious and religious. Only an extremely small proportion of people are ideologically opposed to chappies.

Last weekend I was invited to attend the commissioning service at Birkdale Baptist Church of our newest chaplain for Cleveland District State High School, Cleveland local Heather Decorso. It was uplifting to see the support that Heather received from her local congregation to go into our schools and make a positive change. Heather is one of many chaplains around Queensland who work from a community support base to make our schools a better place for our young people.

In my electorate of Cleveland we are lucky enough to have chappies in most primary and secondary schools. The overwhelming majority of schools in the Cleveland electorate have chosen to take on a chaplain to help support their school community. There is: Angela Wolferstan at Bayview State School and Thornlands State School; Neale Collier and Heather Decorso at Cleveland District State High School; Aaron Blyth at Cleveland State School; Tracey Hodge at Dunwich State School; Terry Keen at Ormiston State School; Carl Coertzen at Wellington Point State High School; Meash Proverbs at Wellington Point State School; Mike Shepherd at Redlands College; Chris Brown at Ormiston College; Father Frank Jones at Mary MacKillop school; and Ashley Warbroke at Star of the

Sea Catholic Primary School. I am proud to be in a government that went to the last election with a commitment to allocate additional funding over four years for the Chaplaincy/Pastoral Care Funding Program. Again, the LNP government is delivering for all Queenslanders.

### Volunteers Week

 **Ms MILLARD** (Sandgate—LNP) (3.47 pm): Today I rise to acknowledge and thank the amazing volunteers whom I represent as the member for Sandgate. Last week, we all celebrated the 25th anniversary of Volunteers Week, a timely reminder of the contribution of volunteers to our quality of life. For the 2014 Volunteers Week, in conjunction with the member for Nudgee I had the opportunity to personally thank over 80 of our local volunteers at an afternoon tea in Fitzgibbon. Those represented 28 of our community groups and included other potential volunteers that explored local opportunities. This was my third year of hosting a Volunteers Week event. In fact, it was the first official event I ever hosted as a new member of parliament in 2012 and I hope to host many more.


The theme for this year's 25th anniversary of Volunteers Week is 'the Power of Volunteering'. That in itself is a powerful theme, but are we convinced? Let us look at why I say, 'Yes, we are' and why I believe as a government we should continue to partner closely with the volunteer based sector. Mahatma Gandhi once said, 'The best way to find yourself is to lose yourself in the service of others'. That is fair enough, but most of us fall short of Gandhi's standard. However, most of us do, will and have served others as volunteers in our lives. The last formal survey cited by Volunteering Queensland was done in 2006 and demonstrated that more than one-third of Queenslanders volunteered in formal organisations and it was estimated that more than that again volunteered in an informal way with friends, relatives or known individuals. That is well over 50 per cent.

In 2006, the value to the Queensland economy of those acts of service was estimated at \$13.4 billion, which is almost triple the 1992 survey results of over \$5 billion, less than 15 years previously. That is not insignificant by any measure. More recently, in 2011 a Volunteering Australia survey found that the two things volunteers most commonly valued about volunteering included, as quoted, 'The difference I make to the community' and 'The sense of purpose it gives me'.

If evidence is what we are looking for, we can only conclude that there is power in volunteering, but more importantly the power is not only kept by the givers but is given to others and to the whole community. It is a real contribution. In the Sandgate electorate, around 18 per cent of individuals identified as a volunteer in the 2011 census, which is almost one in five people. I proudly represent those volunteers and I proudly host afternoon tea for them.

Not every volunteer in the Sandgate electorate could attend my afternoon tea, but I would like to thank and acknowledge every single volunteer in parliament today—every single person who gives of their time and heart to make their corner of the world in the Sandgate electorate a better place. What they do is powerful in our community because it makes a difference to someone and sooner or later to all of us. As a new volunteer of the SES, I make special mention of my team, the Brisbane north-east group. Special thanks goes to those members who have been dedicated to the SES for 10 years or more, of which there are many.

### Murrumba Electorate, Events; Anzac Day

 **Mr GULLEY** (Murrumba—LNP) (3.50 pm): More than any other event, Anzac Day unites Australians. I always feel privileged to be able to attend many services on behalf of my electorate, including at Deception Bay State High School and Mueller College and on Anzac Day itself services conducted by the Deception Bay, Pine Rivers and Redcliffe RSLs. Australians come together not to celebrate or glorify war, but rather to remember those who have served our country during times of conflict and crisis. It is also a time of personal reflection being the grandson of FTD Gulley who served in the First World War and whose damaged pilot's harness retrieved from his plane crash is currently on display in Anzac Hall at the Australian War Memorial in Canberra.

Also during April, the Minister for Education and I had to draw on all of our vocal and timing skills to sing and act along with the children of the newly opened Mango Hill Kindergarten. I had some trouble with technique in keeping up with the enthusiastic kids when singing at the same time as pointing to my head, shoulders, knees and toes.


The kindergarten, operated by Mission Australia, caters for the care of 44 children. It is funded by the state government under the universal access to kindergarten program. I remain in admiration of the patience and passion of the staff such as Candida Bellert, Deb Wilson and Natalie Curtis. They demonstrated how much they value the lifelong benefits of quality early education.

Last month I was sent to jail. I was arrested, sentenced and put behind bars to raise funds for the PCYC Time4Kids youth crime prevention program. Bail was set at \$500. My time in jail raised well over \$1,000 for the Deception Bay and Redcliffe PCYCs.

Homelessness was the cause and the vehicle was a day and night of rock music at the Rockin' for the Homeless fundraiser. Helping out at the door I watched as hundreds of music tragics descended on the Bramble Bay Bowls Club. The family friendly music event featured volunteer local and regional artists. Importantly, proceeds from the event went to Chameleon Housing, the Breakfast Club and the Redcliffe Area Youth Space to coordinate homeless services under one roof. I was proud to lend my support to these valuable community organisations.

I was pleased to learn that two local Murrumba electorate women are set to break into Queensland's male dominated industries with a Newman government Supporting Women Scholarship. I congratulate Mrs Rachel Dudok of North Lakes and Miss Madison Wright of Deception Bay as they take further steps towards becoming qualified workers in a traditionally male dominated industry. My wife was a trailblazer in her time being a graduate industrial chemist and one of the first females to work at a large male dominated industrial site. This grant would have benefited her. As always, it is a pleasure to speak on behalf of the people of Murrumba—a great place.

### Acton, Mr G

 **Hon. JJ McVEIGH** (Toowoomba South—LNP) (Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry) (3.53 pm): I want to contribute some thoughts to the House this afternoon in relation to vision and leadership in agriculture. I wanted to share these thoughts with the House, including the member for Brisbane Central.


In doing so, I refer to the late Graeme Acton. I certainly join with and endorse the very important words that have been shared by the Premier, the member for Keppel, the member for Rockhampton and others in this House after Mr Acton's sad and recent passing. When we think about vision and leadership in agriculture he epitomised those two qualities. He has been recognised for that over the last week, particularly at his funeral service on Monday which was attended by the Prime Minister, the Premier and other representatives of both state and federal politics. As has been said, Mr Acton has been well recognised as a visionary cattleman who understood and advocated very strongly for the need for producers to become price makers not price takers in agriculture.

Whilst I endorse all of the comments that have been made about Mr Acton and his leadership and vision in agriculture in Queensland, I want to add that we certainly all need to take on board his legacy. His understanding of agricultural markets and his dogged pursuit of agricultural markets for his product and that of others across many, many countries is well known. He developed his own brand, Acton Super Beef. His passion for skills and education in agriculture and his support of our agricultural college corporation are well known. His passion for regional communities—the Stockman's Hall of Fame, camp drafting and his centre at Paradise Lagoons that he developed himself—and his support of so many regional activities is well known. His advocacy on behalf of Queensland and the source of advice that he was for me as the Queensland minister and for my federal and state colleagues I must share with the House.

As we mourn Graeme Acton's passing, members in this House now and those who follow us need to take on board his legacy. He was a great man for our state, a great man for our country. His contribution will be celebrated at Beef 2015 in Rockhampton.

*(Time expired)*

### Labor Party

 **Mr CAVALLUCCI** (Brisbane Central—LNP) (3.56 pm): Since being elected to this House, I have had the misfortune to witness a number of demonstrations of ineptitude and offensive behaviour from the Labor opposition. Yesterday and every time the member for Bundamba gets on her feet she demonstrates to all the true depth of the Labor Party.

Yesterday we saw a member of the Katter party, the member for Dalrymple, join the peanut gallery and deliver one of the most offensive and inflammatory statements I have heard in this House. It seems to have been missed by many, but I can tell members that it was not missed by the members of Queensland's Muslim community.

Last night, prejudice and ignorance was perpetuated by the prejudiced and ignorant member for Dalrymple. For those who missed it, I will quote from *Hansard*. He stated—

... we just cannot have people walking around our streets—

...

With their face covered up. We cannot have people walking into banks with their face covered up ... So what is wrong with saying, 'We don't want bombs going off. We don't want terrorism. We don't want these things. We don't want to see these things'?

I say to all Queenslanders who practise Islam and to those who choose to respect the traditions of their faith that you are welcome in our state. The comments by the Katter party member are an outright disgraceful slur on Queensland's Muslim community. It is offensive to the wider Queensland community and it denigrates this House.

The Katter party's views are in fact supported by the Palmer party. Rob Messenger, the PUP candidate for Hinkler, stated—

In the not too distant future terrorists (who now live among us, sustained by our welfare payments) could be armed with modern weapons—capable of killing many innocents, with the flick of a switch.

Clive Palmer refused to disendorse him because the Palmer party members support these comments. As elected members of this House, we are leaders of the Queensland community, of which more than 20 per cent of the population were born overseas—a community where we peacefully practise over 100 religions and belief systems. We are supposed to be leaders of a community where we celebrate the fact that this diversity of culture, this diversity of religion and this diversity of thought has changed the face of Queensland for the better.

As leaders of this community we have an obligation to demonstrate and educate other Queenslanders of the vanity of the false distinctions they might still make among fellow man, the false distinctions based on prejudice and ignorance and instead appeal to our common humanity and all the things that unite us, such as the fact that we want to enjoy raising our families in a tolerant society and embrace the contribution that each of us make.

Only the LNP has demonstrated the acceptance of our entire community. LNP party members preselected the next member for Yeerongpilly, Leila Abukar, a bright, well-credentialed female Muslim. Earlier I spoke to Queensland community leader of the Islamic community, Professor Dr Mohammad Abdulla, and reiterated that the wider Queensland community does not share the prejudiced views of the Katter and Palmer parties. He knows that Queensland and the LNP will stand up for his community.

### **Redlands Electorate, Events; Dooley, Mr DH**



**Mr DOWLING** (Redlands—LNP) (3.59 pm): Today I would like to reflect on an old mate, Desmond Horace Dooley, an active member of my community. I reflect on his activities in recent times encouraging youth in one of his great passions, that of bowls. He has built up a bit of a program at the local bowls club and the young people have embraced it. He will leave a tremendous legacy when he does leave this place. Sadly, there are many more days behind him than in front of him. But he has that great spirit of volunteering going all the way back to the seventies. He has photos and memorabilia of the 1974 floods when he was out in action with his car and his boat around the Jindalee and Rocklea areas. So this is just a passing thought for an old mate, Dessy. We will have to try to catch up.

It will be a busy weekend around the Redlands and it has been a busy week right across my electorate. Tomorrow starts the 48-hour relay. As the name implies, it is 48 hours of people running around a track. It is a fabulous fundraising activity. It commences tomorrow morning. There is still opportunity for people to run along and support it, and there is also tremendous opportunity out there for people to sponsor the runners. So please get in touch through the Sharks football club at Victoria Point or through me. The beneficiaries of this terrific event will be the Redlands Centre for Women—which is rather fitting after yesterday's presentation about domestic violence—and the paediatric ward at the Redland Hospital—two fine establishments in our neck of the woods. They will certainly make great use of those resources.

My thanks and congratulations go to the organising committee for the 48-hour relay. It will also be supported by another event, the Redlands Koala Fun Run—a great activity. So it will be an active weekend in my neck of the woods. Also on Saturday we have Funfest, which is one of the major fetes in my community at Faith Lutheran College, Link Road, Victoria Point. That is an all-day Saturday event, and I encourage everyone to get along.

Speaking of events, it has been a crazy week with all the Biggest Morning Teas. I would like to put on record my thanks to Tranquil Waters, who were kind enough to invite me to their Biggest Morning Tea last week, and also Lake Sherrin, who celebrate not only their Biggest Morning Tea tomorrow but also 85 years of service to aged care in my community. Also, the Redlands cancer fund had their Biggest Morning Tea in Cleveland today. I do apologise that I could not be there. I would also like to thank in advance the community of Salford Waters Retirement Village, and I look forward to their Biggest Morning Tea tomorrow morning.

## PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERS AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

### Message from Governor

**Hon. TL MANDER** (Everton—LNP) (Minister for Housing and Public Works) (4.01 pm): I present a message from Her Excellency the Governor.

The Deputy Speaker read the following message—

MESSAGE

PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERS AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL 2014

*Constitution of Queensland 2001, section 68*

I, PENELOPE ANNE WENSLEY AC, Governor, recommend to the Legislative Assembly a Bill intituled—

A Bill for an Act to amend the Building Act 1975, the Plumbing and Drainage Act 2002, the Professional Engineers Act 2002 and the Queensland Building and Construction Commission Act 1991, and to make minor or consequential amendments of the Acts mentioned in schedule 1, for particular purposes


(Sgd)

GOVERNOR

Date: 21 MAY 2012

*Tabled paper:* Message, dated 21 May 2014, from Her Excellency the Governor, recommending the Professional Engineers and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2014 [\[5188\]](#).

### Introduction

 **Hon. TL MANDER** (Everton—LNP) (Minister for Housing and Public Works) (4.03 pm): I present a bill for an act to amend the Building Act 1975, the Plumbing and Drainage Act 2002, the Professional Engineers Act 2002 and the Queensland Building and Construction Commission Act 1991, and to make minor or consequential amendments of the acts mentioned in schedule 1, for particular purposes. I table the bill and explanatory notes. I nominate the Transport, Housing and Local Government Committee to consider the bill.

*Tabled paper:* Professional Engineers and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2014 [\[5189\]](#).

*Tabled paper:* Professional Engineers and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2014, explanatory notes [\[5190\]](#).

Through this bill, the Queensland government continues to deliver on its plan for a brighter future for the Queensland building and construction industry as one of the four pillars of the Queensland economy. We are delivering on our plan by cutting red tape and reducing the regulatory requirements on business. This bill is another step in the Queensland government's plan to boost confidence in the industry.

The Board of Professional Engineers of Queensland administers the Professional Engineers Act 2002 and manages the registration of engineers. Following a review of the Professional Engineers Act 2002 by the Board of Professional Engineers and a subsequent review undertaken by KPMG, the government proposed a number of amendments which promote compliance with the act, ensuring it is effective and up to date. During the review, KPMG consulted with a range of engineering and construction industry stakeholders to ensure industry concerns were addressed.

The bill will make a number of amendments to the Professional Engineers Act 2002. Firstly, the amendments will clarify critical definitions in the act to provide greater clarity and guidance to stakeholders. In addition, it will be made clear that a person undertaking professional engineering services outside Queensland, for projects based in Queensland, must be a registered professional engineer or working under the direct supervision of a registered professional engineer. Another area of change is the introduction of a new category of non-practising engineer to cater for retired engineers and for engineers on maternity leave or other career breaks.

With respect to the operations of the Board of Professional Engineers, the bill introduces new provisions whereby all penalties and fees recovered by the board under the act are to be paid to the board and become part of the board's funds, to offset costs incurred due to investigatory and disciplinary action taken. The bill also will extend the time for which proceedings for offences against the Professional Engineers Act 2002 can commence from six months to one year after the offence comes to the complainant's knowledge, which will give the board more time to investigate offences and make decisions based on the investigator's report. The bill also gives the board the power to reject a complaint if it reasonably considers that the complaint is unfounded or lacking in substance. This is in addition to the current reasons the board can reject a complaint, which includes frivolous, vexatious or trivial complaints.

The changes contained in the bill also expand options available to the board in decisions about unregistered engineers, such as to caution, reprimand or enter into undertakings, so that lengthy and expensive prosecution processes may be avoided in some circumstances. Finally, the bill permits the delegation of decisions in relation to the registration and renewal process to a board member, a committee of members, the registrar or an appropriately qualified board staff member to alleviate difficulties experienced in processing the increase in the number of registrants.

In May 2013, the government's response to the recommendations of the Transport, Housing and Local Government Committee report No. 14, *Inquiry into the operation and performance of the Queensland Building Services Authority 2012*, was tabled in parliament. The response included the government's 10-point action plan which involved changes to licensing, dispute resolution, building certification procedures and the Queensland Home Warranty Scheme. This bill is the second stage of amendments which form part of the biggest reform to the regulator of the building and construction industry in more than two decades.

The government's plan with these reforms is to make sure that both consumers and contractors have confidence in the industry—confidence to build a new home or to renovate an existing home, and confidence to start or grow a business or get a job within the industry. The first round of this reform process saw the removal of the Queensland Building Services Authority, the BSA, and the establishment of the Queensland Building Construction Commission, the QBCC. The advisory board of the BSA was replaced by a proper governance board for the QBCC while a new QBCC Commissioner was also appointed. These changes are already helping to grow industry confidence, and I am constantly hearing from industry participants about how refreshing they are finding the new QBCC and their new direction and attitude. This second stage implements a number of key reforms.

Firstly, it is proposed to amend the QBCC Act to provide for internal review of QBCC decisions that have the potential to go to the Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal, QCAT. This allows a person who is dissatisfied with a decision about matters such as licensing, homeowner complaints or insurance claims to elect to have the decision independently reviewed within the QBCC, at no cost, before taking the matter to QCAT. This should enhance the quality of decision making within the QBCC and reduce the number of matters being referred to QCAT.

Secondly, it is proposed to amend the QBCC Act to more clearly identify that a licensee ought not to be categorised as a 'permanently excluded individual' merely as a result of a 'relevant bankruptcy event' and a 'relevant company event' arising out of the same incident. This proposed amendment stems from issues raised during the parliamentary committee hearings that bankruptcy and company insolvency events arising from the same circumstances should be treated as a single event. To do otherwise is clearly unfair.

Thirdly, the bill contains provisions which amend the Building Act 1975 and the Plumbing and Drainage Act 2002. Currently, for the plumbing and drainage industry there are different regulators for occupational and contractor licensing. To reduce the industry's administrative costs and the burden on licence holders, the functions of the Plumbing Industry Council, PIC, will be moved to the newly created QBCC. If you hold an occupational and QBCC trade contractor's licence, you will only need to hold a QBCC trade contractor's licence in the future. Having to hold and pay for only one licence will save \$118.90 annually. If you only hold an occupational licence, you will still be required to hold it. However, it will be issued by the QBCC in the future. Additionally, all functions currently administered by the Pool Safety Council including licensing, compliance and disciplinary action relating to pool safety inspectors will be transferred to the QBCC as part of this bill.

As a consequence of these changes, the Plumbing Industry Council and the Pool Safety Council will be disbanded. I want to take this opportunity to thank the members of these councils for their contribution to the plumbing industry and to pool safety. I am confident that these proposed

amendments to the nominated acts will maintain industry standards while streamlining the processes and activities of both the Board of Professional Engineers of Queensland and the QBCC. This will result in improved services to consumers and industry. I commend the bill to the House.

### First Reading

**Hon. TL MANDER** (Everton—LNP) (Minister for Housing and Public Works) (4.12 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a first time.

Question put—That the bill be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a first time.

### Referral to the Transport, Housing and Local Government Committee

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! In accordance with standing order 131, the bill is now referred to the Transport, Housing and Local Government Committee.

### Portfolio Committee, Reporting Date

**Hon. TL MANDER** (Everton—LNP) (Minister for Housing and Public Works) (4.12 pm), by leave, without notice: I move—

That, under the provisions of standing order 136, the Transport, Housing and Local Government Committee report to the House on the Professional Engineers and Other Legislation Amendment Bill by 18 August 2014.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

## COMMITTEE OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

### Portfolio Committee, Reporting Date

**Mr STEVENS** (Mermaid Beach—LNP) (Leader of the House) (4.13 pm), by leave, without notice: I move—

That the report date for the Transport, Housing and Local Government Committee's inquiry on options to incentivise the agricultural and livestock industry to utilise rail referred by the House on 30 October 2013 be extended to 16 June 2014.

As I understand it from the chairman of the committee, it is about a six-day extension to allow matters to be completed.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.


Motion agreed to.

## ELECTORAL REFORM AMENDMENT BILL

### Second Reading

Resumed from 21 May (see p. 1754), on motion of Mr Bleijie—

That the bill be now read a second time.

 **Mr MINNIKIN** (Chatsworth—LNP) (4.14 pm): I am pleased to speak in favour of the Electoral Reform Amendment Bill. The Attorney-General has once again done a great job in fixing up the mistakes of the previous ALP government which was rather fond of policy on the run. Our reforms bring Queensland into line with Commonwealth requirements. The rushed amendments to the Electoral Reform and Accountability Amendment Act 2011 are a prime example of the previous Labor government's incompetent attitude to policy development and implementation. With an imminent election in their sights, the former ALP government sought to make significant changes to the rules that affected electoral expenditure, political donations and public funding of elections. It is crystal clear that the previous administration sought to unashamedly disadvantage other political parties which do not rely on union funding to fund their campaign efforts.

The Electoral Reform Amendment Bill 2013 has two primary policy objectives that it wishes to fulfil. Firstly, this amendment bill seeks to ensure that Queenslanders are given the best opportunity to fully partake in the electoral process and, secondly, boost integrity and accessibility when it comes to casting that all important vote at the ballot box when undertaking one's democratic duty. Currently, voters are not compelled to provide identification when receiving their ballot paper. Therefore, implementing verification of a voter's identity will significantly decrease the risk of voter impersonation. There has been some concern in some sections of the community over the requirements of proof of identity. However, as a government which is prepared to listen, this amendment caters for all sections of the community, ensuring that a variety of documentation can be utilised to establish a person's entitlement to vote. The LNP government and I, as the member for Chatsworth, have not stopped listening to Queenslanders and that will never change. We value the contributions from Queenslanders, and that is why we have encouraged people to have their say via the discussion papers and our electorate officers.

It is important when striving to have a transparent electoral system that mechanisms are in place to provide checks and balances for both the confidence of the voting public and the integrity of the electoral processes. Therefore, this amendment bill will implement a requirement for political parties to lodge their how-to-vote card with the Electoral Commission of Queensland. It recognises that how-to-vote cards are an important part of the election process. Therefore, it is critical that voters are given the true and correct facts in which to make an informed, democratic decision.

For too long the voting public has been bombarded with misleading how-to-vote cards and this has subsequently tied up unnecessary time seeking injunctions and wasting invaluable time in court. It hinders the ability of a voter to make an educated decision on how to cast their all-important vote. Individuals who are not successful in submitting their how-to-vote cards will be given an opportunity to submit revised documents to the Electoral Commission of Queensland.

The opposition will try to register their opposition to this legislation and it just proves that they do not want Queensland to have a fair and transparent voting system. They are happy to accept thousands of dollars from unions yet try to stifle individuals and businesses who seek to participate in the electoral process. I again take this opportunity to remind the House that the eight opposite in the chamber are members of a party that thought it was acceptable to rush through electoral reform without public consultation.


Let us compare and contrast. The Newman government, in comparison, has spent nearly a year releasing two parts of a discussion paper to ensure that everyone has been given ample opportunity to have their say on these important reforms. Another important aspect of this amendment bill is the cost saving to the taxpayer. The legislation will seek to increase the entitlement threshold for public funding from four per cent to six per cent of the primary vote. Hence the taxpayer will not foot the bill for individuals who poll a significantly low portion of the primary vote. Even though everyone has the right to put themselves forward to represent their community—moreover, it is their fundamental democratic right—it is not fair that the community should carry the monetary burden. As differing political parties compete against each other to govern this great state of Queensland, it is important that we respect the democratic process to ensure everyone has a level playing field. That is exactly what this amendment bill seeks to do for Queenslanders by ensuring that we are actively promoting democratic participation for all.

I am delighted that electronic voting will be introduced for Queensland voters who require assistance when casting their vote. Even though they may have impairment it does not mean they should be democratically disadvantaged at the ballot box. Electronic voting will give these voters a sense of independence and control over their ballot paper ensuring that it is flexible to meet their specific needs.

I am confident that education and voter awareness will become a priority after this amendment bill is passed—therefore ensuring that before the next state election all Queenslanders will have total confidence in the changes made to improve the voting process. This amendment bill will ensure that no individual is disadvantaged in the electoral system process.

I congratulate the Attorney-General for having the insight to bring forward an amendment bill that will ensure that the Queensland electoral system is regarded as one of integrity and one which has the highest accountability mechanisms. It is important that all political parties and individuals who seek public office are held to account, especially when there is opportunity to undertake the true honour of representing Queenslanders.

I would also like to place on record my greatest appreciation to all of those Queenslanders who submitted over 250 submissions in response to the discussion paper released in 2013. Extensive public consultation has been crucial in developing this amendment bill as it affects all Queenslanders and their right to cast that all-important vote on polling day. As someone who has worked on nearly all local, state and federal elections since 1989, it is my great pleasure as the member for Chatsworth to add my support to this much needed piece of legislative reform.

 **Mr PITT** (Mulgrave—ALP) (4.20 pm): I rise to contribute to the debate on the Electoral Reform Amendment Bill 2013. I join the Leader of the Opposition and my colleagues in strongly opposing this retrograde and dangerous legislation. This LNP government has no shame when it comes to reducing transparency in our Queensland democracy. They have form when it comes to attacking the most vulnerable in our society, and this is a Premier and a government that has learnt nothing when it comes to donations and cash for access.

The timing of this legislation could not be more telling about the twisted priorities of this government. I fear they really do live on another planet. This legislation is being debated in the shadow of three concerning developments. First, the information coming out of ICAC in New South Wales including specific revelations about donations made to the Queensland Premier in his previous role as Lord Mayor of Brisbane. Second, it is also being debated in the wake of the government's moves to kneecap one of the most respected institutions in Queensland—the anti-corruption watchdog, the former Crime and Misconduct Commission. Third, the Attorney-General—the very person responsible for this legislation—is bringing in changes that would make it easier to keep large political donations a secret at the very time that he is being questioned about his role in awarding a tender against the recommendations of his department and at double the cost to the taxpayer.

It is almost farcical that, when the Queensland community, including the legal profession, said loud and clear that the government's attacks on the independent anti-corruption watchdog should not be progressed, this government's response is to make it easier to make large cash donations to politicians and keep it secret. It is absolutely farcical that, as we hear about the stunning revelations from ICAC, this government's response is to make it easier for lobbyists and big business to make secret donations and peddle access to power.

This legislation illustrates the twisted priorities of this government. This bill on the one hand makes it easier for their business mates to make large donations and not have to declare those donations at all. They remove spending restrictions for elections, giving more influence and power to those with money. What is in it for the rest of Queensland? New requirements that will make it harder to vote, especially for the most vulnerable in our community. The real intention of these laws is to deny the rights of every single adult Queenslanders to cast their vote—all the while being able to say they are keeping compulsory voting in place.

The Newman government have proven that they will sack you, they will cut your vital services and now they think they can deny your right to vote. This legislation has the potential to rob a person of the vote that they have had their entire adult life. Just because some voters come from disadvantaged backgrounds or do not have the same capacity as others, it does not mean they have any less right to vote in an election.

The provisions of this bill which will require voters to provide proof of identity are regressive and unjustified. The most important tenet of democracy is that people are able to vote. Unwarranted obstacles should not be put in the way of Queenslanders wanting to exercise that right. Any policy decision which makes it more difficult to vote reduces the legitimacy of governments and damages the quality of our democracy.

Appropriately, it has been said that this is 'a solution in search of a problem'. It is a disproportionate response that will only further marginalise certain groups of Queensland voters. If there was evidence of widespread voter fraud, there may be some argument to institute a voter ID requirement. However, there is absolutely no evidence that this is an issue. The LNP says it is making these changes under the guise of 'protecting against electoral fraud', but there is absolutely no evidence of electoral fraud in the current system. A 2009 federal green paper reported on 10 cases of multiple voting referred to authorities from the 2007 election. That is 10—not 10,000—across the entire country. In the 2012 Queensland state election there was one case.

Why doesn't the Attorney-General listen to his own department when it says 'there is no specific evidence of electoral fraud'? After the 2012 Queensland election, the Electoral Commissioner referred just one person to the Queensland Police Service for electoral fraud—just one person. That

would not have changed the result in a single Queensland electorate—not even Bulimba which was decided by just 74 votes. In the absence of any evidence of voter fraud, we should therefore act in the interests of maximising the number of people voting and minimising the obstacles in their way.

While the Attorney-General suggests that it is not difficult or cumbersome to provide evidence of identity, many people do not have the relevant papers and are unable to obtain them. This is the case for many Indigenous people, people with a disability, the elderly, the homeless and young people. Submitters to the committee suggested that up to 40,000 voters could be impacted negatively by these proposed changes. Mick Gooda, the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Social Justice Commissioner, stated in his submission to the committee—

Many Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people face difficulties in obtaining formal identification and may have insufficient documents to meet the proposed requirements. A 'vicious cycle' is said to exist where the lack of a birth certificate prevents people from being granted other forms of identification, however individuals cannot obtain a birth certificate because they cannot satisfy the identification requirements to be granted one.

I have heard some members opposite say that concerns about voter ID requirements are a storm in a teacup. Well, I say that I know with absolute certainty that this unreasonable and unnecessary requirement will significantly affect Indigenous people in my electorate, particularly in the community of Yarrabah. I have seen firsthand how the lack of a birth certificate has prevented some Indigenous children from registering for organised sport. Many adults will face a similar issue in terms of being granted other forms of identification that would meet the requirements of these proposed laws, such as a driver's licence, a passport or a recent account or notice issued by a public utility. So, if you do not drive a car, do not travel overseas and are not the account holder for your electricity bill, there is every chance you will not have the appropriate identification. I have heard people say, 'Everyone has power on at their house so why wouldn't they have an electricity bill?' Well, there are still significant overcrowding issues in houses in many Indigenous communities so a person may not be the account holder or even be a full-time occupant of that house.

This bill will end up disenfranchising many of my constituents. Many Yarrabah residents will be badly affected because they may not have the right documents. There is a reason why there is a specific Indigenous Driver Licensing Unit within Queensland Transport, because we know how important having a licence is to a person's employment prospects and general independence. This unit is needed because there is a distinct underrepresentation in many Indigenous communities in terms of driver licence holders. Again, the Social Justice Commissioner said—

... it has been estimated that only 38 per cent of Indigenous people in some local government areas in Queensland have a drivers licence compared to an average of 90 per cent of the rest of the eligible population.

I have also heard some people say that they should just get an 18+ card. It may not sound like much to some but the price of an 18+ card these days is \$58.05.


This is an even bigger issue in other Indigenous communities, particularly on Cape York and the Torres Strait. It is already harder for many Indigenous people in remote areas to vote, and any attempt to make it even harder via these proposals is not right. The member for Cook should be doing everything within his power to make it easier for his constituents to vote; unfortunately, he is supporting this bill which will make it more difficult for them. I know the Labor candidate in Cook, Billy Gordon, knows it is a real issue for those communities. I do note that people who turn up to vote but are unable to present identification are able to use a declaration vote. I quote Mr Gooda again—

Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people attempting to vote may feel intimidated by the requirements to fill in extra paperwork and being treated differently to other voters, a realistic possibility given the figures about the lack of identification in our community I mention above. The declaration process may also have the effect of making people without identification feel further marginalised and may make them reluctant to complete the process. I worry that intending voters may not continue to complete their ballot if required to go through the declaration vote procedure.

This sort of reactionary and discriminatory measure is copied straight out of the playbook of the extremist right wing of the American Republican Party. It is also completely in line with the LNP's history in this state, given that they have never seen an electoral system they did not want to rot. Joh Bjelke-Petersen ran a massive gerrymander that kept him in power despite never winning more than 40 per cent of the vote. The votes of people in conservative areas were worth much more than the votes in working-class areas.

Times may have changed, and thankfully the LNP could not get away with such a flagrantly undemocratic bill in 2014, but they are doing their best to reduce the ability of the elderly, people with a disability, young and Indigenous people to vote on the basis that they are more likely to vote for Labor than other sectors of the community. As I said, the conservative parties in this state have never seen an electoral system they did not want to distort and they have shown that again here this week.

No-one who cares about political transparency, no-one who cares about enfranchising the disadvantaged and no-one who cares about the quality of our democracy would even entertain the idea of supporting this bill. This bill rips away safeguards on the disclosure of electoral donations. It makes it harder for people to vote for no discernible reason beyond electoral advantage. This is absolutely the last thing that any electoral reform bill should be doing. The Labor members in this House are making a stand against the Newman government and their attempts to muzzle potential voters in our state. The fact that 74 members of the LNP are not and will almost certainly vote for this bill speaks volumes.

 **Mr MOLHOEK** (Southport—LNP) (4.29 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Electoral Reform Amendment Bill. I have been looking forward to this debate for some time. In fact, I have been looking forward to this debate since 2006 when I was serving as an elected councillor on the Gold Coast City Council. At that time the council was subjected to an unnecessary and expensive investigation into campaign donations, conflict of interest laws and a whole range of other issues by a Labor government that was more intent on creating a smokescreen for its own poor performance than it ever was in any real, serious electoral reform. What we saw was that some \$8 million of taxpayers' money was wasted on an inquiry that went nowhere. No prosecutions came out of that particular inquiry and there were no real outcomes. In fact, of the 117 plus recommendations that came out of the CMC inquiry, the then Labor government adopted fewer than 20 and those that they did adopt were watered down to such an extent that I would suggest that much of the process was quite meaningless. The reforms were there to just try to save face and restore some degree of credibility in the fact that they wasted so much money on an inquiry that really went nowhere. It seems to me that with Labor there are two sets of rules, and I saw that in council. There was one set of rules for state parliament and then there was a whole other set of rules for local councils. What we saw at the time was a massive Beattie smokescreen which was all about propping up Gold Coast seats and diverting attention away from the state members of the day and doing that at the expense of hardworking councillors on the Gold Coast.

My record as a councillor and a former mayoral candidate on the Gold Coast is undisputed, and I was one of the first councillors to disclose all of the details of election contributions prior to an election. When I ran for mayor in 2008 we would declare all donations as they came in, online, prior to the election and long before the former government introduced any reforms or suggested that there needed to be any tightening up of the way that councils declared their donations. At the time I worked hard to raise a lot of support from the community. It does not matter whether it is \$40 or \$1,000; what is really at stake is the heartbeat behind the person supporting you. I encouraged many people to get behind me, as many did; hundreds of people supported my mayoral campaign, just as they subsequently supported my 2012 campaign when I was elected to this House. I think every donation is important and every donor is important. Regardless of whether someone puts in a little or a lot, we should never discount their opinion or their views.

Let's talk about Labor's record on electoral reform and accountability in respect of conflict of interest and personal conflicts. We saw the debacle over Gordon Nuttall and in the past we have also seen former senior ranking Labor ministers ending up in jail for all sorts of things. The reforms relating to the Gold Coast City Council and other councils back in 2006-07 took things to an extreme. Not that long ago one of my former council colleagues on the Gold Coast was sharing a recent incident with me in which council spent 50 minutes debating whether or not someone had a conflict of interest because a planner who was involved in helping prepare an application on behalf of a developer had been best man at his wedding 27 years earlier. The debate went on for about half an hour. Then the mayor had to use his casting vote to decide whether or not the councillor could come back in and vote on the matter. Just as they thought they had resolved the issue and decided they would not let him back in, one of the other councillors suddenly stood up and realised they had a conflict of interest and had to abstain from voting on whether or not there was a conflict of interest. Sometime around midnight that day or later in the evening council finally got around to debating the matter of the day, which was whether or not they should approve the development application and, more importantly, whether they would create the opportunity for jobs.

I note the member for Mackay used his adjournment speech—and I have raised this previously—to have a go at me about an initiative that I and some local business people undertook to get out there and really start promoting my electorate and creating some interest and investment in Southport. What a cheap shot that was from the member for Mackay. That is what Labor does.


Let's talk about the 2012 state election and the last lot of electoral reforms we had. We saw the previous government change the laws to restrict our ability to campaign while at the same time fleecing the union funds and creating a structure in which the unions could pretty much contribute whatever they wanted so they could manipulate the rules and maximise their own exposure. What we saw was absolutely hypocritical and completely undemocratic. I ask the House: how much say does a young tradesman who pays union dues have as to where the union donations are spent and how they are used? I am sure there are many young tradesmen out there who perhaps would not even consider the investment in a Labor election fund as being a necessary, fair or reasonable way to spend their money.

These reforms that are before the House today basically bring Queensland into line with broadly accepted practices embraced by both sides of federal politics. These are essentially the same rules adopted by the Rudd government or the Gillard government. They are the same rules and principles that the current federal Leader of the Opposition has supported. So I fail to see what is the problem. I am all in favour of seeing a system put in place that standardises the approach to electoral funding and that standardises the disclosure requirements. It is not like we are saying that large donors should not be declared. We are saying that there are some limits. Then if there are significant contributors who do have a clear interest, those interests will be declared and they will be made public, as they should be.

I work hard for my community and I have sacrificed a great deal to represent my community. I am very honoured and blessed to have family and friends, constituents and local businesses who all want to pitch in and help me. I fail to see why any one of them should be considered any less or more appropriate to be a supporter. What we are fundamentally talking about here is the concept of freedom of speech or freedom of choice. I think it is a fundamental tenet of this great, free democratic nation of ours. I believe that if businesses want to get behind one side of politics then they should be allowed to do that. Around 2004 and 2008 I certainly saw plenty of businesses getting behind the previous Labor government with their chequebooks and I did not hear Labor squealing too much about whether they should be accepting that money back in the day. They were all too happy to take those donations, but there was no disclosure around any of those donations, and that really is the fundamental issue that we are debating here today. Our government is more accountable than the Labor government of the past has ever been. Our ministers make their diaries publicly available. We have gone all out as a government to make sure that we are the most accountable and transparent government that this state has ever seen. So these electoral reforms are further evidence of our commitment to having a fair system, a balanced system, but also retaining reasonable levels of accountability that I think are absolutely appropriate.

The objectives of this bill are to create a fairer and more level playing field. I believe it is absolutely appropriate that each and every Queenslanders has the right to express their support for us, Labor, PUP, Katter or an Independent as that is a fundamental pillar—principle—of the democratic process. Some demonstrate their support in dollars; some demonstrate their support in service and volunteering. One person in my last campaign took six months off university to work full time on my campaign. What a great support that is. How do you put a monetary value on that level of support? Why would you even want to diminish the value of that level of support by defining it as some sort of monetary transaction? People contribute as they can and as they will. I think it is absolutely appropriate that we allow people from all walks of life to support not just us but all sides of politics.

We have touched on the fact that the Premier and our ministers have raised the bar in terms of openness and accountability. Our government has initiated the Open Data website where we are making important government information publicly available so that it can be commercialised. I do not believe that Queenslanders have anything to fear in respect of this legislation and in respect of our heartbeat and our passion to see real electoral reform and create a much more level playing field here in Queensland.

 **Ms D'ATH** (Redcliffe—ALP) (4.40 pm): I rise to contribute to the debate on the Electoral Reform Amendment Bill. Any reforms to electoral laws should not be about benefiting any particular political party and wielding the power of the government of the day; it should be about holding all candidates and all parties to account. Electoral laws should ensure that the people of Queensland can have faith in the electoral process and ensure transparency and accountability around political donations and gifts.

The general public are cynical about politicians at the best of times and in the current environment, when we have the revelations from ICAC in NSW—and more locally the people of Redcliffe have had a former elected member mislead this parliament and their community—in this

light it is more important than ever to have laws that not only ensure transparency, but also are seen to provide transparency. You only need to read some of the submissions from individuals to the parliamentary committee to gauge what at least those on this side of the House hear regularly in our communities: the Newman government is out of control. This bill takes the electoral reforms in Queensland backwards and they should be opposed.

I now wish to speak to some of the key changes in the bill. On the proposal to remove donation and expenditure caps and increase the donation and gift disclosure thresholds, the public would be right to be cynical about these amendments. The removal of caps on spending is all about the LNP getting ready to spend up big. We have heard many reports on the large war chest that the LNP is filling, ready for the next election. It will be interesting to see if all of that money goes into Ashgrove, or if the Premier shares it around to help save some of his colleagues. The move of the Newman government in proposing the removal of caps creates the legitimate public anxiety that elections are there to be bought. When you combine these changes with the increasing of donation disclosure thresholds, it can mean nothing less than a watering down of our electoral laws in Queensland for political benefit.

Let's be clear on the proposed changes: the Newman government wants to shift the disclosure threshold for political donations from \$1,000 to \$12,400 and shift the disclosure threshold for gifts from \$200 to \$12,400. The figure of \$12,400 will of course increase with indexation, unlike many of the welfare benefits and family support payments that the Abbott government just froze.

Going to the comments noted in the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee's report into the Electoral Reform Amendment Bill, Professor Graeme Orr of the University of Queensland described the removal of the limits as 'retrograde' and '... a backward step for the key goals of political integrity and equality'. He identified Queensland as one of the three pioneering Australian states and territories which implemented limitations in 2011. Ben Marshall's submission opposed the proposed removal of both donation and expenditure limits, stating—

Removing the cap on donations and expenditure will tend to ratchet up an already expensive electoral exercise, and benefit whichever party has greatest entree with wealthy donors. This would traditionally see the parties to the Right of the political spectrum advantaged, and it is disingenuous to claim the current cap would "restrict participation in the political process". I see no evidence to support this statement, and suggest that the amendment would make the playing field less level than more.

The Bar Association of Queensland strongly recommended the retention of upper limits on political donations and expenditure, identifying the important criterion to be applied. They said—

... that such limits be effective in preventing individuals and entities from obtaining or exerting undue influence on political decision making through the exercise of financial influence.

Of course this is just a small sample of the comments from submitters to the parliamentary committee, but what is clear is that there is a consistent theme across the submissions, and that is that disclosure thresholds should remain. It is not enough for the committee to simply dismiss these submissions on the basis that these thresholds have only been in for a short period of time, and as such there is no harm in going backwards. The opposition strongly disagrees with this view, and the decision of the government to dismiss the views placed before the committee should be condemned.

There is no more recent and obvious example of why the political donations threshold should remain at \$1,000 than the issue currently being dodged by the Attorney-General and the Premier; that is, the granting of a tender for a boot camp of \$2.2 million and then receiving, within a matter of days, a donation of \$5,500. Although the Premier and the Attorney-General claim to have known nothing about this donation and state that it went to the federal LNP, the fact is that the donation appears on the LNP Electoral Commission Queensland returns. It is reasonable to ask about a donation that has been made to the LNP immediately after a tender has been granted. However, under this bill, if passed, any actions of a minister approving tenders and taking donations would be kept secret. I am sure that the LNP will be instructing their donors to keep their donations just below the new threshold, which of course increases each year through indexation, so that their donations will be kept out of the public eye.

Similarly, many views were expressed about maintaining the existing donation disclosure threshold. Despite the Attorney-General stating in his introductory speech for this bill that '... the act will again rely on disclosure and reporting to promote transparency and accountability', the views expressed to the Committee disagree. In his submission Ben Marshall stated—

Increasing the disclosure threshold ... will produce greater secrecy concerning political donations at a time when many are calling for greater transparency in the political process.

Similarly the QCU opposed the increase in the threshold, referring to the sizeable donation made by the former member for Redcliffe to the LNP prior to the 2012 state election. Dr Paul Williams notes that it is a myth that increasing disclosure thresholds and removing donation caps would increase public transparency. Dr Williams states—

... a higher threshold will only make it harder to detect who's donating what to whom.

The argument that disclosing donations of \$1,000 or more and gifts of \$200 or more are an administrative burden is baseless. With technology and the ability to scan and email information at our fingertips, these disclosures can occur with minimal to no cost. Even if some administrative cost occurs, the importance of a political donation system that has transparency and accountability far outweighs any minor costs to time and resources to maintain the disclosure requirements.

On the issue of public funding, the opposition welcomes the amendment to be moved by the Attorney-General to change the eligibility threshold for public funding from 10 per cent down to six per cent; however, the Attorney-General has not justified the change from four per cent being the current threshold. On this issue Professor Orr stated—

If a cut-off is needed, there is a well-established 4% threshold across Australia. That threshold is conventional, but it is rational: 4% is the long-standing figure at which candidates forfeit their deposit.

The onus is on the Attorney-General to make his case and to put forward the evidence to support these amendments. The fact is that the Attorney-General has been found wanting. No case has been made out, and this bill is nothing more than a con on the people of Queensland in a desperate attempt to assist the LNP to hold on to power.

On the issue of imposing voter ID, the opposition has indicated our opposition to this amendment as it will disenfranchise many in our communities. However, the parliament should not simply take the opposition's views on this matter. The committee's report states that over 160 submissions opposed the proof of identity provisions in the bill. The Attorney-General's own department, the Department of Justice and Attorney-General, in its Electoral Reform Discussion Paper of January 2013, on the issue of requiring proof of identity to vote, stated—

Given that Queensland would be the only jurisdiction to require proof of identity on polling day, there is a risk that the requirement would lead to voter confusion. Also, as there is no specific evidence of electoral fraud in this area, introduction of proof of identity requirements could be considered a disproportionate response to the risk.


The committee's report notes that in its briefing to the committee, the department was again unable to provide evidence of voter fraud in Queensland. The Acting Electoral Commissioner for the ECQ, in evidence to the committee, stated—

I am on record as stating at the estimates that at the last state election I referred one person to the Queensland Police Service for multi-voting.

It was confirmed federally that in the 2007 election there were 10 cases. If I refer specifically to Queensland, there was one case in 2012. That is one out of 2,499,763 votes. What does that equate to in real terms? It means that the 'serious problem' that needs addressing in this bill equates to a 0.000004 per cent problem. There is absolutely no evidence to support this claim by the government. If we look at the federal example, out of the 12,930,814 people that voted, they had a problem of 0.000008 per cent—and I was generous because I rounded that one up.

The reality is that there is no problem, either at a state or federal level, in relation to voter ID. It is unfortunate that this government has chosen to ignore the concerns of the Anti-Discrimination Commission of Queensland on that point where they highlight potential discrimination.

The fact is the opposition's concerns and those of many individuals and organisations who provided submissions and evidence to the parliamentary committee are legitimate concerns raised in the context of what the Newman government has been doing over the past two years. This government has stripped away working conditions, overridden and removed many oversight mechanisms and independent bodies, imposed laws and targeted innocent individuals through the VLAD laws, attacked doctors, removed the independence of the CMC and now seeks to give itself the ability to raise thousands of dollars through political donations and spend its considerable war chest at the next election without ever having any transparency and accountability at the same time as disenfranchising people. This bill should be voted down.

 **Mrs CUNNINGHAM** (Gladstone—Ind) (4.49 pm): I rise to speak to the Electoral Reform Amendment Bill 2013. At the outset I want to table the explanatory notes for the amendments that I propose to move in the consideration in detail stage.

*Tabled paper:* Electoral Reform Amendment Bill 2013, explanatory notes to Mrs Liz Cunningham's amendments [\[5191\]](#).

There are a number of matters in this bill that I want to address. Initially I am going to deal with one matter that has been the basis for many contributions, and that is the requirement for proof of identity. I support that. I have listened to the debate in relation to the concerns about the difficulties some people will face in getting appropriate identification. Previous speakers in this debate have listed the types of identification papers that will be required and generally most people will have something that they can use—whether it is an electricity bill or a driver's licence—and I have listened to those who have expressed concern about marginalised individuals who may find it difficult to have some of those mainstream documents. I would certainly hope that, once this legislation is passed—as indeed it will because of the makeup of the parliament—there would be some information made available through the media to advise people of the sort of identification they will need in order to give them some time to work towards getting that if they do not have common identification papers. Whilst there may be statistical information in relation to Queensland being the only state, for a long time I have found it incredible that we do not need to have proof of identity to vote but do if you want to open an account at a video store or if you want to open an account at many other places that have a lesser influence, if you like, on the future of our nation. I really do not have a problem with that requirement provided that the list of appropriate identification is generous and that people will have available to them an opportunity to reasonably be able to identify themselves.


The next issue that I want to raise is the change in the threshold for declaration of gifts. It is increasing markedly. I do not have a view about what is an appropriate level, but \$12,400 is an odd number to pick. I have to acknowledge it is a huge step from \$1,000 to \$12,400. However, I also have to acknowledge though that I believe the introduction by the Labor Party of those thresholds previously was done for political reasons. It was done to make mischief for other candidates. The figure of \$12,400 does sound high but I certainly believe that \$1,000 was too low, and again I know what the background to that threshold was. Whatever the threshold, I believe it should be the same across-the-board for every member—whether a member is a person in a political party or whether they are running as an Independent—because I firmly believe in the importance of all candidates, both as individuals and as members of parties, being treated the same.

Therefore, on that basis I turn to the issue of election funding. I find it offensive in the extreme that the electoral funding in this bill is proposing to treat members of registered parties differently to Independents. It is offensive in the extreme that the vote of an individual who is a member of a party will be worth \$2.90 but if they are an Independent it is worth \$1.45. I do not understand how that could be acceptable to the minister and one of the amendments that I will be moving is to ensure that the payments, irrespective of what the payment is for, are equitable across-the-board. Indeed, when I was speaking with the Office of Parliamentary Counsel I suggested that the amount should be \$1.45 for everybody but realised that that was not going to get legs, so my suggestion is that all candidates who meet the threshold to receive funding receive the same amount—\$2.90 per vote. Indeed, I have said the same about the funding that this government is proposing in terms of policy development—that is, anybody who is a member of parliament who wants to develop policy should be able to access that funding. I certainly hope that there is going to be some structure around eligibility—that it is not just a slush fund for the major parties but that there will be requirements to justify those payments. The people of Queensland will expect that but, irrespective, anybody who can meet those reasonable requirements—not slanted requirements that can only be met by a member of a party but anybody who can prove that they are doing what this payment is supposed to be for—should be able to access that money. That issue is of less importance to me than the election funding amount. I think that there is a view in the community that they should not pay anything, and that is a view that is quite free to be held. There has been a payment for votes to members of parliament for quite some time. There had previously been differences in the amounts, but certainly the amount that is paid per vote, irrespective of where that candidate stands in terms of party membership—major party, minor party, Independent—should be the same, and that is what my amendments intend to provide. I will be interested to hear what the minister says in response and I certainly believe that there is little defence for the bill as it stands in terms of its partiality and bias. Elections are very important occasions and should be treated with respect.

The final amendment that I will be moving is one that is controversial, but I have included it because I believe it is important—that is, the reintroduction of compulsory preferential voting. One member from the LNP who spoke yesterday said that that matter had been canvassed in the inquiry that had been held by the committee, but I do believe that compulsory preferential voting has advantages for a number of reasons. Firstly, it is consistent across state and federal elections, and that has been confusing for people. It gives the greatest value to a voter's vote in the preferential system. It was stopped by Peter Beattie when he was Premier because at the time he could see huge

electoral value in the 'just vote 1' campaign, which is what people did quite vehemently, particularly in my electorate and right across the state. The 'just vote 1' campaign was, again, a political move. It was not determined on the basis of information available to the government at the time; it was information that was garnered by a poll around the state that 'just vote 1' would increase the Labor Party's vote at that forthcoming election and that is how that was created. I do believe in the value of compulsory preferential voting. It gives all voters the opportunity to have their vote count in the best possible way.

I commend my amendments to the House. I look forward to the Attorney-General's response to those amendments and also to the issue of equity in relation to allocation of funding to all members, whether they are in a party or whether they stand as Independents.

 **Miss BARTON** (Broadwater—LNP) (4.59 pm): I rise to contribute to the debate on the Electoral Reform Amendment Bill. At the outset, I acknowledge the great work that the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee did on this particular inquiry. I would also at this time like to thank the secretariat for the work that they do. As I am sure all members of this House are aware, committees would not be able to do the work that they do and conduct the inquiries that they do if it were not for the secretariats. I would also like to acknowledge the support that was provided by the Department of Justice and Attorney-General as well as the Electoral Commission of Queensland. Of course, I also thank those who took the time to make written submissions to the bill and those who took time out of their schedules to appear at the committee's public inquiry.

As has been said by many members of the government, this amendment bill comes out of the government's electoral reform discussion paper, which canvassed the ideas and thoughts of all Queenslanders. Of course, as I am sure members would agree, this process continues the government's trend of wanting to listen to Queenslanders and wanting to hear from them about what they think we should do. I am sure that there are members of this House who took the opportunity to participate in that process and who took the opportunity to make submissions as well as many Queenslanders across the length and breadth of this great state who took the opportunity to have their say and express their points of view.

I want to touch on a couple of things in my contribution. There is the change to the donation caps and the spending caps. There is the simplification of the public funding method and also the provision for policy development funding. There are changes with regard to electronic voting as well as voter ID laws. Then, of course, there are the changes with regard to postal votes. I thought that I would touch firstly on the changes to the donation limits and the spending caps. I am sure that all members who contested the 2012 election would agree that the regulatory burden that was placed on all candidates and all political parties for the 2012 election were particularly burdensome and onerous. I think that we should be making declarations about donations that are received. That is why we have set a declaration limit that is in line with that of the Commonwealth. I think that it would be wrong of any government to say to a particular person that they are not able to freely participate in our democracy in the way that they see fit. The member for Southport touched on the issue of people who choose to make contributions. Some people can make only a small contribution. Some people can make only a donation in kind with their time. But there are some people who have the capacity to make donations of \$10,000 or \$15,000 who are particularly passionate about politics and who are particularly passionate about making sure that our democracy is effective. I do not think that it is appropriate for any government to say that those people are unable to participate in our system of democracy.

The Leader of the Opposition said that members of the government would talk about freedom. It is about freedom. It is about the right of someone to make their own decisions and freely participate as they see fit. I appreciate that some members of the opposition and the crossbenches are not supportive of the lifting of the donation caps and are not supportive of the lifting of spending caps. Perhaps it is not reflective of philosophy but is reflective of their uncertainty as to whether someone might actually wish to donate to the Labor Party campaign for the election.

The other matter that I wanted to touch on was the simplification of public funding. I think it was clear to see that the changes that were made by the previous Labor government were not in keeping with the true intention of public funding of elections. I think it is incredibly important that we ensure that those who spend money to participate in elections are able to recoup some of that money. As I am sure members are very well aware, elections are indeed very expensive things. Ultimately, I think we need to achieve a simplified system that clearly has a dollar amount per vote that kicks in once you reach a certain percentage of the primary vote. I think that is the best way forward. It provides clear guidance for political parties in terms of how much they want to spend and how much they think

they might be able to get back. But I also think that it provides some clear directions to the Electoral Commission and makes sure that there is no confusion whatsoever. As I am sure we are all aware, the Electoral Commission has a lot more to be concerned about than the distribution of public funding.

I welcome the introduction of public funding for the development of policy. In particular, I think out of that we will see not only from the government but also from the opposition and other political parties the development of strong detailed policy that people can take to the next election. Perhaps at that point in time we might have an opposition that has more policies than it has members of parliament. It means that we will have the opportunity to take to the people of Queensland detail about any plan that we have for the people of Queensland and their future. In that regard, I welcome the changes that have been made.

I am also particularly pleased to see the changes that have been made with regard to electronic voting. As members would be aware, during the public hearing we had the opportunity to hear from a blind person who expressed frustration that she had to be assisted to vote. I said to her that I could not imagine what it would be like to have someone know how you are voting. I am sure that all members could probably work out who I voted for at the last election. But that is not the point. The point is that integral to our system of democracy is the notion of a confidential and secret ballot. Anything that we can do to assist people who want to participate freely and wholly in our democracy, anything that we can do to make it easier for them, be they quadriplegic, be they blind, I think is a very good thing. I was particularly pleased that we were able to hear just how positively this change will affect people's lives.

There are, of course, changes in this bill with regard to voter identification laws. The Electoral Commission has said that there was only one recommendation—and I am happy to stand corrected if am not recollecting correctly—but my understanding or recollection of the public hearing was that he said that there was only one case of potential voter fraud that he recommended be prosecuted. The opposition leader scoffed at this—'It was only one of thousands and thousands and thousands of Queenslanders who participated in 2012 election.' I would say that one case of voter fraud is one too many. Surely, we want a system that seeks to protect the integrity of our system of democracy and seeks to protect the integrity of our elections.

I appreciate that not everyone has access to a driver's licence, but, as the Leader of the Opposition pointed out, there are many possible forms of identification that people could use. She even highlighted the possible use of a utilities bill or even the letter that the Electoral Commission sends out to people ahead of an election or when they enrol to tell them which federal, state and council division they are in. I also appreciate that in some cases not everyone has ID on them at the time. There are people who are driving past a polling booth and they think, 'I'll go and vote now,' and then they get there and they think, 'Dammit, I haven't got my ID.' For those voters, there is still available the option of a declaration vote. Someone had suggested—and I think it was the Indigenous legal representatives, ATSILS—that that might be particularly demeaning to some people who need to have a declaration vote because they have no ID on them. Time and time again, particularly at state elections where there are many smaller divisions, across the course of a day at any polling booth hundreds of people will need to fill out a declaration ballot because, for whatever reason, they are not in a position to vote in their home electorate or, because of the quirks of the boundaries of the electorate, the closest polling booth to them is outside of their electorate. I appreciate that some people might be concerned, but I would say to them that they need to appreciate that this provision is not meant in any way, shape or form to demean someone. It is not meant in any way, shape or form to disenfranchise someone. Rather, it is about ensuring and strengthening the democracy that we hold so sacrosanct in this country and of which we should be incredibly proud.

In relation to the changes to postal votes, there are a number of people in my electorate who, for whatever reason, choose to access their right to a postal vote. A significantly large proportion of my electorate are over the age of 65. They are not always in a position to take advantage of the Electoral Commission visits at nursing homes or take advantage of access to a prepoll station. There are people who are going to be working on the day and simply do not, for whatever reason, have access to a prepoll booth.

Mr Deputy Speaker, I am sure that all members of this House would appreciate, particularly those who represent rural and regional Queensland as you yourself do, that anything that we can do to increase access to people in their right to vote is a good thing. More and more Queenslanders are taking advantage of the right to prepoll. More and more Queenslanders are taking advantage of the right to use a postal vote. Anything that we can do to make it easier for people, particularly in rural and regional Queensland, to access their postal votes is, indeed, a good thing.

Ultimately this is about making sure that our system of democracy—one that we hold sacrosanct—is transparent so that people can see what it is that is happening in the electoral system, so that people can see what is happening with public funding for political parties, so that people can be assured that there is no chance of voter fraud, so that the joking messages from the socialists to ‘vote early, vote often’ are not realised because ultimately we want to make sure that the integrity of the system that we hold sacrosanct is upheld. I look forward to supporting the passage of this bill through the House.



**Ms TRAD** (South Brisbane—ALP) (5.11 pm): I rise to make a contribution in opposition to the Electoral Reform Amendment Bill 2013. In truth, this bill would more appropriately be titled the ‘Electoral Integrity and Franchise Regression Bill’ because that is exactly what this bill seeks to do.

It was John Emerich Edward Dalberg Acton, first Baron Acton, Lord Acton, who first wrote in 1887—

Power tends to corrupt, and absolute power corrupts absolutely. Great men are almost always bad men.

I know that we have in the Queensland parliament an LNP government with a massive majority. I know that we have in the Queensland parliament no Legislative Council which can mitigate or reduce the powers of the Legislative Assembly. We have in the Queensland parliament a government that has absolute power and today with this bill we see that they are using that absolute power to corrupt our electoral processes completely. I know that there are good people in the LNP party room—I do know that—but in this bill they are doing a very, very bad thing.

As the member for South Brisbane I have been in receipt of more than 50 submissions—mostly written, some oral submissions—in relation to this bill. There are two key concerns that have been raised through those submissions and they are, firstly, the imposition of voter identification requirements for enrolled Queenslanders trying to exercise their right to vote and, secondly, changes to donation laws which will see the level at which a donation is to be declared drastically increased from \$1,000 to \$12,400—that is, lifting the threshold at which donations should be disclosed to the public from \$1,000 to \$12,400. I will now go into these two points in a bit of detail.

Firstly, in terms of voter identification, the Queensland Council for Civil Liberties stated in its submission to the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee during the consultation period on this bill that—

Voter identification requirements are a solution in search of a problem.

What we have is a solution to a non-existent problem. It is a solution that is not a solution at all. It is a punitive measure that will punish people who are the most marginalised and vulnerable in our community, people like those with a disability, people from non-English speaking backgrounds, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples, young people and the list goes on. I do want at this point to take note and respond to statements made in this House last night by the member for Lytton when he, in making his contribution on this bill, said—

Another way in which the Newman government is helping Queenslanders with a disability be able to have their say and feel more included in the public debate is through a trial of online voting. This is another way of empowering people with a disability to have their say. They are the most marginalised people in our communities. This trial of online voting empowers them to have their say in elections as to who they want to represent their views in this great House. So I commend the Attorney-General for that initiative.

Let me say to the member for Lytton, through you, Mr Deputy Speaker, that there are quite a number of submissions from organisations that represent people with a disability that have raised significant concerns in relation to the voter identification requirements, including Queensland Advocacy Inc., which states—

The right to vote is something that people with disability claim as their greatest opportunity to have some measure of control over their lives. Any impediment to this will add further burden and distress to people who have endured more than most would tolerate.

That was the argument that they put forward in opposition to voter identification requirements contained in this bill. The Queensland Association of Independent Legal Services argued against voter identification requirements. The Anti Discrimination Commission of Queensland argued against voter identification requirements, as did the Australian Human Rights Commission, the Queensland Law Society, the Bar Association of Queensland, and the list goes on. If the member for Lytton would like to come into this place and put a position on behalf of people with a disability perhaps he should show a bit more integrity in that process.

Let me say through you, Mr Deputy Speaker, that this government has put forward the proposition that the increase in the threshold at which donations should be disclosed from \$1,000 to \$12,400 is all about consistency with the Commonwealth Electoral Act. There we have the 'what' but we do not have the 'why'. Why is this necessary? Why is consistency at this level necessary when this government is legislating to not be consistent with the Commonwealth Electoral Act over voter identification requirements? Why is this necessary when this government is suggesting that there should not be any requirements or any uniformity or harmonisation in terms of compulsory preferential voting or optional preferential voting? This is a fig-leaf excuse, it is not a real excuse. What this rationale says is that the Newman LNP government is again treating Queenslanders like mugs—like idiots. If you said to any Queenslander that the Newman LNP government is increasing the level at which donations are to be made public from \$1,000 to \$12,400, do you think that anyone would say, 'Oh, well, that's because of uniformity with the Commonwealth Electoral Act'? It is not about that. They know that the LNP want to keep it secret. They know they want to keep 95 per cent of donations hidden from Queenslanders.

**Government members** interjected.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Watts): Order! Pause the clock. I have called for order. I will have order. Member for South Brisbane, you have the call.

**Ms TRAD:** Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. Let me say to members this: the introduction of these laws here today will enable any person to walk into the electorate office of the member for Ashgrove and hand over \$10,000 with no-one being any the wiser. That is what these laws do. These laws will enable anyone to walk into the Deputy Premier's office and hand over \$10,000 without disclosing it to anyone.

How is democracy served in this context? These laws will allow 10 people to walk into the electorate office of Ashgrove and hand over \$10,000 a pop, and no-one would be any the wiser. I put it to the House that we will be a poorer democracy for it. Earlier today the Attorney-General was quick to want to join the dots for people in relation to the Labor Party. I want to join some dots for the Attorney-General. Yesterday, in relation to the CMC changes Doug Drummond said—

It's quite obviously not intended to encourage corruption, but it's equally clearly intended not to impede the Government in its many activities, including its fund-raising activities.

All of the kerfuffle around the CMC—the CMC changes, the undermining of Ross Martin, the sacking of the PCMC—it has all been about this.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I rise to a point of order.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Watts): What is your point of order, please, Attorney-General?

**Mr BLEIJIE:** The Crime and Misconduct Commission amendment bill was debated two to three weeks ago in this House. It has been debated. The member should move on and debate this bill.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! Thank you, Attorney-General. I will take you back to the bill, thank you.

**Ms TRAD:** I am talking about fundraising, political donations and the comments made yesterday by Doug Drummond in relation to the CMC changes. They are intricately connected, because if there is corruption in this state, if there are corrupt donations being made, it is the CMC or the CCC that will be investigating them, but now it has become a mere extension of the LNP government. Today what this government is doing by changing these laws is making sure that people can make secret donations and Queenslanders will be none the wiser.



**Mr HOPPER** (Condamine—KAP) (5.21 pm): Mr Speaker—

**Mr Rickuss:** It will be good to hear some common sense coming from the member for Condamine.

**Mr HOPPER:** The member for Lockyer will have to bring two bags to parliament from now on. One will be full of brown paper bags when this legislation goes through. The government was going to lift the threshold to 10 per cent. Because of the bullying and thuggery that has gone on in the past few months and the label that the government now has stuck to its name, it has had to reduce it to six per cent. Good on the people of Queensland for standing up to this totalitarian government.

This is an absolute insult to anyone trying to start a political party, which is a democratic process that the nation has always enjoyed. It is a very sad day for the state of Queensland if we see this legislation pass through the House. As we heard from the member for South Brisbane, political donations will now be capped at \$12,400. They were capped at \$1,000. We all went through the last

election and we all had people wanting to donate. That \$1,000 cap put absolute control and transparency on political donations. That transparency is being removed through this legislation. As the member for South Brisbane said, 10 people can walk into an electorate office with \$10,000 each and there is a \$100,000 donation, and those people might all be from the same company. No doubt the government would then award the project that the company wants. That is why I talk about the brown paper bag days. We will see that happen in Queensland under this government. I hang my head in shame when I look at this bill.

The biannual policy development fund can give the LNP up to \$33.5 million of taxpayer funded money that it does not deserve. Why should a political party get a gift like that from the taxpayers of Queensland for policy development? What a joke! This legislation is a rip-off for the people of Queensland. I am ashamed. I will totally oppose the bill in every way. We need an upper house brought back into the state, which is falling into disrepair under this government. We need someone to scrutinise the stupid legislation that keeps coming before this House. We get accused of voting with the Labor Party. We do not vote with the Labor party; we vote against the stupid legislation that this stupid government brings to the House. It is the same with the legislation that is before the House right now.

The bill talks about electronic voting, which is probably the only good thing I can see in the legislation. I agree with electronic voting. I think the whole of Queensland eventually should have electronic voting. At 6.05 on election night, we would know what seat was what. Why do the major parties get \$2.90 per vote and the independents get \$1.45? We are all elected on the same platform. Why is there a difference?

**Mr Bleijie:** There is a difference between us and you, Ray.

**Mr HOPPER:** The Attorney-General has a bit to say, but tonight the weight of this legislation hangs on your head. You should hang your head in shame. No doubt, you will be kicked out at the next election.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! Member for Condamine, direct your comments through the chair.

**Mr HOPPER:** I will summarise how the president of our party sees this legislation. A KAP media release states—

Moves this week by the LNP State Government to introduce the **Electoral Reform Bill** which will remove caps on donations to political parties and increase the candidate deposit retention threshold from 4 to 6 per cent of the primary vote would strangle independents and smaller parties.

Warning Queenslanders about the 'dangerous' amendments, Katters Australia Party Chairman, Shane Paulger, said the LNP is out of control now and without an Upper House to control its megalomania, the state will further suffer.

I believe that is a good statement.

'By its undemocratic actions the Newman government can be accused of actually being worse than the Beattie/Bligh Labor governments, and look where they took us,' Mr Paulger said.

'Big oil and gas companies and the top end of town—

That is what this is about; this is about the Liberal Party government looking after the top end of town—

runs the government now and I fear removing the cap on donations could allow a multinational oil or gas company to buy a political party then prosper even more from the state's gas, oil and coal reserves.'

'The LNP is legislating amendments to increase the donation disclosure threshold from \$1,000 to \$12,400 and introducing bi-annual policy development funding for registered political parties based on relative electoral strength.

The Government of the day is will open to the highest bidder.

This is a sad day for democracy,' Mr Paulger said.

Those are the words of Shane Paulger, our president and, no doubt, the next member for Gympie.



**Dr DOUGLAS** (Gaven—PUP) (5.27 pm): If any proof was required by the public as to whether or not this Campbell Newman government has utterly failed, then the remaining evidence to complete the missing link is contained within this legislation. If the member for Stafford and now sacked assistant minister for health is to be believed, the fundamental basis of the validity of the government is now in question because of what this LNP government intends to implement in this legislation. The member for Stafford, whom the Premier apparently respects, detailed that 'he has trod on some very powerful toes' in his pursuit of greater changes to those new legislative changes being implemented

here today. He further stated 'the broad LNP church' stated by the Treasurer had gone overnight from broad to narrow over the member for Stafford's criticism of laws applying to donations from those seeking a direct commercial advantage.

Today, as stated by the member for South Brisbane, Doug Drummond has raised the links with the CMC, derided by the Attorney-General, who is in the chamber at the moment, and said that by dismantling the CMC's corruption capacity we have seen the government take these further steps: we have seen the PCMC sacked by the government, we have seen people come and go—and there have been others on ethics committees, et cetera—and moneys flowing. Government members cannot hide from it.

It is no secret that the LNP government has degenerated into a pay-per-view government. The Premier has form in this regard by virtue of what ICAC stated when the current Premier was Lord Mayor of Brisbane. For those who just do not get it, the scene goes like this. When a member of the public needs to talk directly to a minister or any member of the executive, they make a booking. In the days before their appointment, they are phoned by an LNP member who asks them for a consultation fee or to buy a block of tickets for a fundraising function or even tickets in a car raffle. What do members honestly think occurs if this person does not buy—read contribute? Silence is guaranteed. Of course people are expecting something in return. Therefore, the member for Stafford reasonably claimed, 'You don't make an investment in business unless you get a return on it.' This is from one the government's own members.

As a former longstanding National Party member, this is the second of the key steps that Tony Fitzgerald stated led to the catastrophic decline in the institutionalised corruption with ministers rotating through meetings after funds had changed hands in advance to guarantee or secure critical, often non-competitive, outcomes to the state and by default the public, and we failed because of it. Where do members honesty think this is all going? I do not just mean the gutter. Honourable members, when the inquiry into these matters comes every word that members utter in *Hansard*—

**Mr Rickuss** interjected.

**Dr DOUGLAS:** Including you, member of Lockyer. Every word will be trawled over for clues, just as is occurring in New South Wales under ICAC. The major change to electoral laws being proposed here are the laws needed to further open the gaps that already exist under ever current legislation. Forget the rubbish being peddled about mirroring federal legislation. That is to shut unthinking members up. That is all the backbench, largely, and some of the executive. The member for Stafford has correctly quoted the New South Wales Premier's response. It was—

The relaxation of caps and donations is occurring just at the same time the New South Wales Premier Mike Baird is saying that he needs to nail the back door shut.

Baird was talking specifically about what is being proposed here today.

The federal government has itself found its own funding and electoral donation mechanisms to be hopelessly deficient and allow far too much flexibility and far too little transparency. Are any members here reading what their own leaders at the federal level are currently saying? If they will not accept what I say, then listen to the words quoted by Christopher Pyne, the Leader of the House in the federal parliament, who said—

I call for the cessation of donations from big business and developers.

Take the blinkers off. There is smoke here. Smoke is billowing out of the parliament. Where there is smoke there is fire. This is a problem.

**Mr Bleijie:** We're not electing a new Pope.

**Dr DOUGLAS:** You will be gone.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Watts): Order! I remind the member for Gaven to direct his comments through the chair.

**Dr DOUGLAS:** Yet here in this legislation this Campbell Newman government is lifting caps and donations and expenditure to a \$12,400 disclosure level. It is simultaneously proposing to impose restrictions by insisting that a party get a six per cent vote in return. That is down from the 10 per cent originally proposed. They are doing a variety of other things to try to prevent what they believe is electoral voting manipulation.

This has happened before, but it occurred after the votes were counted at booths. I heard people talking about this. It actually occurred in 1993. Others might remember the history of Chads in the US. In fact, it was a block of Chads in Florida that elected George Bush Jr over Al Gore. These

orting systems do occur. Those who have done any research on this matter would know that the minimal requirement is bar codes. What came out of the committee report—and I know that there are members from that committee in the chamber now—is that IDs did not come up as being very important at all.

I have listened to the majority of speeches proffered here by some who would know and some who obviously would not know. It is money that is at the heart of driving political machines. As a person who has been involved in this all my life, if there is no money, there is no political machine driving and you do not get people elected. It occurs to me that in their speeches some members are refusing to acknowledge what they know is wrong, some are deliberately vague and just participants who seem to not really want to know and if they know something they are going to put it to one side and some genuinely just do not know. Not knowing is not a defence. Members need to look at what happened with the Fitzgerald inquiry. Those who did not know were the ones most severely affected. That is what happened. The ones who did not know really got done over. So not knowing is not a good place to be. I urge members to go and find out what is going on.

I have raised money for campaigns for a long time. Some know that and some do not know that. I have done it virtually all my adult life, with a variety of people. It is never easy. The rules are always changing. I can tell members that the Labor Party do it, too, and they are an enormous challenge. They have their own system.

**Mr Rickuss** interjected.

**Dr DOUGLAS:** You need to listen to this, member for Lockyer, because we have got you over the line at times. This is always a challenge. We always work within the rules. But these rules are going the wrong way at the wrong time for the wrong reasons. They will not achieve what those opposite believe will occur out of them. There are problems with political fundraising in Australia and it is largely due to the misuse of those funds by political parties, and politicians generally.

The legislation is wrong. The most disgusting part of this legislation is the payment of the party development payment—that is, the funds for policy development—only to those parties registered at the last election on the A multiplied by B over C formula. A is the prescribed amount under the regulations. B is the total number of first preference votes by enforced party candidates. C is the relevant candidate who polled at least, in this case, six per cent of the total first preference votes. It was 10 per cent.

The decision is made three weeks after the end of the financial year. That is just under seven weeks from now. The LNP government intends to pay its party this when the federal government has just instituted a pay rise, raised the age of pensions, cut welfare to those under 25 years of age, raised HECS charges, introduced a debt tax and docked the states \$80 billion. What kind of craziness is this when the LNP, at the same time, has just completed a \$6 million Strong Choices campaign about selling assets? This is nuts, as I heard someone say. The public read that.


**A government member:** You're nuts.

**Dr DOUGLAS:** You know nothing about this. You need to listen to this. Honourable members, either we as a state have surplus funds for such extravagances or we do not.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Berry): Order! Member for Gaven, would you please direct your comments through the chair.

**Dr DOUGLAS:** Thank you for your guidance. Currently the Premier and Treasurer say that they do not have surplus funds to support this type of thing. The Premier says the latest health cuts will cost us 1,200 hospital beds. That is as a result of what is proposed under the Hockey pledge. That is as a result of the reduction in funds. That is 1,200 fewer hospital beds. How many hospital beds are we prepared to lose when government members vote even just for this policy directive? I can tell members that it represents 600 people's hips.

*(Time expired)*

 **Mr BENNETT** (Burnett—LNP) (5.37 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Electoral Reform Amendment Bill 2013. Firstly, I commend the Attorney-General on the extraordinarily thorough research and consultation done prior to formulating this bill. Although I was not a member of parliament at the time, it is evident to any observer that such consultation certainly appears to have been lacking prior to the former Labor government rushing in electoral reform legislation before the 2012 election. This bill seeks to ensure that Queensland has an electoral system with high standards of integrity and accountability at the same time as encouraging a higher rate of participation. I will address some of the key changes proposed by this legislation, and it is a pleasure to do so.

Firstly, I support any development that makes the process of reporting and accounting for donations and campaign expenditure less cumbersome, more transparent and easier for more people to participate. I am sure that there are many who would echo those sentiments. By removing the caps on donations we are able to do away with an unnecessary restriction and, by increasing the disclosure threshold to a level in line with that applied federally, we are reducing the administration burden on many donors while still maintaining the threshold at a realistic benchmark level.

I might also note that, as a first-term member of parliament, should I be fortunate enough to be re-elected next time around I welcome the Attorney General's advice that reporting after the election will be much more simplified. I also welcome the return to a stated dollar amount per vote for electoral public funding. I was astounded to learn that the Queensland public were forced to pay out \$24.5 million in public funding to political parties and candidates in 2012 after paying just \$3.5 million in 2009. This was as a direct result of the electoral reforms rushed through by the former Labor government with very little scrutiny.

Another area in which I get a great deal of feedback from constituents around the time of any election—whether it be state, local, or federal—is the degree of credibility of some candidates. My response to that is that we all live in a democratic society and any person who meets the eligibility criteria is entitled to run for office, and I support that notion. However, I also believe that that right also needs to be balanced with a demonstrated commitment by the candidate to serve in his or her community. Voting Queenslanders deserve to have a field of quality candidates to choose from who, by their actions, have gained some credible level of support within the community that they would represent. By increasing the eligibility threshold for public funding from four per cent to six per cent of the primary vote, I believe that we have struck a good balance between the basic right of any eligible person to run for office and encouraging candidates who are actively involved in, and aware of, the issues in their communities.


I turn now to some of the practical measures contained in this bill that will make the electoral process more accessible and fairer for the voters of Queensland—many of whom currently struggle to be involved due to their personal circumstances. Of course, electronic voting is a development with the potential to give those with vision and hearing impairments the ability to vote without assistance and confidentiality like the majority of people are able to do. However, as much as I would like to see such developments in place as soon as possible, I again commend the Attorney-General on his due diligence and research with respect to issues such as security. While it might be tempting to rush such systems into place, we need to make sure that integrity is vital. I hope that we are at least able to achieve the goal of having some trial sites ready for the 2015 election. Gazing into the future when the time comes that all Queenslanders have the option of voting electronically, I might speculate that many will probably shirk technology, particularly those constituents who do not like it, and of course we all like the tradition of turning up at a polling booth not only for the banter but also to enjoy the barbecues.

I also appreciate the provision in the bill for changes to make postal voting easier, particularly for those who are elderly and frail and for those with a disability that prevents them from attending a polling booth. We always need to be respectful of those people in our communities. With regard to those who are able to attend polling booths, the vast majority of people do the right thing, but we all know there are those in the minority who seek to defraud the electoral system by claiming to be someone they are not and voting at multiple booths. Currently the system for detecting these people is laborious and quite often unsuccessful. The proof of identity requirement that will be introduced as a result of this legislation is a long-overdue development that will bolster the integrity of the system.

Finally, I welcome the measures that will be put in place to allow for greater scrutiny of how-to-vote cards before polling day. Overwhelming the feedback to me as the local member for Burnett is that people want to get rid of how-to-vote cards. I can hope one day that we get to a happy place with that legislative framework.

The requirement to publish cards on the Electoral Commission's website not only gives postal voters access to that information but gives all voters a greater opportunity to view the cards beforehand and determine a course of action for themselves. We also welcome the opportunities to have our volunteers on election day or prepolls not being harassed and being kicked around by those overzealous campaigners particularly from other parties. Combined with the Electoral Commission's power to refuse to register a how-to-vote card if it is likely to deceive or mislead, this will greatly increase the usefulness of these cards.

In closing, I once again commend the Attorney-General and his staff for their research and consultation efforts prior to formulating this bill. It represents a fantastic opportunity to bolster the integrity and efficiency of the Queensland electoral system.

 **Mr KNUTH** (Dalrymple—KAP) (5.43 pm): I rise to speak to the Electoral Reform Amendment Bill 2013. I note there are quite a number of changes, one being the change to the threshold for gifts. I have a very big concern here about electoral funding, where \$2.90 goes to a party and \$1.45 goes to the Independents on a per vote basis. I disagree with that so much. I am absolutely disgusted by this. The Independents are a voice. Likewise, they do not have access to the same funds that parties do, with their backing by the big corporates who believe that if they can provide governments money they will be able to buy themselves into development or buy themselves into a mining development operation or be able to swing governments in the direction that they want them to go in. I believe this would be a much better parliament if we had more Independents and more minor parties to shift the direction in which the major political parties are going at the moment.

I also have a big concern about the fact that a party can be given up to \$12,400 before that donation needs to be declared. I believe that can pave the way, and will pave the way, for corruption. There is no doubt about it. Like the member for South Brisbane was saying before, there will be a return to the use of brown paper bags. It is inevitable. It will happen. Remember this day when this bill was brought forward. One of the bill's objectives states—

- returning the basis for electoral public funding to a stated dollar amount per vote and increasing the threshold for entitlement to public funding from 4% to 10% of the primary vote to reduce the cost of funding to the community;

I know that the minister has foreshadowed that he will be moving an amendment to increase the threshold to six per cent rather than 10 per cent. We considered a 10 per cent threshold as very high and basically it should remain at four per cent. Even though the minister has changed that, I do not know where along the line he showed compassion, showed a little bit of sympathy. I do not know where he got this. I do not know the reasons or the motives behind this. It could have been what happened at the Redcliffe by-election that somehow he decided to show a little bit of compassion, even though we feel that we are just kicked in the guts. Or it could have been what happened in South Australia where the Liberals campaigned very aggressively against the two Independents, meanwhile the Labor Party was in power. And what happened? The Independents were elected and they hold the balance of power. Then the Liberal Party was sulking and sooking because they would not side with them. Why on earth would they want to side with them?


**Ms Trad:** They are big sooks.

**Mr KNUTH:** That is right. Now that I see this legislation, the Electoral Reform Amendment Bill, before the House, I know that the government are desperate. They are clutching at straws. They just cannot believe what has happened to them. They believed from the beginning, 'We are the LNP. Do you realise that we have a mandate? We have a mandate to do what we like.' But that arrogance is starting to filter right across Queensland where it is becoming unstoppable. But you do not have to legislate to get rid of opposition. You do not have to legislate to push the funding per vote down for the smaller people, like we have here, to try to prop yourselves up. If you want to capture the audience, capture the voters of Queensland, it is about good governance. It is about accountability, honesty and integrity. That is all you have to do to win back the people of Queensland. But I do not know whether that is going to happen. I do not think it will. Like I was saying, it is a tidal wave that is virtually unstoppable. These are the issues that I wanted to bring to the attention of the House.

I have one more point to make in regard to having to have some form of identification. This is going to be very, very difficult, especially in Indigenous communities. You need to get the hard sell out there, especially telling the Indigenous people that they need a licence to vote. These people are in very, very remote communities. I believe that this absolutely discriminates against them for that reason. You need to give it a good hard sell. I heard someone before saying that we vote with the Labor Party. As the member for Condamine said before, we vote with nobody; we just vote against the LNP. I do recall when the LNP came to us to ask us to vote on their bill in relation to categorising video games to protect children. It was a very good bill as far as we could see, but the devil was in the detail. We thought, 'We will support them this time. This is so lovely what they are putting forward to protect children.' Then we found ourselves in the *Sunday Mail* as voting with the LNP to sack 200 court reporters and outsource their work to India! So this is why we find it very difficult to vote with the government. When they do put something good in a bill, there is always devil in the detail.

**Ms Trad:** Duplicity.

**Mr KNUTH:** Yes, duplicity. I believe that this is very discriminatory. This kicks smaller parties in the guts. Actually, it kicks everyone in the guts while it gives the LNP a great boost. I believe that in the end the Queensland voters will see through this; in fact, I think they are seeing through it now. I completely oppose this legislation.

 **Mr GRANT** (Springwood—LNP) (5.50 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Electoral Reform Amendment Bill 2013. The bill introduces a number of legislative changes including—

- removing the caps on donations and expenditure as unnecessarily restricting participation in the political process—

**Ms Trad:** Shame.

**Mr GRANT:** Just be patient; your turn will come. The bill also introduces these changes—

- increasing the disclosure threshold to \$12400 to more closely align with the threshold applying at the Commonwealth level
- ...
- in recognition of how-to-vote cards as an important resource for voters—providing the cards are to be made available on the Electoral Commission of Queensland (ECQ) website and granting the ECQ power to refuse to register a card if it is satisfied it is likely to mislead or deceive a voter in casting their vote—

With respect to the first two of these changes, in his submission to the committee, Professor Graeme Orr of the University of Queensland described the removal of the limits as ‘retrograde’ and ‘a backward step for the key goals of political integrity and equality’. He identified Queensland as one of the three pioneering Australian states and territories which implemented limitations in 2011, and he observed that the United States of America and other common law democracies, such as the United Kingdom, New Zealand and Canada, possess at least one of these limitations, with Canada possessing both. My comment in response is that, while such a high and lofty sounding assertion can be easily made with a ring of truth, it fails to take into account what actually happens behind the scenes amongst Labor ranks and what remains hidden from the public.

Professor Orr commented on altering the limit on the amount of a donation to a candidate before the donation must be reported publicly and also an upper limit on the amount that can be spent on election campaigns. However, the very structure of the political landscape between Labor and the unions entrenches their practice of concealing the unethical circumventing of the purpose of donation limits, regardless of whether it is under the current legislation or under the proposed legislation. Labor created the current rules forcing all other party members to publicly declare donations of \$1,000 or more, knowing full well that the unions would supply much greater amounts of money to them without public disclosure. The member for South Brisbane did not want to stay around to hear this!

It does not take much imagination to envisage that if, for example, 2,000 union members each gave a donation of \$200 then a contribution of \$40,000 could find its way to a single candidate. Such an arrangement for Labor candidates gets around the current laws which mandate public reporting of gifts of \$1,000 or more, and they could also avoid publication of the real money trail even when the limit is raised to \$12,400. Do not hold your breath waiting for any Labor MP to admit to these activities. To listen to member after member of the opposition pour scorn on the LNP on this topic was to hear breathtaking hypocrisy.

With respect to the third change I mentioned earlier, the committee report states—

The Bill introduces a number of legislative amendments to the provisions relating to how-to-vote cards which recognises their importance as a resource for voters. The Department advises the Bill will ensure greater scrutiny of how-to-vote cards before polling day and also provide postal voters with access to how-to-vote guidance.

The proposed changes include the following requirements:

- how-to-vote cards must be made available for public inspection at:
  - a. the ECQ's Brisbane office;
  - b. the office of the returning officer for the relevant electoral district; and
  - c. the ECQ's website;
- the ECQ or the returning officer must reject a how-to-vote card if the card is likely to mislead or deceive electors when they cast their votes;
- if a how-to-vote card is rejected, then written reasons must be provided for the rejection; and
- a revised how-to-vote card may be resubmitted by 5pm on the Wednesday immediately before polling day.

These changes are absolutely imperative. This will cut the legs out from under those in our communities who during elections attempt to manipulate and exploit unsuspecting members of the public. It will also ensure accurate information is given to the genuine voting inquirer as to who each candidate wants his or her preferences to flow to.

Finally, I want to comment on the proposed change that implements the requirement that proof of identity is needed for each person to be able to vote in a state election. We have all heard the common phrase on the lips of Labor stalwarts that their people should ‘vote early and vote often’. This

practice has for far too long constituted a corruption of our representative democratic electoral system. A recent Senate inquiry exposed the scale of this practice. This law will stop such rank manipulation and exploitation by corrupt individuals who have been behaving like this for years.

In closing, I want to emphasise that in the lead-up to the next election it is critical that an extensive education program is implemented throughout the state to make voters familiar with the need to have ID with them when they go to vote. I support this bill and thank the Attorney-General for bringing it to the House.

**Mr WELLINGTON** (Nicklin—Ind) (5.57 pm): I rise to participate in the debate on the Electoral Reform Amendment Bill. I must say that I look forward to contesting the next state election whenever Premier Newman decides to call it and under whatever rules the Newman government decides to set down. There are some parts of the bill that I think are good and sensible and will be well received in our community. As I was listening to the debate—and I suppose it started with the contribution from the Attorney-General when he responded to our committee's report—I was reflecting on the very debate we had back in 2011. There is no doubt that abuses were happening then and, unfortunately, I think we are seeing repeated abuses happening under these proposed changes to the electoral laws. I am very disappointed that some in our House do not seem to be able to learn from history.

As we have been here debating this, we have seen the ICAC hearings down south, and I cannot believe we are saying that it is okay to make donations of \$10,000, \$9,000 or \$5,000 and for those donations to all be secret. We have heard about the openness and transparency of the ministers' diaries, but ministers do not have to be too smart to get around the diaries—they only need to put in the diaries what they want to put in them. If ministers really want to do the wrong thing, do members think they will write everything that could incriminate them in the diary when they know it will be on the public record? It is only the dumb people who get caught; the intelligent people find a way to get around the system. The case that was put by some government members was, 'We're open and transparent. Look at how we make our ministers' diaries open and transparent.' Can I say that, quite frankly, if ministers want to do the wrong thing they will find a way to get around the rules. I cannot believe that in 2014 we are here saying that it is okay for all these donations to be made without revealing your identity.

**Mr Rickuss** interjected.

**Mr WELLINGTON:** I take the interjection from the member for Lockyer. At least under the current system a donation has to be declared if it is above \$1,000. Now we are saying that we are going to increase the threshold to \$12,400 and it is going to go up incrementally.

**Mr Rickuss** interjected.

**Mr WELLINGTON:** I will get to the interjection of the member for Lockyer in a minute. I think it is wrong and I think history will show that someone somewhere will start to abuse the system. They will make donations and they will want a return; they will want the favour returned. Whether it is during the life of this government or a future government, mark my words, history will show this is opening the doors to the possibility—and I use the Attorney-General's words which he was light-heartedly throwing around—of corruption and I think that is wrong.

The member for Lockyer said this is adopting the system that the federal parliament operates. I say that does not justify it at all. If something is wrong or you believe it is wrong, that is no excuse to say, 'They're doing it, so it's okay.' On that issue, I cannot support it and I am disappointed—

**Mr Rickuss:** Do the feds know you're disappointed in theirs?

**Mr WELLINGTON:** I am not a member of the federal parliament. As I said, I am running at the next state election as a candidate for the seat of Nicklin. I do not have ambitions to go to Canberra. I want to stay here and fight for the people of Queensland. On the issue of—

**Mr Bleijie** interjected.

**Mr WELLINGTON:** I am not taking the Attorney's interjections. He will have the chance to respond later on. On the issue of the policy development payment, we have heard a lot about the consultation and how it was so much better than what happened under the last government in 2011. Yes, there has been consultation. However, I ask the Attorney-General: when did you go out to the community and talk about the policy development payment? It certainly was not in the first round. We talk about openness and transparency. We have a policy development payment; what are the criteria? There are no conditions on how that money is to be used or accounted for or what are the criteria before people can apply for it. How many policies do they have to develop? I think it is more of a slush fund.

Again, I say that I believe the government has not justified the removal of the four per cent threshold for the reimbursement of moneys that have been spent. We have just seen \$6 million spent on the advertising of the Queensland asset sales. The government can just pluck \$6 million out of the air like that to spend in promoting that. I understand the government is bringing it back to six per cent. So it is better than four per cent. However, I do not believe it has justified moving it from four per cent in the first place.

I turn now to the proof of identification requirements. I have been listening to member after member from the government talk about all this evidence of abuse of the electoral system. I was on the committee. Where was their evidence to our committee? It certainly was not presented by all of the people who fronted our committee. We did not see concrete evidence from the people who are experts in the field to support the claim of widespread voter abuse in our Queensland system. As other members have said, I believe it is a disproportionate response, and I cannot support that component.


I listened to the member for Gladstone talk earlier about her proposed amendments and, as I said, I look forward to contesting the next election. Whether the requirement is to vote 1 only or to number every box and put the LNP last, I am happy. I am prepared to support the member for Gladstone on her proposal. More than ever we need to ensure that all Queenslanders maximise their voting capacity. At the moment some people are able to maximise it by putting 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 whereas other people will just vote 1. If we really want to make sure that all Queenslanders are equal, we should give everyone the same opportunity and promote it to everyone. That way everyone will have a chance to get the maximum value for their vote on election day, whenever the Premier chooses to call it. I am going to support the member for Gladstone on her amendment. I am going to be telling my constituents, 'Put Peter Wellington, the Independent candidate for Nicklin, first and number every box and put the LNP last.' That is what I will be telling my constituents. I will certainly be telling them that on Facebook—and I think we are up to nearly 4,700 likes, and they are from right across the state.

**Mr Bleijie:** They can't vote for you.

**Mr WELLINGTON:** They can certainly vote against the LNP. As the member for Dalrymple said, people want to say how they are voting, 'We are voting against the LNP,' and that is the message I am getting across the length and breadth of this great state of ours. Vote against the LNP and whatever combination comes up after the election—who knows? I think Howard Hobbs will be alright.

I can remember when the Attorney-General was first elected. I listened to many of his debates from the opposition. I just cannot believe that the Attorney-General is leading this debate to increase the threshold of the amount of money that will be able to be donated to candidates to \$12,000-odd. I cannot believe it. I have heard so much from our Attorney-General while he has been in here. I cannot believe that he cannot see that this can open the door for people to do the wrong thing. The Attorney-General might like to think that he will be remembered for a whole range of legislative changes that he has brought to Queensland. However, I think the Attorney-General will be remembered for being the person who brought in these changes which opened the door to people doing the wrong thing and applying unnecessary and improper influence on people in whatever government is in power in Queensland. I think that is wrong. I call on the moderate and the reasonable people on the backbench of the LNP to think it through. Just because this is the way it is done in federal parliament does not justify it. Who is to say that someone is not doing the right thing down there and it is just that they have not been caught because someone did not make a complaint to their corruption committee? I have already talked about the ICAC committee hearings. I can remember listening to that early address by the counsel assisting the commission. He said, 'We don't really know at this stage whether it is simply incompetence from the minister or it is something much more sinister.' And look at what has been discovered right across the political spectrum, from Labor to the other side and people in between.

In closing, I urge members to think about it over our meal break. If this is not changed I think history will show that the Newman government, led on this legislation by our Attorney-General who introduced this bill, has opened the door for people to be able to do the wrong thing and put ministers, assistant ministers or people of influence in compromising positions, and I think that is wrong.

 **Dr DAVIS** (Stafford—LNP) (6.07 pm): I rise to speak on the Electoral Reform Amendment Bill 2013. This bill, amongst many positive changes, provides greater opportunities for third parties to contribute financially to the business of politics in Queensland, which begs the question: what, if any,

is the utility or value of that in our democracy? I hope to answer the question in due course. We remind ourselves that 'democracy', from the Greek words *demos* *kratos*, literally is 'people rule'. Democratic government is government of the people by the people and for the people. So why, if it all, should we take the risk—and I stress take the risk—of allowing third parties to influence that vital relationship?

It is not just a hypothetical risk. The Premier of New South Wales, the Hon. Mike Baird, knows the risk to his Liberal government and to the state of New South Wales. The front door to government is the ballot box and elected representatives, and the back door is other forms of influence. The ever present and real risk of backdoor influence has made Premier Baird determined to nail closed the back door to government. He is drawing on eminent Liberal Party heritage. Former Prime Minister Sir Robert Menzies identified that the challenge for all politicians was to ensure that the public interest was their foremost obligation. In his wisdom he was determined to keep party fundraising at arm's length from policy making and politicians.

Highly experienced liberals Malcolm Fraser and Dr John Hewson have both expressed concerns. Indeed, former Prime Minister Fraser is on the record as 'abhorring' the system that has developed around donations to political parties. Current eminent politician the Hon. Christopher Pyne, coalition House leader in the federal parliament, has used his political acumen, experience and judgement to go contrary to his party's position and suggests that all political donations from corporations and unions be banned, leaving only those from individuals. Liberal Party doyenne Michael Kroger has reportedly called for similar changes. Nobody is suggesting widespread corruption; just the danger to democracy from third-party influence, however subtle.

It is not only experienced senior politicians who are concerned; it is also the concerns within our electorates that we are bound to consider. I am indebted to constituent Father Denis Scanlan for writing to me. He, like other highly valued religious leaders, is in touch with a large congregation and is only too familiar with human frailties. Two days ago he sent me an unsolicited communication on this matter. He has granted me permission to quote it unedited, and I do so. He says—

Firstly, congratulations on standing up for what your electorate and conscious says. The wider community is aching for such representation. The current expectation of political parties to toe the line, even though it is against the wishes of their electorate, is causing a lot of disillusionment and disengaging from the political process, which will be catastrophic for our country.

Secondly, I urge you to vote against the abolition of the limits of donations which individuals and groups can contribute to political parties. If it is to go ahead, there must be immediate notification of all donations to any party member and a strong body such as the New South Wales ICAC.

I have statistical evidence that Father Scanlan's concern is in accordance with a wide cross-section of my electorate.

In his 1774 speech to the electors of Bristol, Edmund Burke reminded us that the wishes of constituents '... ought to have great weight; their opinion, high respect; their business, unremitting attention', but at the same time he cautioned that a politician's '... unbiased opinion, his mature judgement, his enlightened conscious' are all matters he ought not to sacrifice to his constituents, 'to any man, or to any set of men living.' I accordingly have cast widely and carefully to form my opinion on this bill. Throughout my professional life as a medical specialist I have relied on research based evidence, analysis and opinion to best serve my patients. I continue that practice in the service of my constituents.

In the interests of time, I will refer to a particular academic paper which I believe best addresses the question I asked earlier; namely, what is the utility or benefit to the common or public good of corporate, and presumably related, donations? The article is from the *Journal of Business Ethics*, a journal that aims to improve the human condition by providing a public forum for discussion and debate about ethical issues related to business. It is one of 40 journals used by the *Financial Times* in compiling the prestigious business school rank. Indeed when I did my MBA, ethics was an important topic that informs my position today. The particular 2013 article is entitled, 'Managing the Risks of Corporate Political Donations: A Utilitarian Perspective' by Leong, Hazelton and Townley from Sydney's Macquarie University. The paper opines a utilitarian or highest good analysis to corporate political donations. It says—

Unlike the more common rights-based analyses—

that so many members have spoken eloquently on tonight—

it is argued that optimal policy is the one that best satisfies society's rational preferences concerning donor influence, adequate financing, donor pressure and the cost of maintaining and enforcing the democratic system.

The result of this paper suggests that a ban on corporate funding is best if it would be generally observed and sufficient funding from other sources is available, otherwise a donation cap is a better option. Deputy Speaker, clearly we are not at a point where we can introduce a ban, but nor should we, in light of this information, be removing caps. I believe this answers the question that I posed at the start of my speech and it aligns with my electorate's sentiment—demonstrating, indeed, the wisdom and insight of our electorates.

Robust, issues based parliamentary debate is vital so that the people whom we serve can see democracy in action. Edmund Burke observed—

But government and legislation are matters of reason and judgment, and not of inclination; and what sort of reason is that, in which the determination precedes ... full discussion of current—and sometimes rapidly emerging—evidence and opinion.

In that regard, just this afternoon I received an email from one of my constituents who has asked me to vote against this bill. She writes—


As an elderly woman, I remember well the corruption in the government years ago which the Fitzgerald inquiry disclosed. I would hate to see it surface again and we are all human, including members of parliament. The temptation is too great to favour someone who has donated a large sum of money to my party and it is likely to be hard to resist. I prefer donations to political parties to be transparent and of reasonable amount.

As exhorted by Burke, I have exercised my judgement and conscious in the public interest and cannot support this bill in its entirety in its current form. Specifically, I cannot support uncapping donations and raising reporting thresholds when, on current evidence as to the public interest, we should be, to quote Dr John Hewson—

... working towards banning all donations by organisations, companies, associations, unions and research bodies and then limiting individual donations to a low maximum. And we need immediate disclosure of donations.

Such a view would, I believe, accord with the court of public opinion, which would arguably take precedence over legal opinion that has not, to my knowledge, been tested in a court of law.

An added bonus from removing the distractions and temptations of big dollar elections is that it will allow improved focus on the all-important candidate rather than presidential campaigns. I have long held that the best and most cost-effective form of advertising is word of mouth. Absolute trust in government is essential to the prosperity and wellbeing of all Queenslanders, and we should not be undertaking anything that might, without public benefit, risk that trust.

 **Mr KATTER** (Mount Isa—KAP) (6.17 pm): I rise to speak to the Electoral Reform Amendment Bill 2013. I think all members who vote for this bill are going to be judged very harshly, and I think in time that the people who vote for this bill tonight will not be proud of their actions.

I can speak with some authority on this issue because I am part of a minor party that has grown in the last few years, and I think this bill is addressing the emergence of parties like the one I am a part of and trying to remove them or exclude them from the political landscape. We felt that parts of society were being under-represented and that, as the two major parties have gravitated towards the middle, their interests were not being properly represented. We gathered a lot of support in that time. Some 500,000 Queenslanders chose to vote for parties other than Labor and LNP in the last state election, and about 250,000 voted for our party because they were looking for a different set of values. We represented those values, and I think that is a healthy part of the process. I would defend the rights of people who were trying to get into that landscape as well, even if I did not agree with their opinions. I think it is a very healthy part of the process, and to think that someone who has a 'born to rule' attitude is terribly unhealthy for our system.

It should be said that our system was never built to have two parties; it was built to have four or five parties and to widely represent the broad and diverse range of views that are out there, whether we agree with them or not.

This bill specifically targets minor parties and those that want to grow organically, and it makes it almost impossible for them to grow. We found it very difficult starting our party. We were targeting representing people who were not big on cash—that is, not the big end of town—and that \$12,399 figure is not going to hurt them because it was hard to get money out of people who very strongly supported us, because for many of them that is why they wanted us to represent them because they are going broke in their respective industries. In terms of the four per cent going up to 10 per cent and down to six per cent, why do it? The only reason for doing it is to keep small people out of the market. Guess what? The Liberals were small once; Labor was small once. Ideologies grow and they should be contested in the parliament. No-one has the right to shut them out. We have seen movement after movement from this government attacking our party. We lost our resources in 2012. It is perverse and history will judge this government's actions very harshly in that respect.

I will now go through parts of the bill. With regard to removing caps on donations and expenditure, I do not think it could be said better than has already been said. I cannot help but again quote Professor Graeme Orr saying that politics is not a free market in consumer goods. People should be able to go out in the community and shake hands, talk to people in the pub, tell them what they stand for and get voted for like that, not presidential style elections that are won by getting these large corporate donations. I am told that the LNP has amassed some \$30 million in this term which to me speaks volumes and is obscene, and I am sure the same happened with Labor in the past. I think it is unhealthy. We should be judged on our merits going to the ballot box, not by how many leaflets we put in letterboxes. With regard to increasing the candidate deposit retention threshold from four per cent to 10 per cent, effectively the government is telling the general public, 'Don't have a go, mate. People might like you, but you just haven't got the profile. We don't want you to have a go because you're unlikely to get your money back and you probably can't afford to run.' Two or three elections later, that person might make a fine politician. The government is removing that incentive for them to have a go, and I do not know what the benefit is. It will not save any money because it is putting in place the biannual policy development fund. It is beyond me why it would do it other than it is attacking minor parties. It is a bullying tactic where it thinks that only two people belong in a schoolyard and no-one else.

**Dr Douglas:** Dirty money.

**Mr KATTER:** It is dirty money. It is going to be judged very harshly in the public and I think the government is really damaging itself politically with that. In terms of the electoral public funding to a dollar amount per vote at \$2.90 and \$1.45, I know I am being repetitious but it is the same point again. I believe very strongly in the role that Independents play in this parliament. I think they do a tremendous job and it is healthy. Even if people agree with the set-up we have at the moment, it is very healthy to have Independents and minor parties to challenge the mainstream views and offer a different opinion. I think that is very healthy for the system, but this makes it very hard for us to operate and exist. I just think that that is bad for the system, is very cynical and perverse.

With regard to increasing the donation disclosure threshold from \$1,000 to \$12,400, the debate has been started in the United States that there is too much corporate influence in the government and it is trying to reverse this trend. We are enlightened enough in Queensland to go the other direction in that we are welcoming larger corporate type donors to come into the marketplace and if they throw their money around they can express more influence. People put money in for a reason and larger corporate donors especially will expect a return on that investment, and there is no denying it. In terms of introducing the biannual policy development funding, this is the real clanger. This defies any sort of rationale or logic. I do not even know how to talk about this without sounding entirely cynical, but I am told that it could end up retrospectively adding \$3.5 million to the LNP coffers and \$2 million to Labor Party coffers this year. We have had our staff taken off us. I have an electorate the size of France—a third of Queensland. I have to race back here from my electorate to read these bills with no staff or assistance. The government ripped our staff off us. It legislated in the dark of the night and now it is making it harder again for us to win elections or anyone else like us to have a go. It is unfair and—


**Dr Douglas:** Anti democratic.


**Mr KATTER:** It is very anti democratic. I keep saying: those opposite will be judged very harshly by the public on this. There is no sugar coating it and it is out there. More importantly, they will be judged harshly in history as well, and I do not think they will be proud of themselves in 10 years time when they look back at what they have done here tonight. Of course I will be vehemently opposing this bill.

The other issue is people needing to have identification to vote. Obviously that is a big issue for me because Mornington Island and Doomadgee are in my electorate. I am guilty of it myself often, but I think one of the biggest problems we have in dealing with many of the Indigenous issues is that we discount their value. Whilst many lower socioeconomic people might have problems with alcoholism and be really down and out and might not be able to maintain that identification on election day, many of them would surprise you and still have an opinion and still feel very strongly about their vote. The feedback I have received from those communities before is that one thing they find very important is their right to vote. The evidence for that is there because the turnout to vote in Doomadgee and Mornington is surprising.

**Dr Douglas:** They fought for it for 100 years.

**Mr KATTER:** Well, I can tell members that many of them will be ineligible. It is going to be really disappointing to see that. I will be trying my best to ensure that they have ID, but again I do not think that that has been taken into account. I think that will be very unfair on those people. I vehemently oppose this bill. I think it reflects terribly poorly on the government and anyone else who votes for it. This is adding to one of the most cynical days I have experienced in this parliament.

 **Mr RUTHENBERG** (Kallangur—LNP) (6.26 pm): I rise to make a brief contribution to the Electoral Reform Amendment Bill. Needless to say, I will be supporting the bill. We are all human and we do the best we can and, as a collective in this House, it is good to see robust debate. With that comment, I make my contribution. It is my understanding that to be a member of the Labor Party you must join a union and declare loyalty to a faction that is determined by the union you join. You cannot speak out against the party or its policies or you are disendorsed. If you do not function within the party to the behest of the union you belong to, you lose your endorsement. How can a Labor member represent their community when their strings are being pulled by the union? I find the bleating of members of the opposition about this bill to be very hollow given their opinions are not their own but that of the union. This bill will introduce legislation that disadvantages the union by levelling the playing field for everyone else, and to that extent every Labor member comes to this debate with an extreme conflict of interest and they should at least be intellectually honest with themselves and their communities and declare that conflict. We know by firsthand eyewitness accounts that unions have funded campaigns to the value of hundreds of thousands of dollars in single seats and millions collectively to a particular campaign. Often none of this is open to public scrutiny. This opposition is compromised to the extreme in its hollow arguments. How do you spell hypocrisy? A-L-P. I support this bill and thank the Attorney-General on behalf of my community for taking two years to consult widely with Queenslanders and seek their opinions before bringing this bill to this House.

 **Hon. JP BLEIJIE** (Kawana—LNP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice) (6.28 pm), in reply: I start by thanking all honourable members for their contributions to the debate this evening on the Electoral Reform Amendment Bill—an important bill. I will start where the member who just finished left off in terms of the consultation we have undertaken on this bill over the last couple of years. We made it abundantly clear in 2011 what our position was on these types of reforms when we strongly opposed the Labor Party legislation when it was introduced which increased political fundraising or public funding to political parties from \$3½ million to about \$25 million in the 2012 to 2015 electoral cycle. In fact, I heard the crossbenches talking earlier in the debate about ripping off the taxpayer. We are saving the taxpayer. We are saving the taxpayer in this legislation. Under the former government's legislation, it was a \$25 million windfall, mostly to the Labor Party and to the major political parties. We are saving the taxpayer money in terms of these reforms.

Sitting suspended from 6.30 pm to 7.30 pm.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I thank all honourable members for their contributions this evening. I will give members an update with respect to why we are making these reforms and refresh the memories of members in terms of the 2011 amendments, which I referred to in my contribution to the second reading debate.

In 2009, members of parliament went to an election. At that election members of parliament were entitled to about \$1.54 per vote, if my memory serves me correctly. What generally happened was that the votes were tallied at the end of the election day and the winner would be announced. All the candidates who received over four per cent of the vote were entitled to \$1.54 or so per vote. Generally, for the major political parties—I know that it was for the LNP and I assume it was for the Labor Party—the candidate did not get the money; it was returned to the political party. The total cost of that public funding for the political parties and candidates for the \$1.54 per vote was about \$3.5 million. So in 2009, it was \$1.54 per vote. Generally, the candidates of political parties did not receive the money; the political party received the money. I looked at this matter previously and saw that it was the same arrangement for the Labor Party. The candidates did not receive anything unless they were an Independent. In 2009, \$3.5 million was spent by the taxpayer.

Come 2011, Paul Lucas stood in this place and moved amendments. We debated those amendments that he had introduced one month earlier. At the time I indicated that it was one month after the 2010-11 floods, where people in Grantham had lost their lives and so forth. Shortly after that, the biggest priority for the Labor Party was to make sure its political fortunes and its money was there. It was not the Labor Party's money, it was not business money, it was not union money; it was taxpayers' money. The Labor Party wanted to make sure that it built up its war chest if it was going to lose the election in 2012, or whenever it may have held the election.

We debated the laws on the Wednesday, the day after the federal budget and the day before Gordon Nuttall appeared in this place. So there was plenty of diversion around the time the amendments were debated. At that time, we estimated—and it has now been proven because of the returns that were issued after 2012—that we had gone from \$3.5 million in public funding in 2009 to about \$24.5 million. I heard some of the crossbenchers talk about the public funding component of this funding. We estimate that we will be saving approximately \$8 million for the taxpayer, rather than it costing them \$24 million. It will be substantially less, but we estimate about \$8 million.

The parties will get less. I do not think that it is any secret that the LNP organisation does not particularly like the fact that it is losing money or getting less money. I suspect that the Labor Party does not like the fact that it is going to be getting less money. No political party liked it when we cancelled their administration funding two years ago. But at the time we made a commitment that we would save taxpayers' money substantially rather than just turn off the coffee machines in the head offices of political parties.

We opposed the 2011 amendments that were put in by the Labor Party, substantially giving \$24.5 million in public funding. Not only that, the amendments severely restricted a citizen's right to participate fully in elections by capping expenditure for political candidates. They capped the donations that citizens and corporations could give to political parties. The other thing that the Labor Party did in 2011 was to put an associated entity provision in the legislation, which essentially said, 'If you are one association under the corporations legislation and associated by that legislation to another company, then you can only give one donation. You are considered an associated entity, therefore, one person and you can expend only "X" amount of dollars—I think it was \$75,000 to \$80,000—in each electorate across the state.'

There was an exception, though. Although the Labor Party said that companies that were associated can put in only one donation, the exemption was unions. Unions as third parties were exempt from the associated entity provisions. So despite the fact that there are, I think, 22 registered unions in Queensland and about 16 of them actually have in their constitution that they are officially associated and affiliated with the Labor Party, that provision did not apply. In 2011 we moved an amendment to say that, if it was okay for companies and citizens, that it should be okay for the unions. Of course, at that time the Labor Party rejected that amendment.

I turn now to our amendments. We are righting the wrongs in terms of letting people freely participate in an election. People will be able to spend what they want at an election. I can think of one person who will benefit in Queensland. It is not going to be any of us, who are not billionaires. I can think of one billionaire who is potentially going to be helped by these amendments. It is certainly not the Liberal National Party. It is certainly not the Labor Party. It is certainly not me. It is going to be people like Mr Clive Palmer, who we see going right around the country spending all of his money on political campaigns. But we believe that that is his right. We believe that anyone should have the right to spend what they want to spend in an election campaign. If a candidate wants to spend 'X' amount, they should be able to spend that amount. If they want to make donations, they should be able to make donations.

I want to deal with the issue of donations. It is no secret that the unions do not donate to the Liberal National Party. I not sure if we have ever received any donations from the unions. But it can be said that business groups, individuals and corporations give money to both sides of politics. The Labor Party has taken donations from businesses as well as from the unions, which have their lifelong drip line. If I ask myself: why do businesses donate money to political parties? I suspect it is because they want to make sure that there is a government there that has a strong plan and is supportive of business right across the state. I can think of a lot of businesses that may support the government's reform of workers compensation laws. That is good for business. If the Labor Party were elected, it would repeal that legislation. If the Palmer party were elected, it said that it would repeal all the legislation. So that law that enables every business in Queensland, which is getting their premium notices at the moment, a reduction of about 17 per cent in the average premium, would be repealed by the Palmer party and would be repealed by the Labor Party. That is our democracy. People can assist governments, political parties or Independents to get elected if they believe that they are going to stick up for the rights of businesses or citizens. That is why we believe in a free election period where you do not have the restrictions, as we have with the current laws that the Labor Party introduced in 2011, and where people can donate if they wish. A citizen, a corporation, a union can donate to the Liberal National Party, the Labor Party, or an Independent—or any other political party. It is their right as a Queensland citizen to do so.

I will deal now with the threshold issue, which is the increase from \$1,000 to \$12,400. We would like the threshold to remain lower. Tonight, I saw the Premier on the news and he said, 'If we had our way, we would love it to be lower. But we have a few issues.' The first issue is that we do not have laws consistent with the legislation. The Crown solicitor has advised that our laws—

**Ms Trad:** Table it.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** The member should refer to my introductory speech where I tabled legal advice. I would say to the member for South Brisbane to go to the Table Office and grab a copy of the legal advice. The legal advice talks about section 109 of the Australian Constitution and the inconsistencies between the federal legislation and the state legislation.

**Ms Trad:** That would be the new Solicitor General who gave you that advice.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** It was the same Crown Solicitor that the Labor Party had advising them when they were in government. If I can address this issue: we want to make sure there is consistency between the state laws and the federal legislation. The inconsistency is this: if a person, individual or corporate entity gives money to a federal political party, like the Labor Party, for instance, it also has to get disclosed under our laws in the Queensland division, but under two separate regimes: \$12,400 at the federal level and \$1,000 at the state level. We want it to be consistent. The Crown Law advice shows us that the best way forward is to make it consistent. We want to end the confusion, as I just indicated.

We give this commitment to the people of Queensland: once these laws go through, with the amendments I have put in, if the federal government adjusts its legislative disclosure threshold from \$12,400—up or down—we believe it should be consistent and we will adjust it accordingly. The Premier will be writing to the Prime Minister suggesting that if they are going to proceed with electoral reform in the Commonwealth then they should look at reducing the disclosure limit. The Premier made that commitment on TV tonight. If this parliament passes the legislation the Premier, within the next 48 hours, will write to the Prime Minister and say our laws are now consistent with the federal laws and if the federal government wish to proceed with a reduction in the threshold limit, which has been discussed by a few members at the federal level, then of course we would support that and encourage them to do that.

The opposition leader in her contribution made claims about submissions that were made to the green paper. She says she does not know where to find them, she cannot find them, we have not released them. If the opposition and their 24 staff go to [www.justice.qld.gov.au](http://www.justice.qld.gov.au), Corporate Information, Community Consultations, the opposition leader will actually find links to the 254 submissions that were made. And guess what? They are public! You can even get the Labor Party submission. It is all public.

**Ms Trad:** When did they go up?

**Mr BLEIJIE:** About a year ago. If the member for South Brisbane wants to she can see all 254 submissions.

**Government members** interjected.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Miss Barton): Order! There is a lot of conversation across the chamber. If you wish to have conversations across the chamber you can take them outside.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** At 241 the LNP made a submission which you can follow the link to. At 240 Katter's Australian Party made a submission. Submission 252 was from the Queensland Labor Party. There are a few here that are not for publication but that is because, I suggest, the citizens wrote and asked that they be private or confidential, as it is their complete right to. There are submissions from the Teachers Union, the Nurses Union, the Electrical Trades Union and the Council of Unions. You can click on all of these. Nothing is hidden. It is on the Department of Justice website and, quite astonishingly, it is under Community Consultations. The opposition leader misled the parliament yesterday when she came in here and in the debate said we did not release these submissions. If those opposite cannot find them with 24 staff I make the suggestion that maybe instead of the staff opposite tweeting disrespectful photos during the day they could go onto the department website and find all the submissions.

**Mrs Frecklington:** That would be too hard for them.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I take the interjection from the honourable member for Nanango. That would be too hard for the opposition. The facts are that we issued a green paper in January 2013. Submissions closed on 1 March 2013. Outcomes of those submissions were reported in July 2013. Legislation was introduced in this House in November 2013. Debate commenced 20 May 2014. This process has

taken 18 months. That is hardly ramming the legislation through, I would put to honourable colleagues. We have consulted. We have been upfront. We said in 2011 that we opposed the legislation. We did oppose the legislation.

**Mrs Miller** interjected.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I do not know if the member for Bundamba, who is interjecting not from her seat, said anything during the debate in 2011 about how all of a sudden she did not have to go to unions and ask for money any more, that the taxpayers were going to fund her campaign. That is essentially what happened. The funds dried up for the Labor Party and they said, 'Let's get the taxpayer to pay for it.' A couple of months after the taxpayers were recovering from the dramatic floods of 2010-11 the Labor Party said, 'We will get the taxpayers to fork out another \$21 million and pay for our next election to make sure we get re-elected.' Fortunately, Queenslanders are not fools and they only elected seven at the time.

These laws are about making sure that we go through a transparent process with the Queensland public, which we have over an 18-month period. As I said, we will be introducing a phase 2 legislative agenda which will deal with the Redcliffe by-election, canvassers and what happens at polling stations. The Electoral Commission produced a report on those issues. We will look at proceeding down that path.

With respect to the amendments proposed by the member for Gladstone, we will not be supporting them. The issue of optional preferential voting or compulsory preferential voting was contained in our green paper. From the feedback we were getting we formed the view that we do not intend to change the system in Queensland. We will retain the status quo which is the optional preferential voting system. I thank all members for their contributions to the debate this evening and I commend the bill to the House.

Division: Question put—That the bill be now read a second time.

**AYES, 59:**

**LNP, 59**—Bates, Bennett, Berry, Bleijie, Boothman, Costigan, Cox, Crandon, Cripps, Davies, T Davis, Dempsey, Dickson, Dillaway, Dowling, Emerson, Flegg, France, Frecklington, Grant, Grimwade, Gulley, Hart, Hathaway, Hobbs, Holswich, Johnson, Kaye, King, Krause, Latter, Maddern, Malone, Mander, McVeigh, Menkens, Millard, Minnikin, Molhoek, Newman, Nicholls, Powell, Pucci, Rickuss, Robinson, Ruthenberg, Seeneey, Shorten, Shuttleworth, Smith, Sorensen, Stevens, Stewart, Stuckey, Symes, Trout, Walker, Watts, Young.

**NOES, 13:**

**ALP, 6**—Byrne, D'Ath, Miller, Palaszczuk, Pitt, Trad.

**KAP, 3**—Hopper, Katter, Knuth.

**PUP, 2**—Douglas, Judge.

**INDEPENDENTS, 2**—Cunningham, Wellington.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Bill read a second time.

### Consideration in Detail

Clauses 1 to 3, as read, agreed to.

Clause 4—



**Mrs CUNNINGHAM (7.55 pm):** I move the following amendment—

**1 Clause 4 (Amendment of s 2 (Definitions))**

Page 7, after line 6—

*insert—*

(4A) Section 2, definition *first preference vote*, 'or a tick or cross'—  
*omit.*

This is a consequential amendment in relation to the substantive amendment, which is amendment No. 5. On that basis, because it is consequential, I am not intending to divide on it. However, there are several consequential amendments in relation to compulsory preferential voting. I noted with interest that, in justifying his use of \$12,400, the Attorney-General talked about consistency with the federal government structure. Compulsory preferential voting is federally required. On that basis, I commend the amendment to the House.

Non-government amendment (Mrs Cunningham) negatived.

**Mr BLEIJIE** (7.56 pm): I move the following amendment—

**1 Clause 4 (Amendment of s 2 (Definitions))**

Page 6, after line 19—

*insert—*

**gift threshold amount**, for the amount or value of a gift or loan, see section 201A.

I table the explanatory notes to all my amendments.

*Tabled paper:* Electoral Reform Amendment Bill 2013, explanatory notes to Hon. Jarrod Bleijie's amendments [\[5192\]](#).

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 4, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 5—

**Mr BLEIJIE** (7.57 pm): I move the following amendment—

**2 Clause 5 (Amendment of s 89 (Deposit to accompany nomination))**

Page 7, line 13, '10%'—

*omit, insert—*

6%

Amendment agreed to.

Division: Question put—That clause 5, as amended, be agreed to.

**AYES, 63:**

**LNP, 56**—Bates, Bennett, Berry, Bleijie, Boothman, Costigan, Cox, Crandon, Cripps, Davies, T Davis, Dempsey, Dickson, Dillaway, Dowling, Emerson, Flegg, France, Frecklington, Grant, Grimwade, Gulley, Hart, Hathaway, Hobbs, Johnson, Kaye, King, Krause, Latter, Maddern, Malone, Mander, McVeigh, Menkens, Millard, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, Powell, Pucci, Rickuss, Robinson, Ruthenberg, Seeney, Shorten, Shuttleworth, Smith, Sorensen, Stevens, Stewart, Stuckey, Symes, Trout, Watts, Young.

**KAP, 3**—Hopper, Katter, Knuth.

**PUP, 2**—Douglas, Judge.

**INDEPENDENTS, 2**—Cunningham, Wellington.

**NOES, 6:**

**ALP, 6**—Byrne, D'Ath, Miller, Palaszczuk, Pitt, Trad.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clause 5, as amended, agreed to.

Insertion of new clause—



**Mrs CUNNINGHAM** (8.04 pm): I move the following amendment—

**2 After clause 5—**

Page 7, after line 13—

*insert—*

**5A Amendment of s 102 (Supply of ballot papers and electoral rolls)**

Section 102(3), second dot point, 'You may if you wish indicate'—

*omit, insert—*

Indicate

This is consequential on the move to compulsory preferential voting. Whilst I will not be dividing on this, it is not the substantive change, it is necessary in the legislation to move this change to the procedural matter of compulsory preferential voting.

Non-government amendment (Mrs Cunningham) negatived.

Clauses 6 to 8, as read, agreed to.

Clause 9—



**Ms PALASZCZUK** (8.05 pm): This particular clause relates to the amendment of section 107—procedure for voting. If this clause is agreed to this evening, then in Queensland, under the LNP government, the elector, the voter, must give the issuing officer their proof of identity document. Shame, shame, shame, shame! No reason was given by this government as to why they want people to produce ID. There was no evidence—

**Mr Seeney:** 'Go there early and vote often.'

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** Good on you, Deputy Premier. Where is the evidence in Queensland elections of fraud? The Deputy Premier should hang his head in shame when it comes to the dreadful strategy that he put in place in this House today. You should not be speaking at all. You should hang your head in shame.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Miss Barton): Order!

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** I will stare you down any day of the week.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! Leader of the Opposition, you have been in the House long enough to know that you should direct your comments through the chair, please.

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** The Deputy Premier has been in this House for a number of years and I am happy to stare him down any day of the week. He was the one who pulled out of the 7.30 debates because he was a chicken. You could not handle those debates on the ABC at 7.30. He got scared. I am not debating the Leader of the Opposition anymore. He got scared and he ran away. He stands condemned for the strategy that he has put in place in this House today. It is absolutely disgraceful and shameful. Let me get back to the clause.

**Government members** interjected.

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** I am happy to have 74 members yell at me because am I passionate about this issue? Yes, I am. Will I stand up for every voter in Queensland? Yes, I will, because what this government wants to do is to disenfranchise voters throughout this state. Every single LNP member here should feel ashamed because they are saying to their constituents, 'Go to the booth and prove who you are.' Prove it!

*(Time expired)*

**Ms TRAD:** I rise to make a contribution in relation to clause 9 which we are currently looking at in detail. I was compelled by the Attorney-General's summation in relation to the bill to go over the Crown Law advice that he tabled during his explanatory speech back in November 2013. I see that the issue of voter identification regulations were perhaps not in the brief that the Attorney-General gave the Crown Solicitor in relation to the Electoral Reform Amendment Bill. I would like to ask the Attorney-General whether or not voter identification regulations were included in the brief that he requested the Crown Solicitor respond to in relation to the Electoral Reform Amendment Bill. From my reading of the brief that was not actually within the brief given to the Crown Solicitor. If the Attorney-General and the LNP government is hell-bent on ensuring consistency between state electoral laws and Commonwealth electoral laws, I do wonder why this issue is being introduced here tonight.

We know that if this clause is passed here tonight Queensland will stand out alone. Queensland will stand out alone in terms of the Commonwealth electoral laws, in terms of every jurisdiction in this country. What this means is that the government, on the one hand, are proactively distinguishing Queensland electoral law from Commonwealth electoral law on the issue of voter identification regulation but, on the other hand, are telling Queenslanders, like they are idiots, that the reason why they are increasing the disclosure threshold is to bring the Queensland act in line with the Commonwealth act. That is inconsistent. Their arguments, their rationale, are inconsistent and they are selective in their application. I ask the Attorney-General to advise the House whether the brief to the Crown Solicitor included the issue of the voter identification regulations contained in the bill.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** This provision is about preventing electoral fraud. I cannot understand why the Labor Party would be opposing such an important clause.

Division: Question put—That clause 9, as read, be agreed to.

**AYES, 57:**

**LNP, 56**—Bates, Bennett, Berry, Bleijie, Boothman, Costigan, Cox, Crandon, Cripps, Davies, T Davis, Dempsey, Dickson, Dillaway, Dowling, Emerson, Flegg, France, Frecklington, Grant, Grimwade, Gulley, Hart, Hathaway, Hobbs, Johnson, Kaye, King, Krause, Latter, Maddern, Malone, Mander, McVeigh, Menkens, Millard, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, Powell, Pucci, Rickuss, Robinson, Ruthenberg, Seeney, Shorten, Shuttleworth, Smith, Sorensen, Stevens, Stewart, Stuckey, Symes, Trout, Watts, Young.

**INDEPENDENTS, 1**—Cunningham.

**NOES, 12:**

**ALP, 6**—Byrne, D'Ath, Miller, Palaszczuk, Pitt, Trad.

**KAP, 3**—Hopper, Katter, Knuth.

**PUP, 2**—Douglas, Judge.

**INDEPENDENTS, 1**—Wellington.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clause 9, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 10 and 11, as read, agreed to.

Clause 12—

**Mr BLEIJIE** (8.17 pm): I move the following amendments—

**3 Clause 12 (Amendment of s 119 (Making a declaration vote using posted voting papers))**

Page 11, line 15, 'Section'—

*omit, insert—*

(1) Section

**4 Clause 12 (Amendment of s 119 (Making a declaration vote using posted voting papers))**

Page 11, after line 18—

*insert—*

(2) Section 119(3), '6p.m. on the Thursday'—

*omit, insert—*

7p.m. on the Wednesday

Amendments agreed to.

Clause 12, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 13 and 14, as read, agreed to.

Clause 15—



**Mr BLEIJIE** (8.18 pm): I move the following amendment—

**5 Clause 15 (Insertion of new pt 7, div 5, sdiv 3A)**

Page 14, line 25, 'a individual'—

*omit, insert—*

an individual

Amendment agreed to.

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** As I outlined in the debate earlier today, I support efforts to assist trials of ways to make it easier for visually impaired Queenslanders to cast their vote independently and in secret. I thank the advocates from the visually impaired community for their participation in the committee system and their genuine policy interest. I look forward to working with them in implementing these trials. Although I support these specific moves, they are contained in a bill where the whole bill as it stands is not acceptable. We will vote for this clause but we cannot support the legislation as a whole.

Clause 15, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 16—



**Mrs CUNNINGHAM** (8.19 pm): I move the following amendments—

**3 Clause 16 (Amendment of s 122 (How electors must vote))**

Page 16, line 10, 'Section'—

*omit, insert—*

(1) Section

**4 Clause 16 (Amendment of s 122 (How electors must vote))**

Page 16, line 16, 'or (3)'—

*omit.*

**5 Clause 16 (Amendment of s 122 (How electors must vote))**

Page 16, after line 16—

*insert—*

(2) Section 122(2) and (3)—

*omit, insert—*

(2) An elector must vote by—

(a) writing on a ballot paper the number 1 in the square opposite the name of a candidate to indicate the elector's first preference for the candidate; and

(b) writing—

(i) the number 2 in another square; or

(ii) the numbers 2, 3 and so on in other squares;

to indicate the order of the elector's preferences for each of the other candidates whose name is contained on the ballot paper.

This section contains the substantive provisions in relation to compulsory preferential voting. Again, I reiterate that the Attorney-General has made much of being consistent with the federal government. One of the things that I find voters are confused about is whether the state election is compulsory preferential voting when the federal election is. With local government you are required to fill in sufficient squares for the number of positions that are available. As I said in my speech in the second reading debate, the change to a single vote only was brought in by Labor simply because of political opportunism. It was not brought in because it was for the benefit of the voters. I think compulsory preferential voting gives the greatest value to the vote by the individual, and I commend the amendments to the House.

Division: Question put—That the member for Gladstone's amendments be agreed to.

**AYES, 7:**

**KAP, 3**—Hopper, Katter, Knuth.

**PUP, 2**—Douglas, Judge.

**INDEPENDENTS, 2**—Cunningham, Wellington.

**NOES, 62:**

**LNP, 56**—Bates, Bennett, Berry, Bleijie, Boothman, Costigan, Cox, Crandon, Cripps, Davies, T Davis, Dempsey, Dickson, Dillaway, Dowling, Emerson, Flegg, France, Frecklington, Grant, Grimwade, Gulley, Hart, Hathaway, Hobbs, Johnson, Kaye, King, Krause, Latter, Maddern, Malone, Mander, McVeigh, Menkens, Millard, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, Powell, Pucci, Rickuss, Robinson, Ruthenberg, Seeney, Shorten, Shuttleworth, Smith, Sorensen, Stevens, Stewart, Stuckey, Symes, Trout, Watts, Young.

**ALP, 6**—Byrne, D'Ath, Miller, Palaszczuk, Pitt, Trad.

Resolved in the negative.

Non-government amendments (Mrs Cunningham) negated.

Clause 16, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 17 to 23, as read, agreed to.

Clause 24—

**Mr BLEIJIE** (8.27 pm): I move the following amendment—

**6 Clause 24 (Insertion of new s 201A)**

Page 20, lines 13 to 29 and page 21, lines 1 to 18—

*omit, insert—*

**201A Meaning of gift threshold amount**

The **gift threshold amount**, for the amount or value of a gift or loan, is the dollar amount applying for a gift under the Commonwealth Electoral Act, section 304(5)(b)(ii), as indexed under section 321A of that Act.

Division: Question put—That the Attorney-General's amendment be agreed to.

**AYES, 57:**

**LNP, 57**—Bates, Bennett, Berry, Bleijie, Boothman, Costigan, Cox, Crandon, Cripps, Davies, T Davis, Dempsey, Dickson, Dillaway, Dowling, Emerson, Flegg, France, Frecklington, Grant, Grimwade, Gulley, Hart, Hathaway, Hobbs, Johnson, Kaye, King, Krause, Latter, Maddern, Malone, Mander, McVeigh, Menkens, Millard, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, Powell, Pucci, Rickuss, Robinson, Ruthenberg, Seeney, Shorten, Shuttleworth, Smith, Sorensen, Stevens, Stewart, Stuckey, Symes, Trout, Walker, Watts, Young.

**NOES, 13:**

**ALP, 6**—Byrne, D'Ath, Miller, Palaszczuk, Pitt, Trad.

**KAP, 3**—Hopper, Katter, Knuth.

**PUP, 2**—Douglas, Judge.

**INDEPENDENTS, 2**—Cunningham, Wellington.

Resolved in the affirmative.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Miss Barton): For all future divisions on this bill the bells will be rung for one minute.

Division: Question put—That clause 24, as amended, stand part of the bill.

**AYES, 57:**

**LNP, 57**—Bates, Bennett, Berry, Bleijie, Boothman, Costigan, Cox, Crandon, Cripps, Davies, T Davis, Dempsey, Dickson, Dillaway, Dowling, Emerson, Flegg, France, Frecklington, Grant, Grimwade, Gulley, Hart, Hathaway, Hobbs, Johnson, Kaye, King, Krause, Latter, Maddern, Malone, Mander, McVeigh, Menkens, Millard, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, Powell, Pucci, Rickuss, Robinson, Ruthenberg, Seeney, Shorten, Shuttleworth, Smith, Sorensen, Stevens, Stewart, Stuckey, Symes, Trout, Walker, Watts, Young.

**NOES, 13:**

**ALP, 6**—Byrne, D'Ath, Miller, Palaszczuk, Pitt, Trad.

**KAP, 3**—Hopper, Katter, Knuth.

**PUP, 2**—Douglas, Judge.

**INDEPENDENTS, 2**—Cunningham, Wellington.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clause 24, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 25 to 35, as read, agreed to.

Clause 36—



**Mr BLEIJIE** (8.36 pm): I move the following amendment—

**7 Clause 36 (Amendment of s 223 (Entitlement to election funding—registered political parties))**

Page 23, line 25, '10%'—

*omit, insert—*

6%

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** The Labor opposition will support this amendment. Considering the wide range of serious issues that were criticised throughout this process and in great depth during submissions in the public hearing of this legislation, it is disappointing that this is the only change the committee could come up with and that the government would accept. I note that, in his contribution to this debate, the member for Ipswich made specific reference to the issue of increasing the threshold from four per cent to six per cent rather than from four per cent to 10 per cent.

Amendment agreed to.

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** While supporting the amendment, we do not support the substantive clause as outlined in the debate because we oppose the moves to increase the threshold on primary votes received. Despite the fact that the amendment that makes this change is what can be described as slightly 'less bad', the opposition will still be opposing the raising of the threshold from four per cent to six per cent.

Division: Question put—That clause 36, as amended, stand part of the bill.

**AYES, 59:**

**LNP, 58**—Bates, Bennett, Berry, Bleijie, Boothman, Costigan, Cox, Crandon, Cripps, Davies, T Davis, Dempsey, Dickson, Dillaway, Dowling, Emerson, Flegg, France, Frecklington, Grant, Grimwade, Gulley, Hart, Hathaway, Hobbs, Holswich, Johnson, Kaye, King, Krause, Latter, Maddern, Malone, Mander, McVeigh, Menkens, Millard, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, Powell, Pucci, Rickuss, Robinson, Ruthenberg, Seeney, Shorten, Shuttleworth, Smith, Sorensen, Stevens, Stewart, Stuckey, Symes, Trout, Walker, Watts, Young.

**INDEPENDENTS, 1**—Cunningham.

**NOES, 12:**

**ALP, 6**—Byrne, D'Ath, Miller, Palaszczuk, Pitt, Trad.

**KAP, 3**—Hopper, Katter, Knuth.

**PUP, 2**—Douglas, Judge.

**INDEPENDENTS, 1**—Wellington.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clause 36, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 37—

**Mr BLEIJIE** (8.40 pm): I move the following amendment—

**8 Clause 37 (Amendment of s 224 (Entitlement to election funding—candidates))**

Page 24, line 18, '10%'—

*omit, insert—*

6%

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 37, as amended, agreed to.



Clause 38—

**Mrs CUNNINGHAM** (8.41 pm): I move the following amendment—

**6 Clause 38 (Replacement of s 225 (Advance payment of election funding))**

Page 25, lines 9 to 13—

*omit, insert—*

2014—\$2.90; or

This amendment aligns the candidate funding to party funding. At the moment the proposed amending legislation has registered political parties receiving \$2.90 and Independents receiving \$1.45. I note that in his response the Attorney-General talked about \$2.90 going to the party and \$1.45 going to the individual.

I know from experience that running an election campaign as an Independent is a very expensive proposition. It is no cheaper than it is for a party. This is just an entrenchment of the view that parties have greater value than Independents. We pay the same—probably more—for political advertising simply because parties like Big W and Coles have greater buying power. We do not have that same buying power. We generally buy locally: we buy in our local newspapers and on our local television stations. We do not have the advantage of size that the parties have, particularly the LNP at the moment. It is offensive in the extreme that the political parties think themselves so far above an ordinary candidate that they will double the amount per vote that a candidate should receive simply because they are a political party.

As the member for Gaven has said, it is greed and nothing else. It is not just greed; it is arrogance. It is greed and arrogance. It is the belief that the party system has supremacy, and the fact is that, as I said in my speech on the second reading debate, everybody in this chamber is of equal value. This says to the community that the parties have greater value, and that is substantially wrong. I commend the amendment to the House.

**Mr HOPPER:** As the Independent member for Gladstone just said, I find this probably the most arrogant and absurd thing I have ever seen introduced to this House. Why are they better than the member for Gladstone? Why is there such Liberal ignorance, such holiness, that they should get double the money at an election than an Independent or an unrecognised political party? I think this is just absolute absurdity, arrogance at its highest, and it is just a government which is running riot and roughshod over Queensland. They think that they can do anything they want and take from whomever they want, but the people of Queensland will ensure that they pay for this stupid, arrogant legislation.

Division: Question put—That the member for Gladstone's amendment No. 6 be agreed to.

**AYES, 7:**

**KAP, 3**—Hopper, Katter, Knuth.

**PUP, 2**—Douglas, Judge.

**INDEPENDENTS, 2**—Cunningham, Wellington.

**NOES, 63:**

**LNP, 57**—Bates, Bennett, Berry, Bleijie, Boothman, Costigan, Cox, Crandon, Cripps, Davies, T Davis, Dempsey, Dickson, Dillaway, Dowling, Emerson, Flegg, France, Frecklington, Grant, Grimwade, Gulley, Hart, Hathaway, Hobbs, Holswich, Kaye, King, Krause, Latter, Maddern, Malone, Mander, McVeigh, Menkens, Millard, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, Powell, Pucci, Rickuss, Robinson, Ruthenberg, Seeney, Shorten, Shuttleworth, Smith, Sorensen, Stevens, Stewart, Stuckey, Symes, Trout, Walker, Watts, Young.

**ALP, 6**—Byrne, D'Ath, Miller, Palaszczuk, Pitt, Trad.

Resolved in the negative.

Non-government amendment (Mrs Cunningham) negated.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I move the following amendment—

**9 Clause 38 (Replacement of s 225 (Advance payment of election funding))**

Page 25, line 28, 'be a'—

*omit, insert—*

to be

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 38, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 39 to 48, as read, agreed to.

Clause 49—

**Mrs CUNNINGHAM (8.49 pm):** I move the following amendments—

**7 Clause 49 (Insertion of new pt 11, div 5)**

Page 29, line 17, 'of political party'—

*omit.*

**8 Clause 49 (Insertion of new pt 11, div 5)**

Page 30, after line 7—

*insert—*

- (1A) Also, a candidate (an **eligible candidate**) is eligible for a policy development payment for a financial year if, on the day the entitlement to the policy development payment is decided, the candidate is an elected member.

**9 Clause 49 (Insertion of new pt 11, div 5)**

Page 30, lines 17 to 19, 'to which eligible registered political party is entitled'—

*omit.*

**10 Clause 49 (Insertion of new pt 11, div 5)**

Page 30, line 21, after 'party'—

*insert—*

or eligible candidate

**11 Clause 49 (Insertion of new pt 11, div 5)**

Page 30, lines 28 to 31, from 'each relevant' to '(the **last election**)'—

*omit, insert—*

the relevant candidate or candidates

**12 Clause 49 (Insertion of new pt 11, div 5)**

Page 31, lines 2 to 4, from 'all relevant' to 'general election'—

*omit, insert—*

the relevant candidate or candidates

**13 Clause 49 (Insertion of new pt 11, div 5)**

Page 31, lines 6 to 11—

*omit, insert—*

**relevant candidate or candidates** means—

- (a) for an eligible registered political party—each candidate endorsed by the political party in the last general election occurring in or before the financial year, if the candidate polled at least 10% of the total number of formal first preference votes for the candidate's electoral district in the last general election; or
- (b) for an eligible candidate—the candidate.

**14 Clause 49 (Insertion of new pt 11, div 5)**

Page 31, line 17, after 'parties'—

*insert—*

or candidates

**15 Clause 49 (Insertion of new pt 11, div 5)**

Page 31, lines 21, 25 and 28, after 'party'—

*insert—*

or candidate

**16 Clause 49 (Insertion of new pt 11, div 5)**

Page 32, lines 3, 6 and 11, after 'party'—

*insert—*

or candidate

**17 Clause 49 (Insertion of new pt 11, div 5)**

Page 32, line 30, after 'agent'—

*insert—*

or candidate

**18 Clause 49 (Insertion of new pt 11, div 5)**

Page 33, lines 8, 11 and 17, after 'party'—

*insert—*

or candidate

**Mrs CUNNINGHAM:** These amendments deal with the policy development fund. While I question the need for this fund and will probably vote against it in the motion whether to accept a policy development fund or not, the fact is that if there is going to be such an entity, then all should be able to access that funding if there is a genuine basis on which that funding is allocated.

At the moment it is unclear what the circumstances are in which an entity—and in this case, only the two major political parties—can actually access the fund. There have been allegations in the second reading debate that it was a slush fund. I have not heard too much contrary to that. If there is a genuine basis for this fund in terms of policy development and the cost of gaining information on which to base a policy, then everybody in this chamber should be able to access that fund within the constraints of properly constructed guidelines. That is the basis of my amendments.

Division: Question put—That the member for Gladstone's amendment Nos 7 to 18 be agreed to.

**AYES, 7:****KAP, 3**—Hopper, Katter, Knuth.**PUP, 2**—Douglas, Judge.**INDEPENDENTS, 2**—Cunningham, Wellington.**NOES, 64:**

**LNP, 58**—Bates, Bennett, Berry, Bleijie, Boothman, Costigan, Cox, Crandon, Cripps, Davies, T Davis, Dempsey, Dickson, Dillaway, Dowling, Emerson, Flegg, France, Frecklington, Grant, Grimwade, Gulley, Hart, Hathaway, Hobbs, Holswich, Johnson, Kaye, King, Krause, Latter, Maddern, Malone, Mander, McVeigh, Menkens, Millard, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, Powell, Pucci, Rickuss, Robinson, Ruthenberg, Seeney, Shorten, Shuttleworth, Smith, Sorensen, Stevens, Stewart, Stuckey, Symes, Trout, Walker, Watts, Young.

**ALP, 6**—Byrne, D'Ath, Miller, Palaszczuk, Pitt, Trad.

Resolved in the negative.

Non-government amendments (Mrs Cunningham) negated.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I move the following amendment—**10 Clause 49 (Insertion of new pt 11, div 5)**

Page 31, line 8, '10%'—

*omit, insert—*

6%

Amendment agreed to.

**Mrs CUNNINGHAM:** In speaking to this, as I said, I moved my amendments to ensure equity. However, in relation to the policy development payment, there is a lack of information about how this policy payment will be qualified for. There is no information about what work has to be proven before that payment can be made. It is only available to registered political parties that were registered on the polling day for the last general election. It is clearly slanted towards the existing major parties. That is not what our democracy is about. That is not what our community expects. Our community expects fairness. Our community expects transparency and it does not want to see money squandered to the political parties, especially not at this time when the major political parties are crying about the debt that this state is in. This policy development payment appears to me, in the absence of any other information to clarify it, as others have said, a slush fund and it is something on behalf of the people of Queensland I object to. I will not be supporting the clause.

**Mr WELLINGTON:** I join with the member for Gladstone and other members of the crossbenches in asking the Attorney-General to now very clearly set out what criteria has to be met before any money from this proposed policy development fund will be handed over to any political party whatsoever. Without any very clear guidelines and criteria, it can be seen as nothing else but a slush fund—nothing else but a slush fund, a handover of money without any criteria, without any checks and balances. I think that is disgraceful.

Division: Question put—That clause 49, as amended, stand part of the bill.

**AYES, 64:**

**LNP, 58**—Bates, Bennett, Berry, Bleijie, Boothman, Costigan, Cox, Crandon, Cripps, Davies, T Davis, Dempsey, Dickson, Dillaway, Dowling, Emerson, Flegg, France, Frecklington, Grant, Grimwade, Gulley, Hart, Hathaway, Hobbs, Holswich, Johnson, Kaye, King, Krause, Latter, Maddern, Malone, Mander, McVeigh, Menkens, Millard, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, Powell, Pucci, Rickuss, Robinson, Ruthenberg, Seeney, Shorten, Shuttleworth, Smith, Sorensen, Stevens, Stewart, Stuckey, Symes, Trout, Walker, Watts, Young.

**ALP, 6**—Byrne, D'Ath, Miller, Palaszczuk, Pitt, Trad.

**NOES, 7:**

**KAP, 3**—Hopper, Katter, Knuth.

**PUP, 2**—Douglas, Judge.

**INDEPENDENTS, 2**—Cunningham, Wellington.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clause 49, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 50 and 51, as read, agreed to.

Clause 52—

**Mr BLEIJIE** (9.00 pm): I move the following amendments—

**11 Clause 52 (Amendment of s 261 (Disclosure by candidates of political donations and gifts))**

Page 34, lines 29 and 30—

*omit, insert*—

equal to or less than the gift threshold amount

**12 Clause 52 (Amendment of s 261 (Disclosure by candidates of political donations and gifts))**

Page 35, lines 2 and 3—

*omit, insert*—

is more than the gift threshold amount

Division: Question put—That the Attorney's amendments 11 and 12 be agreed to.

**AYES, 58:**

**LNP, 58**—Bates, Bennett, Berry, Bleijie, Boothman, Costigan, Cox, Crandon, Cripps, Davies, T Davis, Dempsey, Dickson, Dillaway, Dowling, Emerson, Flegg, France, Frecklington, Grant, Grimwade, Gulley, Hart, Hathaway, Hobbs, Holswich, Johnson, Kaye, King, Krause, Latter, Maddern, Malone, Mander, McVeigh, Menkens, Millard, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, Powell, Pucci, Rickuss, Robinson, Ruthenberg, Seeney, Shorten, Shuttleworth, Smith, Sorensen, Stevens, Stewart, Stuckey, Symes, Trout, Walker, Watts, Young.

**NOES, 13:**

**ALP, 6**—Byrne, D'Ath, Miller, Palaszczuk, Pitt, Trad.

**KAP, 3**—Hopper, Katter, Knuth.

**PUP, 2**—Douglas, Judge.

**INDEPENDENTS, 2**—Cunningham, Wellington.

Resolved in the affirmative.

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** Once again, we go to the heart of this legislation, which is to increase the caps on political donations from \$1,000 to \$12,400. This is about hiding donations from the public. This is about secret business. This is about not being upfront, not being transparent, not being accountable. The Premier said that he would have a new, open and transparent government. Tonight, he has squashed that forever, because the new mantra is, 'Yes, can do mate. Just donate.' The cap is increased from \$1,000 up to \$12,400.

This week in this House we have had the revelations from this incompetent, bungling Attorney-General, who signed off on a government tender saying, 'Never heard of that before in my life,' which was contrary to his departmental advice. Then six days later a donation was made: \$5,500

from Beyond Billabong to the LNP. Under this new system, Queenslanders would be none the wiser. Under this new system, only five per cent of donations will be in the public eye. This is a retrograde step. This is a backward step.

The government's own member does not support this move. This afternoon, the member for Stafford stood in this House and said that he does not support increasing the caps. That is what their own member of the government said. He cannot possibly support these moves. Every LNP member should hang their head in shame, because now we are going back into being the secret state. We are going back to the Joh Bjelke-Petersen days. The members opposite talk about leadership. There is no leadership from this Premier of this state at all. There is no leadership whatsoever. The increase from \$1,000 to \$12,400—

**Government members** interjected.

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** Mate, we are coming after you. If the members opposite think that the public cannot see what they are doing, they have another think coming.

**Government members** interjected.

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** Come on! Listen to the facts. They do not want to talk about the facts. They just want to cover up. We are going to see secret business in this state.

*(Time expired)*

**Mrs CUNNINGHAM:** The change from \$1,000 to \$12,400 is a substantial change. Although the Attorney-General has argued that it is for consistency with the Commonwealth legislation, that argument has not been held consistently across this legislation. So an argument of consistency is inadequate when it is not applied consistently.

I believe that the people of Queensland will find it very difficult to accept that such a great change is done without unacceptable motives, that it is done without the opportunity for transparency. The cap of \$1,000 made for a lot of extra paperwork, particularly for the Independents. We have to do the paperwork for every donation. We do not have a party structure to do it for us. It certainly did make for additional paperwork. A modest increase in the cap may have been more acceptable, but an increase from \$1,000 to \$12,400 does nothing but put questions in the minds of the people of Queensland that there is something that is unpalatable and unacceptable in the motivation for this change.

**Mr WELLINGTON:** I would also like to join the debate and say that I have listened to the Attorney-General's argument to support this proposal. I believe that his argument of consistency just shows how inconsistent that argument is. We regularly see in the media and we hear about the Attorney-General lodging appeals in relation to court decisions. Here, we are seeing the Attorney-General saying, 'Oh, but I can't because I've got some legal advice saying we may be wrong.' He is worried about maybe being wrong. The Attorney-General knows, as we all know, that there are experts in all fields in all endeavours. We will always find an equally qualified expert to take a position different from another equally qualified expert. Who is to say that the advice that the Attorney-General is relying on will be the winning advice if it goes to court?

I say that, if the Attorney-General wants to be consistent with his other stances in relation to going off to the High Court, appealing to the Court of Appeal, or whatever, why does he not test it in the court? Why does he not leave the cap at \$1,000 and wait until someone challenges it? All we are asking him to do is to do the right thing.

**Mr HOPPER:** As we mentioned before, \$1,000 to \$12,400 is a significant increase. As the member for South Brisbane mentioned in her speech, 10 people could visit the Deputy Premier with \$10,000 each. That amounts to a gift of \$100,000 that the Deputy Premier does not have to register. How corrupt is that? This is terrible legislation. We are going to see the return of the days of the brown paper bags.

We will see the days of the brown paper bag introduced back into Queensland. In about three or four years time Mr Fitzgerald will be too old to conduct an inquiry so we will need someone else to run it. I suggest we bring Mike Horan back. He would do a good job. He would hate this legislation tonight. We would have to bring Mike back to conduct the inquiry into all the brown paper bags. Whatever we do, at the next election please bring the leadership team to my electorate.

**Ms D'ATH:** This particular amendment is the height of hypocrisy and shows the arrogance of this government. I remind the Attorney-General of his comments in the introductory speech that this bill will again rely on disclosure and reporting to promote transparency and accountability. Where is

the evidence that lifting the threshold would in any way create further transparency and accountability? Where is the evidence from the submissions to the committee that shows that anyone actually supports this and thinks that lifting it from \$1,000 to \$12,400 creates greater transparency?

The Attorney-General wants to talk about consistency but it seems to be select consistency, as we have heard from other speakers tonight. He is happy to be consistent on this particular threshold, but not be consistent about the four per cent for public funding or not be consistent in relation to voter identification. It is about time this Attorney-General started listening to some of the stakeholders and individuals out there who have views on this, stakeholders like Ben Marshall, who says that increasing the disclosure threshold would produce greater secrecy concerning political donations at a time when many are calling for greater transparency in the political process; or the Bar Association, which says—

... such limits be effective in preventing individuals and entities from obtaining or exerting undue influence on political decision making through the exercise of financial influence.

Or Dr Paul Williams' comment that a higher threshold will only make it harder to detect who is donating what to whom.

**Mr Ruthenberg:** Exactly. Let's talk about Labor campaigns.

**Ms D'ATH:** We are happy to talk about Labor campaigns because Labor is not afraid to declare its donations. It should not matter who the donation is coming from, it should be declared. It is more important to maintain transparency and accountability. That should far outweigh any individual's interests and whether they want their donation to be disclosed or not. Transparency and accountability should be paramount when it comes to our electoral laws.

**Ms TRAD:** I also rise to make a contribution in terms of this clause. I have again perused the legal advice that the Attorney-General tabled during his explanatory speech in this House in relation to the consistency of the donation disclosure laws between the state and the federal electoral acts. The advice that the Attorney-General was seeking and was given by the Crown Solicitor was—

You have requested advice about the constitutional validity of particular proposed amendments to the Electoral Act 1992 (Qld) (the 'Queensland Act') which would require candidates, registered political parties and associated entities to make monthly returns in relation to certain gifts. I am briefed with a draft Electoral Reform Amendment Bill 2013 (v01, 14 November 2013, 5:01pm) which includes but is not limited to the particular amendments the subject of your request for advice.

Then it goes on to say in the section dealing with the donation disclosure laws—

It is true to say that the general principles of inconsistency under s 109 are relatively settled, but it can be difficult to predict with confidence how a Court will apply them to particular legislation in a particular scenario. Subject to that proviso, for the following reasons, I have concluded that there is a direct inconsistency between the continuous disclosure provisions of the Queensland Act as amended by the draft Bill and the Commonwealth Act.

Light bulb moment! There is inconsistency between the two acts. This inconsistency has been there for over a decade. Have there been any legal problems to date? No, there have not been. This issue around consistency over this particular provision, which is the increase of the threshold around disclosure, is the only issue around consistency that this government is driving, as the member for Redcliffe has already said.

What this provision seeks to do, which the Leader of the Opposition has outlined, is convert donations which should be public, which should be declared, which every Queenslanders should know about, into secret donations. As the Leader of the Opposition said, it is a can-do government—yes, we can do, mate, as long as you donate. That is what it is all about. My question to the Attorney-General is: once this law is passed, once this clause goes through, what is stopping anyone in Queensland walking into the member for Ashgrove's electorate office and handing over \$10,000 without anybody being any the wiser? What will stop any developer, any proponent, Nathan Tinkler, from walking into the Premier's electorate office and handing over \$12,000? Nothing!

**Mr KNUTH:** For the last five minutes I have been condemned and criticised by some of the squawking parrots to the left of me. They are telling me why I should support this amendment. They have been criticising me as a fool for not supporting this amendment increasing the threshold. I am here to represent my electorate. I would have to report back to them and explain to them why I supported the LNP in increasing the threshold from \$1,000. I say to many of the backbenchers who are here that if I support this it would be suicide in my electorate trying to explain to them the benefits of increasing it from \$1,000 to \$12,400, especially since there have been many reports of deals with mining companies—very shonky deals. While the Attorney-General is here, I ask him to please explain the benefits to my electorate of Dalrymple and why I should support the increase from \$1,000 to \$12,400.

**Mr PITT:** I cannot let this opportunity go by without adding my thoughts to this consistency discussion, which has been so prevalent in the last few minutes. This Attorney-General is the most inconsistent person in this place when it comes to consistency. We know that he keeps talking about harmonisation with federal legislation. He uses that as a crutch or an excuse, so that he can get away with whatever he likes. We know he has done this with workplace reform. We know he has done it with workplace health and safety. We know that he pretends it is consistency, but there is none there. We know where he is consistent: he continually finds ways to do damage in his own party in the process of trying to do the bidding of this Premier. It is disgusting to see that, in this particular provision, the cap will increase from \$1,000 to \$12,400 and we know that we would be none the wiser, as we have heard, because of the way that the government is going to do this. When the government says that it is open for business, we know what that really means. It means that the doors are open—

**Ms Trad:** Cha-ching.

**Mr PITT:**—cha-ching—there is the cash register. Can-do mates donate. In this state, the LNP is becoming a shadow of what Queenslanders expected they were voting for. They are turning the state back to the moonlight state. Sadly, they are proud of it. They are proud of what they have put before this House. They say that this is going to improve things, that there will be more consistency. Again I say that this Attorney-General has been consistent on one thing and that is shooting himself in the foot. We know that this legislation is adding weight to the body of evidence that says the Attorney-General must go.

Division: Question put—That clause 52, as amended, stand part of the bill.

**AYES, 61:**

**LNP, 61**—Bates, Bennett, Berry, Bleijie, Boothman, Costigan, Cox, Crandon, Cripps, Davies, T Davis, Dempsey, Dickson, Dillaway, Dowling, Emerson, Flegg, France, Frecklington, Grant, Grimwade, Gulley, Hart, Hathaway, Hobbs, Holswich, Johnson, Kaye, King, Krause, Latter, Maddern, Malone, Mander, McArdle, McVeigh, Menkens, Millard, Minnikin, Molhoek, Newman, Nicholls, Ostapovitch, Powell, Pucci, Rickuss, Robinson, Ruthenberg, Seeney, Shorten, Shuttleworth, Smith, Sorensen, Stevens, Stewart, Stuckey, Symes, Trout, Walker, Watts, Young.

**NOES, 13:**

**ALP, 6**—Byrne, D'Ath, Miller, Palaszczuk, Pitt, Trad.

**KAP, 3**—Hopper, Katter, Knuth.

**PUP, 2**—Douglas, Judge.

**INDEPENDENTS, 2**—Cunningham, Wellington.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clause 52, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 53—

**Mr BLEIJIE** (9.24 pm): I move the following amendment—

**13 Clause 53 (Amendment of s 262 (Loans to candidates))**

Page 35, lines 15 and 16—

*omit, insert—*

more than the gift threshold amount

Amendment agreed to.

Division: Question put—That clause 53, as amended, stand part of the bill.

**AYES, 61:**

**LNP, 61**—Bates, Bennett, Berry, Bleijie, Boothman, Costigan, Cox, Crandon, Cripps, Davies, T Davis, Dempsey, Dickson, Dillaway, Dowling, Emerson, Flegg, France, Frecklington, Grant, Grimwade, Gulley, Hart, Hathaway, Hobbs, Holswich, Johnson, Kaye, King, Krause, Latter, Maddern, Malone, Mander, McArdle, McVeigh, Menkens, Millard, Minnikin, Molhoek, Newman, Nicholls, Ostapovitch, Powell, Pucci, Rickuss, Robinson, Ruthenberg, Seeney, Shorten, Shuttleworth, Smith, Sorensen, Stevens, Stewart, Stuckey, Symes, Trout, Walker, Watts, Young.

**NOES, 13:**

**ALP, 6**—Byrne, D'Ath, Miller, Palaszczuk, Pitt, Trad.

**KAP, 3**—Hopper, Katter, Knuth.

**PUP, 2**—Douglas, Judge.

**INDEPENDENTS, 2**—Cunningham, Wellington.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clause 53, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 54—

**Mr BLEIJIE** (9.28 pm): I move the following amendments—

- 14 Clause 54 (Amendment of s 263 (Disclosure of gifts by third parties that receive political donations or incur expenditure for political purposes))**

Page 36, lines 5 and 6—

*omit, insert—*

more than the gift threshold amount

- 15 Clause 54 (Amendment of s 263 (Disclosure of gifts by third parties that receive political donations or incur expenditure for political purposes))**

Page 36, lines 9 and 10—

*omit, insert—*

equal to or less than the gift threshold amount

Amendments agreed to.

Division: Question put—That clause 54, as amended, stand part of the bill.

**AYES, 61:**

**LNP, 61**—Bates, Bennett, Berry, Bleijie, Boothman, Costigan, Cox, Crandon, Cripps, Davies, T Davis, Dempsey, Dickson, Dillaway, Dowling, Emerson, Flegg, France, Frecklington, Grant, Grimwade, Gulley, Hart, Hathaway, Hobbs, Holswich, Johnson, Kaye, King, Krause, Langbroek, Latter, Maddern, Malone, Mander, McArdle, McVeigh, Menkens, Millard, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, Ostapovitch, Powell, Pucci, Rickuss, Robinson, Ruthenberg, Seeney, Shorten, Shuttleworth, Smith, Sorensen, Stevens, Stewart, Stuckey, Symes, Trout, Walker, Watts, Young.

**NOES, 13:**

**ALP, 6**—Byrne, D'Ath, Miller, Palaszczuk, Pitt, Trad.

**KAP, 3**—Hopper, Katter, Knuth.

**PUP, 2**—Douglas, Judge.

**INDEPENDENTS, 2**—Cunningham, Wellington.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clause 54, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 55—

**Mr BLEIJIE** (9.32 pm): I move the following amendment—

- 16 Clause 55 (Amendment of s 264 (Donations to candidates etc.))**

Page 36, lines 27 and 28—

*omit, insert—*

equal to or less than the gift threshold amount

Amendment agreed to.

Division: Question put—That clause 55, as amended, be agreed to.

**AYES, 61:**

**LNP, 61**—Bates, Bennett, Berry, Bleijie, Boothman, Costigan, Cox, Crandon, Cripps, Davies, T Davis, Dempsey, Dickson, Dillaway, Dowling, Emerson, Flegg, France, Frecklington, Grant, Grimwade, Gulley, Hart, Hathaway, Hobbs, Holswich, Johnson, Kaye, King, Krause, Langbroek, Latter, Maddern, Malone, Mander, McArdle, McVeigh, Menkens, Millard, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, Ostapovitch, Powell, Pucci, Rickuss, Robinson, Ruthenberg, Seeney, Shorten, Shuttleworth, Smith, Sorensen, Stevens, Stewart, Stuckey, Symes, Trout, Walker, Watts, Young.

**NOES, 13:**

**ALP, 6**—Byrne, D'Ath, Miller, Palaszczuk, Pitt, Trad.

**KAP, 3**—Hopper, Katter, Knuth.

**PUP, 2**—Douglas, Judge.

**INDEPENDENTS, 2**—Cunningham, Wellington.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clause 55, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 56—

**Mr BLEIJIE** (9.35 pm): I move the following amendments—

**17 Clause 56 (Replacement of ss 265 and 266)**

Page 37, lines 15 and 16—

*omit, insert—*

the gift threshold amount to the same

**18 Clause 56 (Replacement of ss 265 and 266)**

Page 38, lines 23 and 24—

*omit, insert—*

of more than the gift threshold amount

Amendments agreed to.

Division: Question put—That clause 56, as amended, be agreed to.

**AYES, 61:**

**LNP, 61**—Bates, Bennett, Berry, Bleijie, Boothman, Costigan, Cox, Crandon, Cripps, Davies, T Davis, Dempsey, Dickson, Dillaway, Dowling, Emerson, Flegg, France, Frecklington, Grant, Grimwade, Gulley, Hart, Hathaway, Hobbs, Holswich, Johnson, Kaye, King, Krause, Langbroek, Latter, Maddern, Malone, Mander, McArdle, McVeigh, Menkens, Millard, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, Ostapovitch, Powell, Pucci, Rickuss, Robinson, Ruthenberg, Seeney, Shorten, Shuttleworth, Smith, Sorensen, Stevens, Stewart, Stuckey, Symes, Trout, Walker, Watts, Young.

**NOES, 13:**

**ALP, 6**—Byrne, D'Ath, Miller, Palaszczuk, Pitt, Trad.

**KAP, 3**—Hopper, Katter, Knuth.

**PUP, 2**—Douglas, Judge.

**INDEPENDENTS, 2**—Cunningham, Wellington.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clause 56, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 57—

**Mr BLEIJIE** (9.38 pm): I move the following amendment—

**19 Clause 57 (Amendment of s 271 (Particular gifts not to be received))**

Page 39, lines 25 and 26—

*omit, insert—*

more than the gift threshold amount

Amendment agreed to.

Division: Question put—That clause 57, as amended, be agreed to.

**AYES, 61:**

**LNP, 61**—Bates, Bennett, Berry, Bleijie, Boothman, Costigan, Cox, Crandon, Cripps, Davies, T Davis, Dempsey, Dickson, Dillaway, Dowling, Emerson, Flegg, France, Frecklington, Grant, Grimwade, Gulley, Hart, Hathaway, Hobbs, Holswich, Johnson, Kaye, King, Krause, Langbroek, Latter, Maddern, Malone, Mander, McArdle, McVeigh, Menkens, Millard, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, Ostapovitch, Powell, Pucci, Rickuss, Robinson, Ruthenberg, Seeney, Shorten, Shuttleworth, Smith, Sorensen, Stevens, Stewart, Stuckey, Symes, Trout, Walker, Watts, Young.

**NOES, 13:**

**ALP, 6**—Byrne, D'Ath, Miller, Palaszczuk, Pitt, Trad.

**KAP, 3**—Hopper, Katter, Knuth.

**PUP, 2**—Douglas, Judge.

**INDEPENDENTS, 2**—Cunningham, Wellington.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clause 57, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 58—

**Mr BLEIJIE** (9.40 pm): I move the following amendment—

**20 Clause 58 (Amendment of s 272 (Particular loans not to be received))**

Page 40, lines 8 to 11—

*omit, insert—*

(1) Section 272(1) and (2), '\$1000 or more'—

*omit, insert—*

more than the gift threshold amount

Amendment agreed to.

Division: Question put—That clause 58, as amended, be agreed to.

**AYES, 61:**

**LNP, 61**—Bates, Bennett, Berry, Bleijie, Boothman, Costigan, Cox, Crandon, Cripps, Davies, T Davis, Dempsey, Dickson, Dillaway, Dowling, Emerson, Flegg, France, Frecklington, Grant, Grimwade, Gulley, Hart, Hathaway, Hobbs, Holswich, Johnson, Kaye, King, Krause, Langbroek, Latter, Maddern, Malone, Mander, McArdle, McVeigh, Menkens, Millard, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, Ostapovitch, Powell, Pucci, Rickuss, Robinson, Ruthenberg, Seeney, Shorten, Shuttleworth, Smith, Sorensen, Stevens, Stewart, Stuckey, Symes, Trout, Walker, Watts, Young.

**NOES, 13:**

**ALP, 6**—Byrne, D'Ath, Miller, Palaszczuk, Pitt, Trad.

**KAP, 3**—Hopper, Katter, Knuth.

**PUP, 2**—Douglas, Judge.

**INDEPENDENTS, 2**—Cunningham, Wellington.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clause 58, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 59—

**Ms PALASZCZUK** (9.43 pm): This clause is about the removal of the electoral expenditure caps. This is simply about the LNP lifting the caps on the electorates and essentially that means they can spend however much they want on each electorate. We already know the LNP has amassed a massive war chest. We know now that once this bill is passed donations can be secretly made to the LNP up to \$12,400 a hit. This is about getting ready to outspend the ALP at the next state election.

Let me make this promise to Queenslanders tonight: we will remind them each and every day of the broken promises of the LNP. We will remind Queensland families each and every day about the increase to their electricity bills when this government promised to lower them. We will remind the people of Queensland each and every day about the LNP government federally who wants to now charge Queensland families \$7 to visit their GP—a GP tax. This is what the LNP want to do. They want to attack families. They do not want to listen to people. They are arrogant. They are out of touch. We will campaign right throughout this state. We will run grassroots campaigns. We will do whatever it takes to make sure that the incompetence of this government is highlighted to the community.

In closing let me say that when this legislation is passed tonight it is a shameful day for Queensland. It is a shameful day for democracy in Queensland. It is a shameful retrograde step, taking Queensland backwards to a place I never thought we would revisit. But this LNP have done it single-handedly, single-handedly by attacking the fair and transparent electoral laws—which the *Courier-Mail* supported, which Queenslanders supported. Lifting the caps this time is completely unfair, as are the attacks they have made on the CMC. This double assault on these two pieces of legislation typifies this government. It typifies the arrogance of the massive majority of the government that will seek to do anything to stay in power. They will seek to do anything to stay in power.

We will remind Queenslanders each and every day until the next election that this is a government that does not care. This is a government that is prepared to accept donations—secret donations—and they will do this now hidden away from the public and hidden away from—

*(Time expired)*

**Ms TRAD:** It has long been argued by those who are experts in the field—Professor Orr in his submission made this argument, as have others of international reputation—that, in the absence of donation limits, in the absence of election expenditure caps, in the absence of any sort of boundaries or regulations around donations and expenditure and financing of election campaigns, what will happen is you put democracy up for sale. That is what happens. That is what happens in the absence—

**Government members** interjected.

**Ms TRAD:** I know, Madam Deputy Speaker, that they actually do not like to hear it. They do not like the mirror being held up. But they have to listen to this. In the absence of regulations around expenditure, in the absence of regulations around donations and the disclosure of donations and financing of election campaigns, you put democracy up for sale—which is okay for this can-do government because we know that this is a ‘can-do, mate, as long as you donate’ government.

There are other countries throughout the Western world that do have thresholds, that do have caps, that have better regulations around campaign financing—and this is the way that Queensland should stay. This is where we should be. We should give Queenslanders the confidence that they expect in this democracy, in our democracy, that their vote is as much of a political value as the big donor who might donate \$10,000 to the LNP, that their political value is just the same come election day as the developer who donates or the big end of town that donates to the LNP. Let me just finish on this. It is really clear that what is happening here is a complete and utter erosion of every integrity measure within the Queensland Electoral Act.

**Government members** interjected.

**Ms TRAD:** I know they do not like to hear it, but what the Newman LNP government has done tonight through this provision has put Queensland democracy up for sale.

Division: Question put—That clause 59, as read, be agreed to.

**AYES, 61:**

**LNP, 61**—Bates, Bennett, Berry, Bleijie, Boothman, Costigan, Cox, Crandon, Cripps, Davies, T Davis, Dempsey, Dickson, Dillaway, Dowling, Emerson, Flegg, France, Frecklington, Grant, Grimwade, Gulley, Hart, Hathaway, Hobbs, Holswich, Johnson, Kaye, King, Krause, Langbroek, Latter, Maddern, Malone, Mander, McArdle, McVeigh, Menkens, Millard, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, Ostapovitch, Powell, Pucci, Rickuss, Robinson, Ruthenberg, Seenev, Shorten, Shuttleworth, Smith, Sorensen, Stevens, Stewart, Stuckey, Symes, Trout, Walker, Watts, Young.

**NOES, 13:**

**ALP, 6**—Byrne, D’Ath, Miller, Palaszczuk, Pitt, Trad.

**KAP, 3**—Hopper, Katter, Knuth.

**PUP, 2**—Douglas, Judge.

**INDEPENDENTS, 2**—Cunningham, Wellington.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clause 59, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 60 to 78—

**Mr BLEIJIE** (9.52 pm): I seek leave to move the following amendments en bloc.

Leave granted.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I move the following amendments—

**21 Clause 65 (Amendment of s 290 (Returns for reporting periods by registered political parties))**

Page 42, lines 22 and 28 to 29, ‘registered officer’—

*omit, insert—*

agent

**22 Clause 66 (Amendment of s 291 (Amounts received))**

Page 43, lines 6 and 7—

*omit, insert—*

more than the gift threshold amount, the

**23 Clause 66 (Amendment of s 291 (Amounts received))**

Page 43, lines 9 to 12—

*omit, insert—*

(2) Section 291(2), ‘of less than \$1000’—

*omit, insert—*

equal to or less than the gift threshold amount

**24 Clause 68 (Replacement of s 293 (Outstanding amounts))**

Page 43, line 30 and page 44, line 1—

*omit, insert—*

than the gift threshold amount, the return must include

**25 After clause 78**

Page 48, after line 27—

insert—

**422 Application of Act in relation to Redcliffe by-election**

- (1) This section applies in relation to the by-election held on 22 February 2014 for the electoral district of Redcliffe (the *Redcliffe by-election*).
- (2) This Act as in force immediately before the assent day applies to—
  - (a) the Redcliffe by-election; and
  - (b) a person in relation to the Redcliffe by-election;
 

even though amendments of this Act by the *Electoral Reform Amendment Act 2013* are taken to have commenced on the relevant commencement.
- (3) This section applies subject to sections 419 to 421.

**Mrs CUNNINGHAM:** I wish to speak to clause 78. I am certainly going to vote against clause 78 for one reason: it talks about transitional provisions for the Electoral Reform Amendment Act 2013—

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Gladstone, we are currently discussing amendments Nos 21 to 25, not a specific clause.

**Mrs CUNNINGHAM:** But amendment 25 is to clause 78.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Are you speaking to the amendment?

**Mrs CUNNINGHAM:** No, I am speaking to the clause.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER:** We need to put the amendments before you can speak to the clause. The question is that the amendments be agreed to.

Amendments agreed to.

**Mrs CUNNINGHAM:** I rise to speak to clause 78. Proposed section 421 talks about a policy development payment for the financial year ending on 30 June 2013. So before the policy development fund even existed, this legislation allows the Labor Party—because they will vote for it—and the LNP to get a policy development payment. So before the policy development fund even existed, they are getting a policy payment on the basis of this amendment in clause 78. The bill states—

- (1) The commission must pay a policy development payment instalment under part 11, division 5 to each eligible registered political party for the financial year ending on 30 June 2013 (the *2013 financial year*).
- (2) The amount of the instalment must be worked out under that division for the 2013 financial year as if—
  - (a) part 11, division 5 were in effect on and from 1 July 2012 ...

So tonight on 22 May 2014 we are enacting legislation to establish a slush fund for the major parties and they are going to pay themselves as if it existed in 2013. That is abhorrent and I oppose it.

Division: Question put—That clauses 60 to 78, as amended, be agreed to.

**AYES, 66:**

**LNP, 60—**Bates, Bennett, Berry, Bleijie, Boothman, Costigan, Cox, Crandon, Cripps, Davies, T Davis, Dempsey, Dickson, Dillaway, Dowling, Emerson, Flegg, France, Frecklington, Grant, Grimwade, Gulley, Hart, Hathaway, Hobbs, Holswich, Johnson, Kaye, King, Krause, Langbroek, Latter, Maddern, Malone, Mander, McArdle, McVeigh, Menkens, Millard, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, Ostapovitch, Powell, Pucci, Rickuss, Robinson, Ruthenberg, Seeney, Shorten, Shuttleworth, Smith, Sorensen, Stewart, Stuckey, Symes, Trout, Walker, Watts, Young.

**ALP, 6—**Byrne, D'Ath, Miller, Palaszczuk, Pitt, Trad.

**NOES, 7:**

**KAP, 3—**Hopper, Katter, Knuth.

**PUP, 2—**Douglas, Judge.

**INDEPENDENTS, 2—**Cunningham, Wellington.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clauses 60 to 78, as amended, agreed to.

### Third Reading

**Hon. JP BLEIJIE** (Kawana—LNP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice) (9.58 pm): I move—

That the bill, as amended, be now read a third time.

Division: Question put—That the bill, as amended, be now read a third time.

**AYES, 60:**

**LNP, 60**—Bates, Bennett, Berry, Bleijie, Boothman, Costigan, Cox, Crandon, Cripps, Davies, T Davis, Dempsey, Dickson, Dillaway, Dowling, Emerson, Flegg, France, Frecklington, Grant, Grimwade, Gulley, Hart, Hathaway, Hobbs, Holswich, Johnson, Kaye, King, Krause, Langbroek, Latter, Maddern, Malone, Mander, McArdle, McVeigh, Menkens, Millard, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, Ostapovitch, Powell, Pucci, Rickuss, Robinson, Ruthenberg, Seeney, Shorten, Shuttleworth, Smith, Sorensen, Stewart, Stuckey, Symes, Trout, Walker, Watts, Young.

**NOES, 13:**

**ALP, 6**—Byrne, D'Ath, Miller, Palaszcuk, Pitt, Trad.

**KAP, 3**—Hopper, Katter, Knuth.

**PUP, 2**—Douglas, Judge.

**INDEPENDENTS, 2**—Cunningham, Wellington.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Bill read a third time.

### Long Title

**Hon. JP BLEIJIE** (Kawana—LNP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice) (10.01 pm): I move—

That the long title of the bill be agreed to.


Question put—That the long title of the bill be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

## ENVIRONMENTAL OFFSETS BILL

Resumed from 13 February (see p. 237).

### Second Reading

 **Hon. AC POWELL** (Glass House—LNP) (Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection) (10.01 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a second time.

I am very pleased to rise to speak to the Environmental Offsets Bill 2014 this evening. It was introduced into the House on 13 February this year. To stand here this evening in front of my colleagues and peers and to see the culmination of two years of concerted policy work and consultation come to fruition certainly makes for a great evening. This bill is an important step towards practical environmentalism in Queensland. It establishes a simplified and integrated environmental offsets framework and provides a strategic approach to the protection of Queensland's environment. It is both good for the environment and good for business in this state.

By establishing a new offset framework, we are replacing five existing offset policies that were weighed down with piecemeal, costly and inconsistent requirements. Let me be clear: we have gone from five to one. This is a classic example of how Labor ran environmental regulation. It was all about quantity and never about quality. They measured environmental matters in pages, not in outcomes.

The bill supports the Newman government's commitment to growing a four-pillar economy because it provides a single point of truth for proponents and a legislative one at that. It will end uncertainty and deliver a simpler, more timely and affordable solution for offsets under an integrated regulatory framework. Because of this bill, Queenslanders will have one single offset policy and a process that will restore industry confidence in our great state. This legislation is part of the Newman government's strong plan for a brighter future.

An environmental offset counterbalances unavoidable, negative impacts on a prescribed matter only—and I stress only—after all options to avoid and/or mitigate the impact of a development or activity have been exhausted. Since they were introduced in the early 1980s, a growing number of specific issue offset policies had been developed. For example, offsets can be required under a number of Queensland laws for impacts on matters of national, state or local environmental significance. Offsets may also be required by local governments under their planning schemes and the Commonwealth government under its own policy. This complexity can compromise the viability of developments as well as result in unsatisfactory and fragmented environmental outcomes.

However, this is a new era. The Environmental Offsets Bill establishes the foundation for standardising these inconsistent offset arrangements, the first time offsets have had their own stand-alone piece of legislation. The bill sets out what an offset is and how it will be provided. It complements the assessment provisions in existing legislation that govern if and when an offset is required as a condition of approval. I would like to emphasise again that the new framework does not change the long-established hierarchy of avoid, mitigate and offset. The development assessment framework still requires impacts on matters of environmental significance to first be avoided and reduced before offsets are even considered. However, the bill does reflect the government's commitment to reduce green tape. In particular, the bill removes the double dipping of offsets within and across jurisdictions that was a possibility under the existing offset policies. The bill not only removes unnecessary green tape but also provides flexibility in the provision of offsets, enabling proponents to provide their own offsets, a financial settlement offset or a culmination of the two. Financial settlement allows proponents to get on with their business while leaving the provision of offsets in the capable hands of expert offset providers.

This bill does not compromise the environment. In fact, the opposite is true. It provides a basis for ensuring more strategic landscape scale benefits will be delivered for matters of environmental significance including in the marine environment. Unlike under the existing policies where ad hoc offsets can be scattered across the landscape, the new framework encourages offsets to be located in strategic areas where they have the best opportunity to thrive. Additionally, offsets provision will be focused on managing threats to significant environmental matters to improve their long-term viability in the landscape.

The offsets bill also contains amendments to the National Trust of Queensland Act 1963 and the Currumbin Bird Sanctuary Act 1976. These amendments, which have been actively pursued by the National Trust for many years, will facilitate governance reform to enable the National Trust to become a company. Specifically, the amendments will enable the National Trust to meet the requirements for registration under the Commonwealth's Corporations Act as a company limited by guarantee. On being registered as a company, the National Trust of Queensland will relinquish its statutory status, becoming independent of government. A single company will be created, the National Trust of Australia (Queensland) Ltd, which will encompass the Currumbin Wildlife Sanctuary. As a charitable company, the National Trust will continue its important and admirable work in caring for and preserving Queensland's natural and built heritage. Subsequent to the creation of the National Trust Company, the National Trust Act and the Currumbin Bird Sanctuary Act will be repealed.

I would like to thank the Agriculture, Resources and Environment Committee under the leadership of the member for Lockyer for its constructive comments and recommendations on the bill. I note from the outset that it has recommended that the bill be passed. I thank the committee and the member for Lockyer for the recommendation. For the benefit of the House I now table the government's response to the committee report.

*Tabled paper:* Agriculture, Resources and Environment Committee: Report No. 40—Environmental Offsets Bill 2014, government response [\[5193\]](#).

The committee tabled its report on 14 May 2014, putting forward 16 recommendations and three requests for clarification. I will now respond to the committee's report. I am pleased to advise that more than half of the recommendations have been adopted and will be actioned. These recommendations will contribute to delivering an environmental offset framework that provides the best opportunities for both conservation outcomes and business. However, a number of recommendations have not been supported. Those recommendations that were not supported were only done so after very careful and considered analysis. Many of the recommendations were requests for clarification of terms and meanings or recommendations to amend wording for consistency, and detailed responses are included in the formal response to the committee. Let me now provide more detail about the recommendations that were not supported.

In recommendation 8 the committee recommends that the bill be amended to include an overview of the prescribed activities, prescribed environmental matters and matters of environmental significance as an additional schedule. Extensive consideration was given to this issue prior to the bill being tabled in the House and certainly subsequent to the committee providing its report.

Placement of these items in regulations is considered to be the best fit, as it allows for more timely updates; that is, the regulation is the necessary vehicle to define the range of activities for time to reflect any changes in legislation relating to—

**Mr Rickuss:** More easily modified.

**Mr POWELL:** More easily modified, that's right, member for Lockyer. To reflect any changes in legislation relating to the introduction or reclassification of permitted activities. Additionally, there will be no loss of scrutiny, as those updates of the regulation will still be subject to review and approval by Executive Council.

Recommendation No. 11 will be supported in part. The committee recommended an amendment to include statutory time frames for both the submission of the proponent's notice of election and the administering agency's consideration of a notice of election. The appropriate section will be amended to include a requirement that the administering agency—that is, the responsible government department—takes an action within 40 business days of receiving a properly completed notice. However, the time taken to develop a notice of election will vary significantly from offset to offset; therefore, statutory time frames for a proponent's notices could not be applied. Some larger proponent-driven offsets, for instance, may require significant research, on-ground analysis, landholder negotiation and project design. Even without statutory time lines, proponents have an incentive to submit their plans in a timely manner, as works causing impacts to the matters in question cannot occur until offset arrangements have been approved.

The committee has recommended under recommendation No. 14 that a clause be included to define strategic investment corridors and direct benefit management plans as examples of the delivery of offsets. The committee has rightly identified that strategic investment corridors and direct benefit management plans are likely to be important to the gains achieved through offsets; however, these are only some of the implementation tools used to assist in the provision of an offset. These arrangements are important. However, they also comprise intricate details not suited to the succinct nature and primary function of a bill or regulation.

Furthermore, the statutory policy adequately provides for the establishment of both products. The bill establishes a head of power under primary legislation for the delivery of environmental offsets which may be provided in a number of innovative and effective ways to achieve a conservation outcome. The Queensland Environmental Offset Policy made under the bill is a statutory instrument in accordance with the Statutory Instruments Act 1992 and provides the legislative rigour and necessary details for providing an environmental offset via a direct benefit management plan.

In relation to strategic investment corridors and direct benefit management plans, the committee also recommends that schedule 2 is amended to include definitions as per recommendation No. 14. These expressions are not defined in the bill simply because they are not used in the bill. In Queensland, it is standard drafting convention to only define terms expressly stated within the legislation. The statutory policy established under the bill, once enacted, provides an adequate definition for direct benefit management plans and strategic offset investment corridors to give certainty to its meaning.

We have taken on a number of the recommendations, and these reflect the hard and considered work that the committee put into the review. For example, recommendation No. 1 asked the government to review the operation and performance of the Queensland environmental offsets framework, and recommendation No. 3 asked that the offset ratio cap be included in this review. The government is more than pleased to do a full and thorough review after five years of implementation of the framework.

The committee has recommended that the seven policy principles be clearly spelled out in the environmental offsets policy, and this will be done. Spelling out the principles will ensure that offsets conform to the principles and we will achieve what we set out to achieve: a streamlined, flexible approach to environmental offsets that will deliver greater certainty to industry and result in strategic conservation outcomes for Queenslanders.

The government is proposing a couple of amendments not recommended by the committee. One of these amendments is the removal of transitional arrangements for local government planning schemes. The bill as introduced allowed that those planning schemes with offsets policies in place

could continue, even if inconsistent with this framework, until the scheme was amended or remade. This is considered as being inconsistent with the overall policy intent of the framework—that is, to create a simplified, single offsets framework.

It was noted that some schemes were not due for review for almost 10 years. To ensure that the framework meets its policy and intent and Queensland does not suffer from inconsistent approaches to offsets for a decade, we propose to remove this provision so that local government schemes will be consistent with the state framework.


I would now like to address the issues specifically raised in the dissenting report. The member for South Brisbane says environmental offsets should be a last resort. On that, I completely agree. I have said it numerous times before. But just because something is a last resort does not mean we should make the process more difficult. Governments must be enablers to allow business to get on with what it does best: providing jobs for Queenslanders, driving our economy, and in turn protecting our environment. These so-called arbitrary limits that the member is referring to not only provide certainty to business but also simplify the equation while delivering environmental benefits.

The member for South Brisbane raised consistency with the processes of the Coordinator-General. Since 1938, the role of the Coordinator-General in Queensland has been to coordinate the provision of public infrastructure and encourage development and the creation of jobs. This role, together with the relevant minister, has operated under a distinct act since its inception. This is no different from what was previously the case under the Labor government. Does the member for South Brisbane not support the role of the Coordinator-General? Would the member for South Brisbane prefer that the long-established role of the Coordinator-General be scrapped? Perhaps she does not appreciate the value of job creation and the need to drive development and the economy for the benefit of all Queenslanders and for the environment.

Next, scraping the barrel for more issues, the member for South Brisbane attacks the work of offset brokers. For years under the previous Labor government offset arrangements were approved and forgotten about—ticked and flicked. Only under the Newman government is the offset requirement enshrined in law and a detailed register maintained for compliance purposes. To suggest that a reduction in staff will lead to less compliance is not only untrue but also offensive to the hardworking officers of my Department of Environment and Heritage Protection.

Currently there are almost 500 full-time equivalent employees within EHP who are involved in environmental monitoring and assessment. These staff members are located across the state—from the Gold Coast in the south, to Cairns in the north. They monitor compliance with environmental standards, which will include whether offset requirements have been adequately met or not. The department is always improving its ability to monitor industry performance—such as with the use of satellite imagery—in compliance. This has given EHP the unprecedented ability to monitor environmentally relevant activities across Queensland—far more than the previous Labor government ever achieved.

For the first time ever the state government will be able to take a big-picture approach to the future protection of Queensland's environment. Through strategic investment corridors and direct benefit management plans, Queensland will no longer have a patchwork quilt of areas set aside. Instead, the government can direct offsets to locations that will deliver the greatest environmental outcomes. By working with industry and not against them, we will achieve greater environmental benefits than the current ad hoc and piecemeal outcomes. We have developed a fair and simplified offset framework that helps build Queensland's four-pillar economy whilst retaining a focus on environmental protection. That is why this bill is all part of the Newman government's strong plan for a brighter future. I commend this bill to the House.

 **Ms TRAD** (South Brisbane—ALP) (10.17 pm): I rise to make a contribution to the debate on the Environmental Offsets Bill 2014. Once again we see a bill that has significant environmental conservations being debated at—what time is it? Quarter past 10 at night! I am very happy to take every single interjection and to speak for an hour, which is as long as I have available to me. Let me say once again this government introduces legislation that will have a significant impact on Queensland's environment, and they do it in the tiny, tiny late hours of the last sitting day of the week. This is not a surprise; this is absolute LNP form.

**Mr Hart:** You don't know what 'offsets' means!

**Ms TRAD:** I do know what 'offsets' means. I will take that interjection from—

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Krause): Order! Member for Burleigh, if you want to interject, please sit in your own seat.

**Ms TRAD:** Let me be clear from the outset: Labor acknowledges that environmental offsets can be a useful tool to enhance or extend conservation objectives—

**A government member** interjected.

**Ms TRAD:** I will start again, Mr Deputy Speaker.

**Government members** interjected.

**Ms TRAD:** Let me start again. Let me be clear from the outset: Labor acknowledges that environmental offsets can be a useful tool to enhance or extend conservation objectives where environmental damage is unavoidable in relation to a particular development. However, Labor believes that they should be used sparingly and as a last resort where the impact from development or some level of environmental harm cannot be avoided or mitigated. What we have here essentially in the bill tonight is a pay-and-go system. We have no objection to the consolidation of Queensland's existing environmental offsets frameworks into one piece of legislation and one policy.

I would actually like to see the premise, the science, the evidence on which the environment minister makes his premise that the current policy framework is ineffective and ad hoc and has not led to conservation values for which it was intended. But, unfortunately, like most things that this government does in the area of environmental change—I will not say 'reform' because I think that belies what it actually does when it comes to changing environmental legislation, when it comes to changing environmental protections in this state, or, should I say, winding them back—this government is very good at not conducting reviews, ignoring the science, ignoring the evidence and doing what it pleases in the most arrogant fashion that Queenslanders have become accustomed to. We actually do not have any objection to improving consistency between the Queensland offset framework and the federal framework under the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act.

I do want to acknowledge at this point in time that it is not actually the Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection in Queensland who is taking the lead in relation to the negotiations around harmonisation or accreditation of Queensland's environmental offsets with the Commonwealth. No. I suspect that that is too big a task for the Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection. That has been outsourced to the Deputy Premier. So once again what we have is the Deputy Premier taking the lead role—taking leadership—in relation to environmental protection regulations here in Queensland and not the Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection. Again, I think it is pretty clear what the Deputy Premier and what the Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection's cabinet colleagues think of him and his abilities.

We must be satisfied of one thing before supporting any changes to the current offsets policies. We must be absolutely confident that the changes do not weaken the existing laws. Unfortunately, the opposition is not satisfied that this bill and the accompanying policies pass this critical test.

**Mr Powell** interjected.

**Ms TRAD:** I take that interjection from the Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection. The Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection said there are no policies.

**Mr Powell:** No, I said there are no laws. Don't misquote me. If you're going to take my interjection, get it right.

**Ms TRAD:** Perhaps you should interject a bit more loudly, Minister. You should not be so meek.

**Mr Cripps** interjected.

**Ms TRAD:** I will just wait for Jimmy Carson to settle down. As such, Labor will not be supporting the Environmental Offsets Bill 2014.

Under the terms of the bill, an offset will only be required if both of the following criteria are met: firstly, the prescribed activity will or is likely to have a significant residual impact on the prescribed environmental matter; and, secondly, all cost-effective on-site mitigation measures for the prescribed activity have been or will be undertaken. While I am happy to see that the avoid, mitigate, offset hierarchy will continue to be observed, I am concerned by the new threshold that is being inserted into the act requiring a significant residual impact before an offset is mandated. This lowers the

existing threshold which is one of ecological significance. A paper produced by two solicitors at Norton Rose Fulbright—the Minister for Science's old firm—points out that this is a clear lowering of the existing standards. Rebecca Hoare and Andrew Muir from Norton Rose state—

This proposed new threshold of 'significant residual impact' indicates a substantial lowering of the current standard of 'ecological equivalence' under existing Queensland biodiversity and vegetation offset arrangements. As a result, project proponents would no longer have to offset all residual impacts of a proposed development, but rather, only offset impacts that are likely to be 'significant'. It is likely that this will lead to a reduction in the number of environmental matters requiring offsets.

It is clear from the bill and the policy circulated by the minister that fewer projects will be required to offset their environmental impact. Labor will not support the reduction in environmental protections that this bill entails. We will oppose this bill, just as we opposed the reintroduction of uranium mining, the reduction in vegetation protections and the weakening of national park protections.

Potentially the biggest concern the opposition has with this bill is the imposition of an arbitrary cap on the size of the offset. This bill will cap the offset at a one to four ratio, which is proof positive that this government has decided to ignore the science when developing its environmental offsets policy. Dr Martine Maron, a senior lecturer in environmental management at the University of Queensland, made the following observation in her submission—

Such a ratio is, on its own, meaningless. It is merely the ratio of impact area to the area over which offset actions will be done. This cannot tell us if 'improve or maintain' is being achieved. Instead, what is of relevance is the ratio of impact to benefit. The Bill does not address this. Reliance on simple and arbitrarily-capped multipliers means that the approach will fail to achieve 'improve or maintain'. The illogicality and unscientific nature of arbitrary ratios is the reason that the EPBC Act offsetting approach moved away from arbitrary ratio-based offsetting approaches and towards one based in the ecology of the affected matter and logical accounting approaches.

If we are trying to ensure that developments achieve a no net loss outcome through offsetting their damaging activities, this arbitrary cap prevents us from doing so. Members may remember that during the construction of Sydney Olympic Park in the late 1990s a population of green and golden bell frogs was discovered. These frogs are listed as vulnerable by the federal government and as endangered under the New South Wales Threatened Species Conservation Act. The species has vanished from 90 per cent of its original range. This discovery threw a significant spanner—

**Mr Rickuss:** We're in Queensland.

**Ms TRAD:** I cannot help taking that interjection from the member for Lockyer. I know that the member for Lockyer does not like to look outside his very small world—his very small orbit. He does not like to look at international expertise. He does not like to take account or evidence from scientists who might have a broader perspective.

**Government members** interjected.

**Mr Seeney** interjected.

**Ms TRAD:** It is good to see that the actual minister responsible for offsets has entered the chamber. I welcome the Deputy Premier back into the chamber. As we know, the Deputy Premier is the actual Queensland minister responsible for driving the environmental offset agenda and not his colleague.

**Mr Rickuss:** No-one was driving when you were in power! The Coordinator-General didn't have to do anything about it.

**Mr Seeney:** You never had any offsets legislation.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Krause): Order! The member for South Brisbane has the call.

**Ms TRAD:** Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. I know that the member for Lockyer does not like to look beyond his little world, but let me tell him: it does Queensland well to have the world in Queensland and Queensland in the world and to think outside our borders.

That is what makes us a great state and that is what makes Australia a great country. I will go back to these lovely green and golden bell frogs. This discovery threw a significant spanner in the works and a conservation plan was established. Although the construction plan was changed, with the tennis courts eventually built elsewhere, there was a significant impact on the habitat. Consequently, the New South Wales government under Bob Carr required offsets for the disturbance.

A paper published in the journal *Biological conservation* in January last year assessed the effectiveness of the frog conservation plan. That paper found that a habitat area of 19 times—

**Mr Rickuss** interjected.

**Ms TRAD:** I am not sure. I think this is the part where I am talking about science and fact, which is why they are all getting a little bit testy. As soon as you start talking about evaluations, as soon as you start talking about numbers, facts and science, they start getting really loud and really testy. I know it is 10.30, but just bear with me. If they hold their interjections, I will get through my speech and I will stop taking their interjections.

I will return. A paper published in the journal *Biological conservation* in January last year assessed the effectiveness of the frog conservation plan. That paper found that a habitat area of 19 times that disturbed was required to ensure that there was no net population loss. I will repeat that for the benefit of the minister and other members: 19 times more habitat was required than that which was disturbed. This should be evidence to everyone that a ratio of one is to four is manifestly inadequate to ensure appropriate conservation outcomes.

Moreover, one of the minister's stated reasons for introducing this bill is to ensure consistency with the federal government's offset framework, which does not have an arbitrary cap on the size of an offset. If the minister is aiming to improve consistency between different levels of government, he has a very strange way of showing it—as we have just seen happen with the Electoral Reform Amendment Bill. Unfortunately, the idea that this bill is designed to promote consistency is nothing more than a fig leaf for this bill's real intent: to once again decrease environmental protections in this state.

During the committee hearings into this bill, Ms Rana Koroglu from the Environmental Defenders Office made the following observation—

The EPBC policy has no maximum capped ratio for offsets whereas the Queensland policy uses a one to four maximum ratio, which is solely to limit the liability of proponents when their impacts are so great that the science requires more than a one to four ratio.

Ms Koroglu went to the heart of the matter. The only possible reason for instituting an arbitrary ratio is to lower costs for proponents. Science, not commercial interests, should dictate the size of an offset. I note that the explanatory notes state that a key theme received from consultation was—

Focus should be on ecological outcomes with less reliance on numerical ratios that have little to no scientific justification.

There is nothing scientific about the arbitrary one to four cap that will be enshrined in government policy as a result of this bill. It is said that the minister ignored completely the consultation process conducted by his department and summarised in his own explanatory notes.

The minister touts this legislation as delivering consistency by consolidating separate offset policies. We have already seen that in one crucial area it fails to deliver consistency with the federal EPBC Act, but it also fails to deliver consistency just within Queensland, as projects that fall under the auspices of the Coordinator-General continue to be exempt. If the government—

**Mr Powell** interjected.

**Ms TRAD:** I will take that interjection from the Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection. Let me say to the Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection that this is the minister's legislation. He is touting it as being generational reform—as a landmark initiative that will turn around environmental protection and conservation in this state. If that is what the minister wants all of us to believe, then why did he exclude the activities of the Coordinator-General from the offsets regime? To tell the truth, the real minister responsible for offsets in Queensland has the Coordinator-General under his responsibilities. So it would seem to make sense to me that the activities of the Coordinator-General should be subject to this legislation.

**Mr Rickuss** interjected.

**Mr Cox** interjected.

**Ms TRAD:** I note that the member for Thuringowa and the member for Lockyer are on the speaking list. Perhaps they could hold themselves intact until their turn to speak comes up.

If the government were sincere in its attempt to provide consistency, then this offset framework would extend to the Coordinator-General and projects of state significance. When I questioned the minister about this issue during the committee hearing, his answer was supremely unconvincing. He could only say that the Coordinator-General would continue to be exempt because he operates under a different act. That is an intellectual answer if ever I have heard one! Given that this bill concerns itself with offset frameworks that currently exist in the Nature Conservation Act, the Sustainable Planning Act and the Environmental Protection Act, suggesting that it is not possible or desirable to include the Coordinator-General operating under the State Development and Public Works Organisation Act is disingenuous at best.

Projects that have been declared major projects are likely to have significant environmental effects, which should be offset if they cannot be avoided or mitigated. The Coordinator-General will continue to have the capacity to apply the new Queensland environmental offsets policy on a discretionary basis. That fails to provide the consistency that the minister claims is a reason for this bill.

**Mr Rickuss** interjected.

**Ms TRAD:** Mr Acting Deputy Speaker, can I take that interjection from the member for Lockyer? The member for Lockyer will come to find—

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Berry): Order! I am sorry, member for South Brisbane. Deputy Speaker, I believe.

**Ms TRAD:** Sorry, Mr Deputy Speaker.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Yes. Now, what would you like?

**Ms TRAD:** Mr Deputy Speaker, I would not like anything from you. I was just taking an interjection from the member for Lockyer.

**Madam SPEAKER:** Member for South Brisbane, just keep going.

**Ms TRAD:** Thank you. I will, Mr Deputy Speaker. Thank you for your guidance. I will take that interjection from the member for Lockyer. Labor was in power for longer than this government will be.

**Honourable members** interjected.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Honourable members, I have to be able to hear the member for South Brisbane. So just keep the noise down, if you would not mind. Thank you.

**Ms TRAD:** Unfortunately, there are question marks as to whether environmental offsets have been delivered under governments of both persuasions. In March, Radio National's *Background Briefing* aired a program titled, 'The Trouble with Offsets', which detailed issues with offsets around Australia. The program pointed to the offsets purchased by Whitehaven Coal as part of the conditions for the development of their Maules Creek Mine in New South Wales. The Maules Creek Mine required the clearing of critically endangered white box gum grassy woodland. *Background Briefing* visited the offset properties with a local ecologist only to find that most of the offset sites were covered not by white box gum but by stringy bark. Four local ecologists found significant problems with the quality of the offsets proposed by Whitehaven and approved by the government. Thankfully, this particular offset has now been found compliant after an independent review, but only after four more properties were purchased, increasing the size of the offset by almost one-third.

Although it is encouraging that this issue seems to have ultimately delivered a sound conservation outcome, it is troubling that clearing had already begun at Maules Creek before an adequate offset had been secured.

**Mr Rickuss:** So it worked, but it's still worrying.

**Ms TRAD:** I will take that interjection from the member for Lockyer, because his interjection where he claims that, yes, it is working clearly indicates that he does not understand the argument around the capping of the ratio.

The capping of the ratio is the issue here. There is no cap. There is no maximum in terms of the offset ratio in the EPBC Act. Queensland is introducing a cap on the offset ratio. What this Maules Creek example illustrates, for the benefit of the member for Lockyer, is that when you set a cap on the ratio you cannot expand the offset area to ensure that the offset is effective and delivers the conservation outcomes that are intended by the offset. Hopefully that is clear enough for the member for Lockyer and the chair of the Agriculture, Resources and Environment Committee that did investigate this piece of legislation.

When ecologists raise concerns regarding environmental issues in this state the Newman government vilifies them and ignores them. We need to ensure that there are adequate oversight measures. Unfortunately, this bill does not provide them. There are major concerns with the ability of the Department of Environment and Heritage Protection to monitor environmental conditions and environmental offsets. The Auditor-General's report, *Environmental regulation of the resources and waste industries Report 15: 2013-14*, was scathing of the department. Whilst it dealt primarily with environmental authorities, it stands to reason that similar issues will affect EHP's ability to monitor offsets. Specifically, the report found—

EHP is not fully effective in its supervision, monitoring and enforcement of environmental conditions and is exposing the state to liability and the environment to harm unnecessarily.

**Mr Rickuss** interjected.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Berry): Member for Lockyer, we need to get on with this.

**Ms TRAD:** I will continue the quote—

Poor data and inadequate systems continue to hinder EHP's planning and risk assessments. As a result, EHP cannot target its monitoring and enforcement efforts to where they are most needed.

The Auditor-General also found—

EHP's proactive monitoring was limited by:

- available staff and resources.

These issues are likely to have been significantly exacerbated by the Newman government's massive staffing cuts. One-third of EHP's staff have been sacked in the last two years and it is one of the departments that is still experiencing budget cuts. Unfortunately, Queenslanders can have very little confidence in EHP's ability to ensure that offsets are actually delivered.

Can I say at this juncture that it is not the staff within EHP who should bear the brunt of this criticism. They work with the resources that they have available to them and they work under the direction of executive government. They follow the policies and they do what they can within the resources they are given. I want to place on the record that this is not a personal attack at all on departmental staff. I take my hat off to them. They are doing very important work in a very difficult environment. We need to take these insights, these findings, and build a better department that can protect the environment of Queensland to the standard that Queenslanders demand.


With the increasing use of offset brokers we should seriously consider the regulatory framework in which brokers work. An effective way to ensure brokers deliver what they promise could be to require them to be registered. This would reduce the incidence of fly-by-night traders and give the government an ability to levy fines on brokers if they do not deliver offsets or to strike them off the register entirely and make sure they never engage in offset brokering again.

Turning now to the provisions of this bill which are unrelated to the environmental offsets—the changes to the Coastal Protection and Management Act 1995, the Sustainable Planning Act 2009, the National Trust of Queensland Act 1963 and the Currumbin Bird Sanctuary Act 1976—Labor has no objection to ensuring the validity of existing tidal works authorised under the Coastal Protection and Management Act and the Sustainable Planning Act. Obviously in light of the recent court decision regarding the Gold Coast light rail project it is necessary to clarify these provisions. We also approve of making sure dredge soil disposed in the commercial market attracts royalties.

I do harbour some concerns with the provisions of this bill regarding the Currumbin Wildlife Sanctuary and the National Trust of Queensland. I note that the Webbe-Weller review recommended that the National Trust of Queensland become a non-government organisation, and we are happy to support this change. However, Webbe-Weller also recommended that the National Trust be divested from responsibility for the Currumbin Wildlife Sanctuary and that the sanctuary be set up as either a community organisation or a body operating in its own right within the environment portfolio.

I would also like to place on record the concerns raised by the Gold Coast and Hinterland Environment Council. I invite the minister to step us through his reasoning on this issue and why he has taken a different course of action than that recommended by the comprehensive Webbe-Weller review. I said at the outset of this speech that Labor would only support this bill if it maintained the existing level of environmental protection. It does not. The bill increases the threshold of what activity will require offsets, meaning more environmental damage can be done without requiring an offset. It also removes the requirement to provide an offset which is at least equivalent to the damage done by imposing an unscientific and arbitrary cap on the ratio of an offset. Further, it fails to provide the consistency the minister claims. This is, in fact, a pay-and-go act that allows proponents to damage, to pay, to go. In short, this bill not only reduces the number of projects that will be required to offset their environmental damage, but the projects that do will not even need to offset the full damage of their actions. This is an absolute disgrace.

I put on record my thanks to the secretariat of the Agriculture, Resources and Environment Committee. They have worked incredibly hard in relation to this bill. There were many complex issues to grapple with. They have done an outstanding job within the framework that they have been given. I would also like to thank all of the departmental staff for their work in relation to this bill. I understand that this is government policy and they are doing what they are required to do as poor public servants. I will not be joining the government in criticising them in any way. Ultimately this is poor policy. It is poor policy that will hurt our environment. It is poor policy that will damage our communities and Labor will not be supporting it.

 **Mr RICKUSS** (Lockyer—LNP) (10.47 pm): I rise to congratulate the minister for his leadership in bringing this bill before the House. Over the last 20 years offsets have meandered along with no real direction or focus and as a result we have ended up with complex legislation that was difficult to understand. I congratulate the committee staff, led by Robert Hansen and Megan Johns. They did a wonderful job. We had over 51 submissions, from Dr Hugh Lavery to the Australian Prawn Farmers Association. There was a large group.

I would like to read what Dr Lavery said. I have a lot of respect for Dr Lavery. He was a founding director of research and planning in the Queensland National Parks and Wildlife Service and a chief environmental adviser for 14 years to AMP, one of Australia's largest corporate landholders. He is someone who has the runs on the board and is still working in his field. He states—

Professor D Fisher of QUT Law School (author of *Australian Environmental Law and International Environmental Law*, and long-time Editor of *Queensland Environmental Practice Reporter*) emphasises that an environment which relies on legislation to deliver management is inadequate; the community must be incentivised to be (pro)actively involved.

This minister is trying to incentivise the community to be involved. I have just listened to the patronising speech made by the Labor member.

**A government member:** Sanctimonious.


**Mr RICKUSS:** Yes, and sanctimonious. They were in power on and off for nearly 20 years and the Coordinator-General, for example, never had to do anything with environmental offsets. In its report, the committee states—

The committee recommends that the Deputy Premier and Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning, in consultation with the Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection, publish guidelines for environmental offsets that may apply to major coordinated projects under the *State Development and Public Works Organisation Act 1971*.

Can members guess what? The minister has accepted that recommendation. The member for South Brisbane has been harping on about us having no direction and no ability, but something that they did not do for 20 years we will bring into place, which is this whole regime of offsets. I refer again to Dr Hugh Lavery, who concluded by saying—

By all means, tidy up the current evolving legislation; bringing all components of the environment together under one regimen is essential if the infinite complexities of ecosystem behaviour—and subsequent 'double counting' by land managers—are to be avoided.

This will create a new enterprise and a new marketplace for new rural enterprises in Australia. Dr Lavery is one of the leading scholars in his field. Professor Hugh Possingham, to whom I have spoken over the years, also feels that this is the way forward and that it is great to bring together the legislation. I commend the minister for his courageous decisions on this bill. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Hon. JA STUCKEY** (Currumbin—LNP) (Minister for Tourism, Major Events, Small Business and the Commonwealth Games) (10.51 pm): I rise to contribute to the debate on the Environmental Offsets Bill 2014. My focus is on the provision relating to governance reform of the National Trust and, consequently, the Currumbin Wildlife Sanctuary, and specifically amendments to the National Trust Act 1963 and the Currumbin Bird Sanctuary Act 1976. These governance reform amendments were initially proposed in a 2008 Labor government commissioned report known as the Webbe-Weller review. Recommendation 88 in that report supported a two-pronged recommendation made for governance reform. It stated—

The National Trust of Queensland should become a non-government organisation instead of a government statutory body acting as a community organisation.

Further, it stated—

The Currumbin Wildlife Sanctuary should be divested to community form or enabled to operate in its own right by suitable form within the Environmental portfolio.

I might add that both of those recommendations, along with a number of others across the subject material, were supported by the former Labor government.

Amendments contained in this bill will enable the National Trust to become a company and, in doing so, will see the repeal of the National Trust Act and the Currumbin Bird Sanctuary Act. These changes will mean the National Trust will relinquish its statutory standing and become independent of government, as was suggested in the Weller report. Notably, these amendments do not propose that the National Trust divest responsibility for the Currumbin Wildlife Sanctuary. The National Trust of Australia (Queensland) Ltd will continue as a charitable, not-for-profit organisation with a continued focus on its primary objective of the conservation, protection and appreciation of our natural and cultural heritage.

Since the introduction of this bill to parliament, I have met constituents and discussed the legislation with residents and local stakeholder groups who have, understandably, shared their concerns for the future of our much beloved community icon, the Currumbin Wildlife Sanctuary. As honourable members would be aware, I have been a very strong advocate of the sanctuary for a quarter of a century now, and there is no way I would support legislation that I believed would harm in any way the future of the sanctuary or any fundamental move away from its current use. I appreciate the genuine concern of residents, particularly when they hear words such as 'repealing the act' or 'privatisation'. However, I wish to allay those fears and urge our community to play a more active role in the future prosperity of our sanctuary.


Jonathan Fisher, the CEO, explained the proposed changes well when he said what we will see is—

... the creation of an independent of government, not for profit, community focused, membership based organisation who have a say in protecting the properties owned by the National Trust, and not a private company focused on profits for distribution to shareholders.

On 27 March on Gold Coast ABC radio, he further said, '... we understand the word trust in our title is there to be earned and not to be abused.' That is very important and is a significant part of why I am supportive of these changes.

The draft constitution of the National Trust discusses the concept of becoming a governing member. I have been a member of the National Trust for several years now and will be looking at what is involved in applying to become a governing member, once those specific details are finalised. Governing members will be entitled to a vote and any motion to sell any property would require a majority—75 per cent as per the Corporations Act—in attendance. I encourage Currumbin residents with a keen interest in our sanctuary to apply to also become governing members so they can have a direct and meaningful say in its future.

As the local state member for Currumbin, I will continue to fight for the best interests of the sanctuary and ensure the actions of the National Trust continue in that vein, as they have done to date. For many years I have unsuccessfully lobbied Labor ministers for funding and I have continued to lobby this government. I am pleased to say we have had some success. Unlike then Labor minister Kate Jones, who never bothered to visit, and Anna Bligh, who only ever used Currumbin sanctuary for promotional photo shoots when it suited her, in March this year Minister Powell visited the Currumbin Wildlife Hospital to announce a \$100,000 grant to plant 15,000 fodder trees to feed our koalas. That money is proper recognition of the stellar efforts of the staff and volunteers at the hospital who are treating an increasing number of wildlife each year. I am confident that under this new structure we will continue to see the National Trust act in our sanctuary's best interests and support it long into the future as an education and conservation facility.

 **Mr COSTIGAN** (Whitsunday—LNP) (10.56 pm): Tonight I rise in support of the Environmental Offsets Bill. In doing so, I acknowledge the work of the Minister for the Environment and Heritage Protection while he ensures that we look after our environment, which is very dear to the hearts of many people in my electorate in particular—the place that I call paradise. Our community takes enormous pride in looking after the environment. Those people are perhaps headed by a lady named Libby Edge, who is well known to the minister as well as the Minister for National Parks, Recreation Sport and Racing.

**Mr Dickson** interjected.

**Mr COSTIGAN:** I take the interjection from the latter minister, because I fondly recall both of them being in Airlie Beach, at Boathaven Beach, last year to announce some important funding for Libby's highly acclaimed Eco Barge environmental program, alongside me. For those unfamiliar with it, the program cleans up rubbish on our islands and in our waterways. It is outstanding work thanks to a willing band of volunteers. It is important that we acknowledge the work of people such as Libby Edge and it is also very important that we acknowledge that the Newman LNP government is steadfast in protecting our iconic and diverse Great Barrier Reef and marine areas such as the Whitsundays. While I represent the electorate of Whitsunday, I will make sure it stays that way.

Members should make no mistake: this bill is an important cog in the wheel of protecting one of the world's most recognised ecosystems for generations to come. This government is committed to an integrated and collaborative approach with our federal colleagues to ensure long-term protection and conservation of the reef ecosystem. When providing offsets, the new offsets framework focuses on addressing key threats to matters of environmental significance. Importantly, the offsets framework ensures there is a clear nexus between the species or environmental value impacted and the outcome delivered through the actual offset.

For complex ecological systems such as marine environments, strategic and targeted management actions can be applied that will improve species survival or act to remove threats. For example, under this approach, our approach, offset requirements across a number of marine impacts can be pooled and used to reduce erosion and chemical run-off in the form of a direct benefit management plan. Improving water quality will form a major investment priority for these direct benefit management plans, as improving water quality and coastal habitat along the reef will be key in protecting iconic species such as turtles and dugong, which are, of course, two species that are familiar sights in the waterways in my electorate, in places such as the Whitsunday Passage, Repulse Bay and the Hillsborough Channel.

At the same time, it will also control the infestation of that scourge known as the crown-of-thorns starfish. There is no restriction on who can produce a DBMP. That means that experts from our universities—places like James Cook University—our NRM groups, like reef catchments based in Mackay, and industry can develop an effective strategy to counterbalance impacts on a species or ecosystem. This plan must be made in accordance with set criteria and be officially enforced as effective measures that will benefit the impacted matter. This strategic approach will complement and work with the recently announced Commonwealth Reef Trust—a \$40 million investment to improve the resilience and condition of the reef.

There are fundamental differences between marine and terrestrial ecosystems. The marine world is characterised by larger scale connectivity, incidences of alternate stable states and susceptibility to the effects of distant, diffuse impacts such as watershed run-off and sedimentation.

These factors have been taken into account to form a scientifically, robust marine calculator. The department has worked with the experts to align the existing marine fish habitat offsets calculation with the calculator for terrestrial impacts proposed for the new offsets framework. This ensures marine offsets are based on the costs of undertaking an offset, including on site works and management costs as opposed to an antiquated annual total ecosystem services approach developed under the previous Labor government.

The new marine financial calculator works in a similar way to the terrestrial calculator. In contrast to the terrestrial calculator, however, there is obviously no calculation of landholder incentive. Onsite costs for marine offsets are determined by the impacted marine bioregion and whether or not the impact is located inshore or offshore as determined by national, territorial sea baseline map. Further, a sliding scale per hectare cost is also applied to marine offsets to account for economies of scale.

Our government is committed to being renowned worldwide in its ability to not only implement best practice environmental policy but also work hand in hand with industry, landholders, our environmental groups and NRM groups to protect our iconic marine ecosystems that are fundamental to the lifestyle and culture of so many Queenslanders.


Before closing, I would like to acknowledge Hamilton Island Enterprises, which is very conscious of looking after our environment. On Hammo, as us locals call it, they do everything they can to do what they call 'protecting the magic'. That is the catchphrase that they use over there and for good reason.

HIE works closely with our National Parks and Wildlife Service and also the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority. With GBRMPA, HIE are reef guardians, similar to so many schools that we have around in our region and further up and down the coast. HIE has always recycled its water. That is something they pointed out to the Premier when he toured the island with me some months ago. That recycled water is put to very good use, particularly when it comes to keeping the gardens nice and green.

Unless it is an absolutely last resort no sewage or waste is pumped into the marine park, even though I am advised that HIE has approval to do so if required. On Hammo they also have their own desalination plant. To top it off, unlike the council, they recycle as much as they can with gadgets like a glass crusher machine, with the glass then used in pits and pipes and gardens. There is also the mulching of cardboard and other waste.

Environmentally conscious they certainly are on Hamilton Island. I salute the Chief Executive Officer of HIE, Glenn Bourke, and his team, but also the Oatley family—in particular, the legendary Bob Oatley who has been an ornament to Australian commerce, sailing, tourism and much more. His unwavering commitment to tourism and the environment in my electorate should be acknowledged.

In closing, I thank all those organisations that made submissions in relation to this bill. I acknowledge the work of the Agriculture, Resources and Environment Committee under the stewardship of the member for Lockyer. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr TROUT** (Barron River—LNP) (11.03 pm): I commend the member for Whitsunday on a very long, great speech. I rise to make a short contribution to the Environmental Offsets Bill 2014. The Environmental Offsets Bill establishes a framework that will provide opportunities for landholders to receive income in return for voluntarily agreeing to managing their land—and, in most cases, part of their land—as an environmental offset.

Unlike the legislation of the previous government in Queensland, this bill recognises that the best people to look after the environment are the landholders. An offset can apply to the whole property or to certain areas only, depending on what value needs to be offset and the owner's future plans for their land. The landowner can either manage the on-ground management actions themselves or enter into an agreement with an offset provider to deliver the environmental outcomes.

Management activities include weed management, feral animal control, fire management, erosion control, fencing and watering requirements. Many landholders in rural and regional Queensland are willing and able to conduct these activities themselves. The more landholders who participate in these arrangements the better the overall environmental and community benefits will be.

This bill provides opportunities for more robust environmental management from the people who know the land and what their threats are. Owners of freehold land, leasehold land and local councils are all able to enter into an offset agreement provided there is a direct link between the value being impacted and the ecosystem or species being counterbalanced.


Landholders will need to enter into a binding agreement over the land to protect the values generated by the offset to ensure certainty going forward. This will limit future development potential on the offset site for the life of the offset agreement and ensure that the land is managed to benefit the environmental value impacted by development elsewhere.

The benefit in landholders facilitating or allowing offsets on their land is quite simple. They receive an incentive through an income stream to improve and maintain the land in its natural condition. This can be over a period of 20 years. Through this process landholders will also make an invaluable contribution to protecting our natural resources by being part of a landscape approach to conservation.

In some instances landowners may also be a partner in bringing back a species that may have disappeared from the area. In exchange, infrastructure providers and developers will be able to demonstrate their social responsibility to the community and the environment by providing revenue to landholders to compensate for the loss of environmental values.

Under the former government, state approvals were guided by five separate Queensland government environmental offset policies creating complexity, delays and uncertainty for proponents. Finding sites for offset placement often involved buying land and locking it up in a protected area. The new offset framework provides greater certainty and flexibility—flexibility for proponents to be able to select the way in which offsets will be delivered.

This bill is just another example of how the Queensland government is partnering with industry and landholders for the betterment of all Queenslanders and its precious environment and fulfilling its commitment to reduce costs to business and cut green tape. I commend this bill to the House.

 **Mr COX** (Thuringowa—LNP) (11.07 pm): Unlike the previous speakers—and given the whip is looking at me—I will summarise my speech and get to the point. How does this bill improve certainty for proponents? This is what I would unashamedly like to speak about tonight. This government is about bringing balance back when it comes to the environment and economic development in this state.

Before I go any further, I would like to point out that this bill is very much in line with the government's policy to grow a four-pillar economy, to deliver improved infrastructure and planning and to restore accountability in government. The new offset framework provides greater flexibility—flexibility for proponents to be able to select the way in which their offsets can be delivered. The present system is prescriptive and difficult to navigate. Proponents have difficulty in delivering on inflexible requirements. This causes unnecessary and costly delays, not to mention that they do not always achieve the best outcome for the natural environment.

The simplified, scientifically based approach to determining an offset obligation and flexibility in offset delivery options will provide greater certainty. This is a clear improvement on the current policy approaches where offsets can take years to find. Further, offset obligations will be transparently available to all so business and industry can accurately plan their projects, unlike the existing policy provisions which create uncertainty and constrain the economy.


I think it is important to mention here the brains behind the calculator. Queensland has developed a calculator model for the obligation, based on the Commonwealth calculator—the offsets assessment guide. The Commonwealth calculator has been developed utilising a balance sheet approach to estimate impacts and offsets for threatened species, especially in ecological communities. This calculator is based on work performed by the University of Queensland under Professor Hugh Possingham.

For financial settlement offsets, this bill makes it clear that the proponent's obligation in relation to the offset delivery ends once the required payment is made. This also means that projects can get off the ground earlier and negates unnecessary delays to project start dates. This is better for the proponent and better for the Queensland economy—without jeopardising Queensland's unique and much loved environment.

The financial management approach provides opportunities for greater accountability, reporting and transparency than the current offsets regime. Further, it provides opportunities to invest in environmental outcomes in a strategic manner. The Queensland government has succeeded with this bill where others have not by establishing a framework that simplifies and ensures consistency for proponents.

In my corner of the state we have many unique habitats and ecosystems that are dear to our hearts and help to make the north what it is. We also live in the largest and one of the fastest growing areas in northern Australia, and we understand the importance of many types of development that have to occur if we are to provide a strong economy, along with the quality of life and services that others enjoy in other parts of the state.

Once again, I thank the minister for presenting a bill to the House and to our committee that provides for all Queenslanders in their own unique backyards to find a balance in preserving our natural surrounds and building a great place to live, work and play. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mrs CUNNINGHAM** (Gladstone—Ind) (11.10 pm): I rise to speak to the Environmental Offsets Bill 2014. I have to commend the Agriculture, Resources and Environment Committee for what is a very informative report. I listened to the opposition spokesperson's contribution to this bill with some concern. I note that Dr Martine Maron states in her submission in relation to her view that the arbitrary 1:4 cap on the ratio of the land affected to the area to be offset is unwelcome—

Such a ratio is, on its own, meaningless. It is merely the ratio of impact area to the area over which offset actions will be done. This cannot tell us if "improve or maintain" is being achieved. Instead, what is of relevance is the ratio of impact to benefit. The Bill does not address this. Reliance on simple and arbitrarily-capped multipliers means that the approach will fail to achieve 'improve or maintain'. The illogicality and unscientific nature of arbitrary ratios is the reason that the EPBC Act offsetting approach moved away from arbitrary ratio-based offsetting approaches and towards one based in the ecology of the affected matter and logical accounting approaches.

I read that and wondered whether that comment does not contradict much of what is being said about the alignment of the state offset policy with the federal offset policy where we are saying we are aligning it to the feds but the basis on which the EPBC Act operates is going to differ from the one that this bill proposes.

I note that the committee has made 16 recommendations. In my area we have a lot of heavy industry and a lot of reclamation of port land, and there have been several instances where offsets have been required. There was quite a level of debate over whether the offsets were appropriate and whether, in offsetting the area that was to be lost, the community who would be affected by that loss were adequately compensated by the offset area. It was geographically significantly more distant from the community and therefore the community that was losing access would not be compensated at all.

I have a lot of regard for the Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection. He has come to my electorate on a number of occasions, particularly in relation to the port. While this government has found it difficult to address the concerns in the past—that is, environmental harm that may have happened—I believe did happen, but the current government would say may have happened—under

the previous government's management—this current minister has drawn a line on the sand and said, 'From now on we are going to work to regain community confidence in the management of the port,' and I commend the minister for that. Recommendation 6 of this report states—

The committee recommends that the Deputy Premier and Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning, in consultation with the Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection, publish guidelines for environmental offsets that may apply to major coordinated projects under the *State Development and Public Works Organisation Act 1971*.

That was, I believe, in response to the fact that the Coordinator-General is exempt from the whole-of-government environmental offset policy. I have to say that is absolutely illogical. The one entity that manages the largest projects with the greatest potential for environmental impact is the Coordinator-General. So the Coordinator-General is exempt, except if this recommendation is accepted—and there is no guarantee that it will be—the Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning, who is made the primary minister in this statement, will do this in consultation with the Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection. I do not have a lot of confidence that the Deputy Premier and Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning has any interest in environmental protection.

**A government member** interjected.

**Mrs CUNNINGHAM:** It is the truth. I think the Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection has a great deal of work to do to re-establish confidence from the community's point of view in this process particularly where the Coordinator-General is exempt from the whole-of-government environmental offsets policy.

I would seek the minister's clarification on three matters and I do not believe they have been clarified at this point in the debate. They are clarifications that the committee asked for. The committee invited the minister to clarify—

- a) the risks, if any, which are associated with raising the threshold from 'any' residual impact to 'significant' residual impact;

Can I say that the 'if any', I think, is fairly redundant. In this House we changed workers compensation legislation from 'impact' to 'significant impact' as far as work being a contributor to injury was concerned. It had a major impact on the ability of workers to access WorkCover. So changing 'any' to 'significant' is a huge step. I am interested in the minister's response to that. The second part to that request for clarification states—

- b) how cumulative residual impacts are monitored and managed under the current planning and development assessment framework.

The second clarification that was sought was—

The committee invites the Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection to further explain how potential duplication between state and local government offsetting requirements may be reduced, and how this will ensure that local government offsets policies align with the Bill's requirements.

I would be interested in how many local governments have the power to actually require offsets. In my region the major planning is taken away from local government. The Coordinator-General manages it and the Coordinator-General is exempt. I have to talk from my own local experience. Our local council does not get too much opportunity to have too much say in any of the major projects. Our big area that has been set aside for heavy industrial use is a black hole in the local planning scheme. It has been removed from the local planning scheme. So the council will be spitting against the wind as far as their ability to impact offsets is concerned.

The third clarification that was sought was—


The committee invites the Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection to advise the House: what qualifications, skills or experience would qualify a person for appointment as an enforcement officer and, similarly, what would disqualify a person from being appointed; and which persons prescribed under a regulation he envisages would be appointed as enforcement officers in accordance with clause 44 (1)(e).

Given the department's advice that it does not propose to appoint consenting persons as enforcement officers in accordance with clause 44(1)(e), the committee invites the Minister to assure the House that this provision should remain in the Bill.

The member for Barron River talked about landowners managing offsets. I have the utmost confidence in landowners who offer their land as an offset to be able to do just that. The people who do that value the environmental qualities on their properties and do so because of their commitment to environmental management and preservation.

I am concerned that, in this process and in the position the current Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection finds himself, the environment will once again—as it was in the previous government—at times be subservient to state development. I think this will be more so because the

Minister for Environment appears unable to influence the Coordinator-General, particularly in relation to major developments which occur in my electorate and in relation to the requirements on heavy industry, large industry, applying for development approvals because they will be exempt.

 **Mrs MADDERN** (Maryborough—LNP) (11.20 pm): I rise tonight to make a brief contribution to the debate on the Environmental Offsets Bill 2014. Environmental issues have the capacity to create division and angst within communities. We have all seen media reports of such division in recent years in relation to mining and, in particular in my region, the Traveston Dam. Given the diverse views, it is the responsibility of government to carefully legislate to give balance to the opposing views and to provide the best possible outcome for Queenslanders now and into the future. The issue of providing environmental offsets is complex, and these difficulties are not unique to Australia or Queensland. Countries all over the world are grappling with the issue of allowing for development and investment while at the same time protecting the environment and ensuring the retention of biodiversity and safeguarding rare and endangered ecosystems.


In Queensland there has been an overarching environmental policy with four separate subordinate policies. Given the difficulties being experienced by other jurisdictions in developing processes which effectively address the environmental offsets issue, this bill demonstrates that this LNP government is not afraid of tackling the difficult issues and of setting in place legislation which will reduce red tape by allowing for one single offset for each impacted matter, rather than the current situation which could mean developers could be required to provide offsets for Commonwealth requirements, state requirements and local government requirements. Further, the legislation will give developers the option of providing and managing the offsets themselves, utilising a financial calculator to provide funds for the state to provide the offsets or a combination of both of these options.

An offset is an activity undertaken to counterbalance a significant residual impact on an environmental matter. This is because it compensates for loss of these environmental values to the community. Under this bill, we are ensuring that offsets will deliver greater outcomes through strategic placements by the implementation of creative solutions. The placement of offsets will be assisted through the identification and mapping of strategic offset investment corridors which will be those areas in the region where there are large tracts of intact landscape providing corridors for wildlife. Strategic corridors provide landscape scale benefits. They connect conservation hubs such as national parks in corridors that are under low development pressure and not zoned for urban development.

Of particular value has been the inclusion in the bill of the option for proponents to use a financial offset calculator to allow for the payment of a cash equivalent to the government instead of the proponent actually providing the on-ground offset. This option has a number of advantages in that it allows the proponent to move more quickly to turn the first sod on the project, and it also allows for the placement of offsets by the government in strategic corridors.

Following a briefing by the department on the way the calculator works, I consider this option is very workable as the assessment of offsets required will be the same for the calculator as for a proponent driven option. Many of the same processes will be followed in using the calculator in terms of ascertaining the purchase price of the relevant type of land, the cost for management plans and the costs incurred in terms of legal fees, stamp duty, et cetera. This option builds a significant level of flexibility into the way offsets can be delivered.

In summary, the bill introduces a new environmental offsets framework that will align five existing offset policies into one simplified policy. It will: remove inconsistencies and duplication within and across jurisdictions; streamline assessment; simplify offset requirements; reduce complexity and costly time delays for projects; and, importantly, ensure a landscape scale environmental outcome. I believe the bill will succeed in the balancing act of protecting Queensland's unique biodiversity values and supporting economic growth for all Queenslanders. The minister is to be commended for providing a framework for what are leading-edge processes for the delivery of environmental offsets. It pleases me to support the bill.

 **Hon. AC POWELL** (Glass House—LNP) (Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection) (11.24 pm), in reply: I want to start by thanking the government members who have contributed to the debate this evening for their thoughtful and considered contributions. I acknowledge the member for Gladstone and I thank her for her contribution. I would like to spend a moment addressing some of the concerns the member for Gladstone raised.

I can tell the member for Gladstone that, during my second reading speech, I did table the government's response to the committee's report. In terms of recommendation 6, the member for Gladstone asked whether I in consultation with the Deputy Premier would publish guidelines for environmental offsets that would apply to the State Development and Public Works Organisation Act. The answer is yes. We are going to work on doing exactly that. So, as per the committee's recommendation, we will look to achieve that.

The member for Gladstone mentioned a couple of other things. She raised the question of whether the community that incurs the impact will be adequately compensated. The answer is yes. The new environmental offset policy is actually going to require an environmental offset for any impact to be located as close as possible to where that impact is occurring. What we do is we start ideally in the same local government area and we try to achieve it in the same local government area. That is getting increasingly challenging in a place like Brisbane, and it is perhaps less challenging in the Gladstone Regional Council. Certainly, in South-East Queensland, it is very hard to find something in the same local government area. We then look at the sub-bioregion of that ecosystem, we then go to the same bioregion and we then go to an adjacent bioregion. So there is actually a hierarchy that we would look to achieve.

The member for Gladstone also asked if there were any risks associated with raising 'any impact' to 'significant residual impact'. Raising the threshold to 'significant residual impact' is a risk based approach that recognises that not all impacts will have an adverse effect. If you take one tree out of what is largely an intact landscape, it is going to have an impact but the impact will not be that adverse. If, however, there is an endangered species that relies on that one tree for their habitat, then yes the impact will be significant. So that is what it is, in essence, trying to achieve—to look at whether that has a significant impact on what it is we are trying to protect. So it is very risk based and it is very scientifically based, and it is consistent with the Commonwealth government in that regard.

The member for Gladstone mentioned the inability of my department, the Department of Environment and Heritage Protection, to influence decisions made by the Coordinator-General. I completely and utterly disagree. My officers work with the office of the Coordinator-General in providing input into the decisions made by the Coordinator-General and in terms of the conditions that are imposed by the Coordinator-General, and that can include offsets and has in the past included offsets. I would point out that the member for Gladstone suggested that the Coordinator-General makes most of the decisions when it comes to approving industry. That is not actually accurate. A vast majority of industry environmental approvals come through the Environmental Protection Act which is through my department. It certainly may not seem to be the case in the member for Gladstone's local government area because she has such an extensive state development area and therefore the Coordinator-General does oversee a lot of the projects there. But across the state, day-to-day EIS approvals, environmental authorities or environmentally relevant activity approvals all come through EHP. The other area would be the Sustainable Planning Act, and therefore it is local government and the Department of State Development, Infrastructure and Planning, which is compliant with this legislation.

So I refer those brief comments to the member for Gladstone for her consideration. I would also refer her to the response that I tabled during my second reading speech. It does outline that we are accepting more than half of the recommendations and I mentioned in my second reading speech the ones we are not accepting and I elaborated on why we are not accepting them.

I am not going to address anything that the member for South Brisbane raised because it is nothing new. We heard it all during the committee hearings, whether that was during the public briefings that were provided by my department, the numerous private briefings or the extensive written communication that was provided from the department to the committee in response to questions raised by the member and by others on the committee. So there is nothing new in what she has raised tonight with two exceptions that I will address. In relation to the National Trust and Currumbin Wildlife Sanctuary, the member spoke about the Webbe-Weller review. The Webbe-Weller review was one of many reviews—at least seven—that we can consider have been done since the 1980s on the National Trust and Currumbin Wildlife Sanctuary. All the reviews have recommended various forms of governance reform. We have brought the governance reform that the National Trust actually wanted to the House this evening to be debated. After more than 30 years of review and consideration, what we are delivering tonight is what the National Trust has been actually seeking for a number of years now.

I want to pick up on comments made by the member for South Brisbane regarding the Auditor-General's report. On a number of occasions I have accepted the recommendation of the Auditor-General's report but refuted the tone in which he suggested there was risk of serious environmental harm because of what the Auditor-General found in the department. First of all, let me say that the Auditor-General did not tell us anything we did not already know. He certainly did not tell us anything that we were not already working on. We actually said to the Auditor-General, 'Give us another six months. You did your review in 2011. Come back in six months time when we have implemented a lot of the things that you are going to tell us we need to do and then tell us whether we have achieved the changes that you have asked us to achieve.' That would have been much more useful than telling us things that we already knew.

Interestingly, the Auditor-General did not set a benchmark on what he and his team were trying to compare us against—not to the 2011 report or to any other regulator around the nation. If he was going to make comments about impacting on the environment, it would have been helpful to compare it to other jurisdictions around the nation. Certainly from our reading of it, there was no evidence found of reported or serious environmental harm having been caused because of the way EHP regulates industry. Let me say what we are doing. We are progressively replacing the former Labor government's antiquated IT systems; we are employing innovative technologies; and we have a new regulatory strategy that is getting our officers out from behind the desk, doing more compliance and monitoring than they have ever done.

In conclusion, I do want to thank many of the department officers who have now spent more than two years working on this piece of legislation, a lot of it through extensive consultation, and I am going to name them. There have been a couple who have helped us over short stretches, quick bursts, to give us a bit of assistance. So to Andrew, Catherine, Mike, Wade, Andy, Leesa, Narelle, Chris and Selina, I say thank you very much for helping out the team. To those who have been there since day one and have seen this all the way through—Carol, Jane, Vanessa, Craig, Chris, Gillian, Kaitlyn, Grant, Niall, Leanne, Briony, Andrew and Juliana—I say thank you very much for your continued efforts. To the leadership of Scott, Leslie and Tamara, I say thank you for seeing this through to tonight.

I want to also acknowledge the valued input from our regional staff who are based in Cairns, Townsville, Mackay, Emerald, Rockhampton, Toowoomba and Brisbane as well as the input from a range of other agencies, particularly State Development, Infrastructure and Planning; Natural Resources and Mines; Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries; National Parks, Recreation, Sport and Racing; and Queensland Treasury and Trade. It has certainly been a team effort. What we have tonight is a great piece of legislation that, for the first time, puts a legislative framework around offsets, that brings together five disparate policies into one, that achieves a great outcome for the environment because for the first time we will be getting strategic conservation outcomes for the environment and a win for business in the reduction of green tape. I commend the bill to the House.

Division: Question put—That the bill be now read a second time.

**AYES, 65:**

**LNP, 61**—Barton, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Cavallucci, Choat, Costigan, Cox, Crandon, Cripps, Davies, T Davis, Dempsey, Dickson, Dillaway, Emerson, Flegg, France, Frecklington, Grant, Grimwade, Gullely, Hart, Hathaway, Hobbs, Holswich, Johnson, Kaye, King, Krause, Langbroek, Latter, Maddern, Mander, McArdle, McVeigh, Menkens, Millard, Minnikin, Molhoek, Newman, Nicholls, Ostapovitch, Powell, Pucci, Rickuss, Robinson, Ruthenberg, Seeney, Shorten, Shuttleworth, Smith, Sorensen, Stevens, Stewart, Stuckey, Symes, Trout, Walker, Young.

**PUP, 2**—Douglas, Judge.

**INDEPENDENTS, 2**—Cunningham, Wellington.

**NOES, 6:**

**ALP, 6**—Byrne, D'Ath, Miller, Palaszczuk, Pitt, Trad.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Bill read a second time.

### Consideration in Detail

Clauses 1 to 147—

**Mr POWELL** (11.43 pm): I seek leave to move amendments en bloc.

Leave granted.

**Mr POWELL:** I move the following amendments—

- 1 **Clause 8 (What is a *significant residual impact*)**  
Page 14, lines 17 to 20—  
*omit, insert—*  
(2) If a prescribed environmental matter is a protected area and the adverse impact of the prescribed activity results, or will or is likely to result, in 1 or more of the following, for the purpose of subsection (1)(b), the impact is significant—
- 2 **Clause 8 (What is a *significant residual impact*)**  
Page 15, lines 3 to 6—  
*omit, insert—*  
(4) If a prescribed environmental matter is, or is in, a legally secured offset area and the adverse impact of the prescribed activity on all or part of the matter results, or will or is likely to result, in 1 or more of the following, for the purpose of subsection (1)(b), the impact is significant—
- 3 **Clause 8 (What is a *significant residual impact*)**  
Page 15, line 14—  
*omit, insert—*  
this or another Act);
- 4 **Clause 8 (What is a *significant residual impact*)**  
Page 15, after line 18—  
*insert—*  
(5) For subsection (2), a protected area does not include a nature refuge.  
(6) To remove any doubt, it is declared that subsection (2) does not apply to a prescribed environmental matter in a protected area.
- 5 **Clause 10 (What is a *prescribed environmental matter and a matter of environmental significance*)**  
Page 16, line 14, 'it is'—  
*omit.*
- 6 **Clause 10 (What is a *prescribed environmental matter and a matter of environmental significance*)**  
Page 16, line 15, before 'a matter'—  
*insert—*  
it is
- 7 **Clause 10 (What is a *prescribed environmental matter and a matter of environmental significance*)**  
Page 16, line 18, before 'the subject'—  
*insert—*  
it is, or may be,
- 8 **Clause 10 (What is a *prescribed environmental matter and a matter of environmental significance*)**  
Page 16, lines 21 to 27—  
*omit.*
- 9 **Clause 13 (Content of environmental offsets policy)**  
Page 18, lines 7 to 8—  
*omit, insert—*  
(e) set out the requirements for calculating the amount required for a financial settlement offset; or  
(f) include any other provision relating to the main purpose of this Act.
- 10 **Clause 14 (Imposing offset condition)**  
Page 18, line 21, 'cost-effective'—  
*omit, insert—*  
reasonable
- 11 **Clause 14 (Imposing offset condition)**  
Page 18, lines 26 and 27, 'for the same prescribed environmental matter.'—  
*omit, insert—*  
for—  
(a) the same, or substantially the same, prescribed activity; and  
(b) the same, or substantially the same, prescribed environmental matter; and  
(c) the same, or substantially the same, area of land.

**12 Clause 14 (Imposing offset condition)**

Page 18, line 29, 'authority'—

*omit, insert—*

agency

**13 Clause 15 (Restriction on imposition of offset condition)**

Page 19, lines 4 to 33—

*omit, insert—*

- (1) An administering agency must not impose an offset condition on an authority if the significant residual impact on the prescribed environmental matter relates to an area—
  - (a) for which there is an existing Commonwealth condition about—
    - (i) the same, or substantially the same, prescribed activity; and
    - (ii) the same, or substantially the same, prescribed environmental matter; or
  - (b) about which the Commonwealth has decided not to impose a Commonwealth condition for—
    - (i) the same, or substantially the same, prescribed activity; and
    - (ii) the same, or substantially the same, prescribed environmental matter.
- (2) Subsection (1) applies regardless of whether the administering agency considers—
  - (a) if there is an existing Commonwealth condition—the significant residual impact on the prescribed environmental matter is, or is likely to be, more significant than the impact for which the existing Commonwealth condition was decided; or
  - (b) if the Commonwealth decided not to impose a Commonwealth condition—the Commonwealth should have imposed a Commonwealth condition.
- (3) Subsection (1) does not apply if the prescribed environmental matter to which the condition relates is a protected area.
- (4) An administering agency that is a local government must not impose an offset condition on an authority if the significant residual impact on the prescribed environmental matter relates to an area—
  - (a) for which there is an existing State condition about—
    - (i) the same, or substantially the same, prescribed environmental matter; and
    - (ii) the same, or substantially the same, prescribed activity; or
  - (b) about which the State has decided not to impose a State condition for—
    - (i) the same, or substantially the same, prescribed environmental matter; and
    - (ii) the same, or substantially the same, prescribed activity.
- (5) Subsection (4) applies regardless of whether the administering agency considers—
  - (a) if there is an existing State condition—the significant residual impact on the prescribed environmental matter is, or is likely to be, more significant than the impact for which the existing State condition was decided; or
  - (b) if the State decided not to impose a State condition—the State should have imposed a State condition.
- (6) In this section—
 

**Commonwealth condition** means a condition that may be imposed on a licence, permit or other authority under a relevant Commonwealth Act, the effect of which is equivalent to an offset condition.

**existing** means—

  - (a) for a State condition—an offset condition that has been imposed; or
  - (b) for a Commonwealth condition—a condition that has been imposed under a relevant Commonwealth Act.

**14 Clause 15 (Restriction on imposition of offset condition)**

Page 20, after line 6—

*insert—***State condition** means an offset condition.**15 Clause 16 (Conditions that apply under this Act to authority)**

Page 20, after line 19—

*insert—*

- (5) Subsection (4) applies despite anything to the contrary in the *Sustainable Planning Act 2009*, section 347(1)(b) and (c).

**16 Clause 18 (Election about delivery of offset condition)**

Page 21, lines 15 to 29 and page 22, line 1—

*omit, insert—*

- (1) This section applies if, under an authority granted under another Act by an administering agency, the authority holder may—
  - (a) carry out a prescribed activity to which an offset condition relates for a prescribed environmental matter; or
  - (b) carry out a prescribed activity mentioned in paragraph (a) in stages (a **staged activity**) and deliver an environmental offset for each stage of the staged activity.
- (2) It is a condition of the authority that, before the authority holder starts any part of the prescribed activity mentioned in paragraph (a), or each stage of a staged activity mentioned in paragraph (b), the holder must—
  - (a) elect, by notice in the approved form given to the administering agency, to deliver the offset condition, or the offset condition for each stage of the staged activity, by—
    - (i) a proponent-driven offset; or
    - (ii) a financial settlement offset; or
    - (iii) a combination of a proponent-driven offset and a financial settlement offset; and
  - (b) agree with the administering agency about the delivery of the offset condition for the prescribed activity mentioned in paragraph (a) or the stage of the staged activity.
- (3) If an authority holder gives a notice of election that involves a proponent-driven offset, it is also a condition of the authority that the notice

**17 Clause 18 (Election about delivery of offset condition)**

Page 22, line 17, after 'requirement of'—

*insert—*

, or of an authority under,

**18 Clause 18 (Election about delivery of offset condition)**

Page 22, lines 21 and 22, from 'Land' to '2002'—

*omit, insert—**Land Protection (Pest and Stock Route Management) Act 2002***19 Clause 18 (Election about delivery of offset condition)**

Page 22, lines 30 to 32—

*omit.***20 Clause 19 (Reaching agreement about delivery)**

Page 23, after line 23—

*insert—*

- (3A) If the administering agency fails to give notice under subsection (2) or (3) within 40 business days after the administering agency receives the notice of election, the holder of the authority may apply for a review of failure to give notice in the way provided for under subsection (6).

**21 Clause 19 (Reaching agreement about delivery)**

Page 23, line 27, after 'arrangement'—

*insert—*

before the authority holder starts any relevant prescribed activity under the authority

**22 Clause 19 (Reaching agreement about delivery)**

Page 23, lines 32 to 34—

*omit, insert—*

- (6) A regulation may provide for—
  - (a) a review of the decision to give a notice under subsection (3), or a failure to give a notice under subsection (2) or (3), within 40 business days after the administering agency receives the notice of election; and
  - (b) what happens if the authority holder and administering agency do not reach

**23 After clause 19**

Page 24, after line 2—

*insert—***Division 2A Amending agreements after prescribed activity starts****19A Amending agreement after prescribed activity starts**

- (1) This section applies if—
- (a) an administering agency and an authority holder have entered into an agreed delivery arrangement under section 19 that involves a proponent-driven offset; and
  - (b) the authority holder has started the prescribed activity to which the authority relates.
- (2) By further agreement (also an **agreed delivery arrangement**), the authority holder and administering agency may amend either or both of the following—
- (a) the agreed delivery arrangement;
  - (b) an offset delivery plan about the delivery of the proponent-driven offset.
- (3) In considering whether to enter into a further agreement, the administering agency must have regard to the matters mentioned in section 19(1)(a) and (b).
- (4) An offset delivery plan amended under this section must comply with the requirements of section 18(4) and (5).

**24 Clause 23 (Requirements for financial settlement offsets)**

Page 25, lines 8 to 18—

*omit, insert—*

required by, and in the way stated in, the agreed delivery arrangement—

- (a) if the offset condition relates to a matter of local environmental significance that is prescribed as a prescribed environmental matter—to the local government that is the administering agency; or
- (b) if the offset condition relates to a matter of State environmental significance that is prescribed as a prescribed environmental matter and further prescribed as relevant for this section—to the local government that is the administering agency; or
- (c) otherwise—to the department.

*Note—*

See also sections 84 and 88.

- (3) In deciding the amount to be required as a financial settlement offset, an administering agency must calculate the amount in accordance with the environmental offsets policy.

**25 Clause 25 (Environmental offset agreement)**

Page 26, lines 12 to 15—

*omit, insert—*

government's trust fund—the local government;

- (b) otherwise—the chief executive.

**26 Clause 28 (What is a *legally secured offset area*)**

Page 28, lines 12 to 16—

*omit, insert—*

- (2) Also, an area is a **legally secured offset area** if, after an offset condition is imposed on an authority—
  - (a) the area is dedicated, or declared by regulation, as mentioned in the *Nature Conservation Act 1992*, section 29(1) or 46; and
  - (b) the area is subject to a delivery or management plan or agreement (however described in the *Nature Conservation Act 1992*) to achieve a conservation outcome for a prescribed environmental matter.

**27 Clause 29 (Declaration of environmental offset protection area)**

Page 28, lines 25 to 28—

*omit, insert—*

- (1) An owner of land may apply, in the approved form, to the chief executive for a declaration the land stated in the application is an environmental offset protection area.
- (1A) The application must be accompanied by—
  - (a) an environmental offset agreement and offset delivery plan, which are designed to achieve a conservation outcome; and
  - (b) the signed consent to the declaration of each person with an interest in the land stated in the application.

**28 Clause 29 (Declaration of environmental offset protection area)**

Page 29, lines 27 to 31—

*omit, insert—*

- (c) each other person with an interest in the land within the area has consented to the declaration.

**29 Clause 30 (Recording of declared areas, etc.)**

Page 30, lines 27 to 30 and page 31, lines 1 to 10—

*omit, insert—*

- (b) give notice to the land registrar that the declaration has been made.
- (2) The notice under subsection (1)(b) must—
  - (a) include particulars of the land within the area the subject of the declaration; and
  - (b) state that an environmental offset agreement and, if relevant, an offset delivery plan, exist in relation to the land.
- (3) If the land registrar is given a notice under subsection (1)(b) about land within the area the subject of the declaration, the land registrar must keep a record in a way that a search of a register kept by the land registrar will show—
  - (a) the declaration has been made in relation to the land; and
  - (b) an environmental offset agreement and, if relevant, an offset delivery plan exist in relation to the land.

**30 Clause 30 (Recording of declared areas, etc.)**

Page 31, lines 13 and 14, from 'the land' to 'registered'—

*omit, insert—*

a record may not be included in a register

**31 Clause 33 (Correcting, updating or removing registry record)**

Page 32, lines 1 to 19—

*omit, insert—***33 Updating or removing registry record**

- (1) This section applies if there is a registry record kept by the land registrar about a declaration of an environmental offset protection area (a **registry record**).
- (2) The chief executive may ask the land registrar to remove the registry record if—
  - (a) there was an error in the notice given to the registrar; or
  - (b) the declaration has been amended; or
  - (c) the declaration has been revoked and replaced.
- (3) The land registrar must remove the registry record if asked to do so by the chief executive.
- (4) After the removal, the chief executive may give the land registrar a notice containing information about—
  - (a) a declaration of an environmental offset protection area that was previously made; or
  - (b) a new declaration of an environmental offset protection area.
- (5) The notice must comply with section 30(2).
- (6) If the land registrar is given a notice under subsection (4), the land registrar must keep a registry record in a way that a search of a register kept by the land registrar will show the information given under subsection (4).
- (7) No fee is payable in relation to a removal or recording of a registry record under this section.

**32 Clause 36 (Offence relating to compliance notice)**

Page 34, lines 11 and 12—

*omit, insert—*

- conservation outcome—1665 penalty units; or
- (b) otherwise—300 penalty units.

**33 Clause 41 (Functions of inspectors)**

Page 35, line 16, 'inspectors'—

*omit, insert—***enforcement officers****34 Clause 44 (Appointment and qualifications)**

Page 36, lines 25 and 26—

*omit, insert—*

- (d) other persons prescribed by regulation.

**35 Clause 83 (Object of offset account)**

Page 57, line 18, after 'offsets'—

*insert—*

to achieve conservation outcomes

**36 Clause 85 (Payment of amounts from offset account)**

Page 58, line 15, before 'The'—

*insert—*

(1)

**37 Clause 85 (Payment of amounts from offset account)**

Page 58, lines 25 to 30—

*omit, insert—*

- (d) paying other amounts required or permitted under this Act to be part of the offset account.
- (2) If a financial settlement payment has been made for a prescribed environmental matter that is a protected area, the chief executive must give the amount to the department responsible for the administration of the protected area for the delivery of an environmental offset as mentioned in section 7(3).
- (3) However, subsection (2) does not apply for financial settlement payments received in relation to impacts on—
  - (a) other matters of environmental significance within a protected area; or
  - (b) a protected area that is a nature refuge.

**38 Clause 88 (Payment of amounts into and from trust fund)**

Page 59, lines 26 to 28 and page 60, lines 1 and 2—

*omit, insert—*

- (2) The local government may transfer an amount from a trust fund only for—
  - (a) paying expenses incurred, directly or indirectly, by the local government in the delivery of the environmental offset to achieve a conservation outcome; or
  - (b) paying fees or expenses related to administering the trust fund; or
  - (c) paying other amounts prescribed, or required or permitted, by regulation to be paid out of the trust fund.

**39 Clause 92 (Regulation-making power)**

Page 61, line 20, 'identified'—

*omit, insert—*

registered

**40 Clause 94 (Application of this Act or existing Act)**

Page 63, lines 10 to 12, from 'if the' to 'offset'—

*omit, insert—*

to the extent a new environmental offset condition is imposed on the amended authority

**41 Clause 95 (Transitional regulation-making power)**

Page 63, after line 32—

*insert—*

- (5) To remove any doubt, it is declared that the operation of an existing Act includes the operation of subordinate legislation or other statutory instruments under the existing Act.

**42 Clause 138 (Amendment of s 346A (Environmental offset conditions))**

Page 88, after line 8—

*insert—*

- (3B) Section 347(1)(b) and (c) does not apply in relation to a deemed condition.

**43 Clause 138 (Amendment of s 346A (Environmental offset conditions))**

Page 88, lines 16 to 19—

*omit, insert—**omit.*

**44 After clause 138**

Page 88, after line 19—

*insert—***138A Insertion of new s 346B**

After section 346A—

*insert—***346B Conditions of authority**

- (1) This section applies if, on or after the commencement of this section, a condition comes into force that is an environmental offset condition under section 346A.
- (2) To the extent the environmental offset condition is inconsistent with a deemed condition, the deemed condition prevails.

*Note—*

See the *Environmental Offsets Act 2014*, section 5(3). Under that provision, particular imposed conditions prevail over deemed conditions.

**45 Clause 139 (Insertion of new ch 10, pt 10)**

Page 89, lines 13 to 31 and page 90, lines 1 to 20—

*omit.***46 After clause 139**

Page 91, after line 10—

*insert—***139A Amendment of sch 3 (Dictionary)**

Schedule 3—

*insert—***deemed condition** see the *Environmental Offsets Act 2014*, schedule 2.**environmental offset** see the *Environmental Offsets Act 2014*, schedule 2.

I table the explanatory notes to my amendments.

*Tabled paper:* Environmental Offsets Bill 2014, explanatory notes to Hon. Andrew Powell's amendments [\[5194\]](#).

Amendments agreed to.

Clauses 1 to 147, as amended, agreed to.

Schedules 1 and 2—

**Mr POWELL** (11.43 pm): I seek leave to move amendments en bloc.

Leave granted.

**Mr POWELL:** I move the following amendments—

**47 Schedule 2 (Dictionary)**

Page 97, line 6, 'section 19'—

*omit, insert—*

sections 19 and 19A.

**48 Schedule 2 (Dictionary)**

Page 98, after line 19—

*insert—*

**land registrar** means the registrar of titles under the *Land Title Act 1994* or another person responsible for keeping a register for dealings in land.

Amendments agreed to.

Schedules 1 and 2, as amended, agreed to.

### Third Reading

**Hon. AC POWELL** (Glass House—LNP) (Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection) (11.44 pm): I move—

That the bill, as amended, be now read a third time.

Question put—That the bill, as amended, be now read a third time.

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a third time.

### Long Title

**Hon. AC POWELL** (Glass House—LNP) (Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection) (11.45 pm): I move—


That the long title of the bill be agreed to.

Question put—That the long title of the bill be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

### Error in Answer to Question

 **Hon. CKT NEWMAN** (Ashgrove—LNP) (Premier) (11.46 pm), by leave: I would like to clarify a comment that I made on Wednesday, 21 May in the House during question time. It was reported in *Hansard* that I made a comment regarding residents of the Logan community. It has been drawn to my attention that the comment has been taken out of context, and I rise quickly to correct the record.

What was reported in *Hansard* was not an accurate recording of what I said. On examining the footage, it is evident that what I said was different to what was recorded in *Hansard*. Let me be clear: the interjection I made was in reference to Mr Palmer and the member for Gaven's comments on what he thinks of his constituents. Late last year the *Courier-Mail* reported very prominently that the member for Gaven said that his constituents were 'bogans'. That was the front page of the *Courier-Mail*.

I do not think the people of Queensland in any electorate are 'bogans'. I understand the mayor of Logan, Pam Parker, has taken offence to what was recorded in *Hansard* and again I would like to set the report straight. My interjection was not correctly reported. My government has worked hard for the people and city of Logan since coming to government. I look forward to continuing to work with the mayor in the future and for the people of Logan.

I would like to remind the House that professional members of the parliamentary media gallery were in the House at the time of the interjection, and no-one reported anything untoward in my comments at that time. I reiterate: my interjection was not to cause any offence, nor did it when it was made, and *Hansard* has since been corrected to correctly reflect my comments at the time.

## SPECIAL ADJOURNMENT

**Mr STEVENS** (Mermaid Beach—LNP) (Leader of the House) (11.47 pm): I move—

That the House, at its rising, do adjourn until 9.30 am on Tuesday, 3 June 2014.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.


Motion agreed to.

## ADJOURNMENT

**Mr STEVENS** (Mermaid Beach—LNP) (Leader of the House) (11.47 pm): I move—

That the House do now adjourn.

### Cultural Precinct Master Plan


 **Ms TRAD** (South Brisbane—ALP) (11.48 pm): I rise to put on record some concerns that I have in relation to the recently announced Cultural Precinct Master Plan which was released by the state government on 5 May. Can I also just put on the record, before I detail my concerns in relation to the master plan, that I acknowledge that I requested from the minister for arts, science and information technology a briefing in relation to the draft master plan which he forwarded to me today, and I want to put on the record my thanks to the minister for responding to my request so promptly.

The first issue I want to put on the record in relation to the cultural precinct master plan relates to the very limited time frame for the public and the local community—in fact, all of the Queensland community—to be consulted on what is quite a significant redevelopment or redesign of the cultural precinct of South Bank. The government had initially provided 25 days for the community to be consulted on a plan that it purports spans two decades in terms of investment, redesign and

construction within that area. This was woefully inadequate. I put my concerns on the record three days after the release of the master plan and I am pleased—and I will acknowledge the minister's efforts in this respect—that the minister has listened to that concern that I not only expressed but many members of my electorate expressed, local developers expressed and local businesses expressed. So I want to put on the record my thanks in relation to that. My other concern in relation to the cultural precinct draft master plan is in fact what appears to be a plan to overdevelop and extremely commercialise what is a very renowned cultural precinct—the cultural heart of our state. There is the proposal to build two 30-storey towers or the suggestion that two 30-storey towers may be built—one atop a new theatre next to the Playhouse and one atop or in proximity to the museum or a new science centre. I think that the suggestion or the proposal to put two 30-storey towers in that precinct runs counter to what that public space and what that area is designed for.


*(Time expired)*

### **Pine Rivers Electorate, Schools**

 **Mr HOLSWICH** (Pine Rivers—LNP) (11.51 pm): Today I had the opportunity to welcome into Parliament House school captains, principals and P&C presidents from all of the schools in Pine Rivers. This is the third year in a row now that I have had the opportunity to do that and it is certainly a wonderful day and a wonderful highlight of my year to bring in our student leaders—four school captains from each of the schools as well as four middle school leaders and four senior school leaders from the high schools. It is certainly great to see them engaging in this precinct, to see them learning about our parliament and to have the opportunity then to have lunch with them as well. I want to particularly thank the Minister for Education, Training and Employment for spending some time talking to the students today and taking some questions, and certainly some of the students did not hold back with some tough questions. Whilst they were here today I had the opportunity to talk to the school principals about the Great Results Guarantee and how that is playing out in schools in Pine Rivers. This year schools in Pine Rivers received around \$893,000 as part of the Great Results Guarantee, and the principals certainly appreciate the autonomy they have in being able to spend that money. One of the principals I spoke to today was telling me how they are making sure that they squeeze every cent out of every dollar that they receive to ensure they get maximum benefit for the students at their school.


It is great to see some of the plans that the schools have in place and it is great to see how they are already starting to deliver on them. Strathpine West State School in particular has a number of strategies in place, one of which is developing a Home Link strategy to support parents of at-risk students and students who are not learning at expected standards. Today it was great to hear from its principal about the engagement that it is having with parents and the way it is supporting students who are at risk when it comes to their literacy and numeracy levels. Another one of its strategies revolves around gathering an early diagnosis of language difficulties in prep and year 1, and I think that just sums up exactly what the Great Results Guarantee is all about—making sure that we have early intervention and making sure that we deal with any potential literacy and numeracy issues while students are still young. Lawnton State School is spending \$60,000 of its allocation on a literacy and numeracy coach three days per week, and a number of other schools are doing similar things. We certainly have a strong plan for a brighter future for students throughout Queensland and I am certainly very grateful that this money is being well spent at Pine Rivers schools. I look forward to seeing the results in this year and years to come.

### **Campbell, Mr G**

 **Mr LATTER** (Waterford—LNP) (11.54 pm): Tonight I rise to speak with a heavy heart for certainly a very unfortunate circumstance. On the day of Saturday, the 17th of this month, Mr Gary Campbell was struck and killed by a truck while riding his bicycle. Mr Gary Campbell was married to his wife, Sue, and was a family man, and I wish to express my condolences to his wife and to his children and to their family at large. I want to speak a little bit about Gary Campbell—certainly a very well regarded, well respected man in our community who happened to work for the Logan City Council. In fact, Gary was the program leader for the indoor sports centres program for more than 10 years and was a driving force behind the development of the Logan Metro Sports Centre and the establishment of the Logan Thunder WNBL team. Gary was also involved in the development of the leadership development program at Logan City Council and was very much in demand to be mentor to many LDP participants because of his excellent leadership qualities and ability to build great teams. Gary died doing something that he absolutely loved. In fact, in the circle of friends that he

had—those who enjoy riding, cycling if you will—this is a toll that comes as rather a heavy burden on them as well. This, although a very brief contribution, is about expressing my sincerest condolences, as I mentioned before, to Gary Campbell's wife and children, to his friends and family at large, and to his acquaintances and colleagues at the Logan City Council who respected him greatly.

### Ipswich Show

 **Mr BERRY** (Ipswich—LNP) (11.57 pm): This is an opportunity for me to appraise this House as to the conclusion of the 141st Ipswich Show which concluded after the event of 16, 17 and 18 May 2014. I was very happy as to how the event went. I was—

**Mr Dillaway:** Did you bring your camel?

**Mr BERRY:** I was in the camel competition and I sit next to the member for Ipswich West, who got into the final, but unfortunately he let the team down. The LNP was just beaten by free enterprise, but next year I think the member for Ipswich West will do a lot better and I sincerely hope that they give him a better camel. I cannot repeat here what I called my camel because it may offend somebody in the House, but anyway I will move on. The weather was absolutely fantastic—typical weather for a show. It rained a little bit on Saturday night—five millimetres—but it was fine. Everything was great.

The one thing that I really love about going to a show is the number of young people there, particularly this year more than any other year. There were not only young people but also families and babies. There were so many prams. It was just so great to see that there has been an influx of young people to Ipswich who are having families and they went to the place that we all enjoyed as children. I have to mention Angus, the person who conducts the show. He is an absolute gentleman from Toowoomba, but he has been doing shows for as long as there has been a Moses. I say to Angus: I really do enjoy how you conduct the show, the respect you have for the competitors and your ability to be able to keep the momentum going in a show such as this. The Ipswich Show goes for three days, so it is a long show and one which really was well attended. There were over 20,000 people and 200 single exhibits. My learned friend from Ipswich West put his turkeys in, and we thank him for that.

**Mr Choat:** And the ducks.

**Mr BERRY:** We thank him for giving these turkeys a lesson not to—


**Mr Choat:** What about the ducks?

**Mr BERRY:** The ducks too, but they lost their colour! There is a little bit of history to the Ipswich Show, because it started on 2 April 1873 and moved from an area around Churchill to where it is held today.

I really have to thank the president, Marcia Cruickshank; the vice-president, Darren Zanow; Rusty Thomas and the committee, strong as it is; and in particular the volunteers and, of course, those patrons. They really did support the show. It is a hallmark of Ipswich life. I want to see at least some members there next year. I ask them to come to my stand and I will tell them about what is happening in Ipswich. It is a great place to live; a great place to work. It makes me so excited to be here that, in fact, with the enthusiasm—

*(Time expired)*

### Racing Queensland

 **Dr DOUGLAS** (Gaven—PUP) (12.00 am): This week the deputy chairman and one of the directors of the Racing Queensland board resigned amidst reported statements that the deputy chair in particular had been excluded from further wagering negotiations that are currently being undertaken by the board. These negotiations are probably the most important that the board will ever consider if the current minister's public statements are to be believed, since he stated repeatedly that he suspects that the former wagering tenderer, Tatts Group, underpaid the government by at least \$150 million annually.

Despite his claims that he has had an inquiry into the former board and that much came out of it, there is little evidence to show that anything for the betterment of Queensland Racing has occurred. This was followed by the most incredible statement of all. The minister gave the clear statement that he would take Queensland from being eight furlongs behind New South Wales and Victoria to being at least a furlong in front.

The replaced Toowoomba cushion track is now so impossible to race on that, today, racing was transferred to Dalby—Dalby! That is after they have spent that enormous amount on the track. They could not run on it. To demonstrate the loss of confidence in the industry's failure, this year's QTIS yearling sales in March was the worst on record. Breeders are rapidly exiting the industry and in the last two years the breeding stock population has declined by 26 per cent. This year's decline will be 20 per cent. That is a 46 per cent decline during the minister's tenure.

In summary, after two years of the minister being responsible for his portfolio, we have an industry that is facing economic crisis, farms closing down, trainers closing stables and employment in the industry reducing each week. Today, a crisis meeting was held for the stakeholders involved—that is, owners, breeders, jockeys, trainers and anyone else involved. Unfortunately, the majority of owners and breeders—virtually everybody in that group—did not turn up. There was a smattering of trainers and jockeys at the meeting, but nothing was achieved out of it.

The previous week there was a crisis meeting held between the Premier, the Deputy Premier, the Treasurer and Minister Dickson. They met with the chair of Queensland Racing and some very critical major owners. Basically, what was stated was that the wagering agreement is in serious trouble and that no-one can stand by and watch this amateur government, which has no idea what it is doing, undermine racing in Queensland to the point at which there will be no industry. They have let the state down. The minister has as well. They have cost us a lot of money. They may well have destroyed an industry that is very critical for Queensland. Who will be held accountable? This is a dreadful situation. It is an ongoing problem and it needs urgent correction. We need a new minister.

### **Gimblett, Ms G, OAM; Boonah Show; Marburg Show**



**Mr KRAUSE** (Beaudesert—LNP) (12.03 am): Last Friday, I attended the farewell for Gerry Gimblett OAM, who was the principal of Beaudesert State School for 14 years until this year. Gerry was much loved by the Beaudesert community, but she has decided to move on to other ventures in her life. Over her 14 years at Beaudesert State School she became an integral part of the community and the affection and genuine gratitude shown for Mrs Gimblett's work at Beaudesert State School over those 14 years was very much on display last Friday. Gerry was farewelled by all the children at the school, who formed a large circle on the oval. She went around and said goodbye to each of them individually. Gerry was quite famous for her 'Beauification' of children who moved into the area, inculcating them in the culture and tradition of Beaudesert State School. The school certainly has a great culture. She was also famous for singing to each child on their birthday. Certainly, Gerry has left a great impression on many young people. She is moving on to run a hotel in Yaraka and we certainly wish her well. On behalf of the whole community, I thank Gerry for her work in the community.

Last weekend the Boonah Show was held—on the same day as the Ipswich Show, in fact. Boonah Show was celebrating its 114th show. So it is not quite as old as the Ipswich Show, but it certainly had a great day last Saturday. A lot of people went through the gate and many sections had a record number of exhibits. For example, I note that the flower section had to take more space in the showgrounds because there were so many entries from around the region. The prime beef cattle show on the Friday and stud beef cattle show as well on the Saturday had many entries from breeders and exhibitors but also on the Saturday a lot of schools from around the region brought their cattle to Boonah to show them. It was a great day. I commend the Boonah Show Society for all the work that they have done.


A couple of weeks before that I was lucky enough to attend the Marburg Show in the electorate of Ipswich West. I know the president of that show society quite well, being my father, Robert Krause. I would like to table an extract from *Queensland Country Life* of 8 May 2014, because Stan Wallace, one of the legends of *Queensland Country Life*, was there to open the Marburg show. I thank Stan very much for coming along to the show on that day. Despite the fact that there was a good westerly blowing, it was a great day as well. I know that the member for Ipswich West was well received at the show and I thank him for his attendance.

*Tabled paper: Queensland Country Life article, dated 8 May 2014, page 87, regarding the Marburg show [5195].*

There are a lot of great things going on in the Beaudesert electorate, including in the racing sector. I disagree absolutely with the comments of the member for Gaven. Country racing is back in town—

*(Time expired)*

### Lengyel, Ms O; Holocaust Remembrance Day

 **Mr CHOAT** (Ipswich West—LNP) (12.05 am): On Monday night I started reading a book. It is a book that I have read before and I have it with me now. It is titled *Five Chimneys*. It is a survivor's true story of Auschwitz, a woman named Olga Lengyel. It is a compelling read, albeit difficult at times. Indeed I have never experienced such emotion while reading a book. The kinds of experiences as described in the book will stay with me forever.

In 1944, Olga Lengyel worked as a surgical assistant in Cluj, the capital of Transylvania, at the clinic owned by her husband, Miklos. As early as 1943, the Lengyels had heard about Nazi atrocities against civilians in occupied territories. However, like many people at the time, they refused to believe that it could be possible. In May 1944, Dr Miklos Lengyel was called to the police station in Cluj, most likely because he was denounced as a Jew. When Olga was told that her husband was to be deported immediately to Germany, she insisted that she and her children be allowed to join him. So that the family would not be separated, Olga's parents also joined Miklos at the train station for the trip to Germany. The family and other hapless passengers were forced into crowded cattle cars.

Upon arrival in Auschwitz-Birkenau, young men, including Miklos, were selected for slave labour while Olga's parents and two young sons were sent directly to the gas chambers. Olga was selected to work in the camp's crude medical centre, which probably saved her life. I wish to read a reflection by Olga so that it is on this parliamentary record—

Mea culpa—

in Olga's native tongue 'my fault'—


mea maxima culpa—I cannot acquit myself of the charge that I am, in part, responsible for the destruction of my own parents and of my two young sons. The world understands that I could not have known, but in my heart the terrible feeling persists that I could have, I might have, saved them.

Olga died in 2001 in the United States aged 93.

Recently, on 27 April my wife, Nicky, and I were privileged to attend the Jewish shrine for holocaust victims by Mr Jason Steinberg for Holocaust Remembrance Day commemorations. It was a moving ceremony with such reverence displayed.

This week we have heard some trivialisation of the matters of the holocaust. Such disregard hurts people. The murder of six million Jews, 1.5 million of them children, and an additional five million others in the Nazi death camps must never be trivialised or forgotten. I stand here and express my respects to the victims, survivors and their families on behalf of my Ipswich West community. May God bless them and keep them in his presence. There are two important words that say so much: never again!


### Nicklin Electorate, Community Services

 **Mr WELLINGTON** (Nicklin—Ind) (12.08 am): I have more good news for the people of Nicklin. The good news is that the former Namtec building, located on the corner of Mathew Street and Quota Park, Nambour, will now be able to continue to be used for the delivery of community services as a result of a cooperative formed between the following not-for-profit community organisations: Equity Works Association Inc., Inclusion Plus Family Support Inc., Spiral Inc., Skills Inc., and Parent to Parent Association Queensland Inc.

The delivery of these community services will only be possible because the Minister for Communities, Child Safety and Disability Services, the Hon. Tracy Davis, intervened in the timing of the proposed government auction sale as a result of my request so that the not-for-profit community organisations could organise their finances and prepare an offer for the proposed auction sale. The records show that as a result of the one-month delay in the holding of the public auction this community cooperative was able to prepare their finances and on the auction day submit the highest offer and purchase the site.

In this regard I would like to thank Minister Davis for her ongoing interest in how the cooperative was progressing in the lead-up to the auction day and on the auction day. I believe this group of not-for-profit community organisations are leading Queensland in showing how a number of not-for-profit community organisations are able to work together in delivering a range of different and important community services to our region. On behalf of our community organisations I invite Minister Davis to come and visit our project when her diary is free so that she can meet personally with the range of community organisations and see the great work that this Queensland first venture is doing.

### **Crows Nest Show; Justices of the Peace**

 **Mrs FRECKLINGTON** (Nanango—LNP) (12.11 am): I would like to share with the House a couple of wonderful visits by two of the senior ministers of our government. It was fantastic to welcome the Hon. Lawrence Springborg, Minister for Health, to open the Crows Nest Show. I congratulate Athol Gossow and all of his committee for the amazing show that they put on. It was absolutely wonderful to have the minister take time out for one of my smaller country shows. I also had the Attorney-General come to the great areas of Nanango, Kingaroy and Yarraman. I really want to thank the Attorney-General for this visit. It was extremely important for the people in that South Burnett region where we have actually seen a decline in the crime rates, particularly around drugs in the local school. It was fantastic that he was able to take the time to visit the South Burnett area and talk about the important work he has been doing in relation to youth justice and much more.

The Attorney-General also had an opportunity to call in to see a great LNP stalwart, Mr Jim Bond, at Yarraman Wild Horse FM. It was just lovely that he could go on live radio. Jim Bond and Wild Horse FM stream live all around the world through their podcasts. They are really promoting that great part of the world. One of the highlights of the Attorney-General's visit was when we got all of the local JPs together in the Kingaroy Town Hall forecourt to acknowledge all of the hard work that they do. They also participated in an information session. I need to acknowledge Mrs Marion Peterson, the president of the local Kingaroy JP branch, and Mr Ben Madden, the Registrar at the Kingaroy Courthouse. Together these two work hard to coordinate the JPs in and around the South Burnett area. They deliver an excellent service. They are dedicated JPs who help out the people of Kingaroy and Nanango.

I would also like to take the time to congratulate several of our very special JPs who have been given awards. Mr Ray Black, Mr Nelson Dimond and Mr Peter Peacey received 50-year certificates and Mr Ian Stewart-Koster of Crows Nest received a 25-year award. I thank very much all the JPs from my Nanango electorate.

Question put—That the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 12.14 am (Friday).

### **ATTENDANCE**

Barton, Bates, Bennett, Berry, Bleijie, Boothman, Byrne, Cavallucci, Choat, Costigan, Cox, Crandon, Cripps, Crisafulli, Cunningham, D'Ath, Davies, C Davis, T Davis, Dempsey, Dickson, Dillaway, Douglas, Dowling, Emerson, Flegg, France, Frecklington, Grant, Grimwade, Gulley, Hart, Hathaway, Hobbs, Holswich, Hopper, Johnson, Judge, Katter, Kaye, Kempton, King, Knuth, Krause, Langbroek, Latter, Maddern, Malone, Mander, McArdle, McVeigh, Menkens, Millard, Miller, Minnikin, Molhoek, Newman, Nicholls, Ostapovitch, Palaszczuk, Pitt, Powell, Pucci, Rice, Rickuss, Robinson, Ruthenberg, Seeney, Shorten, Shuttleworth, Simpson, Smith, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stewart, Stuckey, Symes, Trad, Trout, Walker, Watts, Wellington, Woodforth, Young