ISSN 1322-0330

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

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

FIRST SESSION OF THE FIFTY-FOURTH PARLIAMENT

Tuesday, 5 August 2014

Subject Page

FS SIMPSON
SPEAKER

NJ LAURIE
CLERK OF THE PARLIAMENT

LJ OSMOND
CHIEF HANSARD REPORTER

Table of Contents – Tuesday, 5 August 2014

Table of Contents – Tuesday, 5 August 2014

TUESDAY, 5 AUGUST 2014

The Legislative Assembly met at 9.30 am.

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

For the sitting week, Madam Speaker acknowledged the traditional custodians of the land upon which this parliament is assembled.

ASSENT TO BILLS

Madam SPEAKER: Honourable members, I have to report that I have received from Her Excellency the Governor letters in respect of assent to certain bills, the contents of which will be incorporated in the *Record of Proceedings*. I table the letters 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: 12 June 2014

> "A Bill for An Act to amend the Child Protection (Offender Reporting) Act 2004 for particular purposes and to make related minor and consequential amendments to the Acts mentioned in schedule 1"
>
> "A Bill for An Act to amend the Duties Act 2001, the Land Tax Act 2010, the Mineral Resources Act 1989, the Payroll Tax Act 1971, the Petroleum and Gas (Production and Safety) Act 2004, the State Penalties Enforcement Act 1999 and the Taxation Administration Act 2001 for particular purposes"

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

12 June 2014

Tabled paper: Letter, dated 12 June 2014, from Her Excellency the Governor to the Speaker advising of assent to bills on 12 June 2014 [5418].

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 Bill, 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: 19 June 2014

> "A Bill for An Act to amend the Sustainable Planning Act 2009 for particular purposes, to amend the South-East Queensland Water (Distribution and Retail Restructuring) Act 2009 and the State Development and Public Works Organisation Act 1971 for other particular purposes, to amend the City of Brisbane Act 2010 and the Local Government Act 2009 for other particular purposes and to amend the Industrial Relations Act 1999 and Industrial Relations Regulation 2011 for other particular purposes"

This Bill is 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

19 June 2014

Tabled paper: Letter, dated 19 June 2014, from Her Excellency the Governor to the Speaker advising of assent to bills on 19 June 2014 [5419].

ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF STAFFORD

By-Election, Return of Writ

Madam SPEAKER: I have to report that the writ issued by Her Excellency the Governor on 19 June 2014 for the election of a member to serve in the Legislative Assembly for the electoral district of Stafford has been returned to me with a certificate endorsed thereon by the returning officer of the election, on 19 July 2014, of Anthony Joseph Lynham to serve as such member. I table the endorsed writ for the information of the House. I now call the honourable member forward to take the oath of allegiance and of office.

Tabled paper: Writ for by-election—Electorate of Stafford held on 19 July 2014 [5420].

MEMBER SWORN

Dr Anthony Joseph Lynham, having waited at the bar of the House, was invited by Madam Speaker to enter the chamber.

Madam Speaker administered the oath of allegiance and of office to Dr Lynham, who then subscribed the Roll of Members.

Madam SPEAKER: Honourable members, on behalf of the parliament I welcome to the Queensland Legislative Assembly the new member for Stafford.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

Madam SPEAKER: Before reading the next statements, I wish to advise members that there are some difficulties with the bells today. Welcome back! There is a move to have that rectified as soon as possible.

Tabled paper: Oath of Allegiance and of Office taken by Dr Anthony Lynham [5625].

SPEAKER'S STATEMENTS

Appointment of Acting Parliamentary Crime and Misconduct Commissioner

Madam SPEAKER: Honourable members, pursuant to section 308 of the Crime and Misconduct Act 2001, I advise that on 20 June 2014 I approved the appointment of Mr Mitchell Kunde as Acting Parliamentary Crime and Misconduct Commissioner for the period that the Parliamentary Crime and Misconduct Commissioner was absent from the state, 19 June to 12 July 2014. This appointment had the bipartisan support of the Parliamentary Crime and Misconduct Committee and I table the relevant correspondence from the committee.

Tabled paper: Letter, dated 20 June 2014, from the Chairperson of the Parliamentary Crime and Misconduct Committee to the Speaker regarding the appointment of an Acting Parliamentary Crime and Misconduct Commissioner [5421].

Appointment of Parliamentary Crime and Corruption Commissioner

Madam SPEAKER: Honourable members, I have to report that Mr Paul Favell has been re-appointed as the Parliamentary Crime and Corruption Commissioner for a further term of two years commencing on 22 August 2014. The re-appointment had the bipartisan support of the Parliamentary Crime and Corruption Committee and I table correspondence from the committee.

Tabled paper: Letter, dated 19 May 2014, from the Chairperson of the Parliamentary Crime and Misconduct Committee to the Speaker regarding the proposed reappointment of Mr Paul Favell as Parliamentary Crime and Misconduct Commissioner [5422].

Appointment of Integrity Commissioner

Madam SPEAKER: Honourable members, pursuant to section 73 of the Integrity Act 2009, I advise that on 1 July 2014 Governor in Council appointed Richard Bingham as Integrity Commissioner. In accordance with section 79 of the act, my deputy administered the affirmation of office to the Integrity Commissioner on 1 July 2014 and I table the affirmation of office.

Tabled paper: Affirmation of Office of Richard Eardley Bingham as Integrity Commissioner, affirmed and subscribed on 1 July 2014 [5423].

APPOINTMENTS

Opposition

Hon. A PALASZCZUK (Inala—ALP) (Leader of the Opposition) (9.34 am): For the information of the House, I table details of opposition appointments to the shadow cabinet. This shadow cabinet reshuffle was required due to the election of Dr Anthony Lynham as the new member for Stafford. It is my pleasure to welcome Dr Lynham to the shadow cabinet. I advise the House that he has accepted the shadow portfolios of education, science, IT and innovation, and primary industries and fisheries. He will also be the shadow minister assisting the leader on the Public Service. I am also pleased to announce that the member for Redcliffe has been promoted and will now be responsible for the portfolios of justice and Attorney-General, disability services and housing.

Tabled paper: Queensland shadow cabinet, 5 August 2014 [5424].

PETITIONS

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

Mornington State School, Flashing Lights

Mr Dillaway, from 444 petitioners, requesting the House to install flashing lights along Riding Road at Morningside State School, Saints Peter and Paul's Catholic School and Bulimba State School [5425, 5426].

Palmers Creek, Green Zone

Mr Bennett, from 53 petitioners, requesting the House to give consideration to changing the boundary of the current marine no-fishing zone 'green zone' south of Palmers Creek at Innes Park and Coral Cove [5427, 5428]

Bundaberg, FE Walker Street-Ashfield Road Intersection, Upgrade

Mr Bennett, from 780 petitioners, requesting the House to upgrade the intersection of FE Walker Street and Ashfield Road, Bundaberg to a roundabout or traffic lights as a matter of urgency [5429, 5430].

The Clerk presented the following e-petitions, sponsored by the honourable members indicated—

Horses, Slaughter

Dr Douglas, from 163 petitioners, requesting the House to implement regulations with minimum standards for the slaughter of horses, including a captive bolt and solid kill pen at least 20 metres from other horses [5431].

Gladstone Regional Council

Mr Bennett, from 121 petitioners, requesting the House to consider changing Gladstone Regional Council from undivided to divided representation, along the lines of State and Federal governments [5432].

Public Assets, Sale

Mrs Miller, from 2,368 petitioners, requesting the House to initiate the process for a binding referendum to be held in accordance with the requirements set out in the Referendums Act 1997, for a time within the 2014 calendar year, asking the people of Queensland whether they support the sale, or partial sale through equity partnerships, of state owned assets [5433].

Dutton Park State School, School Zone

Ms Trad, from 204 petitioners, requesting the House to designate the section of Annerley Road adjacent to the Dutton Park State School as a school zone [5434].

Labrador-Paradise Point-Runaway Bay, Bus Route

Ms Barton, from 59 petitioners, requesting the House to reinstate bus routes which travel from Labrador, Paradise Point and Runaway Bay directly into southern suburbs that the light rail will service and to lengthen the operating hours on the timetable of these bus routes [5435].

The Clerk presented the following e-petitions, sponsored by the Clerk in accordance with Standing Order 119(4)—

Beerwah State Forest, Motorcycle Facility

From 772 petitioners, requesting the House to oppose the proposed location for an off-road motorcycling facility in the Mooloolah logging area, Beerwah State Forest [5436].

Child Sex Offenders, Register

From 417 petitioners, requesting the House to establish a public register of child sex offenders to track their whereabouts and provide notification to the public of the presence of a child sex offender in their community [5437].

Petitions received.

TABLED PAPERS

PAPERS TABLED DURING THE RECESS

The Clerk informed the House that the following papers, received during the recess, were tabled on the dates indicated—

10 June 2014—

5366 Response from the Minister for Local Government, Community Recovery and Resilience (Mr Crisafulli) to a paper petition (2252-14) presented by the Clerk in accordance with Standing Order 119(3), from 893 petitioners, requesting the House to remove the Cassowary Coast Regional Council Mayor

5367 Health and Community Services Committee: Report No. 51—Subordinate legislation tabled between 12 February 2014 and 1 April 2014

16 June 2014—

5368 Transport, Housing and Local Government Committee: Report No. 45—Rail freight use by the agriculture and livestock industries

18 June 2014—

5369 Response from the Minister for Education, Training and Employment (Mr Langbroek) to a paper petition (2263-14) and an ePetition (2247-14) sponsored by the Clerk of the Parliament in accordance with Standing Order 119(3) and 119(4), from 2,109 and 468 petitioners respectively requesting the House to allocate Lot 1, on Crown Plan SL841384, County of Stanley Parish of North Brisbane, in its entirety for the sole use and occupation by the Brisbane Central State School in order to accommodate the total educational needs of current and future state primary school students in the BCSS catchment area

5370 Response from the Minister for Education, Training and Employment (Mr Langbroek) to an ePetition (2240-14) sponsored by Mr Sorensen, from 5 petitioners, requesting the House to build a safer fence around the perimeter of the Torquay State School grounds

19 June 2014—

5371 Response from the Minister for Transport and Main Roads (Mr Emerson) to a paper petition (2264-14) and an ePetition (2230-14) presented by Miss Barton from 111 and 27 petitioners respectively requesting the House to note the increase in bus and truck use on Matthew Flinders Drive as a major thoroughfare since the changes in TransLink services and to request bus routes use an alternate thoroughfare

5372 Response from the Minister for Education, Training and Employment (Mr Langbroek) to an ePetition (2210-14) sponsored by 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

20 June 2014—

5373 Response from the Minister for Local Government, Community Recovery and Resilience, (Mr Crisafulli) to a paper petition (2262-14) presented by Hon Bleijie, from 4,580 petitioners, requesting the House to amend the Local Government Act, and its subordinate legislation, to allow competition for the commercial waste management and recycling services currently being performed by the Sunshine Coast Council

5374 Response from the Minister for Transport and Main Roads (Mr Emerson) to a paper petition (2265-14) presented by Mr Knuth, from 83 petitioners, requesting the House to prioritise the installation of school flashing lights at Atherton State High School

23 June 2014—

5375 Response from the Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Services (Mr Dempsey) to a paper petition (2267-14) and an ePetition (2248-14) sponsored by the Clerk of the Parliament in accordance with Standing Order 119(3) and 119(4), from 329 and 438 petitioners respectively 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

24 June 2014—

5376 Response from the Minister for National Parks, Recreation, Sport and Racing (Mr Dickson) to a paper petition (2272-14) and an ePetition (2234-14) sponsored by the Clerk of the Parliament in accordance with Standing Order 119(3) and 119(4), from 1,011 and 3,254 petitioners respectively requesting the House to oppose the construction of the Greyhound Racing Track at Cronulla Park on social, economic and animal welfare grounds in favour of a more inclusive, multi-use facility for the community

5377 Response from the Minister for Local Government, Community Recovery and Resilience (Mr Crisafulli) to a paper petition (2273-14) sponsored by the Clerk of the Parliament in accordance with Standing Order 119(3), from 3,490 petitioners, requesting the House to appoint a Whitsunday Regional Council administrator until local government elections are held and Whitsunday Regional Council senior management positions are occupied by high performing staff

5378 Response from the Minister for Local Government, Community Recovery and Resilience (Mr Crisafulli) to an ePetition (2207-14) sponsored by Mr Crisafulli, from 65 petitioners, requesting the House to investigate the Townsville City Council and its links with developers over inconsistencies in the current Townsville City Plan 2013

26 June 2014—

5379 Auditor-General of Queensland: Report to Parliament No. 18: 2013-14—Monitoring and reporting performance

27 June 2014—

5380 Letter, dated 19 June 2014, from the Chair of the Joint Standing Committee on Treaties to the Speaker, regarding treaties tabled on 17 and 18 June 2014

30 June 2014—

5381 Response from the Acting Treasurer and Minister for Trade (Mr Emerson) to a paper petition (2266-14) and an ePetition (2208-14) sponsored by Ms Palaszczuk, from 67 and 548 petitioners respectively, 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

5382 Transport, Housing and Local Government Committee: Report No. 46—Transport and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2014

1 July 2014—

5383 Electoral Commission Queensland: Statistical Returns on the Redcliffe By-Election, 22 February 2014

5384 Response from the Minister for Energy and Water Supply (Mr McArdle) to a paper petition (2269-14) and an ePetition (2257-14) sponsored by Mr Bennett from 264 and 983 petitioners respectively requesting the House to implement an immediate 33% reduction to principal irrigation tariffs T62, T65 and T66

3 July 2014—

5385 Response from the Minister for Transport and Main Roads (Mr Emerson) to two paper petitions (2271-14 and 2270-14) and an ePetition (2244-14) sponsored by Miss Barton from 12, 89 and 62 petitioners respectively, requesting the House to increase the service of bus route 711 by extending the route to Broadbeach through Surfers Paradise from Southport

4 July 2014—

5386 Response from the Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection (Mr Powell) to an ePetition (2256-14) sponsored by the Clerk of the Parliament in accordance with Standing Order 119(4), from 260 petitioners, requesting the House to suspend further shooting of Agile wallabies within the Cassowary Coast until all non-lethal alternatives are exhausted and an independent scientific study is conducted

8 July 2014—

5387 Finance and Administration Committee: Report No. 41—Inquiry into Auditor-General's Report No. 4: 2012—Managing Employee Unplanned Absence-Government Response

11 July 2014—

5388 Auditor-General of Queensland: Report to Parliament No. 1: 2014-15—Internal control systems 2013-14

14 July 2014—

5389 Marine Incidents in Queensland 2013

18 July 2014—

5390 Overseas Travel Report: Report on an overseas visit by the Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection (Mr Powell) to Qatar, 13-20 June 2014

23 July 2014—

5391 Overseas Travel Report: Report on an overseas visit by the Minister for Science, Innovation and the Arts (Mr Walker) to the United States of America, 22-26 June 2014

24 July 2014—

5392 Professional Standards Act 2004: The Law Society of Western Australia Scheme—amended version

5393 Transport, Housing and Local Government Committee: Report No. 47—Subordinate legislation tabled between 1 April 2014 and 6 May 2014

25 July 2014—

5394 Committee of the Legislative Assembly: Report No. 10—Consideration of the Appropriation (Parliament) Bill 2014

28 July 2014—

5395 Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee: Report No. 68—Criminal Law Amendment Bill 2014

5396 State Development, Infrastructure and Industry Committee: Report No. 44—State Development, Infrastructure and Planning (Red Tape Reduction) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2014

5397 State Development, Infrastructure and Industry Committee: Report No. 44—State Development, Infrastructure and Planning (Red Tape Reduction) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2014—submissions received in relation to the inquiry

29 July 2014—

5398 Copy of Gazette Notice from the Queensland Government Gazette, dated 25 July 2014, advising that the Governor, acting by and with the advice of the Executive Council and pursuant to section 481A of the Workers' Compensation and Rehabilitation Act 2003, has approved WorkCover Queensland's payment of $82,803,029 (GST inclusive) to the Department of Justice and Attorney-General

30 July 2014—

5399 South East Queensland Regional Plan 2009–2031: State Planning Regulatory Provisions: Current as at May 2014

5400 Manual for the National Tax Equivalent Regime April 2014 (Version 9)

5401 Amended Queensland Motorways Limited Road Franchise Agreement: Road Franchise Agreement between the State of Queensland (the state) and Queensland Motorways Limited, the Gateway Bridge Company Limited and Logan Motorway Company Limited (franchisees)—Incorporates amendments to 30 June 2014

31 July 2014—

5402 Health and Community Services Committee: Report No. 36—Inquiry into sexually explicit outdoor advertising—government response

5403 Finance and Administration Committee: Report No. 46—2014-15 Budget Estimates

5404 Finance and Administration Committee: Report No. 46—2014-15 Budget Estimates –Additional Information

1 August 2014—

5405 Agriculture, Resources and Environment Committee: Report No. 42—2014-15 Budget Estimates

5406 Agriculture, Resources and Environment Committee: Report No. 42—2014-15 Budget Estimates—Additional Information

5407 Transport, Housing and Local Government Committee: Report No. 48—2014-15 Budget Estimates

5408 Transport, Housing and Local Government Committee: Report No. 48—2014-15 Budget Estimates—Additional Information

5409 Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee: Report No. 69—2014-2015 Budget Estimates

5410 Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee: Report No. 69—2014-2015 Budget Estimates—Additional Information

5411 State Development, Infrastructure and Industry Committee: Report No. 45—2014-15 Budget Estimates

5412 State Development, Infrastructure and Industry Committee: Report No. 45—2014-15 Budget Estimates—Additional Information

5413 Health and Community Services Committee: Report No. 52—2014-15 Budget Estimates

5414 Health and Community Services Committee: Report No. 52—2014-15 Budget Estimates—Additional Information

5415 Education and Innovation Committee: Report No. 35—2015-15 Budget Estimates

5416 Education and Innovation Committee: Report No. 35—2015-15 Budget Estimates—Additional Information

5417 Education and Innovation Committee: Report No. 35—2015-15 Budget Estimates—Additional Information—Volume 2

STATUTORY INSTRUMENTS

The following statutory instruments were tabled by the Clerk—

Health Act 1937, Radiation Safety Act 1999—

5438 Health Legislation Amendment Regulation (No. 2) 2014, No. 81

5439 Health Legislation Amendment Regulation (No. 2) 2014, No. 81, explanatory notes

Stock Act 1915—

5440 Stock Identification Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2014, No. 82

5441 Stock Identification Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2014, No. 82, explanatory notes

Commission for Children and Young People and Child Guardian Act 2000—

5442 Commission for Children and Young People and Child Guardian Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2014, No. 83

5443 Commission for Children and Young People and Child Guardian Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2014, No. 83, explanatory notes

Private Health Facilities Act 1999—

5444 Private Health Facilities (Standards) Amendment Notice (No. 1) 2014, No. 84

5445 Private Health Facilities (Standards) Amendment Notice (No. 1) 2014, No. 84, explanatory notes

State Development and Public Works Organisation Act 1971—

5446 State Development and Public Works Organisation (State Development Areas) Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2014, No. 85

5447 State Development and Public Works Organisation (State Development Areas) Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2014, No. 85, explanatory notes

Regional Planning Interests Act 2014—

5448 Proclamation commencing remaining provisions, No. 86

5449 Proclamation commencing remaining provisions, No. 86, explanatory notes

Land Sales Act 1984—

5450 Land Sales Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2014, No. 87

5451 Land Sales Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2014, No. 87, explanatory notes

Regional Planning Interests Act 2014, Sustainable Planning Act 2009—

5452 Regional Planning Interests Regulation 2014, No. 88

5453 Regional Planning Interests Regulation 2014, No. 88, explanatory notes

Liquor Act 1992—

5454 Liquor Amendment Regulation (No. 2) 2014, No. 89

5455 Liquor Amendment Regulation (No. 2) 2014, No. 89, explanatory notes

Criminal Law (Criminal Organisations Disruption) and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2013—

5456 Proclamation commencing remaining provisions, No. 90

5457 Proclamation commencing remaining provisions, No. 90, explanatory notes

Criminal Law (Criminal Organisations Disruption) and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2013—

5458 Criminal Law (Criminal Organisations Disruption) and Other Legislation Amendment (Postponement) Regulation 2014, No. 91

5459 Criminal Law (Criminal Organisations Disruption) and Other Legislation Amendment (Postponement) Regulation 2014, No. 91, explanatory notes

Rural and Regional Adjustment Act 1994—

5460 Rural and Regional Adjustment Amendment Regulation (No. 3) 2014, No. 92

5461 Rural and Regional Adjustment Amendment Regulation (No. 3) 2014, No. 92, explanatory notes

Electricity and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2014—

5462 Proclamation commencing remaining provisions, No. 93

5463 Proclamation commencing remaining provisions, No. 93, explanatory notes

Electricity Act 1994, Petroleum and Gas (Production and Safety) Act 2004—

5464 Electricity and Another Regulation Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2014, No. 94

5465 Electricity and Another Regulation Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2014, No. 94, explanatory notes

Communities Legislation (Funding Red Tape Reduction) Amendment Act 2014—

5466 Proclamation commencing remaining provisions, No. 95

5467 Proclamation commencing remaining provisions, No. 95, explanatory notes

Disability Services (Restrictive Practices) and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2014—

5468 Proclamation commencing remaining provisions, No. 96

5469 Proclamation commencing remaining provisions, No. 96, explanatory notes

Adoption Act 2009, Community Services Act 2007, Disability Services Act 2006, Prostitution Act 1999, Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal Act 2009—

5470 Disability Services and Other Legislation Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2014, No. 97

5471 Disability Services and Other Legislation Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2014, No. 97, explanatory notes

Motor Accident Insurance Act 1994—

5472 Motor Accident Insurance Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2014, No. 98

5473 Motor Accident Insurance Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2014, No. 98, explanatory notes

Hospital and Health Boards Act 2011—

5474 Hospital and Health Boards Amendment Regulation (No. 2) 2014, No. 99

5475 Hospital and Health Boards Amendment Regulation (No. 2) 2014, No. 99, explanatory notes

TAFE Queensland (Dual Sector Entities) Amendment Act 2014—

5476 Proclamation commencing remaining provisions, No. 100

5477 Proclamation commencing remaining provisions, No. 100, explanatory notes

TAFE Queensland Act 2013—

5478 TAFE Queensland Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2014, No. 101

5479 TAFE Queensland Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2014, No. 101, explanatory notes

Further Education and Training Act 2014—

5480 Proclamation commencing remaining provisions, No. 102

5481 Proclamation commencing remaining provisions, No. 102, explanatory notes

Agricultural Chemicals Distribution Control Act 1966, Animal Care and Protection Act 2001, Animal Management (Cats and Dogs) Act 2008, Building Act 1975, Chemical Usage (Agricultural and Veterinary) Control Act 1988, Education and Care Services Act 2013, Education (Overseas Students) Act 1996, Education (Queensland College of Teachers) Act 2005, Electrical Safety Act 2002, Explosives Act 1999, Fire and Emergency Services Act 1990, Further Education and Training Act 2014, Health Act 1937, Nature Conservation Act 1992, Petroleum and Gas (Production and Safety) Act 2004, Plumbing and Drainage Act 2002, Private Employment Agents Act 2005, Property Agents and Motor Dealers Act 2000, Prostitution Act 1999, Queensland Building and Construction Commission Act 1991, Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal Act 2009, Transport Operations (Road Use Management) Act 1995, Transport (Rail Safety) Act 2010, Weapons Act 1990, Workers' Compensation and Rehabilitation Act 2003, Work Health and Safety Act 2011—

5482 Further Education and Training Regulation 2014, No. 103

5483 Further Education and Training Regulation 2014, No. 103, explanatory notes

Workers' Compensation and Rehabilitation Act 2003—

5484 Workers' Compensation and Rehabilitation Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2014, No. 104

5485 Workers' Compensation and Rehabilitation Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2014, No. 104, explanatory notes

Adoption Act 2009, Child Protection Act 1999, Commission for Children and Young People and Child Guardian Act 2000, Corrective Services Act 2006, Guardianship and Administration Act 2000, Legal Profession Act 2007, Public Guardian Act 2014, Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal Act 2009, Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements Act 1982, Youth Justice Act 1992—

5486 Public Guardian Regulation 2014, No. 105

5487 Public Guardian Regulation 2014, No. 105, explanatory notes

Liquor Act 1992—

5488 Liquor Amendment Regulation (No. 3) 2014, No. 106

5489 Liquor Amendment Regulation (No. 3) 2014, No. 106, explanatory notes

Crime and Misconduct and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2014—

5490 Proclamation commencing remaining provisions, No. 107

5491 Proclamation commencing remaining provisions, No. 107, explanatory notes

State Penalties Enforcement Act 1999, Transport Infrastructure Act 1994, Transport Operations (Road Use Management) Act 1995—

5492 Transport and Other Legislation (Dangerous Goods) Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2014, No. 108

5493 Transport and Other Legislation (Dangerous Goods) Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2014, No. 108, explanatory notes

Fire and Emergency Services Act 1990—

5494 Fire and Rescue Service Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2014, No. 109

5495 Fire and Rescue Service Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2014, No. 109, explanatory notes

State Buildings Protective Security Act 1983—

5496 State Buildings Protective Security Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2014, No. 110

5497 State Buildings Protective Security Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2014, No. 110, explanatory notes

Agricultural College Amendment Act 2014—

5498 Proclamation commencing certain provisions, No. 111

5499 Proclamation commencing certain provisions, No. 111, explanatory notes

Education (Overseas Students) Act 1996, Industrial Relations Act 1999, Public Sector Ethics Act 1994, Public Service Act 2008, Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements Act 1982—

5500 Agricultural College Consequential Amendments Regulation (No. 1) 2014, No. 112

5501 Agricultural College Consequential Amendments Regulation (No. 1) 2014, No. 112, explanatory notes

Agricultural Chemicals Distribution Control Act 1966, Animal Care and Protection Act 2001, Animal Management (Cats and Dogs) Act 2008, Apiaries Act 1982, Brands Act 1915, Chemical Usage (Agricultural and Veterinary) Control Act 1988, Drugs Misuse Act 1986, Fisheries Act 1994, Land Protection (Pest and Stock Route Management) Act 2002, Nature Conservation Act 1992, Stock Act 1915, Veterinary Surgeons Act 1936—

5502 Agriculture and Fisheries Legislation Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2014, No. 113

5503 Agriculture and Fisheries Legislation Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2014, No. 113, explanatory notes

Rural and Regional Adjustment Act 1994—

5504 Rural and Regional Adjustment Amendment Regulation (No. 4) 2014, No. 114

5505 Rural and Regional Adjustment Amendment Regulation (No. 4) 2014, No. 114, explanatory notes

Coastal Protection and Management Act 1995, Nature Conservation Act 1992, Queensland Heritage Act 1992, Waste Reduction and Recycling Act 2011, Wild Rivers Act 2005—

5506 Environment and Heritage Protection Legislation Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2014, No. 115

5507 Environment and Heritage Protection Legislation Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2014, No. 115, explanatory notes

Land and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2014—

5508 Proclamation commencing remaining provisions, No. 116

5509 Proclamation commencing remaining provisions, No. 116, explanatory notes

Land Act 1994, Petroleum and Gas (Production and Safety) Act 2004—

5510 Land and Other Legislation Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2014, No. 117

5511 Land and Other Legislation Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2014, No. 117, explanatory notes

Electricity Act 1994—

5512 Electricity Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2014, No. 118

5513 Electricity Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2014, No. 118, explanatory notes

Forestry Act 1959, Marine Parks Act 2004, Nature Conservation Act 1992, Racing Act 2002, Recreation Areas Management Act 2006—

5514 National Parks, Recreation, Sport and Racing Legislation Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2014, No. 119

5515 National Parks, Recreation, Sport and Racing Legislation Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2014, No. 119, explanatory notes

Building Act 1975—

5516 Building Amendment Regulation (No. 2) 2014, No. 120

5517 Building Amendment Regulation (No. 2) 2014, No. 120, explanatory notes

Architects Act 2002, Building Act 1975, Building and Construction Industry Payments Act 2004, Domestic Building Contracts Act 2000, Housing Act 2003, Plumbing and Drainage Act 2002, Professional Engineers Act 2002, Queensland Building and Construction Commission Act 1991, Residential Services (Accreditation) Act 2002, Retirement Villages Act 1999—

5518 Housing and Public Works Legislation (Fees) Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2014, No. 121

5519 Housing and Public Works Legislation (Fees) Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2014, No. 121, explanatory notes

Public Service Act 2008—

5520 Public Service Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2014, No. 122

5521 Public Service Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2014, No. 122, explanatory notes

Duties Act 2001, First Home Owner Grant Act 2000, Land Tax Act 2010, Mineral Resources Act 1989, Petroleum and Gas (Production and Safety) Act 2004, State Penalties Enforcement Act 1999—

5522 Revenue Legislation Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2014, No. 123

5523 Revenue Legislation Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2014, No. 123, explanatory notes

Health Ombudsman Act 2013, Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal Act 2009—

5524 Health Ombudsman Regulation 2014, No. 124

5525 Health Ombudsman Regulation 2014, No. 124, explanatory notes

Education (Queensland Curriculum and Assessment Authority) Act 2014—

5526 Proclamation commencing remaining provisions, No. 125

5527 Proclamation commencing remaining provisions, No. 125, explanatory notes

Education (Accreditation of Non-State Schools) Act 2001, Education (Queensland College of Teachers) Act 2005, Education (Queensland Curriculum and Assessment Authority) Act 2014, Public Sector Ethics Act 1994, Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal Act 2009, Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements Act 1982—

5528 Education (Queensland Curriculum and Assessment Authority) Regulation 2014, No. 126

5529 Education (Queensland Curriculum and Assessment Authority) Regulation 2014, No. 126, explanatory notes

Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal Act 2009—

5530 Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2014, No. 127

5531 Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2014, No. 127, explanatory notes

Appeal Costs Fund Act 1973, Associations Incorporation Act 1981, Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act 2003, Body Corporate and Community Management Act 1997, Building Units and Group Titles Act 1980, Casino Control Act 1982, Charitable and Non-Profit Gaming Act 1999, Collections Act 1966, Cooperatives Act 1997, Coroners Act 2003, Dispute Resolution Centres Act 1990, Electoral Act 1992, Electrical Safety Act 2002, Evidence Act 1977, Funeral Benefit Business Act 1982, Gaming Machine Act 1991, Information Privacy Act 2009, Interactive Gambling (Player Protection) Act 1998, Introduction Agents Act 2001, Jury Act 1995, Justices Act 1886, Justices of the Peace and Commissioners for Declarations Act 1991, Keno Act 1996, Land Court Act 2000, Land Sales Act 1984, Legal Profession Act 2007, Liquor Act 1992, Lotteries Act 1997, Partnership Act 1891, Penalties and Sentences Act 1992, Personal Property Securities (Ancillary Provisions) Act 2010, Property Agents and Motor Dealers Act 2000, Property Law Act 1974, Prostitution Act 1999, Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal Act 2009, Recording of Evidence Act 1962, Relationships Act 2011, Retail Shop Leases Act 1994, Right to Information Act 2009, Second-hand Dealers and Pawnbrokers Act 2003, Security Providers Act 1993, Status of Children Act 1978, Supreme Court of Queensland Act 1991, Tattoo Parlours Act 2013, Tourism Services Act 2003, Wagering Act 1998, Wine Industry Act 1994, Work Health and Safety Act 2011—

5532 Justice Legislation (Fees) Amendment and Repeal Regulation (No. 1) 2014, No. 128

5533 Justice Legislation (Fees) Amendment and Repeal Regulation (No. 1) 2014, No. 128, explanatory notes

Civil Liability Act 2003—

5534 Civil Liability Regulation 2014, No. 129

5535 Civil Liability Regulation 2014, No. 129, explanatory notes

Construction and Tourism (Red Tape Reduction) and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2014—

5536 Proclamation commencing certain provisions, No. 130

5537 Proclamation commencing certain provisions, No. 130, explanatory notes

Casino Control Act 1982, Charitable and Non-Profit Gaming Act 1999, Gaming Machine Act 1991, Interactive Gambling (Player Protection) Act 1998, Lotteries Act 1997, Wagering Act 1998—

5538 Gaming Legislation Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2014, No. 131

5539 Gaming Legislation Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2014, No. 131, explanatory notes

Personal Injuries Proceedings Act 2002—

5540 Personal Injuries Proceedings Regulation 2014, No. 132

5541 Personal Injuries Proceedings Regulation 2014, No. 132, explanatory notes

Building and Construction Industry (Portable Long Service Leave) Act 1991—

5542 Building and Construction Industry (Portable Long Service Leave) Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2014, No. 133

5543 Building and Construction Industry (Portable Long Service Leave) Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2014, No. 133, explanatory notes

Environmental Protection Act 1994—

5544 Environmental Protection Amendment Regulation (No. 2) 2014, No. 134

5545 Environmental Protection Amendment Regulation (No. 2) 2014, No. 134, explanatory notes

River Improvement Trust Act 1940—

5546 River Improvement Trust Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2014, No. 135

5547 River Improvement Trust Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2014, No. 135, explanatory notes

Petroleum and Gas (Production and Safety) Act 2004—

5548 Petroleum and Gas (Production and Safety) Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2014, No. 136

5549 Petroleum and Gas (Production and Safety) Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2014, No. 136, explanatory notes

Sustainable Planning Act 2009—

5550 Sustainable Planning Amendment Regulation (No. 5) 2014, No. 137

5551 Sustainable Planning Amendment Regulation (No. 5) 2014, No. 137, explanatory notes

Electricity Act 1994, Gas Supply Act 2003—

5552 Energy Legislation Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2014, No. 138

5553 Energy Legislation Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2014, No. 138, explanatory notes

Forestry Act 1959—

5554 Forestry (State Forests) Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2014, No. 139

5555 Forestry (State Forests) Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2014, No. 139, explanatory notes

Queensland Training Assets Management Authority Act 2014—

5556 Proclamation commencing remaining provisions, No. 140

5557 Proclamation commencing remaining provisions, No. 140, explanatory notes

Queensland Training Assets Management Authority Act 2014, Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements Act 1982—

5558 Queensland Training Assets Management Authority Regulation 2014, No. 141

5559 Queensland Training Assets Management Authority Regulation 2014, No. 141, explanatory notes

Water Act 2000—

5560 Water Resource Plans Amendment Plan (No. 1) 2014, No. 142

5561 Water Resource Plans Amendment Plan (No. 1) 2014, No. 142, explanatory notes

Industrial Relations Act 1999—

5562 Industrial Relations Legislation Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2014, No. 143

5563 Industrial Relations Legislation Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2014, No. 143, explanatory notes

Environmental Offsets Act 2014—

5564 Proclamation commencing certain provisions, No. 144

5565 Proclamation commencing certain provisions, No. 144, explanatory notes

Environmental Offsets Act 2014, Nature Conservation Act 1992, Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal Act 2009—

5566 Environmental Offsets Regulation 2014, No. 145

5567 Environmental Offsets Regulation 2014, No. 145, explanatory notes

Environmental Offsets Act 2014—

5568 Environmental Offsets (Transitional) Regulation 2014, No. 146

5569 Environmental Offsets (Transitional) Regulation 2014, No. 146, explanatory notes

Sustainable Planning (Infrastructure Charges) and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2014—

5570 Proclamation commencing remaining provisions, No. 147

5571 Proclamation commencing remaining provisions, No. 147, explanatory notes

State Development and Public Works Organisation Act 1971—

5572 State Development and Public Works Organisation Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2014, No. 148

5573 State Development and Public Works Organisation Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2014, No. 148, explanatory notes

Sustainable Planning Act 2009—

5574 Sustainable Planning Amendment Regulation (No. 4) 2014, No. 149

5575 Sustainable Planning Amendment Regulation (No. 4) 2014, No. 149, explanatory notes

Heavy Vehicle National Law Act 2012—

5576 Heavy Vehicle National Law (Postponement) Regulation 2014, No. 150

5577 Heavy Vehicle National Law (Postponement) Regulation 2014, No. 150, explanatory notes

Water Act 2000—

5578 Water Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2014, No. 151

5579 Water Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2014, No. 151, explanatory notes

Major Sports Facilities Act 2001—

5580 Major Sports Facilities Regulation 2014, No. 152

5581 Major Sports Facilities Regulation 2014, No. 152, explanatory notes

Aboriginal Land Act 1991—

5582 Aboriginal Land Amendment Regulation (No. 4) 2014, No. 153

5583 Aboriginal Land Amendment Regulation (No. 4) 2014, No. 153, explanatory notes

Electoral Act 1992—

5584 Electoral Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2014, No. 154

5585 Electoral Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2014, No. 154, explanatory notes

Economic Development Act 2012—

5586 Economic Development Amendment Regulation (No. 3) 2014, No. 155

5587 Economic Development Amendment Regulation (No. 3) 2014, No. 155, explanatory notes

Criminal Law Amendment Act 1945—

5588 Criminal Law Regulation 2014, No. 156

5589 Criminal Law Regulation 2014, No. 156, explanatory notes

Nature Conservation Act 1992—

5590 Nature Conservation (Protected Areas Management) Amendment Regulation (No. 2) 2014, No. 157

5591 Nature Conservation (Protected Areas Management) Amendment Regulation (No. 2) 2014, No. 157, explanatory notes

Governors (Salary and Pensions) Act 2003—

5592 Governors (Salary and Pensions) Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2014, No. 158

5593 Governors (Salary and Pensions) Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2014, No. 158, explanatory notes

Royal National Agricultural and Industrial Association of Queensland Act 1971—

5594 Royal National Agricultural and Industrial Association of Queensland Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2014, No. 159

5595 Royal National Agricultural and Industrial Association of Queensland Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2014, No. 159, explanatory notes

Casino Control Act 1982, Charitable and Non-Profit Gaming Act 1999, Gaming Machine Act 1991, Interactive Gambling (Player Protection) Act 1998, Keno Act 1996, Liquor Act 1992, Lotteries Act 1997, Racing Act 2002, State Penalties Enforcement Act 1999, Wagering Act 1998—

5596 Liquor and Gaming Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2014, No. 160

5597 Liquor and Gaming Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2014, No. 160, explanatory notes

Adult Proof of Age Card Act 2008, State Penalties Enforcement Act 1999, Tow Truck Act 1973, Transport Operations (Marine Safety) Act 1994, Transport Operations (Passenger Transport) Act 1994, Transport Operations (Road Use Management) Act 1995—

5598 Transport and Other Legislation Amendment Regulation (No. 2) 2014, No. 161

5599 Transport and Other Legislation Amendment Regulation (No. 2) 2014, No. 161, explanatory notes

Nature Conservation Act 1992—

5600 Nature Conservation Legislation Amendment Regulation (No. 2) 2014, No. 162

5601 Nature Conservation Legislation Amendment Regulation (No. 2) 2014, No. 162, explanatory notes

Nature Conservation Act 1992, Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal Act 2009—

5602 Nature Conservation (Wildlife Management) and Another Regulation Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2014, No. 163

5603 Nature Conservation (Wildlife Management) and Another Regulation Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2014, No. 163, explanatory notes

Financial Accountability Act 2009—

5604 Financial and Performance Management Amendment Standard (No. 1) 2014, No. 164

5605 Financial and Performance Management Amendment Standard (No. 1) 2014, No. 164, explanatory notes

Transport Operations (Road Use Management) Act 1995—

5606 Transport Operations (Road Use Management—Vehicle Registration) Amendment Regulation (No. 2) 2014, No. 165

5607 Transport Operations (Road Use Management—Vehicle Registration) Amendment Regulation (No. 2) 2014, No. 165, explanatory notes

Housing Act 2003—

5608 Housing Amendment Regulation (No. 2) 2014, No. 166

5609 Housing Amendment Regulation (No. 2) 2014, No. 166, explanatory notes

MINISTERIAL PAPERS TABLED BY THE CLERK

The following ministerial papers were tabled by the Clerk—

Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Services (Mr Dempsey)—

5610 Queensland Police Service—Authorities for Assumed Identities: Annual Report 2013-14

Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning (Mr Seeney)

5611 Maroochydore City Centre Priority Development Area Development Scheme

Treasurer and Minister for Trade (Mr Nicholls)

5612 Letter, dated 15 July 2014, from Treasurer and Minister for Trade (Mr Nicholls) to Clerk of the Parliament regarding an error in paragraph 10 on page 11 of the Budget Speech.

MEMBERS' PAPERS TABLED BY THE CLERK

The following members' papers were tabled by the Clerk—

Member for Inala (Ms Palaszczuk)—

5613 Letter, dated 23 June 2014, from the Leader of the Opposition (Ms Palaszczuk) to the Integrity Commissioner (Dr Solomon) regarding meetings with registered lobbyists during the month of April 2014

5614 Opposition Diary—Leader of the Opposition, 1 April 2014—30 April 2014

5615 Letter, dated 21 July 2014, from the Leader of the Opposition (Ms Palaszczuk) to the Integrity Commissioner (Mr Bingham) regarding meetings with registered lobbyists during the month of May 2014

5616 Opposition Diary—Leader of the Opposition, 1 May 2014—31 May 2014

Member for Redlands (Mr Dowling)—

5617 Non-conforming petition relating to Karragarra Island being designated a permitted area for the use of conditional registered people movers

REPORT TABLED BY THE CLERK

The following Report was tabled by the Clerk—

5618 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—

Sustainable Planning (Infrastructure Charges) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2014

Amendment made to Bill*

Clause 19 (Insertion of new ch 10, pt 11)—

Page 90, line 23, 'section 140C..'—

Omit, insert—

section 140C.

Clause 49 (Amendment of schedule (Dictionary)—

Page 146, lines 23-24, '***adopted charge***, for chapter 4C, see section_99BRCF(1)'—

Omit, insert—

adopted charge, for chapter 4C, see section 99BRCF(1)

* The page and line number references relate to the Bill, after amendments made in consideration in detail unless stated otherwise.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

World War I, 100-Year Commemoration

Hon. CKT NEWMAN (Ashgrove—LNP) (Premier) (9.38 am): It is important that we draw the attention of the House to a very important date in history for Queensland and Australia. One hundred years ago today, the Premier of Queensland, Digby Denham, pledged Queensland's support to the Commonwealth as he had received news war had broken out with Germany. Notice of this news came to the Premier in the form of an urgent telegram from Joseph Cook, the sixth Prime Minister of Australia. The 'wire', as it was referred to, read—

Melbourne 12.45pm 5th August 1914. Honourable the Premier Brisbane. Official information has been received that war has broken out with Germany Joseph Cook Prime Minister.

In response to this telegram, on 5 August 1914 in parliament the Queensland Premier, Digby Denham, said—

I may here intimate that His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor has received a similar communication from the Prime Minister, which he has communicated to me. I at once sent the following reply to the Prime Minister:—

"The Right Honourable the Prime Minister, Melbourne Though we regarded war with Germany as inevitable, your telegram informing us that war has actually broken out with Germany is received with profound sorrow-stop. In this crisis Queensland unreservedly places all her resources at service of Commonwealth and mother country D Denham, Premier".

This response was received with 'general cheers' in the House and Queensland was now officially involved in the First World War, a war that would last until Germany surrendered on 11 November 1918. Queenslanders invested greatly in this war. Over the four years, 57,705 men and women voluntarily enlisted in support. Those men and women were pivotal in the battles across the First World War. Our state's support initially commenced with 1,000 men departing North Queensland to capture the wireless station in German New Guinea in early August 1914.

The 9th Infantry Battalion, which was raised at Enoggera, in Brisbane, was first ashore on the beaches of Gallipoli on that fateful morning of 25 April 1915. Men and women played crucial roles in the battles of the Western Front, the Middle East and all other theatres of war. To mark this anniversary, I table, for the information of all members, a copy of the telegram received from the Prime Minister by Premier Denham and the Premier's reply by telegram to the Prime Minister.

Tabled paper: Telegram from then Prime Minister Cook on 5 August 1914 advising that war had broken out with Germany [5619].

Tabled paper: Telegram from then Premier Denham acknowledging advice that war had broken out with Germany on 5 August 1914 [5620].

These are important historical documents, especially today, as we commemorate this date, 100 years on and remember how this impacted the lives of our fellow Queenslanders. I move—

That the House take note of this statement and that the House acknowledges agreement by observing one minute's silence as a mark of respect.

Hon. A PALASZCZUK (Inala—ALP) (Leader of the Opposition) (9.41 am): I join the Premier in recognising the significance of this day in the history of our state, our nation and the world. One hundred years ago, half a world away, the die was cast for one of the most horrific periods in world history. The First World War, as we know it to be today, would wipe out a generation of young men and sow the seeds for an even more devastating conflict two decades later.

For a young nation like Australia, dutifully bound to the British Empire, its impacts would be profound. Ours was a youthful nation, forging its own identity as a federation, when the war came calling. It would demand from us our strongest young men, asked to fight in foreign lands, while families back home would rally together in the face of fear and uncertainty. One hundred years on it would be easy to ask why a country like Australia would participate in a largely European conflict.

As the *Hansard* read by the Premier has indicated, in 1914 the answer was simple. When Britain called Australia would answer; and answer we did. More than 400,000 Australians would volunteer to fight this war, including more than 57,000 Queenslanders. To put those numbers in context, Queensland's contribution equated to about 8½ per cent of our state's population at the time and nearly 38 per cent of all men aged between 18 and 44. Around 280 Queensland women are believed to have volunteered as nurses. It was a volunteer army that would be sent to fight against the might of the German machine and the tenacity of the Turkish defender.

Among those volunteers would be the 9th Battalion, the Royal Queensland Regiment. One of the first battalions to be raised, the 9th was raised at Enoggera and made up entirely of Queensland volunteers. As the Premier stated, it was among the first ashore at Gallipoli on 25 April 1915, and would further distinguish itself on the Western Front, including playing a role in the great allied offensive of 1918. It would serve with distinction until armistice was reached.

The 9th Battalion's black and blue colour patch would become a badge of honour for those who served. It would also be seen on the streets of Brisbane, with the wives and girlfriends of those brave soldiers wearing miniature colour patches with pride.

From the shores of Gallipoli to the fields of Belgium and western France, not to mention the deserts of the Middle East, Queensland and Australian soldiers would fulfil their duty with honour and valour. But this would be a war defined not so much by the glory of victory but by sacrifice. Around 10,000 Queenslanders, among 60,000 total Australians, would never come home. At around 65 per cent, Australia's casualty rate was amongst the highest of any nation.

Amongst those Queenslanders were at least two nurses—Norma Mowbray from St George and Rosa O'Kane from Charters Towers. In an era where repatriation would prove impossible, our dead would forever remain interred on the fields where they fell. Those who did come home would carry the physical and mental scars for the rest of their lives. Often the families they would return to would never be the same again. It is the responsibility of all of us to ensure that the sacrifices of that generation are never forgotten.

Whether it is the Soldiers and Sailors Memorial on the Esplanade in Cairns, the Soldiers Memorial Gate of Honour in Townsville, the Anzac Memorial Park in Millmerran or the Women's War Memorial, among others, at Anzac Square here in Brisbane, Queenslanders have and will continue to honour those who serve and remember those who died. It is the least we can do given the magnitude of what they gave. Lest we forget.

Madam SPEAKER: Honourable members, I acknowledge statements made today by the Premier and Leader of the Opposition. Today is a very sombre day in Queensland's past. With over 57,000 Queenslanders involved in the First World War, the impact was felt far and wide and remains written in our collective and individual histories. Many left our shores. Sadly, not all returned.

Many of you in this room today will be related to men and women who served in the First World War and in conflicts since. Further, the Parliamentary Library identified 39 former members of the Queensland parliament who served and distinguished themselves in Army, Navy and support services. In most instances, they entered politics after the war, but a small number left parliament to serve and then returned to their role as a member of the Queensland parliament. At least 10 were original Anzacs.

The O'Donovan Room will be open this week throughout each sitting day and during the dinner breaks for members to view a selection of rare texts which are on a short loan to us from the Queensland State Archives. These include original documents relating to the declaration of the First World War. Included is the telegram to the Premier of Queensland from the Prime Minister advising of the outbreak of war, which Premier Newman has quoted earlier this morning.

In the same way that the then Premier of Queensland responded to the Prime Minister advising that 'Queensland unreservedly places all her resources at service of Commonwealth and mother country', we remain unreservedly supportive and united in memory of those who paid such a high price for us.

The question is that the statement be noted and that the House express its agreement with the motion by observing a minute's silence.

Whereupon honourable members stood in silence.

Malaysia Airlines Flight MH17

Hon. CKT NEWMAN (Ashgrove—LNP) (Premier) (9.48 am): It is with deep regret and sadness that I ask this House to reflect upon the tragic deaths of the 298 passengers and crew, including 38 Australian citizens and residents—eight of them Queenslanders—who lost their lives on Malaysia Airlines flight MH17 over eastern Ukraine on 17 July 2014. The eight innocent Queenslanders travelling on the flight were: Wayne John Baker and Theresa Jennifer Baker; Emma Bell; Jill Helen Guard and Roger Watson Guard; Howard Ramon Horder and Suzann Horder; and Helena Maria Sidelik. We are all outraged and upset by the circumstances of these deaths. We cannot begin to imagine nor comprehend the kind of grief, loss and anguish that their loved ones must be going through at this time.

Madam Speaker, I know I speak for all Queenslanders when I say our thoughts and prayers are with you, the families and friends of the deceased, and that we will do all that we can do to help you through the difficult time ahead. Condolence books are available to be signed at Parliament House, the Government House Gatehouse, the Executive Building and at members' electorate offices. An online condolence book is also available at www.qld.gov.au/mh17.

This morning I was joined by you, Madam Speaker, and the Leader of the Opposition at the condolence book here at Parliament House. We lit a candle in memory of all those on board MH17 which will burn for the duration of this parliamentary sitting. I would encourage Queenslanders to sign the condolence book. This is an opportunity for the community to demonstrate their support for the grieving families and friends, to let them know that they are not grieving alone and that all Queenslanders are thinking of them during this sad time.

On behalf of all Queenslanders, I have written to the next of kin with a message of sympathy and support. As a mark of mourning and respect for the many victims, Australian and Queensland flags were flown at half-mast all day on Saturday, 19 July 2014 from buildings and establishments occupied by government departments and affiliated agencies. Many other organisations also flew their flags at half-mast on this day. The flags will again be flown at half-mast on a national day of mourning which has been declared for this Thursday, 7 August 2014. A national memorial service will also occur on that day. I inform all members that it is my intention to represent Queensland at that memorial service, and the Leader of the Opposition has informed me this morning that she will also be travelling to the service at my invitation.

It is also timely to remember those on board MH370, which disappeared in March of this year. The search is continuing for those on board the flight, and the Australian government is working with the Malaysian and Chinese authorities on a future remembrance event. Four Queenslanders were on board MH370, and I know that all members will again join me in offering our prayers and support at this difficult time to their families and friends.

Madam Speaker, I would also like to take this opportunity to acknowledge the brave and selfless work of the international team who are helping to identify the victims of MH17 and to return them home as soon as possible. This is a sad and extremely challenging task which is a priority for the next of kin and all Australians. I would also like to acknowledge the dedicated team in eastern Ukraine seeking to retrieve the missing persons and to find out exactly what happened. This includes the joint Dutch-Australian police force, including 150 Australian Federal Police and a number of Australian defence personnel. On behalf of this House, we thank them for their courage and professionalism and wish them a safe and speedy mission.

I know I speak for all Queenslanders when I say that those responsible must be brought to justice. There is no place in our world for such a reprehensible terrorist act. There is no place to end so many innocent lives and forever affect so many others. I move—

That the House take note of this statement and that the House acknowledges agreement by observing one minute's silence as a mark of respect.

Hon. A PALASZCZUK (Inala—ALP) (Leader of the Opposition) (9.53 am): It is not often that this House has cause to pause and pay its respects to its innocent citizens killed as a result of armed conflict. Today we remember eight people who called Queensland home who died among the 298 passengers and crew on board the Malaysia Airlines flight MH17 passenger jet that was shot down over Ukraine. They were all truly innocent victims who died for motives we do not yet fully know and will surely never fully comprehend.

Anyone reading coverage of the crash would be struck at how many of the Australians killed were returning home from holidays in Europe. They were innocent people, especially the very young children lost, doing a simple, innocent thing many of us do from time to time—coming home. They died in a foreign land apparently as a result of a type of conflict so foreign to our own way of life. Here in Australia we pride ourselves on our ability to embrace the peaceful resolution of conflict. We often forget that not everyone in our world shares what we take for granted. We can sometimes be reminded of that in the most awful way. Such is the case with flight MH17.

Madam Speaker, all Australians have been moved by reports of the loss of so many lives, the loss of people who were mothers, fathers, sisters, brothers, uncles, aunts, sons, daughters, cousins, friends, neighbours or workmates—people their family and friends were looking forward to offering the simple gesture of welcoming back home. Sudden and unexpected loss of life is always difficult to understand and deal with. The events surrounding the downing of this flight have made it especially hard for those who have lost loved ones. I want to take this opportunity to acknowledge the work of the federal government including Foreign Affairs staff, crash investigators and other authorities for their efforts in dealing with the difficult aftermath of this tragedy.

Today we remember eight people from our state, other Australians and those from other nations whose lives were so brutally cut short. We pay our tributes to them as we consider so many of our fellow Australians, especially the very young children, who have been denied their futures. The thoughts and prayers of all of us in this House are also with the families, friends, colleagues and communities who mourn them. Today we pause to think of those we have lost as well as those burdened with spending the rest of their own lives trying to make sense of a truly senseless act.

Madam SPEAKER: Honourable members, I acknowledge statements made today by the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition. We think of and pray for the family and friends who have lost loved ones in the MH17 tragedy. We pray for peace and for protection for those who are trying to bring these loved ones home. The question is that the statement be noted and that the House express its agreement with the motion by observing one minute's silence.

Whereupon honourable members stood in silence.

Law and Order

Hon. CKT NEWMAN (Ashgrove—LNP) (Premier) (9.57 am): Madam Speaker, this government came to power promising to make Queensland a safe place to live and raise a family. For the past two years we have been implementing a strong plan to do just that. We are on track to meet our pledge to recruit an extra 1,100 police officers, with more than 800 extra officers now at work. That means 800 more officers both on the beat preventing crime and hard at work tracking down offenders.

Police Commissioner Ian Stewart has confirmed reported crime is down more than 10 per cent across Queensland. There is much work still to be done, but the number of assaults, robberies and break-ins suffered by Queenslanders is down significantly. These positive results are not just down to more police however. We are funding two police helicopters for South-East Queensland to help police find and apprehend offenders. We are rolling out technology like iPads to allow police to spend more time fighting crime and less time in the station.

Since we brought in Australia's toughest antihooning laws, more than 9,500 cars have been impounded or immobilised for hooning. We have also got new laws to shut down out-of-control parties. We will not tolerate violent and antisocial behaviour. These strong measures mean our streets and suburbs are now safer for everyone.

Madam Speaker, the activities of criminal gangs pose a unique challenge to law enforcement. Since the introduction of our new laws and measures, gang crime has decreased and so has gang membership. Queenslanders are seeing these gangs smashed and seeing crime rates fall—and they are getting behind our tough stance.

We have cracked down on drug dealers by strengthening sentences and implementing new, tougher unexplained wealth laws. We have beefed up the laws on illegal guns. We have legislated to increase monitoring of sex offenders and introduced a 'two-strike' mandatory life sentence for repeat child-sex offenders. We are also implementing our Safe Night Out Strategy to stamp out alcohol and drug related violence. We want young Queenslanders to go out at night and have a good time without the threat of violence or bad behaviour.

We are having great success with our youth boot camps and our new graffiti laws. Later this week we will be releasing the latest detailed crime statistics for the state. I am confident that they will confirm our strong approach to crime is working. Unlike Labor, this government has a strong track record on law and order. We said we would make Queensland a safer place to live and raise a family, and that is what we are delivering.

ABSENCE OF MINISTER

Mr STEVENS (Mermaid Beach—LNP) (Leader of the House) (10.00 am): I wish to advise the House that the Minister for Tourism, Major Events, Small Business and the Commonwealth Games is absent for this sitting week. Minister Stuckey is in the UK for matters in relation to the Commonwealth Games, tourism and trade. Minister Davis has been appointed as acting minister for this portfolio for the duration of this absence.

NOTICE OF MOTION

Social Housing

Mrs D'ATH (Redcliffe—ALP) (10.01 am): I give notice that I will move—

That this House:

- notes that the Newman government has been attacking the rights of public and social housing tenants on multiple fronts since it was elected in March 2012;
- notes that the government's latest attack is forcing ordinary Queenslanders to apply for permission to be absent from their homes for any period;
- condemns this practice as a restriction on a person's freedom of movement within a free and democratic society; and
- calls on the housing minister to immediately rescind this restrictive and discriminatory policy.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Crime and Corruption Commission

Madam SPEAKER: Order! Question time will finish at 11.02 am.

Ms PALASZCZUK (10.02 am): My question is to the Premier. I refer the Premier to the recent Stafford by-election and his statement that his government got some decisions wrong and needed to listen more, and I ask: will the Premier follow through on his commitment to reintroduce bipartisanship to the appointment of the chair of the Crime and Corruption Commission and immediately remove Dr Ken Levy?

Mr NEWMAN: I thank the Leader of the Opposition for the question. I note that she has clearly observed that the government has said that in the wake of the Stafford by-election we will do our best to listen more and consult more on issues. There are many great examples of us doing that already. In relation to the bipartisan appointment, a fortnight ago yesterday I made it very clear that that is indeed what we will do.

In relation to the comments about Dr Levy, I say this: there is a proper process now for a bipartisan recruitment process for a new head of the CCC. Right now the CCC needs to get on with the job of fighting organised crime and criminal gangs and making sure that it is a tough body to ensure there is not malfeasance or wrongdoing in the public sector in Queensland, because that is the way that we have set it up and that is what it should do.

In relation to the work against criminal gangs, it is very pleasing to note the latest crime statistics. We are seeing very significant reductions in criminal activity in the state. The Crime and Corruption Commission and the Queensland Police Service can take great credit for that. Together

they are working to free our state from the clutches of organised criminal activity. It is no surprise that because of the great work by the CCC and the QPS we are seeing such positive crime statistics. We are seeing this state is safer for people to raise their families.

I was talking to my wife, Lisa, this morning and she reflected on how comforting it was to know that people who manufacture drugs, distribute those drugs and sell them in the community are being driven from this state. My wife was reflecting on the views of many women whom she speaks to, particularly women with children, who are so pleased that it is now harder to buy drugs in Queensland. The police minister might want to elaborate on this. It is harder and drugs have become more expensive. Why? Because the costs of doing business, the penalties of doing business in Queensland, have been raised for criminal gangs. That means that our kids are safer. They are less likely to be confronted in schools with someone trying to push drugs which could either seriously damage as a one-off or ruin their lives totally. It is important right now that we continue the fight. This is no time for the opposition to play politics with an important appointment such as the head of the Crime and Corruption Commission.

Political Parties, Donations

Ms PALASZCZUK: My next question is to the Premier. I refer the Premier to the result of the recent Stafford by-election and I ask: will the Premier listen to Queenslanders and reverse his electoral law changes that allow big business to make large political donations of up to $12,400 without any public declaration and in complete secrecy?

Mr NEWMAN: I again note that the Leader of the Opposition has been listening somewhat to the things that I have been saying. I made a statement two weeks and one day ago about such matters in the wake of the Stafford by-election, and I said very clearly at the time what our position was on this matter. If the Labor Party want to ask about election donations, there is still opportunity for them to come into this place and talk about the link between the member for Bundamba and her political financiers—that is, the CFMEU. There are some very serious allegations being aired just a few short blocks away about the activities of that organisation. It might be good for the Leader of the Opposition to tell the House at some stage, to tell the people of Queensland, whether she supports the member for Bundamba continuing to take money from such an organisation.

There is another matter we have never had any straight answers on, and that is the donations by the Obeid family and associated organisations. We have never heard an explanation for that whatsoever. We saw the launch of a book in the last few weeks which clearly labelled the Obeid-Labor Party family as essentially the most corrupt political group of people, particularly Mr Obeid himself, that arguably New South Wales has ever seen. I would like to know, and I am sure Queenslanders would like to know, why the Australian Labor Party take donations from them, why they have not given them back and what the member for South Brisbane knows given that she herself was the signatory on the return from the Labor Party.

Our position is very clear when it comes to openness and accountability. We have restored a whole range of measures that Labor took away. We have also put in place some things of our own. We have been the first state in Australia to publicly release ministerial diaries monthly. I note the Leader of the Opposition had a few administrative problems in making her diary public. We made it once again illegal to lie to parliament. We have published open data—1,200 datasets online, most previously hidden away by the Labor Party. We have introduced a bill to improve parliamentary scrutiny of government spending. We publish and report against six-month action plans. While on the subject of the Crime and Corruption Commission, we made it possible for the PCCC to have open hearings, and lobbyist contact with government is now publicly available. If it is about accountability, it sits over here, not over there on the opposition benches.

Police Resources

Mr HART: My question without notice is to the Premier. Can the Premier please update us on the government's pledge to put extra police on the beat and explain how this is making Queensland a safer place?

Mr NEWMAN: I thank the member for Burleigh for his question, because he knows that the tough laws we have put in place, the strong laws that we have put in place, are strongly supported by his constituents. In the last 24 hours or so almost 90 per cent of people on the Gold Coast and I think 78 per cent of all people in Queensland have said that they want these strong laws to stay. Those strong laws have cleaned up the situation on the Gold Coast, with the extra police that we promised and delivered. The actions we have taken have made it a safer place for families.

We have got 800 extra police on the beat today, many on the Gold Coast. There are extra officers in each of the state's five police regions based on local need. We have those police helicopters in South-East Queensland. We are making it easier for the police to do their job by eliminating bureaucracy and red tape so they can spend more time out there on the beat, on the job. We are also trialling rapid action patrol groups operating from police hubs. The first hub was established on 7 May at Varsity Lakes on the Gold Coast with a hundred police making up the Gold Coast rapid action patrols. On 27 May we announced the trial of a second rapid action patrol group in Townsville. This means the police can get out there with minimum administrative work in the office. They can get straight out on the beat and fight criminal activity. That is why we are seeing such a dramatic reduction in crime. That is why the police commission is able to report that crime is down around 10 per cent. That is why we are seeing dramatic reductions in crime on the Gold Coast and in places like Townsville. We are strong on this issue. We are strong and we are committed because we want families to be safe.

Again, I reflect on what I was talking about in relation to the conversation with my wife this morning. I know that today mothers of younger children and, indeed, teenagers are feeling better because they know that it is harder for these criminals peddling their drugs to affect their kids. I take great personal satisfaction from knowing that that is the case because that was the commitment we made; that is the commitment we have delivered. We make the commitment today to continue that work, to go after criminals and to make sure that this great state of Queensland is not a place where criminals can act with impunity. At the end of the day it is because of the families, the mums and dads and the boys and girls, of Queensland that we do these things. We will continue to fight for them on this very important matter.

Stafford By-Election; Fitzgerald, Mr T

Mr MULHERIN: My question is directed to the Premier. I refer the Premier to the results of the recent Stafford by-election and ask: now that the government has promised to listen more, will the Premier or his deputy invite Tony Fitzgerald back for another chat about the government's approach to integrity and accountability issues?

Mr NEWMAN: I thank the member for Mackay for his question. I also thank him for acknowledging that the Deputy Premier did reach out and had a meeting with Mr Fitzgerald. I guess that demonstrates that we are prepared to listen to all Queenslanders, even our critics. I notice as well the comment about accountability. The member for Mackay might well savour this. If one has a look at what was said by the same gentleman, as I recall, he had a few unpleasant things to say about the Australian Labor Party a few years ago. It is there on the public record. Honourable members opposite should think about that when I go through the accountability measures that we have implemented. Let us look at the Labor Party track record.

They legalised lying to parliament. They refused to release ministerial diaries. The Leader of the Opposition still has these administrative problems in releasing her diaries. They politicised the RTI process. What do I mean by that? They had politicos in their offices actually processing the RTI requests. A few weeks ago I presented numbers at the estimates process which was a nice compare and contrast in terms of the number of documents that were released back then versus now. The number of documents released by this administration because it is handled by public servants, not politicos, has gone through the roof. Our release rate is a far better track record.

Members opposite will not hand over the contact lobbyists register for the period from around 2009 to when they lost government. Where have they gone? Who are the only ministers who have gone to jail from any administration in the last 20 years? That is right, Mr Nuttall and Ms Rose. They are the ones who have gone to jail. That is right; they were their colleagues, party members of the Australian Labor Party. What about the Labor mates who were allowed to run political investigations in the CMC? I will move on.

What have we done? We are the first state, as has been noted by many commentators, to publicly release ministerial diaries on a monthly rolling basis. We made it illegal once again to lie to parliament. We have open data—1,200 datasets spearheaded by my right-hand man, the member for Mermaid Beach, who is releasing all sorts of data that was hidden. We have introduced a bill to improve parliamentary scrutiny of government spending. We publish and report on six-month action plans. We have public and open hearings as the default position for the PCCC and lobbyists' contact with government is now publicly available.

(Time expired)

State Penalties Enforcement Register

Mr MINNIKIN: My question without notice is to the Treasurer and Minister for Trade. Can the Treasurer outline any actions taken by this government to reduce the number of significant debtors throughout the State Penalties Enforcement Register reform program?

Mr NICHOLLS: I thank the member for Chatsworth for the question. Like many Queenslanders, the member for Chatsworth is very much in favour of a fair go and also a fair cop. If you use a toll road or if you cop a fine, most people say fair enough and pay it. I do not think they want to, but at least they will wear it if I can put it that way. However, there are others who steadfastly refuse to pay what they owe and that increases the burden on every other Queenslander who does the right thing.

In recent years we have seen significant growth in the volume and the complexity of the debts that are referred to the State Penalties Enforcement Register, otherwise known as SPER. Unlike those opposite, who put reform in this area into the too-hard basket, this government has given the commitment that we will take steps to collect those outstanding fines. I reflect on the estimates process in which I was asked a number of questions and the Commissioner for State Revenue also answered a number of questions about the level of indebtedness, which continues to be a challenge.

We are stepping up a reform program at SPER to improve the recovery of unpaid fines and court imposed penalties, including the progressive use of different enforcement options. SPER investigators will shift their focus to those debtors who have the largest debts and those who have the largest number of debts. There are 1,700 debtors who have a single debt of more than $5,000 and there are 25,000 debtors who have 20 or more debt items equating to more than $5,000 in total.

The options available to SPER include the seizure and sale of property, wheel clamping and the potential sale of vehicles to recover unpaid debts. Other enforcement options that are used in other jurisdictions which are either not available or not used in Queensland are also now going to be considered. These include vehicle registration suspension, work and development orders and a wide range of community service. SPER's approach will be carefully considered on a case-by-case basis so that debtors are not left facing untenable hardship. We believe these reforms will reduce the outstanding debt and will also send a clear message to the community that enough is enough when it comes to debtors who have the financial capacity to pay their fines but choose not to do so.

Every dollar that is not collected has to be financed by the people of Queensland. That is an additional burden that we think is unacceptable. We will implement the required reforms to ensure the burden is not carried by those people who do the right thing. As we have heard today, the government is committed to making Queensland the safest place to live, work and raise a family. Our SPER reform program continues delivering on this promise by ensuring people take notice of the law rather than simply defy it.

Sale of Public Assets

Mr PITT: My question without notice is to the Premier. I table pages from the federal budget that detail allocations towards asset sales scoping study consultants as well as a page from the 2009-10 Treasury annual report, which shows that the previous government disclosed scoping study costs prior to transactions proceeding and/or concluding, and I ask: if the Abbott government and the previous state government can release the cost of asset sales scoping studies, will the Premier explain why his government cannot?

Tabled paper: Extract of Federal Treasury Annual Report 09-10 p 43 titled 'Analysis and evaluation of administered and controlled financial statements' and extract of Department of Finance report p 117 including section headed 'Smaller Government—scoping studies for four operations of government' [5621].

Mr NEWMAN: I thank the member for Mulgrave for his question. This is a similar question to one that was put forward a few weeks ago back at estimates. My understanding was that the honourable member incorrectly advised the committee that this is what has gone on. As we know with the member for Mulgrave, the claims pile up and pile up but when you look at them, they do not really stack up and we see that the wind just blows it all away.

At the end of the day what we have to deal with is $80 billion worth of debt that was accrued by those opposite. I am very happy to talk about the Strong Choices policy position of this government, because what Queenslanders increasingly will focus on as we get towards the next election is what the Labor Party's plans are. At the moment they have no plans. We have a plan to deal with $80 billion worth of debt, and we have a plan to invest $8.6 billion in the infrastructure that this state needs. How would the Labor Party fund the necessary infrastructure? The credit card is maxed out

thanks to those opposite. It behoves the Labor Party to tell the people of Queensland how they would deal with the debt that they built up and how they would then pay for important infrastructure. For example, how would they hypothetically afford a new sports stadium somewhere in this state? How would they hypothetically afford to build the Underground Bus and Train project? How would they afford to extend the light rail on the Gold Coast into the heavy rail?

As we move towards the next election we will tell Queenslanders exactly how we would see the $8.6 billion spent and we know where that money is coming from, but those opposite will be caught in the full glare of the media spotlight. At that stage the member for Mulgrave will be like a rabbit caught in the headlights because he will have nowhere to go if he does not start to tell Queenslanders how—

(Time expired)

Madam SPEAKER: Before I call the member for Cairns, I understand that the division bell system was tripped by an apparent electrical spike. This spike occurred after the system was checked this morning. The unit has been reset and is operational. I call the member for Cairns.

Far North Queensland, Community Safety

Mr KING: Good news! Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question without notice is to the Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Services. Can the minister please highlight the positive work this can-do LNP government is doing to ensure that our far northern communities are safer under the Cairns safer streets and safer communities initiative?

Mr DEMPSEY: I thank the member for the question, as this government is determined to make Queensland and its far north the safest place to live, work and raise a family—and most importantly, as the Premier alluded to, for the children of future families and particularly the men and women of Far North Queensland.

Two weeks ago I had the honour to travel to Far North Queensland alongside the Assistant Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Affairs, the member for Cook, David Kempton, and Acting Deputy Police Commissioner Peter Barron. We visited five far northern communities including Aurukun, Thursday Island, Doomadgee, Mornington Island and West Cairns, where we met with community leaders and elders to discuss the great work that this government is doing in those communities.

In July 2013 we implemented the Cairns Safer Streets Task Force, a multi-agency, whole-of-government collaboration with the Queensland Police Service and a number of government and non-government agencies in areas including youth welfare, health, disabilities, Indigenous affairs, education and housing. The task force has conducted research to identify factors contributing to crime and antisocial behaviour in Cairns and Aurukun and has developed a number of recommendations and strategies to address those particular issues. The task force is also engaged in a number of community initiatives as well as crime prevention and crime reduction initiatives.

One of the outcomes of this task force was the establishment of the Mooroobool hub in West Cairns. It is a place where a range of services are offered. We have now extended this program into Safer Streets, Safer Communities programs and are in the process of rolling it out across Far North Queensland communities. It is about identifying issues within individual communities and tailoring the programs to that community by empowering local elders and local leaders. We are breaking down the government silos and getting all departments talking. Whether it is health, education, crime or housing, the Safer Streets, Safer Communities program will see departments sharing information and working together for the betterment of those communities.

When I was on the ground discussing initiatives with mayors and community leaders in these communities, the direction this government has taken was strongly supported. It is only by working together that this government can continue to deliver on a strong plan for a brighter future for Cairns and far north communities. With strong laws and more than 800 extra police on the beat, crime rates right across Queensland are coming down. Only this government has a strong plan to revitalise front-line services and ensure that police have the resources they need to keep our communities safe not just now but, as the Premier just alluded to, for generations to come.

Sale of Public Assets

Ms TRAD: My question without notice is to the Premier. I refer the Premier to the results of the recent Stafford by-election and I ask: will the Premier listen to Queenslanders, halt his taxpayer funded Strong Choices campaign, and immediately rule out the biggest sale of government owned assets in the state's history?

Mr NEWMAN: I thank the member for South Brisbane for the question. I can only say that I have already answered this question in the public domain and I draw her attention to my statements. May I say that if we are to get debt down and save money on interest so that we can afford to continue to revitalise front-line services, and if we are to invest in the infrastructure that this state needs, there are some strong choices that have to be taken. That is what we have been saying.

It is very clear that the Australian Labor Party spent too much money. Over a 10-year period prior to us getting into government, the expenses of the Queensland government went up on average 8.9 per cent every single year. That is why we had to take strong action in the first 12 months, and that is why the result was that after the first full year of this government we saw expenses growth curtailed to 0.2 per cent. There were strong choices taken then, but sadly more strong choices have to be taken. A yawning ongoing fiscal deficit year after year was the result of that runaway expense growth. We did not do it; the Australian Labor Party did it to Queenslanders and we lost the AAA credit rating.

Decisions were made way back in 2007, and if people do not believe me they can go and look at the historical stuff on the old Queensland Water Commission website. You will see press statements in 2007 by the QWC, relevant ministers and the Premier at the time saying that the price of water was going to go through the roof, and you will also see me as the Lord Mayor of Brisbane saying that this was going to happen because of poor and reckless financial management. We said back then that this would be the result and there would be pressure on people's cost-of-living expenses. Sadly, this government is left to pick up the pieces from Labor's financial incompetence.

Now we are articulating a plan which will get debt down by $25 billion, which will then allow $8.6 billion to be spent on building this state's infrastructure: the schools, hospitals, roads and great community, cultural and sports facilities that the mums and dads and kids of this state expect and deserve. That is what we are doing. But where is the Australian Labor Party's plan? Well, they do not have one—

(Time expired)

Court Diversion Programs

Mrs MADDERN: My question without notice is to the Minister for Health. With reference to the Newman LNP government's strong plans to make our streets and homes safer, can the minister provide any updates on how this state government is investing in court diversion programs for those with drug and alcohol addictions?

Mr SPRINGBORG: I thank the honourable member for Maryborough for her question and thank her very much for the passion that she brings into this place and for the wonderful transformational work she has done in her electorate in recent times. When I was in Maryborough only recently I saw a sense of optimism in that community towards the future of Maryborough Hospital. This is the first time we have seen that in more than two decades. That hospital is now being invested in and people actually see it as having a crucial future for health provision in that area.

It is extremely important that we talk about these issues today, because alcohol and drug diversion programs are absolutely crucial when it comes to dealing with the issue of substance dependency in our community. Certainly we know that there is a lot of crime which is related to alcohol and drug dependency in this state. It really makes a lot of sense to intervene earlier and to divert those people into appropriate programs. We know the cost of crime relating to this in our community. We know the cost to our emergency departments throughout Queensland. Unfortunately, there is a cultural subset which is causing a significant escalation in those particular areas.

In the 2014-15 financial year up to $4.4 million will be invested in diversion programs, including up to $3.1 million for direct services through non-government partners and $1.3 million for court and police activity and service coordination. Also, as a result of the improvements made by the Newman government, the delivery of diversion services in future will be more efficient, effective and outcomes focused, with stronger links to hospital and health service activities.

After coming to government we set about appointing a former auditor-general, the much respected Glenn Poole, to look at Queensland's entire grants and service arrangements program. Around $1 billion is outsourced to NGO providers in this state. Many of those do an exceptionally good job, but it is quite clear that there had not been any oversight of that for at least 10 years and it was more of an inputs focused system than an outputs focused system. As a consequence of the recent service agreements with the providers I have just mentioned, we will be making sure that we more effectively manage and measure the outcomes they are actually achieving to make sure that

more people are remaining alcohol and drug dependency free into the future. These are not the sorts of measures we have used traditionally in the past, because we have not enforced those particular processes. I think the taxpayers have an expectation that, if they are investing $2 billion more in the Queensland Health budget over two years, much of that to these service providers, we get real outcomes for Queenslanders with dependency.

North Queensland Helicopter Rescue Service

Mr KATTER: My question without notice is to the Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Services. In a short period recently, three tasks undertaken by the North Queensland Helicopter Rescue Service were unable to be performed by the busy fixed wing service. This proves that the service saves lives, yet it has no base funding from the state. Meanwhile, the three other services in the state received $13.46 million. Is the minister willing to give a fraction of this funding to the north-west service as it struggles to stay alive on community raised funds?

Mr DEMPSEY: I thank the member for the question and particularly note his interest in the rotary wing service provided in the Mount Isa region. As the member knows, as recently as last week I visited Mount Isa, where I took up with the honourable mayor, Tony McGrady. We spoke about this particular issue. I also visited a number of other community organisations. I also met with Father Mick Lowcock, a local priest, and spoke about the use of this helicopter and how we would be meeting the high standards and the health needs of the Mount Isa community. For a bit of trivia, Father Mick Lowcock was my local priest over 25 years ago. He married me on 16 September. It was great to catch up with him on this occasion.

On the ground in Mount Isa I was able to talk with people from Neighbourhood Watch, Crime Stoppers and other community organisations and with the Rural Fire Service, auxiliary fire officers and members of Queensland Fire and Emergency Services at their own fire station. I also visited the police station and there took up not just with the hardworking officers at the station but also with the Queensland Police Union to discuss ways in which we could enhance the quality of services provided by police and emergency services across Mount Isa and Far North Queensland. We also talked about how we could increase the liveability for those officers who go into other remote and regional areas. We have to remember not just the officers but also the families, because they make a great number of sacrifices in allowing their men and women to go out into the field to help keep communities safe.

I compliment the provider of the helicopter service. I met with him in Brisbane early last year, if I remember rightly, along with all of the other helicopter service providers. We said that we would provide funding on a needs basis. The information we have received from Queensland Health and the other agencies on the ground is that, by making sure we had a permanent fixed wing service and an additional rotary service, we would continue to meet the needs of Mount Isa.

I really do ask the Katter party, who kept Labor in government federally for many years and supported a carbon tax—

(Time expired)

State Schools, Discipline

Mr GRANT: My question is to the Minister for Education, Training and Employment. Can the minister please advise the House what the Newman government has done to help principals and teachers restore discipline in Queensland state schools?

Mr LANGBROEK: I thank the honourable member for the question. I know that he is as committed as all other members in this House to making sure our children have a safe environment and are free to learn. That is something we found at the principals round table I held in the electorate of Springwood with the honourable member some months ago. It was important for our principals, teachers and parents to know that they should have the right to determine some of the discipline measures that are applied in their own schools so that they can manage inappropriate behaviour by students in their schools. It is not fair to expect principals and teachers to deal with what are often complex disciplinary situations without giving them the tools that they tell us they need to address them.

Of course, not every school is the same. Different situations call for different approaches to discipline. But under the previous government basically the same approach was given to everyone. That approach was to say, 'We'll just have more suspensions and exclusions.' Increasing numbers were held up as proof of how the situation was supposedly under control, because more students were being suspended or excluded.

It is important to note that, out of over 500,000 students in the state system, only about 1,100 students are actually excluded or expelled. We want to make sure those students also get an education. It is actually a much smaller number than I think people would expect, given that in the past students would sometimes get more than one suspension, long or short, and that led to numbers being inflated.

The important issue was that we wanted to put the principles of what local schools wanted back into the hands of principals. We need to realise that over 90 per cent of students are well behaved but it is the other few per cent who disrupt the rest of the class and impact on teaching and learning. For too long our principals have been fighting with one hand tied behind their back in terms of the options. They had limitations on how long they could suspend a student without an appeal from parents and from students. They also had limitations on how long they could keep someone in class at lunchtime and after school.

Some of the options we have given under the Strengthening Discipline in Queensland State Schools reforms are: principals and teachers can now carry out disciplinary measures on non-school days, including through a Saturday detention; expanded grounds for suspensions and exclusions; short-term suspensions of up to 10 days; long-term suspensions of between 11 and 20 days; and community service interventions that require students to perform, outside of school hours, tasks that are beneficial to the community.

Just a couple of weeks ago the Premier and I attended a community service intervention program at Loganlea State High School where students who misbehave are required to perform tasks to improve their school instead of being suspended. Parents are very supportive and we want to put this power back into schools where principals, teachers and students—

(Time expired)

Gladstone Hospital

Mrs CUNNINGHAM: My question without notice is to the Minister for Health. Minister, thank you for your recent visit to Gladstone. Will the minister clarify what capital works this government will commit to in the next 12 months to improve services to the community and the working environment for our dedicated hospital staff at the Gladstone Base Hospital?

Mr SPRINGBORG: I thank the honourable member for Gladstone for her question. It was a great privilege to travel to Gladstone the other day to have the opportunity to visit the hospital and also speak with some of the staff about the issues which are important to them and to commend them for the great work that they are doing and also to visit the Gladstone Ambulance Station. I understand the honourable member, because of a longstanding, very important personal engagement, was not able to be there, but we certainly appreciate the role of the honourable member for Gladstone in advocating on behalf of her hospital and her community. As the honourable member is aware, as a consequence of her hard work and advocacy over the last few years and in particular the last 12 months, the government has made a significant provision in this year's state budget through the local hospital and health service and the board that oversees that to start planning around the upgrade of the emergency department at Gladstone. That is something which I think is well and truly overdue. Once we have gone through that particular program, we will really see when we develop this plan what is required and then we will work on the investment program to upgrade that emergency department.

As the honourable member is aware, there has also been significant refurbishment carried out in particular parts of that hospital in partnership with some of the major gas companies in the area. In particular, I want to congratulate and commend both Santos and QGC for their partnership with the state government, with the local hospital and health service and its board and with the Gladstone Hospital community to invest in some new service provision such as a complete overhaul of the high-dependency unit, which is going to be remade to be far more functional with the latest equipment, and work has also started now to upgrade the operating theatre. From early next year a whole range of orthopaedic procedures which are not currently conducted at the Gladstone Hospital will be able to be done there for a whole range of joints where people are routinely sent to Rockhampton. That will be a major boon for the people of Gladstone. The joint appointment of the orthopaedic surgeon only recently and the work around that recruitment will see that service grow in that area and it makes sense to work with the Mater because it is a co-located hospital and it actually has that critical mass. In terms of the new radiology contract across Central Queensland, this will see imaging facilities in Gladstone which are currently not available such as a 128-slice CT scanner which

will mean that diagnostic imaging will be able to be done in Gladstone for that community whereas currently people have to go to Rockhampton. That community will have better diagnostics and better services as a consequence of the investment directed by this government in partnership with the resources sector.

(Time expired)

Local Government, Community Safety

Mrs FRANCE: My question without notice is to the Minister for Local Government, Community Recovery and Resilience. Minister, can you please advise the House how the government is assisting local government to make communities safer?

Mr CRISAFULLI: I thank the member for the question. I can imagine members in the House asking, 'Why would the Minister for Local Government be talking about a matter of law and order?' Quite simply the answer is because the days of councils being about just roads, rates and rubbish are over. If you speak with people in communities, particularly those in regional Queensland, they will tell you that at the top of their list is community safety. They want to feel safe in their homes and they want to feel safe in their communities, their suburbs and their parks. Over the course of the last two years we have partnered with local government to deliver in the order of $5 million worth of closed-circuit television in places like Moreton Bay that the member represents and we have done it systematically because it matters to communities. This is not just about the larger councils like Moreton Bay and this is not just about Brisbane and the Gold Coast, because across Queensland we have received applications for councils to embark on a journey to get involved in CCTV—places like Bundaberg, Charters Towers, Warwick and Laidley. We are talking about small communities that five, six or seven years ago would not have thought about this being important, but it is important to them because it is important to their community.

In fact, I was in Dalby the other day looking at a place where we will be putting CCTV in beside Myall Creek. Unfortunately it is a little bit late in this situation because some mindless fools trashed a public toilet, creating tens of thousands of dollars worth of damage, but no doubt the council will continue to do that. I toured the control centre that they will be upgrading. The quality of the images in a small town like Dalby will be such that you can zoom in and you will be able to see the whites of somebody's teeth. It is incredible and a great facility.

Mr Dempsey: And straight back to the police station.

Mr CRISAFULLI: And straight back to the police station. It is without a shadow of a doubt top technology. I say in jest one comment that was made though: I had with me our candidate for Condamine, Mr Pat Weir, and he remarked that the one thing that the CCTV camera would not be able to spot in Dalby is the member for Condamine! It has been some time since he has been seen in Dalby, but it is a wonderful facility to protect that wonderful regional community. The crimes that this will help solve are varied. It is not just the big issues like murders and assaults. The other day I was in Stanthorpe—ably represented by the member for Southern Downs—where some fools jumped into a garden bed and were doing breaststroke in flowers. That crime was solved by having CCTV. Communities do not care which level of government delivers services for them. They do not care if it is the council, the state or the federal government. They care about what it means to them and their families, and together we are working to build a safer Queensland for all of our families.

Uranium Mining

Mr KNUTH: My question without notice is to the Minister for Natural Resources and Mines. Minister, as the government has progressed uranium development in Queensland, will the minister take into consideration recent natural disasters where Charters Towers experienced its second biggest flood in history, a category 2 cyclone, an earthquake and the fact that there has already been a contamination spill from Ben Lomond uranium mine before any development approval of this mine?

Mr CRIPPS: I must say that I am delighted to have the question from the member for Dalrymple because it gives me an opportunity to talk about the world's best practice framework which has recently been put in place by this government to allow for the recommencement of uranium mining in Queensland. Those members who are members of the Agriculture, Resources and Environment Committee would have heard me speak extensively about this issue during the recent estimates committee process. It is a great opportunity for me to remind honourable members about the rigorous process that we have been through to put this framework in place, because of course we took the decision to recommence uranium mining in Queensland in late 2012. We did not simply

recommence receiving applications for uranium mining in Queensland immediately. This government took a considered and progressive approach to the recommencement of this industry in Queensland and we took the following 18 months to develop a world's best practice framework to ensure that when this industry does recommence in this state it does so under a world's best practice, modern 21st century framework both in terms of the conditions in which employees will work on these sites and also in terms of the protection of the environment.

The uranium implementation committee visited other jurisdictions in Australia which have been undertaking uranium mining in recent decades, including the Northern Territory and South Australia. Western Australia commenced uranium mining even more recently and we consulted and discussed the arrangements that those jurisdictions have in place for uranium mining in those states and territories. We took the time to carefully consider how we would recommence this important industry in Queensland and it was only from 1 July this year after considering all of these issues that we will now actually take applications for the industry to recommence. In relation to the way forward from now on, I remind the member for Dalrymple that, should an application come forward, we will assess it under our framework. It will also have to comply with Commonwealth legislation for the operation of the industry.

I am very confident that we have taken the time to consider the appropriate best practice approach for the recommencement of this industry. I look forward to companies expressing an interest in undertaking uranium mining again in Queensland. I was delighted to go out to North-West Queensland and to the Cloncurry shire last week and not only announce that we were prepared to take applications but also announce a competitive tender process for rare earth elements on the former Mary Kathleen mine site.

(Time expired)

Pine Rivers Electorate, Child Protection

Mr HOLSWICH: My question without notice is to the Minister for Communities, Child Safety and Disability Services. Can the minister advise what the government is doing to provide more support to vulnerable young people in my electorate of Pine Rivers?

Ms DAVIS: I thank the honourable member for his question and for his ongoing support of vulnerable families and vulnerable young people in his electorate. This government has a strong plan for a brighter future for vulnerable young people and is absolutely focused on making Queensland the safest place to raise a family, to live and to work. As part of this, we are working to improve the state's child protection system. We have begun implementing the landmark reforms to build stronger families with $406 million worth of new investment over the next five years.

In addition to these reforms, my department is working very hard with its partners to revitalise local front-line services. I was very pleased to be able to visit the Pine Rivers Neighbourhood Centre with both the member for Pine Rivers and the member for Kallangur to learn more about the great work that they are doing not only in the Pine Rivers local area but, of course, all the way across to the Redcliffe peninsula.

Last month, I also had the opportunity to pop in and see Hetty Johnston and her team at their service at Strathpine to meet and to talk to some of the counsellors about the work that they are doing to assist local families who had fallen victim to childhood sexual assault. I am very pleased that earlier this year this government was able to contribute an additional $100,000 to Bravehearts so that they could continue to deliver counselling sessions for victims of this heinous crime on Brisbane's north side. That funding has gone directly to providing front-line services for people in the Pine Rivers shire. Seventy people will be able to access those extra services. That is 700 more sessions and over 1,200 counselling hours to people so that they can get their lives back on track. I would like to take a moment just to commend Hetty and her team for doing the great work that they do in this space.

In addition to our child protection reforms, we are also strengthening the justice system. This work, spearheaded by the Attorney-General, is helping to protect those individuals in our community who have in the past found themselves requiring the assistance of Bravehearts and other organisations because those perpetrators of sexual assault, or sexual violence, were not being treated in the manner that they should have been or in response to community expectations about how these perpetrators of such dreadful crimes would be treated by the law.

(Time expired)

Beyond Billabong

Mrs D'ATH: My question is to the Attorney-General. I refer to the Lincoln Springs boot camp operator, Beyond Billabong, which was awarded a multimillion dollar contract after the Attorney-General's personal intervention and I ask: will the Attorney-General confirm that the contractor has had to approach unsuccessful tenderers seeking assistance to provide the services Beyond Billabong was contracted to provide itself?

Mr BLEIJIE: I thank the honourable member for the question. I have visited the Lincoln Springs boot camp quite recently with the members for Cairns and the other local members in Far North Queensland. I have to say that the results of the boot camp are amazing—better than I would ever have expected, and I see the thumbs up from the member for Townsville. Since these boot camps have been operating around Queensland, 130 young people have commenced the youth boot camps. Under the old regime, they would have been in and out of detention. We all remember the statistics: about 30 per cent of young offenders were in and out of detention more than five times. There was no hope for them.

I recall a story where a young 14-year-old was released under the old Labor regime. He was put out into a car. He said he got into the car with his cousin. He was 14 years old. His father had committed suicide and his mother was a drug addict. The former government released him into the care of a cousin who was on bail for offences that he had committed himself and with a teenage pregnant girl in the car. When I was told that story I wondered, 'What future does that 14-year-old have?' Under the Labor government he had no future—other than a future back in detention, a revolving-door cycle. He now has hope. He now has opportunity, because we are delivering real action.

I note that the honourable member has been appointed the shadow Attorney-General. Let me read some of the excerpts from comments about participants. Remember, these are the kids who had no future by going to the Cleveland Youth Detention Centre. Participant I says—

I am actually thinking about the future now. I want to finish my education. I want to finish school and I want to do something with my life.

The father of participant X says—

We as a family are so proud of our son. To see him at the graduation and how well he did and all the other boys also is a great thing. He is happier now and has hope. As his Dad I will support him and I believe he will get this Station job because he now believes in himself and has had the opportunity at the camp to live the outdoors life with the horses and he loved it.

The carer of participant Y says—

Mr PITT: I rise to a point of order. I ask that the Attorney-General answer the question. The question relates to tenders and contracting. I ask you to rule on relevance under standing order 118(b).

Madam SPEAKER: Thank you, Leader of Opposition Business. Attorney-General, I ask you to address the question.

Mr BLEIJIE: Thank you, Madam Speaker. The carer of participant Y says—

Since he got back from Boot camp we can certainly see a change ... He is being more conscientious towards staff and he appears a lot happier. We have always known he is an intelligent young man. And it now seems that the boot camp has given him the opportunity to have a go at something and he loved it.

The mother of participant Z says—

I truly believe with the support and mentoring he has received from Jimmy and your team at Beyond Billabong, he has the potential to rehabilitate. Boyd Curran and his program for the troubled youth are a godsend to parents like myself who go through a difficult journey with our Children. The future is looking brighter because of Beyond Billabong, so Thank you from the bottom of my heart.

To answer the question, this is about partnerships. This is about partnering with the community to make sure that we get these young kids back on track so that they can live the life that we all want to live.

Honourable members interjected.

Madam SPEAKER: Order! I warn members on my left and my right.

Social Housing

Mr PUCCI: My question without notice is to the Minister for Housing and Public Works. Can the minister please update the House on the impact of the three-strikes policy and how it is successfully deterring antisocial behaviour in social housing?

Mr MANDER: I thank the member for Logan for his question. It is a good time—12 months after we introduced this policy on 1 July last year—to reflect on the success of this policy. The first question we need to ask is: why did we bring in this antisocial behaviour policy, commonly known as the three-strikes policy? We brought it in for a number of reasons. The first reason was that every year it is costing the state around $5 million to repair the damage that has been done by a very small minority of rogue tenants in public housing. The other reason was that, as I travelled around the state to community cabinet meetings, I had residents across my desk in tears as they told me about the bad luck that they had in being situated next door to the neighbours from hell. I could not do anything but try to act to stop this from happening.

One year after this policy was introduced we have had some very effective results. Last year, there were 1,277 first strikes issued. But quite encouragingly, there were only 291 second strikes. So only 25 per cent of people who received a first strike also received a second strike. Then only a further four per cent of people—51 people—received their third strike, which meant they had to leave public housing. We also had 83 people who had a first and final strike because their behaviour was so bad we just could not keep them in public housing.

Our message to a small minority of people who give a lot larger group of people a bad name is that if you cannot respect government property and you cannot respect your neighbours you have no future in public housing. The success of this program will not be measured by how many people we evict. That is not what this is all about. This is not about being tough for the sake of being tough. This is about being fair. This is making sure that those who are in heavily subsidised public housing respect what they actually have. The success of this program will be measured by the number of people whose behaviour we modify, the number of people whom we can help sustain their tenancies so that they can stay in their public housing property. Madam Speaker and the member for Logan, after 12 months I believe that this program has been working extremely well. It has sent a clear message to people that if you are in public housing respect your neighbours and respect your property.

Madam SPEAKER: The time for questions has expired.

SPEAKER'S STATEMENT

School Group Tours

Madam SPEAKER: Before calling matters of public interest, I wish to acknowledge schools visiting today: King's Christian College in the electorate of Mudgeeraba; Gregory Terrace from Brisbane Central; St Mary's Ipswich from Ipswich; and St Thomas More College from Sunnybank.

MATTERS OF PUBLIC INTEREST

Newman Government, Performance

Hon. A PALASZCZUK (Inala—ALP) (Leader of the Opposition) (11.02 am): This morning it is a question of where do I actually begin? I think I will begin with the most recent by-election in Stafford. I am pleased to advise the House that the revised swing for the state seat of Stafford is 19.1 per cent. On behalf of the opposition, I would like to formally welcome Dr Anthony Lynham to the Queensland parliament as the new member for Stafford.

Let us talk about Stafford. Stafford was symbolic of what people are feeling not just in Stafford but across Queensland. We know that there were several issues at play here. The No. 1 issue is how arrogant the Premier and his team are as well as being out of touch with the local community. When Dr Lynham and I went around and spoke to the people in Stafford this came through very clearly in their remarks. What was also very telling, and is something that I have been talking about in this House for over two years, is that the nearly 20,000 people who lost their public sector jobs have come back to haunt this government. Day in, day out the public talk about the impact that is being felt by one of their family members losing a job because of this government.

If we turn back the clock to earlier this year, Redcliffe was the start of the people's reaction to what was happening in Queensland. With Redcliffe we saw the election of Yvette D'Ath with a 17.2 per cent swing. One would think this would have been a wake-up call for the government. But it was not a wake-up call because the government continued to attack. Let us go through the people that they have continued to attack over the last two years. First of all the government said that public

servants had nothing to fear yet it cut up to 20,000 jobs through the public sector. Then we had the attacks on the ambulance officers, the firefighters and the nurses. Then we had the attack on the doctors. Who can forget the ongoing doctors crisis brought about by the Health minister's own making; attacking doctors and not listening to the former member for Stafford, Chris Davis.

Mr Crisafulli interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: They do not want to listen. You should be listening. We know what seat you represent. You should be listening a lot more.

Mr Pitt: They are listening, they just don't like what everyone is saying.

Ms PALASZCZUK: That is right. They do not like what we have to say. I will keep saying it because Queenslanders are hurting and they are sick of this arrogant and out-of-touch government. Let us talk about what happened after the Stafford by-election. After the Stafford by-election the Premier of this state went for his little fun run the next morning and stood in front of the cameras and said, 'Yes, we've had the Stafford by-election and Queenslanders don't appreciate me.' That is what the Premier said. The phones would have been running hot that afternoon. The phones would have been ringing non-stop. Cabinet ministers would have been ringing around. The backbench would have been ringing around.

Mrs D'Ath: Bruce McIver would have called, too.

Ms PALASZCZUK: McIver would have been ringing up, 'Premier, that's not what you say after a massive swing of that magnitude in Stafford.' What were the backflips? I would love to run through these backflips.

Ms Trad: Trivial backflips.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Trivial backflips. I will take that interjection from the member for South Brisbane. First of all there will be no more bikies in pink jumpsuits. I am quite sure that one of our shadows was asking questions during the estimates process about how many bikies were in pink jumpsuits. Of course, we had no answer. The second backflip was, I am proud to say, actually adopting the opposition's policy of restoring the estimates process. What we saw over the two days of the estimates hearings was nothing short of a debacle. It was disgraceful. Those opposite know it was a farce. I am pleased that they have finally accepted the opposition policy to restore it.

Now I come to the crucial point. This is the wake-up call for the Premier. This is testament to the fundamental fact that this Premier is failing to listen. I am talking here about the bipartisan appointment of the chair of the anticorruption watchdog in this state. We all know the Premier and the Attorney-General spoke at length about backing in their person and how they could choose who could be the chair because we did not need bipartisan support. Actions speak louder than words. Today I am calling on the Premier of this state to remove Dr Ken Levy as the chair of the CCC. He does not have bipartisan support, plain and simple. Today is the test of the Premier's leadership. If you believe in what you say and you stand by the principle that the chair of the anticorruption watchdog in this state should have bipartisan support, the chair of the CCC must stand down immediately. The chair of the CCC must stand down today. No ifs, buts or maybes, not waiting until the new process, today is the day for the chair of the CCC to stand down.

I have been very concerned of late about this government's most recent attacks. The most recent attacks include not only attacking our lawyers and the judiciary but also continuing attacks on Tony Fitzgerald. This is a man whose integrity and honesty should not be questioned by anyone in this state. What we have seen over the last six months is a campaign to attack this man. If the government is true to its word and is now about listening, these attacks must stop forthwith.

After the Stafford by-election we learnt from the *Courier-Mail* that this government is embarking on a new operation called 'operation boring'. Today we saw it in action during question time and now we are seeing it in action during MPIs. The truth is that for the past two years the code that was implemented in this state was called 'operation attack'. It was about attacking anyone—any citizen in this state—without fear or failure.

This Premier is incapable of changing. A leopard does not change its spots. After the Redcliffe by-election, the Premier said he would listen. Then we had the fight over doctors' contracts. They fought with the former member for Stafford because he stood up against the electoral donation laws that were being rammed through this parliament. Then we had the Stafford by-election and the government said it would make some fundamental changes, but they do not go anywhere near as far as they should. Following the changes to the electoral donation laws, the public knows very clearly what this government is about: it is about hiding secret donations from the public's view. Labor will go

back to $1,000 donation limits. We will declare $1,000 donations and, in the future, we will make that retrospective. I am putting the LNP and the party organisation on notice: collect your records, because if Labor is re-elected we will make those laws retrospective and all those donations will be in the public domain. Secret donations are a hallmark of this government and that must change.

In conclusion, if Redcliffe and Stafford are not a wake-up call for this government, I do not know what is. Queenslanders are hurting and this government is failing to listen and it is failing to understand, and a leopard will not change its spots.

(Time expired)

Townsville Electorate, Health

Mr HATHAWAY (Townsville—LNP) (11.12 am): I am glad that I can rise after that contribution. Never let the facts get in the way of a good story. I will present a different version of history that is based on evidence and fact. Today I rise to speak on the significant health sector improvements in Townsville and North Queensland. I note these to record my gratitude to the Townsville Hospital and Health Service. The latest figures show how the elective surgery lists at the Townsville Hospital have been slashed. In June 2013, there were three urgent cases; in June this year, there were none. In June 2012, there were 317 semi-urgent cases, in June 2013 that number fell to 73 and in June 2014 there were none. In 2012 there were 199 non-urgent cases, in 2013 there were 31 and June this year there were none. Let me restate that: in June this year, no patients waited longer than the clinically recommended times for elective surgery.

Over the past year, a number of new services have been implemented, including the North Queensland Persistent Pain Management Service with outreaches to Cairns, Mackay and Mount Isa. The Townsville Hospital started a neurology training program to boost the number of neurologists practising in the region. The Townsville Hospital is the first regional hospital in Australia to be accredited to offer this new program. The Josephine Sailor Adolescent Inpatient Unit and Day Service has opened. It is the first North Queensland overnight inpatient facility and day-therapy service for adolescents who live with mental illness.

Phase 1 of the Townsville Cancer Centre was recently opened. The Townsville Cancer Centre has moved into a new unit, while the old section will be refurbished by early next year. The two sections will then be combined to provide a unit twice the size of the previous centre. The centre can now provide more complex treatments to cancer patients who in the past have had to travel to capital cities for their treatment. This allows patients to have the full support of their family and friends while they undergo medical treatment. In the recent state budget, the Queensland government allocated $16.3 million towards the running of this service and the federal government has also provided funding for the expansion.

The expansion of the centre includes updated telehealth facilities, including a purpose-built telehealth clinic room; three additional bunkers with two additional linear accelerators, which will provide a total of five linear accelerators; and additional clinic rooms to meet the requirements for the new facilities, including rooms for allied health staff. Recently I visited the new centre. I was impressed not only by the expansion but also by the dedication and professionalism of the nurses and clinicians that work in the unit. I record my congratulations to the cancer centre director, Aniko Cooper, and her staff who have been there every step of the way during the transition.

As a result of effective local clinical management, the Townsville HHS has had an operating surplus for two consecutive years. What does this mean on a day-to-day basis? It means that our local hospital and health service has more money to spend on providing more services. Over the past year, the board has reinvested an extra $7 million to provide more care, including more than 500 surgeries and 3,000 specialist medical and surgical outpatient appointments, and $3.5 million was invested in a mobile health van and staff accommodation on Palm Island.

This financial year we will see even more services come online at the Townsville Hospital. There will be new services in sub-acute, paediatric intensive care, paediatric oncology, operating theatres and short-stay day surgery. To meet the future growth of the hospital and the increase in demand, it is expected that there will be growth of about 200 full-time equivalent positions, including 80 nurses and 25 doctors over the next 12 months. I am also aware that the Townsville Hospital and Health Service is giving serious consideration to the feasibility of establishing a North Queensland cochlear implant centre, which, if realised, would be the first outside of the south-east corner. This would bring a better response closer to home for those amongst our North Queensland community who live in silence. This demonstrates what can be done through local boards making local decisions

and with the best clinicians and staff providing an outstanding service that meets the needs of North Queensland patients. I congratulate the board and the hospital staff on these outstanding achievements.

I turn briefly to our local Queensland Ambulance Service, as the HHS is not the only health service in Townsville that is leading the way. Our local ambos are also a shining light. Townsville has become one of only three places in the state to receive a new patient ambulance transport system, the Low Acuity Response Unit, and is the first regional centre to do so outside the south-east. This will significantly improve ambulance waiting times by effectively targeting a response and clinical solution for non-emergency cases. It will also relieve pressure on the public hospital by freeing up resources in our emergency department. Five additional paramedics and two new vehicles have been allocated to the new system.

(Time expired)

Local Government, Public Outdoor Fitness Equipment

Hon. DF CRISAFULLI (Mundingburra—LNP) (Minister for Local Government, Community Recovery and Resilience) (11.17 am): During question time I mentioned that local government is so much more than roads, rates and rubbish and I talked about the push into areas such as community safety through CCTV. I want to talk about another thing that I have seen that is changing the face of councils, which is a push into getting their communities fitter and healthier. This is something that we should all take a huge interest in. Year on year, the demand on our health system increases and time and time again our communities deal with issues associated with being overweight. This is something that every level of government needs to take a good long hard look at, to see what each of us can do in that regard.

Over the course of the last couple of decades, increasingly councils have been working to install footpaths and upgrade parks, and that has been tremendously helpful in getting people active. I want to see a move to the next generation—that is, public outdoor fitness equipment. It is my wish that every single one of our 77 local government areas has at least one piece of public fitness equipment for people to use; at least one piece of equipment in each of the 77 areas. I have a fundamental belief that it does not matter if you are rich or poor or if you are black or white; whatever your background, you deserve the right to have the best opportunity to be healthy. It is up to all of us to provide facilities to enable that to occur.

It is with a heavy heart that I inform the House that more than 20 local government areas do not have some form of public outdoor fitness equipment, including many of our Indigenous communities. We must change that. It is not just those Indigenous communities but also some of our larger communities that do not have such facilities. For example, the Whitsundays is a beautiful part of the state where exercise should be second nature, but there are no outdoor fitness equipment parks in the Whitsundays or the North Burnett area. I say to those councils that we are ready, willing and able to partner with you to make that happen.

I have seen firsthand the benefit of this exercise equipment. In my home city of Townsville there are few of these. There are two in my electorate. One is in Sherriff Park, Mundingburra. The second was only recently installed in Riverside Park in the suburb of Douglas, which is where I live.

In the short time that that has been constructed I have seen a march of people using it. It has not just been fit, able-bodied people but young kids and older residents. They are making the most of what is a beautiful outdoor area. We combined it with a dog off-leash area. There is something for everyone. People can go in and make the most of it.

It came about as a result of an idea raised by the local Neighbourhood Watch group. They said, 'Wouldn't it be great if there were a way to engage people, get them to know their neighbours and, at the same time, get them fit and healthy.' I teamed up with local councillor, Trevor Roberts. There was a contribution from the state and the council and it is now a reality.

The other day I was with the member for Pumicestone at Bongaree. There is a wonderful project going on there. We have created a much stronger foreshore. We were discussing what a beautiful area it is but that it lacked fitness equipment. To her great credit, the member for Pumicestone immediately engaged with her council and suggested that it would be in their interests to put in an application. It is very difficult to say no when there is a persistent local member and a council that is engaged enough to put in an application. The result is a contribution of $40,000 for that project. It will be delivered this financial year. That is action on the ground and it will help our communities become fitter.

I want to finish where I started and say clearly that I will not rest until every person in this state has an ability to be able to exercise at free, safe, accessible fitness equipment in their local area. It does not have to be advanced. It can be as simple as a few static bars where people of different fitness levels can get in and do some form of activity. We must do better in this regard.

I put the challenge to councils: if councils do not have exercise equipment then they should have a look where they can put it. If they have basic equipment then they should have a look where they can take it to the next level. If they have equipment that is of a high level then they should see where they can install some in another part of their city or region to enable everyone to have access. It does not matter what level of government, we all have a role in promoting fitter, healthier communities.

(Time expired)

Newman Government, Performance

Hon. TS MULHERIN (Mackay—ALP) (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (11.22 am): Queenslanders are fast finding that the Newman government is not a government that listens. The Newman government is a government that does as it chooses and when it chooses and to whom it chooses. One only needs to look at the string of broken promises laid out by the Premier, including the unemployment target that lies in tatters and a plan to sell Queensland assets no matter what.

When the Newman government was elected, the Premier declared he would govern with grace, humility and dignity. Then he arrogantly sacked 14,000 workers. When Queensland delivered a 16 per cent swing against the Newman government in Redcliffe, he said he would listen and then he trashed accountability. When Queenslanders delivered a swing of more than 19 per cent in Stafford he admitted that he had not been listening and then said he would listen again. To show he listened, he apologised for a litany of mistakes that he and the Attorney-General had made yet he fails to remove the Attorney-General or rule out asset sales.

At the launch of his multimillion dollar Queensland Plan, the Premier flew into Hervey Bay, told Queenslanders what they thought and flew out again. He is a fly-in fly-out Premier who refuses to listen. Worse for regional Queensland, the Newman government cannot arrive at a solid stance on fly-in fly-out workforces.

The Deputy Premier has no time for local workers who do not want to travel to Brisbane or Cairns just to fly back to their home town for work. He is quoted in the Toowoomba *Chronicle* as follows when it comes to workers who do not want to travel to Brisbane, 'If they want to live locally, there are plenty of opportunities to work locally.' The Deputy Premier also said at last month's estimates hearing that he supported all the previous government's decisions to approve FIFO during a housing shortage while acknowledging that the economic conditions had since changed and that this shortage no longer existed.

In stark contrast, the Premier claimed that he is opposed to 100 per cent FIFO. However, he seems to lack the support of his 2IC. As we know, the Premier's leadership must be under pressure given the LNP's poor performance in two by-elections. Queenslanders deserve to know who is in charge of FIFO in the LNP. Is it the Premier or is it the Deputy Premier?

The human toll of such practices are devastating, especially for regional Queensland. I know the Premier and the Deputy Premier recently received the same email I did from a concerned local. The email outlines absurd situations like one worker who was forced to drive eight hours from Mackay to Cairns so he could be part of the FIFO workforce at Daunia, just two hours drive from his home. Another situation involves a mother concerned about her son who holds all the relevant tickets and owns a house 20 minutes—

Mr Cripps interjected.

Mr MULHERIN: You can change the conditions—

Mr Cripps interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Ruthenberg): Order!

Mr MULHERIN: You can change the conditions as you have done with the temporary accommodation—

Mr Cripps interjected.

Mr MULHERIN: You change the conditions when it comes to the fly-in fly-out workforce. Another situation involves a mother concerned about her son who holds all the relevant tickets and owns a house 20 minutes from the Moranbah mine. However, he has been told that once construction ends he needs to move to Brisbane to continue to work at the mine just minutes from his house. Another local worker was told employment would be conditional on him staying within the workers camp after his shift and flying back to Brisbane or Cairns at the end of his rotation. Local businesses are being thwarted under these arrangements, with a service station reporting a 50 per cent downturn over the past two years and motels going broke.

Mr Cripps interjected.

Mr MULHERIN: You want to go out and talk to locals and talk to businesses while you are talking to mining companies.

Mr Cripps interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MULHERIN: When the previous Labor government approved FIFO mines it was brighter economic times—

Mr Cripps interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Member, just a second! I will ask members to address the chair not each other. I would ask that interjections be audible not yelled. I call the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

Mr MULHERIN: When the previous Labor government approved FIFO mines it was in brighter economic times, where unemployment was lower, workers were in tight demand and vacancy rates for accommodation were two per cent not 37 per cent. Today, unemployment is 6.3 per cent. This is well above the Premier's own target of four per cent. Every opportunity should be given for local workers to get local jobs.

One hundred per cent FIFO mines are hurting Queensland, especially regional Queensland. The Premier and Deputy Premier need to work out who is in charge and what their policy on FIFO is. This government needs to end the damage it is causing to regional Queensland and make it clear to the Coordinator-General that the parameters are no 100 per cent FIFO in Queensland.

Moreton Bay Regional Council, Draft Planning Scheme

Mrs FRANCE (Pumicestone—LNP) (11.27 am): I rise today in parliament to make a speech about a very serious matter affecting the residents of Pumicestone, and in fact the residents of all electorates within the Moreton Bay Regional Council catchment—that is, the Moreton Bay Regional Council draft planning scheme. The draft planning scheme on display until 15 August on the Moreton Bay Regional Council's website has caused outrage amongst residents of Toorbul, Meldale, Bribie Island, Ningi, Beachmere and Caboolture due to the new category of restricted development.

The outrage expressed by residents has not only been about the new category meaning that they will not be able to build on their vacant land or add an extra bedroom to their home, but that such major changes were slipped through in a 4,000 page document, dumped on the internet, with no direct consultation, no community meetings and certainly no explanation as to why this is being done.

It is very hard for residents who have never had floodwaters through their houses to understand why they are now having such severe restrictions put on them that will impact on their rights, their property values and their options for insuring their homes. It is hard to understand why their home that has never had floodwaters through it is now classified as being in a location where there is an extreme personal safety risk and a majority of buildings can fail or major personal risk with light framed buildings expected to fail.

This just does not make sense to long-time locals who have never seen floods in our local area like those that, unfortunately, Grantham and Toowoomba experienced. Instead, we have seen floodwaters slowly rise with the tide—creeping up millimetre by millimetre through the drains or the canals and then slowly going away until the next high tide.

I first became aware of the plan when I overheard my husband and dad, who are both local real estate agents, talking about the plan and the impact it would have, and is in fact already having, on the property market due to the restricted development category being out there for all to see on public documents. While I acknowledge that this is a council matter, the constant stream of outraged residents contacting me with regard to the council's plan has meant that I cannot simply sit quietly and direct them to the website and tell them to interpret the 4,000-page document themselves—

Mr Johnson: And the people of Pumicestone don't want you to, either.

Mrs FRANCE: I take that interjection. The people of Pumicestone do not want me to sit on my hands and do nothing. I just cannot direct them to make a submission, cross their fingers and hope that council will take into consideration their views. This plan will have significant financial impacts on residents and on how our communities will develop. For that reason, I intend to continually rally my community and make them aware of the plan and encourage them to make submissions to the Moreton Bay Regional Council.

I have been out and about discussing this plan with my constituents and encouraging them to make those submissions via the council's website. I have met with the reps from the Toorbul Progress Association in the lead-up to their community meeting on Friday night, and I congratulate them on raising awareness in their community. I have letterbox dropped the communities of Toorbul, Donnybrook and Meldale to alert residents to changes affecting them in this council plan. I have spoken with many residents from Toorbul, Meldale, Donnybrook, Bribie Island, Ningi, Caboolture and Beachmere who are directly affected by this plan. I have met with many people from Beachmere.

The most memorable was the group that organised for me to come over to Beachmere and have a cup of coffee, and I was thinking it was going to be with Sharon and Paula. I got a phone call saying that there were about 40 people there, and by the time I got there 10 minutes later we estimated that there were about 150 people out the front of Sharon's bakery. So I congratulate Sharon, Paula, Len, Frank and Charlie on really rallying their community and making sure that residents know what is in store with the draft plan that is on display.

I have been actively lobbying council on this plan and I have raised awareness with my constituents through social media, letters, a Channel 7 interview last night, and I will front the Beachmere community on Thursday night to outline how we can make a difference and make sure council understand our concerns about this plan. I will continue to lobby council to extend the time frame of this plan that is on display, to contact residents directly who are impacted and outline what those changes are to them, and to revise the restricted development category that is going to have such a big financial impact on our residents. This matter is far too important to simply make a submission to council and hope that they act on it. I thank the Deputy Premier for allowing me to continually lobby him on this matter. I apologise to his wife for doing that over breakfast this morning as well while they were trying to have a bit of time aside. But this issue is far too important to my community to sit back and do nothing.

Sale of Public Assets

Mr PITT (Mulgrave—ALP) (11.31 am): Last week had been labelled 'Treasury Week'—supposedly the big 'economic' week for the Newman government. However, we saw remarkably little of the Treasurer, even less talk of the economy and still no plan for rising youth unemployment. There was no admission last week, as there was from the Premier in December 2012, that his government's cuts had contributed to a slowing of the economy. And the Treasurer's major appearance of the week came right at the end as he refused to rule out the sale of the Royal Children's Hospital site to the private sector—not that dissimilar to when the Treasurer at last month's estimates hearings refused to rule out providing the private sector with a controlling management stake over the electricity network. Last month the Treasurer made the absurd claim that it would have been a 'mammoth task' to tell voters that it was not just a private funding model being contemplated, that it was in fact a full-blown privatisation of the electricity board and management as well.

It is fundamentally dishonest for this government to spend $6 million of taxpayers' money to ask for their opinion on 'private funding' for the electricity network and then claim afterwards that this means that Queenslanders support a different model for the privatisation of management, debt and future profits of the electricity network. It is even worse to then spend up to $20 million of taxpayers' money on Strong Choices to spread blatant mistruths and propaganda about state debt including false information and absurd counterfactual scenarios and hypotheticals about what the state could do without any debt—without any consideration of what the state would look like without both the income-earning government businesses and infrastructure funded from this debt.

And the Premier's April 2013 pledge that he would not seek a mandate for the 'divestment' of the electricity network in this term or the next has well and truly been broken. You only need refer to page 15 of Budget Paper No. 2 which describes the electricity network privatisation model as 'a divestment'. Last week the Premier launched the Queensland Plan, which did not include any mention of asset sales, privatisation, outsourcing or contestability—a plan said to be from the people,

a plan that stands though in stark contrast to the plans the Premier and Treasurer have for this state. Their plan is for the largest program of asset sales in our state's history—a plan that the Treasurer claims is his 'smartest choice' and a plan that does not have the support of Queenslanders, as the overwhelming message of the 19.1 per cent swing in Stafford demonstrated. It is the only plan the LNP had for debt repayment all along after telling Queenslanders before the election that it had a plan for a plan.

Under the Newman government, combined fiscal deficits have worsened by $884 million between 2011-12 and 2014-15, our economy has slowed from growth of four per cent to three per cent, and unemployment has risen from 5.5 per cent to 6.3 per cent. All the while the Newman LNP government is claiming that it has got this state 'back on track', with a slower economy, higher unemployment and higher deficits on the Treasurer's own preferred measure of a fiscal balance that is not used by any other state or territory.

It is for good reason that people are opposing the Newman government's 'plan for a plan' on debt. The assets proposed for sale are expected to deliver a return to the taxpayer of $2 billion this financial year, which is equivalent to what the state will receive from coal royalties. This is a return to the state after these assets have serviced the debt that they hold. They are assets that deliver a greater return to the taxpayer than gambling taxes and levies, or land tax, or motor vehicle registration.

The Treasurer's so-called 'smartest choice' dossier makes the claim that these assets only contribute a small percentage of overall revenue by including GST and Commonwealth grants into their calculation. However, the Treasurer knows all too well that coal royalties are crucial to the budget bottom line—just ask the Queensland Resources Council. And the Treasurer knows that the returns from the businesses he has proposed for divestment are also significant. It is expected that the return from these assets will grow to more than $2.6 billion a year by 2017-18. This revenue stream will be lost to future generations forever if these income-producing assets are sold.

The sale of essential monopoly infrastructure as proposed by the Newman government has also been brought into question by independent experts. The Chair of the ACCC, Rod Sims, in June said—

Privatising in ways that limit competition in order to maximise the one-off sale proceeds is the wrong way. Such an approach increases the sale proceeds by effectively taxing future generations and Australia's future competitiveness.

The sale of control over monopoly infrastructure proposed by the LNP, such as the potential sale of a controlling management stake over our electricity network, will do just that. Similar comments have been made by Professor in Economics Stephen King, who said—

… privatisation without competition is like a hidden tax. The government gets more today because we will all be paying more tomorrow.

I could not agree more. The Newman government's plan for a record $33.6 billion sale of assets will only place a hidden tax on Queenslanders into the future. The Newman government will have more money to spend on promises for the next election, but we will all be paying more tomorrow.

Queenslanders sent a message to both political parties at the last election. They want their public assets to stay in public hands for the benefit of future generations. The 'smartest choice' for Queenslanders will be at the next election. The LNP will sell your assets; Labor will not. While we are talking about the Stafford by-election, let us think about what the Premier has said. He said he is listening but he just does not care what you have to say.

(Time expired)

Wild Dogs

Mr JOHNSON (Gregory—LNP) (11.37 am): Mr Deputy Speaker, in 1795 an Englishman born of Scottish parents started off the wool industry in Australia.

Government members: Mic!

Mr JOHNSON: I put the bloody thing on. I will start again, Mr Deputy Speaker.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Ruthenberg): Member, I am sorry but you will need to withdraw that unparliamentary language.

Mr JOHNSON: What was that?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Just withdraw please, member.

Mr JOHNSON: I will withdraw whatever the problem is.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you. Start again.

Mr JOHNSON: In 1795 an Englishman born of Scottish parents started off the wool industry in Australia—John Macarthur. In 1797 he introduced the Spanish merino to this country and from there the rest is history. In the central west of Queensland, in the south-west of Queensland and in northern Queensland today the wool industry is on its knees for the very reason of wild dogs. The downturn in the economy has also contributed to that. In the early 1990s, when John Kerin pulled the floor price on wool, we saw the situation gravely impacted again as a result of that interference by the then federal government.

There are many graziers in Western Queensland who are spending countless tens of thousands of dollars of their own money to build fences around their own properties. These dog-proof fences, on the scale of single and multi properties, are occurring right throughout the central west and the south-west as I speak. I know that my colleague the member for Warrego and his son Will have done it at Tarrina at Tambo. Bill Chandler has done it at Hillalong at Barcaldine, and there are many other people in the region continuing to do it.

I know our state government has contributed $3.8 million to support the development of cluster fences in south-west Queensland. I say to the federal government today: get behind the state government on this initiative. It is one that is worth a lot of merit and it is one that must go ahead. It has to for the revitalisation of the wool industry in this state, the rebirth of the wool industry in this state and the reignition of an industry that made this country great.

Many of you would still remember the old $2 note with the photo of a sheep's head and John Macarthur beside it. That is the person and that is the animal that gave this country the start it has got. We all talk about other industries but there is none that surpasses the wool industry in this state for creating that wealth generation capacity. From Cunnamulla in the south-west to Richmond in the north and all towns in between, those places were crowded with shearers and other related wool industry people every week of the year until recent years, the early nineties, when we saw the demise of the industry. Now with the influx of wild dogs we have a situation that is threatening not only the wool industry but also the cattle industry.

The Premier has met with Bill Chandler, Jenny Keogh, Michael Pratt and Dominic Burden in relation to this. I congratulate those four people for the work they are doing and the committee that they are a part of. The business houses in western, central, south-western and north-western Queensland will also benefit from this. We will see growth again in towns. We will see money in the towns. We will see employment in the towns. We will see productivity booming right throughout rural and regional Queensland complemented by the cattle industry but not as the sole survival of rural productivity. The cattle industry is not an industry that should fit into that country as such, but if we can reignite and reinvigorate the wool industry by way of spending $10 million or $20 million I do not think anyone can comprehend what the worth will be of the flow-on benefits and the value added benefits of that industry to not only the economy of this state but also the social benefits and productivity of this state.

I say here today we must build this fence. With the task ahead, we will double the agricultural productivity in this state by the year 2040, with all the issues that we saw created by biosecurity fallout in recent times. The wool industry is one that stands head and shoulders above the rest. It is one that is going to create an environment where Queensland rural economies will become strong and grow again.

World War I, 100-Year Commemoration; Mining

Dr DOUGLAS (Gaven—PUP) (11.42 am): It is 100 years since the declaration of war in Europe. Three great empires fell and the Commonwealth rose to the occasion. Sixty thousand Australians died. Sixteen of those were from the community of Acland in the Nanango electorate. Very little good ever comes from war, but those who gave the ultimate sacrifice did so for all of us who followed and their communities. They were patriots but their greatest gift was their belief in mateship, not the one that I am about to detail but the real version of mateship: true giving rather than taking and wanting nothing in return other than to be affectionately remembered together with building something greater for what they gave as their personal sacrifice. My great uncle Hugh Douglas was killed and lies buried at Etienne in France forever. The suburb of Douglas, which was named after his brother Robert, was mentioned in a speech today by the member for Mundingburra, as he lives there.

Today I intend to begin the case against the actions of the Deputy Premier, the member for Callide, for hijacking the greater public interest in favour of him and his mates. The greatest food bowl in the Southern Hemisphere has been placed under a mining lease—at least 93 per cent of the total area and not seven per cent which cannot possibly be mined. Furthermore, 32 open-cut mines and 40,000 production CSG wells between Dalby, Toowoomba and Warwick are planned or in place. What has occurred in just over two years of this LNP government has been nothing short of unrestricted, devastating overdevelopment of high-quality, prime agricultural land in favour of increasingly overseas owners and energy consumers in China and Europe. This could not have happened without the early planning work of the now deposed former Bligh Labor government. Now we have a secretive, dangerous, greedy LNP government with the Deputy Premier front and centre amongst those developments, for he is the keeper of the keys to the new El Dorado as they see it. The signs of grubby politicians' hands are all over it. These riches would make a sweet deal from generous and overly generous superannuation packages look positively pale in comparison.

Prior to the 2012 election, the Deputy Premier spent 18 months going with energy representatives of QGC, Arrow, New Hope, Shell and Wagner to see every proposal. On Tuesday, 22 November 2011 the Deputy Premier stood outside the Gowrie Junction community centre to speak. They asked where the money was going to come from once the LNP got into power. The Deputy Premier replied at the time, 'Everything east of Kingsthorpe will be safe.' Kingsthorpe is a village halfway to Oakey and in easy sight of Toowoomba on the Warrego Highway, for those who may not know. Therefore, everything north, south and west would be mined. You ask where is the evidence? Take note of it today. B-triples are coming through Toowoomba since the second range crossing is five years away. The state has laid 18 inches—that is half a metre—of asphalt which is three times the normal thickness to plan for those B-triples and there is no new excess rail capacity. Secondly, there is the secret deal on the range crossing. Most of the money—$80 million—has been spent to reduce the corners so that B-triples can negotiate the road. New Hope Coal donated $700,000 to the LNP and was allowed to move to Acland stage 3 despite the Deputy Premier saying it would not occur. The father of the member for Nanango was appointed by the Deputy Premier to the GasFields Commission. I table the letters written by that member to the locals. I also table the press release issued by the member for Nanango.

Tabled paper: Document, dated 19 February 2012, to Mr and Mrs Plant regarding Acland Stage 3 [5622].

Tabled paper: Document, dated 20 February 2012, titled 'Press Release by LNP candidate for Nanango regarding Acland Stage 3' [5623].

So you rightly ask: money for mates? Well, $10 million for the Royalties for the Regions went into O'Mara Road in the Charlton-Wellcamp industrial development, benefiting the family and brother primarily of the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry. I table all of the relevant correspondence.

Tabled paper: Bundle of media articles relating to the Royalties for the Regions program [5624].

But listen to this: within five minutes of this Charlton area, where $10 million of our money went, are the two greatest black spots that are killing and maiming Queenslanders and tourists. Today I state very clearly that the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry and the Deputy Premier have major conflicts of interests which they have not declared. I also say that the member for Nanango is damned by her actions and those of her community, and there will be further investigation into these matters as I will detail.

World War I, 100-Year Commemoration; Southern Freight Rail Corridor

Mr RICKUSS (Lockyer—LNP) (11.47 am): I rise to raise some concerns about the southern freight rail corridor and the planning that has been put in place for that southern freight rail corridor. It is of real concern to me that this was a poor decision by the previous Labor government dating back to 2006. Paul Lucas signed off on a briefing note on 28 December 2006. As members would notice, that is around Christmas time. Paul came in from holidays to sign off on this briefing note. It is of real concern that the route they have chosen does not relate anywhere near to the route that probably should be used. About 140 kilometres of that line goes through the Lockyer, yet I was not consulted. Neither was the Lockyer council, which probably has 50 or 60 kilometres, yet the then member for Ipswich West, Wayne Wendt, the member for Ipswich, Rachel Nolan, and the Ipswich City Council were consulted. This is poor planning right from the word go.

I advised Minister Emerson of my concerns in 2012. I advised the Deputy Prime Minister before he was the Deputy Prime Minister on 28 May 2013. I advised the Deputy Premier of my concerns on 27 March 2014. I advised the Deputy Prime Minister again on 3 July. I met with ARTC on 2 June 2014

in Ipswich. John Fullerton, who is the CEO of ARTC, was at that meeting. I have since corresponded with him in early July and have not had any correspondence back. I realise John is pretty busy. He must be pretty busy. He does not have an email so he must be extremely busy.

The email has to go to a V Hutchinson at ARTC. I have been notified that that has been received. I have also sent it off to Jim Armstrong at ARTC and Russell Smith at Port of Brisbane. This is about getting it right. This is a multibillion-dollar project. For some reason they are taking this alignment from Kagaru, which is down near Bromelton. It is about 100 kilometres longer than the route that should be taken. This extra 100 kilometres will cost somewhere in the vicinity of $2 billion to $3 billion. I cannot believe that with this project we are heading towards another disaster. This really does have to be reviewed.

I call on the Deputy Prime Minister and anyone else who is involved, such as John Fullerton, to hold a round table to review this properly. As I said, I was at a meeting in early June with John Anderson, the former Deputy Prime Minister, and John Fullerton. I raised these issues at that meeting. I have had no correspondence at all from ARTC. It is like they are ignoring this process. This is $2 billion to $3 billion of Australian taxpayers' money. I do not want to stop the project, but this is the wrong project. We have seen it time and time again. Look at the delivery of the fast internet. What a disaster! The report came out this morning and it is a total disaster.

Mr Krause: NBN.

Mr RICKUSS: NBN, that is the one. It is a total disaster. Billions of dollars have been wasted and I do not want to see this happen here. Look at some of the hospital disasters and the dam disasters. Let us get this right. We are only going to get one shot at putting a tunnel through the range for the fast trains and that sort of thing. Let us make sure we have the right alignments. Let us make sure we have this right. I call on any parliamentarian involved to sit down and work through this to ensure it is right, not just take a carte blanche attitude towards it. The port people, for instance, seem to feel it is about getting freight to the port. However, we have to do this right.

While I only have a few seconds remaining, I want to raise the issue of the First World War. Tom Watson and Phil Mostert from the Lockyer-Gatton Light Horse Troop have two light horses and they are in full regalia down on the green. I would like to congratulate the light horse associations in my area.

Mr Johnson: Hear, hear! Wonderful, wasn't it?

Mr RICKUSS: They do a wonderful job and they have beautiful mounts. They have all the gear down there, too. If any of the members who come off roster at 12 o'clock could go down and say g'day to Tom and Phil, that would be most appreciated.

(Time expired)

Electoral Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2014

Mr WELLINGTON (Nicklin—Ind) (11.52 am): This morning I take this opportunity to speak against the $3 million gift that the Newman-Bleijie government has made to the Liberal National Party, the Labor Party and the Katter party. That $3 million is contained in the Electoral Amendment Regulation (No. 1) of 2014, which was tabled in the House this morning by the Clerk. The Clerk also tabled the explanatory notes that go with those regulations. It is interesting that contained in the explanatory notes is a heading 'consultation'. Guess what it says under the heading of 'consultation' dealing with this issue of the $3 million gift? It states—

Comprehensive community consultation was undertaken on the Amendment Act. Proof of identity requirements and policy development payments, and their prescription by regulation, were considered as part of this consultation.

It is a sham. Extensive community consultation with Queenslanders about this $3 million gift was not conducted. I refer members to the matters that were raised during our committee's consideration of this bill. I refer members to the matters discussed when we debated this bill in the chamber. I also refer members to the matters that I raised during the recent estimates hearing. When I questioned the Attorney-General during the estimates hearing only a couple of weeks ago—and that was a shemozzle; we had everyone trying to find out what was happening—and I asked the Attorney-General how the government chose the $3 million, guess what? He took the standard response, 'Not me. I don't know. It's the Treasurer. Talk to the Treasurer.' Yet this is the Attorney-General who sits in cabinet every Monday I understand. The cabinet together make a decision, but he was not prepared to put his hand up and say, 'I was partly responsible.' It was not that long ago when the Attorney-General was out there issuing press releases stating, 'We are going to save Queenslanders over $3 million of wasted funds. We are going to save money.'

This is another abuse of power by this Newman Liberal National Party government in Queensland. It is an abuse of power because there is nothing at all contained in the regulation, the explanatory notes or the bill that has already been debated and passed in this House that requires any of that $3 million to go to policy development. It could simply go to paying off debt owed to a bank or it could simply be banked. There is no requirement for any accountability regarding this $3 million which is going to these political parties. I say that that is wrong. We hear the Premier, the Attorney-General and every other minister of this government stand up here—and they have been standing up here for the last two years—and talk about how it is so hard in Queensland and that we have to save the dollars, yet under this regulation they can quite easily hand over $3 million without any checks or balances. It would not have been difficult to put a requirement in the regulations which sets out how that $3 million was to be accounted for. That would not have been unreasonable, but the government was not prepared to do even that. I say that is an abuse of power. We need to see that abuse stopped and I believe the only way we can stop the abuse of this Liberal Party government is to stop the government. The way we can do that is at the next election make sure the Liberal National Party is not returned to office in Queensland.

We hear about how we have optional preferential voting in Queensland. I say that we need to also educate Queenslanders so that, when they cast their vote, they do not just vote for the person they want; they need to make sure the person they do not want to represent them does not get there by default. The only way we can make sure that happens in Queensland is to ensure voters number every box starting with the candidate they want to support—the candidate they want to represent them—going through the list of candidates and finishing with the candidate they do not want to represent them. That will send the clearest message to this Liberal National Party and to all candidates that preferential voting is possible in Queensland and everyone has an equal opportunity to maximise the power of their vote whenever the Premier chooses to call that election.

I hope he calls it soon. Many Queenslanders are sharing their thoughts with me. I can assure honourable members that they do not want to see the Premier, the Attorney-General, the police minister, their bodyguards or their security forces around. They say, 'We want to see Queensland return to the situation where everyone is equal before the law.'

Carmichael Mine and Rail Project

Mrs MENKENS (Burdekin—LNP) (11.57 am): I would like to wholeheartedly welcome the federal government's approval of Adani's $16.5 billion Carmichael mine and rail project to export up to 50 million tonnes of thermal coal a year by 2017. A 189-kilometre section of rail line will link those mines to the expanded port of Abbot Point, which is in the Burdekin electorate. At full export capacity, it is estimated the project will contribute $2.97 billion to the Queensland economy each year for the next 60 years. It will generate an estimated 2,475 construction jobs and a further 3,920 jobs during the operations phase.

The Carmichael mine and rail project has been approved under the strictest environmental laws. Australia has never before seen such a rigorous assessment taking into consideration public comments and independent reports of all descriptions. It is not just Adani; we see other companies like GVK Hancock, QCoal and others that desperately want to get projects off the ground and do business in Queensland. I know the people of Bowen, Collinsville, Home Hill and Ayr in the Burdekin electorate have been waiting long enough for the promised jobs, the much needed security in our communities, as well as the royalties which will flow back into our towns by way of improvements to roads, infrastructure, schools, hospitals and services. Instead, sadly, businesses have closed and families have had to move away while the extremist groups play their games.

Despite ticking all the boxes and despite these projects getting the nod from previous Labor governments, who of course were in bed with the Greens, we still have the scaremongering campaigns. We have the greenie doomsday soothsayers extolling that the end is nigh for our reef, putting the boot into tourist operators. How do they sleep while their beds are burning? How do they sleep while their actions are burning our economy, burning holes in the pockets of hardworking families struggling to live in our regional communities?

The people who live in our mining towns are not faceless names on some GetUp! petition; they are real people who live, and wish to remain in, our small mining towns. They do not want to move away to the cities to sip lattes or be accosted at traffic lights to sign petitions which are thrust upon them. The GetUp! campaign's director actually had the audacity to come out and state that Greg Hunt's decision was against the will of the majority of Australians. He is obviously not particularly good at maths, claiming that over 260,000 people had signed his petition and 80 per cent want to see

the Great Barrier Reef protected from dredging. I am not quite sure how 260,000 people equate to 80 per cent of Australia's population which, according to the Bureau of Statistics, is over 23.5 million. The maths do not quite add up there; it is more like one per cent. His hands must have been firmly clasped around a tree that day and he was not able to hold them up to count properly. I am not sure of his maths and of the coercion involved in these kinds of hysteria-whipping petitions.

The Mackay Conservation Group has also weighed in. This crowd held a so-called 'information session' in the Burdekin electorate peddling misinformation. My office received tearful phone calls from Merinda townsfolk who had been doorknocked and told their homes were in jeopardy, and this was after the Deputy Premier had allayed their fears on the state development area—shameful tactics. As at the end of 2013 the Queensland resource sector directly employed 64,000 people. Of these, nearly 29,000 were employed within the coal industry and 27,250 employed within the gas industry. The scaremongering is absurd. You really have to wonder about the real motives of these people, especially if banks are also being pressured not to lend to companies associated with mining and coal seam gas.

I am a shareholder and a strong supporter of community banking, being on the steering committee for what today is the very successful Home Hill Community Bank. I am well aware of the Bendigo and Adelaide banks' affinity for community; however, I am deeply disappointed by the banks' stance on resource sector funding. These communities directly and indirectly rely on mining to exist and for individuals to save and fund their mortgage payments at banks. It really does give a whole new meaning to the term 'green bank' if banks are also being coerced. Our regions—regions like the Burdekin—are sick and tired of being held to ransom by extremist groups who are hell-bent on the destruction of Queensland's regional economies.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: The time for matters of public interest has expired.

CRIMINAL LAW AMENDMENT BILL

Resumed from 8 May (see p. 1467).

Second Reading

Hon. JP BLEIJIE (Kawana—LNP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice) (12.03 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a second time.

On 8 May 2014, the Criminal Law Amendment Bill was introduced into the Queensland parliament. Parliament referred the bill to the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee for consideration and requested the committee table its report on its consideration of the bill by 28 July 2014. I note the committee tabled its report on 28 July 2014. The only recommendation made by the committee is that the bill be passed. The government thanks the committee for its timely and detailed consideration and notes its recommendation. At the time the opposition notified the committee that it had reservations about aspects of the report but that it would detail the reasons for its concern during debate on the bill.

As I outlined at the time of the introduction of the bill into the Legislative Assembly, this bill is yet another demonstration of this government's ongoing commitment to get tough on the criminal element of society in terms of where victim and community sentiment is at the moment and to make this state the safest place to live, work and raise a family. The bill makes miscellaneous amendments to a number of criminal law and criminal law related statutes. I will briefly touch on some of the more significant amendments and the issues that have drawn comment during the committee process.

The retrospective application of Queensland's double jeopardy exception regime raised comment from some legal stakeholders in their submissions to the committee. Current exceptions to the rules against double jeopardy can only be applied to acquittals that occur after October 2007—a point in time when forensic and scientific technology was already significantly advanced. It also means that Queensland is the only state that does not apply its double jeopardy exception regime retrospectively. I acknowledge and recognise that the ability to challenge the finality of concluded proceedings is an infringement of fundamental legislative principles. However, in the context of certain serious offending this must be viewed against powerful factors to counter that position: in particular the significant advances in forensic and scientific technology, the high quality and reliability of this subsequent evidence and the very strong public interest in pursuing convictions for

Queensland's most heinous unsolved crimes where the prime suspect was acquitted. There are a number of safeguards provided in chapter 68 of the Criminal Code, and the bill's amendments do not weaken or remove any of these.

I would like to thank RSPCA Queensland, Brisbane Lawyers Educating and Advocating for Tougher Sentences (BLEATS) and others in the community for the support expressed for the new offence of serious animal cruelty that the bill will introduce into the Criminal Code. This new offence will target those persons who intentionally inflict severe pain and suffering on an animal. This type of offending is abhorrent and cruel, and this new offence sends a very strong message that such behaviour will not be tolerated. Some concerns were expressed to the committee by the Queensland Law Society about the impact that the new offence may have on legitimate farming and veterinary activities and also the appropriateness of RSPCA Queensland's role in enforcing the new serious animal cruelty offence.

I can confirm that the new offence is directed at a narrow cohort of offenders who intentionally torture animals. A person will not be liable if their conduct is authorised, justified or excused under the Animal Care and Protection Act 2001 or another law other than section 458 of the Criminal Code. For example, part 6 of the Animal Care and Protection Act provides a number of exceptions to offences. Submissions made by the RSPCA Queensland and BLEATS contain detailed information about the expertise and experience of RSPCA inspectors and the representation provided in prosecutions and appeals by a pro bono panel, including a number of prominent Queen's Counsel.

The government is of the view that RSPCA Queensland has in recent years established itself as a credible prosecutorial body and has over 200 barristers and solicitors throughout Queensland on its pro bono panel. While RSPCA officers will be able to commence proceedings and have carriage of the committal hearing for a new indictable offence, the Director of Public Prosecutions will continue to have the sole responsibility of preparing, instituting and conducting animal cruelty proceedings on indictment on behalf of the state. This is consistent with all other types of offences charged by the Queensland Police Service under the Criminal Code once they reach the higher courts.

To protect the integrity of sports betting and protect the wagering market from those who try to corrupt sport for their own profit, the bill introduces six new offences into the Criminal Code that target match-fixing conduct. These new offences support the government's commitment to the National Policy on Match-Fixing in Sport. As observed by the committee, Queensland will benefit from the introduction of these laws and have the support of the Australian Wagering Council.

To ensure looters are adequately punished if they steal property from a declared area under the Disaster Management Act 2003, the bill amends the existing offence of stealing by looting in the Criminal Code to ensure that an increased penalty applies in these circumstances. This amendment implements the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee's recommendation No. 2 in its *Report No. 40 on the Criminal Code (Looting in Declared Areas) Amendment Bill 2013*.

The bill amends the Bail Act 1980 to insert a new condition for a court or police officer to consider when determining if bail should be granted to a nonresident, that is, a person who is not an Australian citizen or permanent resident. The amendment provides that the bail granting authority must consider imposing a condition for the surrender of an accused person's passport and a prohibition on applying for a new passport. The bill also inserts a new section to mandate that where a surrender passport condition is imposed on any defendant, the person must be detained in custody until the passport is surrendered. The amendments to the Bail Act will help ensure that defendants who pose a flight risk are not inadvertently released from custody and able to use their passports to abscond from the jurisdiction before their court matter has been dealt with. Where an offender has fled the jurisdiction and is able to be located overseas, extradition proceedings may be lengthy and costly. I am advised that since 1 July 2011, warrants have been issued for 47 international tourists who have been granted bail but failed to appear in court for offences including: serious assault, fraud, drug and good order offences.

The bill increases the maximum penalty for the offence of procuring engagement in prostitution in section 229G(2) of the Criminal Code where the person procured is a child or a person with an impairment of the mind. The increase in the maximum penalty from 14 to 20 years imprisonment and the inclusion of this offence in the schedule of serious violent offences in the Penalties and Sentences Act 1992 will ensure the adequate punishment of offenders who prey and exploit the young and vulnerable in our community.

I note the support for these amendments from Protect All Children Today. I also note that Family Voice Australia expressed some concerns about the legalisation of prostitution generally to the committee. However, I can confirm that the amendments in the bill do not seek to significantly or

fundamentally alter the current law governing prostitution and are simply about ensuring consistency in the overall approach in the Criminal Code to protecting the young and vulnerable from sexual depravity.

To strengthen the community protection regime provided by the Dangerous Prisoners (Sexual Offenders) Act 2003, the bill amends the offence provision under the act to bolster the offence and insert a new circumstance of aggravation to target dangerous prisoners who tamper or interfere with their monitoring device for the purpose of avoiding their location being monitored. The new aggravated offence carries a maximum penalty of five years imprisonment with a mandatory minimum penalty of one year imprisonment to be served in actual jail. I note the comments made by some legal stakeholders to the committee regarding this mandatory punishment requirement. However, this type of behaviour by the prisoner strikes at the very heart of the community protection regime and requires harsh sanctions to deter and condemn such behaviour against our children.

The bill amends the Evidence Act 1977 to establish a rebuttable presumption that an expert witness is to give their testimony in a court proceeding by audio or audiovisual link. This amendment aims to encourage greater participation in the justice system by skilled witnesses and may reduce the cost and disruption to them as a result of having to give evidence in court. As has been seen in a number of high-profile trials this year alone, expert witnesses play an important role in assisting court proceedings.

Further, the bill contains amendments to complement introduction of a new system for electronic pleas of guilty in Queensland magistrates courts. While the Justices Act 1886 already allows written pleas of guilty in certain circumstances and the amendments in the bill do not contain any substantive changes to existing provisions, the new electronic system is an important initiative to further improve the efficiency of our state's courts and provide a more professional and user-friendly interface as well as provide more standardised and consistent information to all parties. I note that the legal profession has expressed some concerns about the need to ensure the new system does not lead to potential injustices and can confirm that all existing safeguards, including provisions for a reopening and withdrawal of a plea of guilty, will continue to apply to the new e-pleas system.

This government is committed to a fundamental reform of the Queensland youth justice system and the bill provides several amendments to the Youth Justice Act 1992. I note that comment was made on the amendments to increase boot camp safety and security by providing a head of power to enable youth detention centre employees to be engaged at a sentenced youth boot camp to use, if necessary, practices such as force, restraint, separation and personal searches. It is important to note that the use of these practices will be subject to strict regulatory and operational limitations. Clear regulatory guidelines—similar to those currently governing the use of these practices in detention centres—will be inserted in the Youth Justice Regulation 2003, including the requirement to record details of each instance of the practices' use.

I again thank the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee for its consideration of this bill and acknowledge the very valuable contribution of those who have made submissions to the committee.

Finally, I would like to foreshadow that I will be seeking to amend the bill during the consideration in detail stage of the debate to include amendments to the Crime and Corruption Act 2001. This government has listened to the people of Queensland and, in response to the concerns raised, the proposed amendments will reintroduce the requirement of bipartisan parliamentary committee support for the appointment of the Crime and Corruption Commission chairman, deputy chairman and ordinary commissioners. This was the appointment process that existed prior to the provisions of the amendment act commencing. As no new permanent commissioner appointments have been made to the CCC, the bipartisan parliamentary committee support requirement will apply to any new permanent appointments made to these positions. The amendment will not apply to the chief executive officer, given this is a new, separate position created by the amendment act and the bipartisan parliamentary committee support requirement therefore did not previously apply to the chief executive officer.

Since the election of this government we have seen crime reduce by 10 per cent across the whole state. The reforms contained in this bill are part of this government's strong plan to make Queensland the safest place to work, live and raise a family. It is only under this government that Queenslanders can look forward to that bright future that awaits. I commend the bill to the House.

Mrs D'ATH (Redcliffe—ALP) (12.13 pm): I rise to make a contribution to the debate of the Criminal Law Amendment Bill 2014. At the outset I wish to advise that the opposition will not be opposing this bill, but I will be raising a number of issues with which we have some concerns.

This is an omnibus bill that contains amendments to a vast array of legislation covering multiple subject areas. Omnibus bills are not unusual in the parliament. They are often used to bring together amendments to many acts that are of a technical or non-contentious nature, and departments often have at least one such bill each year. Certainly this has long been the case for the Department of Justice and Attorney-General. For example, the explanatory notes to the Treasury Legislation Amendment Bill 2002 state—

The Treasury Department approved the implementation of a program of omnibus legislation in order to make a number of technical amendments to Acts administered by the Department on a regular basis. The amendments which will be included in the omnibus Bills will generally be of a technical nature ...

The Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee has on a number of occasions referred to the omnibus nature of bills in its reports. In report No. 16 on the Guardianship and Administration and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2012 the committee said—

Arguably omnibus Bills may breach the fundamental legislative principle in ss.4(2)(b) of the *Legislative Standards Act 1992* because they fail to have sufficient regard to Parliament, forcing members to support or oppose a Bill in its entirety when that (omnibus) Bill may contain a number of significant unrelated amendments to existing Acts that would more appropriately have been presented in topic-specific stand-alone Bills.

The committee then went on to comment 'that the amendments to the range of acts contained in the bill, while diverse, are relatively non-controversial and would not appear to constrain members' consideration of the bill when debate occurs in the House'. The committee had a different attitude in relation to the Youth Justice (Boot Camp Orders) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2012. It said—

The Committee's concerns with omnibus bills relate primarily to Members' feeling their ability to vote for or against such a bill in its entirety, as limiting their actions. These issues arise when bills such as this are presented containing a number of unrelated matters and unrelated amendments of varying significance, some of which a Member may agree with and others the Member may disagree.

…

There is nothing uncontroversial about the Bill. As outlined later in this part 2, there have been many submissions provided to the Committee raising substantial issues with both the youth justice component of the Bill and also the anti-discrimination aspects.

This is the case with the bill currently before the House. It is not merely of a technical nature—it contains some quite controversial amendments—and submissions have been received which are quite critical of certain aspects of the bill. To include amendments to a diverse range of acts over a diverse range of subject matter forces members to vote for or against the bill in its entirety, even though they may have a range of opinions on the separate parts of the bill.

There was an incident in the Canadian parliament in 1982 where the opposition parties were able to take a significant stand against such a piece of legislation. There was a dispute over whether an omnibus bill should be split and the parts voted on separately. The government would not agree. At that time it was the case that when there was a division in the Canadian House of Commons the bells rang for either 15 or 20 minutes, depending on the nature of the division. When the bell-ringing time had elapsed, the government and opposition whips advanced side by side to the Speaker and bowed, indicating that all was well and the bells could stop and the division begin. Because of the disagreement, the opposition whip refused to make the ceremonial entry. The bells rang for 15 days, until the government agreed to split the bill. As honourable members could imagine, the standing orders were promptly changed after that, but it was an extreme measure taken to illustrate how important it is that members of parliament are given the freedom to vote separately on individual contentious issues.

In its report on the youth justice bill the committee recommended that—

The Attorney-General and Minister for Justice limit the use of omnibus bills and ensure that substantive policy issues which are deserving of their own consideration by the Legislative Assembly be brought forward in stand-alone bills.

This is a recommendation which has considerable merit and one that I, again, urge the Attorney-General to adopt.

I note that the Attorney-General has circulated amendments to be moved during consideration in detail to restore the requirements for the chair of the Crime and Corruption Commission to only be appointed if they have the bipartisan support of the Parliamentary Crime and Corruption Committee. The amendment is in line with the statement by the Premier that he recognised his mistake in making that change and that he would reverse the decision. This backflip was in response to the absolute trouncing that the LNP received at the Stafford by-election, which resulted in us having the pleasure of witnessing Anthony Lynham being sworn in this morning as the new member for Stafford.

The Attorney-General has had the added embarrassment of the Premier acknowledging that virtually all of the mistakes he identified as having been rejected by the people of Queensland were decisions of the Attorney-General in this portfolio. The opposition is pleased that this amendment has been made. We consider it a start. The changes to the accountability and integrity measures in this state that have been made by this government are breathtaking and I suggest that the Premier and the Attorney-General look further than this limited—

Mr RICKUSS: I rise to a point of order. What is the relevance of this?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Ruthenberg): Is your point of order relevance?

Mr RICKUSS: Yes.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member, I am listening and I think the member for Redcliffe is sticking within the broader intent or parameters of the bill and I am going to allow her to continue at this point.

Mrs D'ATH: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. I suggest that the Premier and Attorney-General look further than this limited change in order to win back some semblance of support from the Queensland public. In relation to the amendments that have been put forward by the Attorney-General today, the Attorney-General has taken the House to the fact that the chief executive position—a new position—with the Crime and Corruption Commission does not attract the requirement for bipartisan support and the explanation given by the Attorney-General is that, because it did not attract bipartisan support in the past because such a position did not exist, there is no need for it now. We certainly disagree with this position and would call on the Attorney-General when it comes to the appointments of the body that the bipartisan support required for the appointments should extend to the chief executive—the new position—as well as the commissioners, as has been outlined.

The most significant amendment contained in this bill is the change to the double jeopardy laws giving them retrospective application. The previous Labor government worked with the member for Nicklin to introduce a bill that received the support of every member in this House in 2007. Queensland was the second jurisdiction in Australia to make changes to this aspect of the law. That bill balanced the public desire for changes to double jeopardy to allow an acquitted person to be tried again where fresh and compelling evidence that was not available at trial later became available with the need for there to be finality of criminal proceedings. The bill did not operate retrospectively but applied to all persons acquitted after the date the amendments commenced. During the debate of the bill the then opposition supported the bill as it stood. The member for Gladstone did mention the issue of retrospectivity, although she fell short of saying she would prefer the act to be retrospective. Her concern, as she expressed it, was that this meant it will not be an answer for the Kennedy family. She was of course referring to the family of little Deidre Kennedy whose brutal death captured the outrage of the entire Queensland community. It was the failed reprosecution for perjury of her alleged killer, Raymond Carroll, that sparked much of the call for changes to the double jeopardy laws. However, it is highly unlikely that there is any possibility that Raymond Carroll could ever be tried again for murder even if these amendments were to be passed and the law had retrospective operation. As the then Attorney-General, the then member for Toowoomba North, said during the debate of that bill—

> It is important to note that whatever reforms are adopted it will not change the outcome in the Carroll case or enable any further action to be taken against Carroll. Even if the reforms are applied retrospectively, such as to leave Carroll vulnerable to a further prosecution, a retrial would only be possible if new evidence came to light that satisfied the requirement of being 'fresh and compelling'.

The existing evidence cannot support a retrial against Carroll. This is because both courts of appeal after the murder trial and after the perjury trial did not think the existing evidence was sufficient to convict Carroll. The Chief Justice of Queensland, the honourable Paul de Jersey, told the Queensland Law Society *Proctor* publication in February last year—

> 'It is noteworthy Carroll was not a DNA case. It is undoubtedly the virtually utter reliability of DNA analysis which gives teeth to push for this change.'

This view was repeated by the member for Caloundra—

I can certainly envisage that the immediate catalyst for this bill was in fact the tragic and very sad murder of Deidre Kennedy and the acquittal of Raymond John Carroll in a series of trials and appeals to the High Court and beyond. Concern in relation to this bill is that the bill itself will never attach to Carroll because all of the evidence had been put before the initial courts and therefore would not fit the definition of 'fresh' as contained in the bill presented here tonight.

It is disappointing that when the Attorney-General announced the proposed change to make the law retrospective that announcement was reported as—

The man accused of one of Queensland's most shocking murders could be retried under proposed changes to the state's double jeopardy laws.

Police would be able to again pursue former RAAF recruit Raymond Carroll for the alleged abduction, rape, and strangling death of Ipswich toddler Deidre Kennedy.

This gives false hope to the family of Deidre Kennedy and others who expect that Carroll will again be tried under these law changes. That could only occur if fresh and compelling new evidence became available that was not available in the original trial and could not have been ascertained with proper diligence.

In his speech on the bill, the then independent member for Maryborough said that he was pleased that the amendment has not been made retrospective. The member for Lockyer described it as a good balance of the double jeopardy law. The retrospective application of these laws is opposed by the legal stakeholders that made submissions on the bill. The Queensland Law Society, the Bar Association of Queensland, the Queensland Council for Civil Liberties and the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Legal Service all opposed the amendments. The Law Society in its submission said—

The Society is concerned that the double jeopardy exception will now apply retrospectively. We particularly note that section 4(3)(g) of the *Legislative Standards Act 1992* states that legislation should not 'adversely affect rights and liberties, or impose obligations, retrospectively.' The Society submits that it is not an appropriate answer to this breach of legislative standards to state that Queensland will otherwise be the only state which does not have a regime operating retrospectively.

An accused may have conducted his or her previous trial in a particular way (such as making a decision to give evidence or not) understanding that the law as it then stood provided that an acquittal prevented a retrial. It would be unconscionable for this to be altered by retrospective application of this provision. In this regard, we note that such an approach would not accord with the principles of natural justice and procedural fairness.

No-one can help but be moved by the case of Deidre Kennedy. No-one can help but be moved by the courage and tenacity of Faye Kennedy, who has pursued her desire for law changes to this point. There are undoubtedly Queensland families whose immeasurable pain in losing a loved one to an horrific crime has been compounded by the person charged with their murder having been acquitted and no person having been held responsible. I could not even begin to imagine their pain and their heartache and would not pretend to be able to. In the same way I could not expect that they would understand how anyone could not support a change to the law that gave them some hope, however intangible, of justice. As has been said, the rule against double jeopardy is not a rule designed to protect the guilty but to protect the innocent. The state with all its resources and powers has many advantages over the defendant in a criminal trial. That advantage is compounded after the passage of time. The prosecution in a criminal offence starts from the advantage that many jurors will say, 'If there was nothing in this case the police would never have brought it.' The criminal justice system rectifies those imbalances by the presumption of innocence and placing the burden on the prosecution. In addition, this attempt to correct the imbalance is supported by the rule against double jeopardy.

Bringing a person to trial many years after they have already been acquitted means that they are also at a disadvantage in respect of any evidence that might adduce in their defence or to explain any new evidence. They might have disposed of evidence after their previous trial believing they would never again have need for it. Because of the time that has elapsed, potential witnesses might have died or they might have lost contact with them, not realising they were required until they were acquainted with the new evidence. Anyone convicted after the 2007 amendments knew their position at the time they were convicted. They were aware of what the law was. Making the laws retrospective means that the position of acquitted persons changes when the laws are passed. The decision therefore as to whether to support the retrospectivity of these amendments is a complex one. It is necessary to balance the overwhelming desire to ensure that persons who have committed horrific crimes are held accountable for those crimes with the reluctance to overturn legal positions that have stood the test of time for over 800 years.

When Queensland introduced the exceptions to the rule against double jeopardy in 2007, we were, as I said, the second jurisdiction to do so. Since then, all of the other states have done so. The original position was rightly very cautious. Overturning 800 years of legal principles should be approached with caution. Since those changes, there have been no cases where these laws have been used in Australia. I have found three cases in the UK, which has utilised its changed double jeopardy laws to reprosecute murderers. There has not, however, been a surge of cases using the laws. The approach has been cautious and only cases where the fresh evidence has been compelling can be entertained by the courts. Being mindful of the concerns expressed about making these laws retrospective but also being mindful of the strong community support for the changes, the opposition will not be opposing these amendments.

In relation to the terms 'chair' and 'deputy chair', these amendments allow chairs and deputy chairs of various government boards, tribunals and similar entities established under an act to choose their preferred title—whether it be chair, chairperson, chairman or chairwoman or another similar chair title, irrespective of what chair title is used in the act.

These amendments are in response to community concerns expressed in consideration of the amendments made to the crime and misconduct act, where the head of the CCC was renamed chairman. They are virtually identical to section 18B of the Commonwealth Acts Interpretation Act. The Attorney-General said during his speech to the CMC bill that the changing of the term 'chairperson' to 'chairman' was the subject of concern in 12 of the submissions to the committee on that bill and had also been raised in media reports. He said further—

The government's position is that the term 'chairman' does not refer to any gender and given section 32B of the Acts Interpretation Act 1954, words indicating a gender includes each other gender. The use of the term 'chairman' will not prevent an appropriately qualified woman from being appointed a chairman of the commission. However, having listened to the concerns of the community, in a bill to be introduced into the parliament in the not-to-distant future we will move amendments to the Acts Interpretation Act to ensure in future people who take on positions in government on any board or body can use their preferred title. That way we are not individually addressing each particular piece of legislation, we are addressing it through the Acts Interpretation Act and people can refer to themselves as they wish in the future.

In its submission to the bill the Queensland Law Society did not support the change and queried whether the public expenditure related to the introduction of this amendment is needed when a gender-neutral option is currently in place. In fact, section 24 of the Reprints Act 1992 provides the following—

If the name of an office established by a law uses a word indicating a gender or that could be taken to indicate a gender, the name of the office may be changed.

It is the government's rationale that the proposed amendment will avoid the matter being addressed in a fragmented fashion in individual pieces of legislation. However, since 1992 it has been possible to address the issue in any reprint of legislation. There is no similar provision in Commonwealth legislation. The gender-neutral form of legislative drafting has been in place since 1992 and there is no need to change the position now. If the government is true to its word, it would change the title of head of the CCC back to 'chair' and then this section, which allows anyone to call themselves their preferred option of title, could apply. It would also give an undertaking to stop any further changes that change the titles of government positions from their current gender-neutral terms.

The bill also amends the Bail Act to require a court or a police officer, when deciding whether to grant bail to a nonresident, to consider whether to make it a condition of the bail that they surrender their passport. Currently, under the act if the court or police officer is considering that the imposition of special conditions is necessary to secure that a person, for example, appears in accordance with their bail, they are required to impose such conditions as they think fit to achieve that purpose. This could include the surrender of a passport.

In 1992, the Queensland Law Reform Commission released a working paper on the Bail Act, which stated—

The Act also enables more specific bail conditions to be imposed. For example, the defendant may be required to … surrender a passport.

A further amendment contained in the bill requires that, if a passport surrender condition is imposed, whether on a resident or nonresident, the person may be detained in custody until they physically surrender their passport. None of the submissions to the committee addressed this amendment in any substantive way. However, there has been some criticism in the media.

The issue raised is in relation to people who cannot immediately put their hands on their passport. If a person is detained in custody, how can they gain access to their passport in order to surrender it? Unless they have a friend or a family member who can gain access to their home and search for the passport, they will be detained in custody. This will often mean a night or a few days in the watch-house before being released. This problem is amplified when a person is arrested when in Queensland on holiday and their passport is at a home, which one would imagine it usually would be. Until someone searches their home and then sends the passport by some means to Queensland, this person will be detained in custody. There must be some way that the federal immigration authorities can be advised when an offender is released on bail so that their name is placed on an alert for immigration officials at all ports and airports.

I would like the Attorney-General to please explain what steps he has taken to investigate the action that could be taken to prevent persons released on bail from leaving the country without requiring their detention in custody until they physically surrender their passport. Also, what will happen if the passport has been stolen? A person can send their friend or family member to search their house for their passport only to be unable to locate it. This could be because the passport had been stolen earlier and no-one realises until they look for the passport. People could also have two passports. Australian authorities would not necessarily know whether a person has a passport from another country. Notification to immigration officials would be a much more effective method of restricting someone leaving the country, because it would not matter what passport they were travelling on.

In relation to match fixing, in June 2011 the anticorruption working party formed by the Coalition of Major Professional and Participation Sports, the body representing the seven major sports codes in Australia in respect of which betting takes place, released its working paper. The state and territory sports ministers subsequently agreed to implement nationally consistent legislation. Phil Reeves, the then minister for sport in Queensland, announced Queensland's intention to participate in this model. New South Wales, South Australia, Victoria, the Australian Capital Territory and the Northern Territory have subsequently enacted laws relating to match-fixing issues. However, following the election of the Newman government Queensland dropped the ball and failed to introduce legislation in a timely fashion like many of its counterpart states and territories did. That led the leading national newspaper in 2013 to describe Queensland as—

... the weak link in Australia's defensive line against match-fixing and a 'soft target' for organised crime gangs looking to capitalise on international sports events, according to officials in Canberra.

We were told the following—

Documents obtained under Freedom of Information laws reveal officials are concerned that the lack of consistent match-fixing laws will lead astute crime bosses to focus on games held in jurisdictions where they could avoid a conventional fraud prosecution.

The officials noted that Victoria, NSW, South Australia, the Northern Territory and ACT had introduced tougher laws but Western Australia and Queensland had decided to stick with their existing laws. Queensland was also holding out on the introduction of new sports betting regulations.

The Australian Crime Commission report titled *Organised crime and drugs in sport* identified an increasing level of association between professional athletes and organised criminal identities in Australia, leaving athletes vulnerable to corrupt practices such as match fixing. Late last year the member for Yeerongpilly introduced the Criminal Code (Cheating at Gambling) Amendment Bill 2013. His bill is similar to Victoria's legislation, but did not include some aspects of that other state's legislation. He subsequently wrote to the committee advising that he would introduce a number of amendments during the consideration in detail. This bill adopts his recommendations and is largely consistent with the national legislation.

The previous Labor government commenced the process that resulted in the national legislation and the Newman government has been embarrassed into introducing these amendments by the bill introduced by the member for Yeerongpilly. The opposition supports these amendments and is pleased that eventually the Newman government has been brought kicking and screaming to the table before Australia hosts the Cricket World Cup and the Asian Football Confederation's Asian Cup in 2015.

This bill also introduces a new offence of serious animal cruelty. At present, there is an animal cruelty offence in the Animal Care and Protection Act 2001 and section 468, titled 'Injuring animals' provides the following—

Any person who wilfully and unlawfully kills, maims, or wounds, any animal capable of being stolen is guilty of an indictable offence.

The offence carries up to three years imprisonment in the case of domestic animals and seven years if the animal in question is stock. There has been much discussion in recent times that these existing offences do not provide adequately for the case where a person intentionally inflicts severe pain and suffering on an animal—in effect, the torture of an animal. On 13 October 2011 the then Attorney-General, Paul Lucas, introduced the Criminal and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2011 into the House. It included an offence of serious animal cruelty for which the penalty was seven years imprisonment. This offence was identical to the offence contained in this bill. That bill also contained identical provisions relating to an extension of the powers of RSPCA inspectors and the granting of interim prohibition orders.

There is provision to make a prohibition order on conviction and an interim prohibition order where a person is charged. There have been cases, especially puppy-farming cases, in which the defendant has funded their prosecution by continuing their puppy-farming business between being charged and the charges being finally determined. The interim order will prevent this occurring in future. Brisbane Lawyers Educating and Advocating for Tougher Sentences—BLEATS—is concerned that there must be a prosecution launched before a prohibition order or interim prohibition order can be made. BLEATS suggests that, in some cases where a person has serious mental health issues that means that they cannot be prosecuted because they are of unsound mind and unfit for trial, even though there is evidence of animal cruelty no prohibition order could be made.

The department advised the committee in its correspondence that it has referred the issue back to the Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry for consideration. I would ask the Attorney-General if he might update the House on the progress of this matter and whether that department has provided any advice in relation to this aspect.

In relation to stealing by looting, on 21 March 2013 the member for Yeerongpilly introduced the Criminal Code (Looting in Declared Areas) Amendment Bill 2013 to extend the existing looting provisions in the Criminal Code to situations where a declaration has been made under the Disaster Management Act. The existing looting provision increased the penalty from five years to 10 years where the offence was committed during a natural disaster, civil unrest or an industrial dispute or if the thing stolen is left unattended by the death or incapacity of the person in possession of the property.

The committee, in considering the 2013 amendment, recommended that the issue be referred to the Attorney-General to consider whether an amendment was necessary. He advised the committee in correspondence that such an amendment would be beneficial and that he would progress the amendment during the next appropriate bill. It is unfortunate that the committee, which is meant to be bipartisan, cannot accept a private member's bill such as that introduced by the member for Yeerongpilly on its merits. This bill had considerable merit yet the committee could not support that the bill be passed. Instead it referred the issue to the Attorney-General who introduced his own bill. If the Attorney felt there could be refinements made to the bill there was a process that would allow him to move amendments during consideration in detail. To simply reject the private member's bill and introduce his own legislation is churlish and a sad indictment on the independence of the committee.

On the issue of procuring engagement in prostitution, I turn now to the amendments relating to that matter. The Criminal Code currently provides for an offence of procuring engagement in prostitution. This bill increases the maximum penalty for the offence from 14 years to 20 years where the person procured is a child or a person with an impairment of the mind. The bill also adds the offence to the schedule of serious violent offences in the Penalties and Sentences Act 1992. An SVO means an offender must serve 80 per cent of their sentence if sentenced to 10 years or more. The opposition supports these amendments.

The bill also amends the Criminal Code in relation to dangerous driving offences. Under the Criminal Code there are a number of offences where a person can be convicted of an alternative charge where the evidence does not prove the offence charged but if no alternative is charged on the indictment. For example, a person charged with murder could be found guilty of manslaughter if the evidence did not satisfy the jury as to murder. Similarly, a person charged with an offence arising from the driving of a motor vehicle, for example vehicular manslaughter, can be convicted of dangerous driving of a motor vehicle causing grievous bodily harm or death. The code has an offence of dangerous operation of a vehicle. This applies to a person who is operating a vehicle and is not restricted to someone driving the vehicle, for example, if a passenger in a vehicle pulls on the handbrake causing the vehicle to go out of control. It also applies to all vehicles, not just motor vehicles. 'Vehicle' is defined in the code to include a motor vehicle, train, aircraft, vessel or anything else used or to be used to carry persons or goods from place to place. This bill amends the code to

ensure that the wider definition of 'dangerous operation of a vehicle' applies to the alternative verdict provision rather than the more limited dangerous driving of a motor vehicle. There is also a corresponding amendment to the Penalties and Sentences Act to allow a court to order a licence disqualification where the offence is committed in connection with the operation of a vehicle rather than just driving. The opposition supports these amendments.

This bill also contains amendments to give increased power to the Attorney-General to appeal certain matters. Under the Criminal Code the Attorney-General has standing to appeal sentences imposed for indictable offences dealt with either on indictment or dealt with summarily. This bill amends the Justices Act 1886 to provide the Attorney-General with the standing to appeal sentences for simple offences disposed of summarily. According to the Attorney-General, the proposed amendment is complementary to the Attorney-General's existing appeal powers. No further explanation has been given for the amendment. This amendment is entirely unnecessary. The Queensland Police Service that prosecutes summary matters in the Magistrates Court has a right of appeal. They often seek the assistance of the DPP in exercising that power. No further appeal right is necessary. The real reason the Attorney proposed this appeal is that he was professionally embarrassed when he attempted to appeal a decision of a summary offence in the Magistrates Court when he had no standing and the Court of Appeal ridiculed him—in a very polite way, of course. He became the butt of quite a few jokes. Samantha Macey, who raised $23,341 by telling people the money would go towards the 2011 Premier's flood disaster appeal, was sentenced to a partly suspended jail term for fraud offences, together with 240 hours community service and restitution. She appealed to the District Court. The District Court judge allowed that appeal, rendering the term of imprisonment fully suspended and setting aside the order for payment of restitution. The Attorney-General purported to lodge an appeal to the Court of Appeal and was forced to abandon it when he was advised he had no standing. As the then Chief Justice said—

'Unsurprisingly, the Attorney-General has this morning abandoned that proceeding and we ordered that the 'purported' notice of appeal, I suppose it should be called, filed on the 7th of January 2013, be struck out. Any appeal in this situation would need to have been instituted by the complainant, Christine Price, if granted leave to appeal under s 118(3) of the District Court of Queensland Act 1967.

The opposition does not support this amendment. The Attorney-General has provided no explanation at all for its inclusion in this bill and the current provisions are perfectly adequate.

The Criminal Proceeds Confiscation Act 2002 makes provision for interstate confiscation orders and warrants that are issued in other states and territories to be recognised in Queensland and vice versa. By way of example, if the department is advised that a confiscation order has been made in New South Wales in respect of a certain person and that person has property in Queensland, the courts in Queensland can recognise the interstate order and action can be taken against the Queensland property. Currently, these mutual recognition provisions require a criminal charge or conviction before such an order can be recognised under the scheme. This bill amends the Criminal Proceeds Confiscation Act 2002 to remove the requirement that interstate restraining orders and pecuniary penalty orders must be based on a criminal charge or conviction. Queensland has expanded its criminal proceeds scheme to include the ability to restrain property without necessarily relying on a charge or a conviction, such as through the unexplained wealth laws. Attacking the proceeds of crime is a major factor in attacking organised crime. The opposition supports these laws which strengthen the criminal proceeds scheme in Queensland.

On GPS tracking devices, under the Dangerous Prisoner (Sexual Offender) Act 2003 there is an offence of breaching a supervision order, punishable by a maximum term of imprisonment of two years. This bill changes the offence under the DPSOA of breaching a supervision order from a summary offence to an indictable offence. It then creates an aggravated offence of contravening the relevant order without a reasonable excuse by removing or tampering with a stated device, for example a global positioning system tracking device, for the purpose of preventing the location of the released prisoner being monitored. The new aggravated offence is a crime punishable by a maximum penalty of five years imprisonment with a mandatory minimum period of one year's imprisonment to be served wholly in a Corrective Services facility. Indictable offences can still be dealt with in the Magistrates Court if the penalty that can be imposed is sufficient. The maximum that a magistrate can impose is three years imprisonment. These offences follow the procedure normally adopted for dealing with indictable offences in the Magistrates Court. The opposition is not opposed to the change in the nature of the offence from summary to indictable and is not opposed to the increase in the maximum penalty from two years to five years. We do not, however, support mandatory sentencing and are opposed to the minimum penalty of one year's imprisonment to be served wholly in a Corrective Services facility.

It is important to retain a discretion in the sentencing court. All offences are different and all offenders are different and there may just be a case where exceptional circumstances and the interests of justice dictate that the penalty is not appropriate and it would be an injustice to impose it. Both the BAQ and the QLS expressed opposition to the mandatory nature of the minimum penalty. The opposition has always maintained an opposition to mandatory sentencing and has always proposed an amendment during consideration in detail that retains a discretion in the sentencing court. I would like to foreshadow that I will be doing so again.

The bill also contains further amendments to the DPSOA. These amendments clarify the definition of serious sexual offence under the schedule to ensure that the regime applies where an offender has been convicted of an offence of a sexual nature and the person against whom the offence was committed is not necessarily a real person but they were represented to the offender as a real person and the offender believed them to be a child. For example, they might be a police officer posing as a child. The explanatory notes explain that the amendment is to overcome the challenges confronted in Dodge v. Attorney-General for the State of Queensland and ensures that the regime extends to prisoners convicted of offences such as section 218A of the Criminal Code, using the internet to procure children under 16, or section 218B, grooming children under 16, even where the conviction is based upon a fictitious child rather than an actual child, for example, a police officer posing as a child but the prisoner believed them to be a child. These are important amendments that ensure persons envisaged to be captured under this regime are so captured and strengthen the toughest sexual offender laws in the country, which were introduced by the previous Labor government.

Now, I turn to a favourite topic for the opposition: the Attorney-General and the boot camps. This bill contains amendments that will allow staff from the youth detention centres to work in the sentenced boot camp at Lincoln Springs in order to 'provide services to maintain good order and discipline at a boot camp centre'. In his introductory speech, the Attorney-General stated that youth detention centre workers will be engaged at the Lincoln Springs sentenced youth boot camp centre to supervise young offenders so as to better protect staff, offenders and property. Queensland Corrective Services officers are currently engaged in supervising offenders at the Lincoln Springs centre. Concerns have been raised with the opposition about the legal implications of this practice.

I ask the Attorney-General to please explain why adequate security has not been able to be provided by the successful tenderer. Surely the provision of security would have been an important component of any expression of interest. Would the Attorney-General also please explain what powers those Corrective Services officers have been exercising at Lincoln Springs? It is curious that youth detention workers require legislative amendment to be able to exercise their powers at Lincoln Springs, but Corrective Services officers have been working there without any legislative support. These amendments again expose the bungling that has been a characteristic of the bungling-boot-camp Attorney-General.

The explanatory notes sugar coat what has happened and explain this amendment as addressing an emergent issue. The Attorney-General might like to explain to the House how this issue is an emergent issue, because although it might be emergent now it was entirely predictable and any person who has any idea about maintaining good order in youth detention facilities would have identified the issue and put measures in place before the situation become emergent. The Attorney-General is aware that his first boot camp experiment failed when the youths escaped and used weapons to threaten neighbours and staff within the boot camp. He would have been well aware of the need to maintain good order for the safety of staff, other participants and the community. To fix that particular bungle, the Attorney-General closed the boot camp and issued a new tender. He then chose not to award the tender to the best qualified organisation as selected by his own expert panel. Questions are flying around the place as to why the expert panel was ignored and why the Attorney-General met with the eventual winners during the tender process.

Mr BERRY: I rise to a point of order.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Ruthenberg): What is your point of order, member for Ipswich?

Mr BERRY: Relevance.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Ipswich, again the member for Redcliffe is developing an argument. I am listening quite carefully. I ask the member for Redcliffe to continue.

Mrs D'ATH: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. The Attorney-General has never provided an adequate explanation of this. Therefore, it is not surprising that the capacity of Beyond Billabong to deliver the necessary security and protective services seems to have been found wanting, which has

led to the Attorney-General seconding Corrective Services officers to the boot camp to try to maintain good order. The opposition does not believe that this was provided for in the boot camp contract and that the taxpayer is supplementing the private organisation to effect government policy. In effect, the taxpayer is paying twice: once to the private provider and then in the provision of staff to the boot camp. The boot camp amendments are required to address what the explanatory notes describe as—

The lack of a head of power to use proportionate force has prevented appropriate measures being taken to address several recent incidents at the Lincoln Springs boot camp centre.

The problem has always been that Corrective Services, youth justice and boot camp operators have lacked sufficient powers to use force against young people in the boot camp. The first 10 youths were volunteers, many simply removed from the Cleveland Youth Detention Centre. That is right: sentenced youths were removed from youth detention and put in the boot camp. The estimates process revealed that eight out of the 10 have already reoffended since being released. This amendment fixes up the issue that, if they had remained inside the youth detention centre, the staff could have used appropriate and reasonable force to deal with unrest, but the boot camp staff are powerless to act. I have already described how staff could not act in the Cairns boot camp debacle to stop neighbours being threatened and the behavioural issues have obviously not abated if the explanatory notes are accurate when they describe the measures as being necessary 'to address several recent incidents at the Lincoln Springs boot camp centre'. Can the minister fully explain the incidents that require these emergent amendments? We can only assume that the reports to the opposition office of youths on roofs staging protests with staff going to bed instead of dealing with the issue are accurate.

The explanatory notes state—

Youth detention centre officers are specially trained and experienced in working with young offenders and are able to appropriately employ a range of practices such as use of force, restraint, separation and personal searches.

The amendments are fairly general in nature and regulations will be made that we are told will restrict the practices that a youth detention centre officer may employ in maintaining good order and discipline at a boot camp centre. The explanatory notes state—

Clear guidelines around the use of practices such as use of force, restraint, separation and personal searches will be prescribed in the Youth Justice Regulation 2003, as well as the obligation to record all instances of their use.

This bill also contains amendments that allow information identifying a child as the subject of the Child Protection Act 1999 to be used in preparing and providing presentence reports ordered by the Children's Court. The QLS has expressed concerns that, as some youth justice matters will now be heard in open court, this information may be made public through this process. The department advises that restrictions under the Child Protection Act 1999 on the publication of this information will remain in force. Further, the use and disclosure of the information is subject to the relevant court's power to limit the disclosure of the presentence report.

The then Chief Magistrate and now Chief Justice, Tim Carmody, wrote to the committee seeking clarification as to whether the confidentiality provisions, especially section 189, are breached if a member of the legal profession or an officer of a government department discloses to the court that an application is about to be made (a) to close the court; and/or (b) for a publication prohibition order because the child or young person is a person to whom the CPA is relevant. The department provided clarification to the committee on this issue. However, the views expressed where just a single view and, as the then Chief Magistrate identified, he had consulted with the President of the Children's Court, Judge Michael Shanahan, and the Children's Court Magistrate, Leanne O'Shea, who both supported his view that these issues could benefit from clarification. I still hold some concerns about the issue, despite the committee report.

There is another amendment in the bill that I would like the Attorney-General's clarification on. This bill seeks to amend both the Criminal Code and the Justices Act to provide that when sentencing an offender the court may treat a prior conviction as a circumstance of aggravation for the purposes of the Penalties and Sentences Act, even if it is not alleged. If the prosecution wishes to rely on prior convictions as a circumstance of aggravation, which increases the maximum penalty applicable for an offence, in the case of identifiable offences the allegation must be included in an indictment and in the Magistrates Court a defendant must be served with a notice alleging a prior conviction as a circumstance of aggravation. This allows the defendant to consider whether the allegation is correct and challenge it where it is not. Whilst certainly not common, it is not unheard of for police to allege a prior conviction where charges were dropped before trial or where it has been entered against someone with the same name.

In the case of Miers v Blewett (2013) QCA 23, a person was charged with breaching a domestic violence order. Under the domestic violence act, if a person has been convicted twice in the past three years the penalty is increased. As I have said, under the Justices Act if the prosecution seeks to rely on a prior conviction as evidence of a circumstance of aggravation they must serve notice on the defendant. In this case, the defendant was not served notice and the Court of Appeal held that the two prior convictions could not be relied on in sentencing, either to increase the maximum penalty applicable or under the provisions of the Penalties and Sentences Act which require a court to take into account prior convictions. Prior convictions for other offences were able to be taken into account, however.

The Court of Criminal Appeal overturned a prior decision of Washband v Queensland Police Service, which held that the entire criminal history could not be relied upon in sentencing because notice had not been given. The Court of Criminal Appeal in Miers v Blewett relied on the 1981 High Court decision of the Queen v De Simoni. These amendments seek to amend the law so that, where prior convictions are not alleged in the charge or indictment, they may not be relied upon to increase the maximum penalty as a circumstance of aggravation, but they can be relied upon to be considered by the sentencing judge or magistrate in considering whether higher penalties should be imposed, provided they are not higher than the maximum. The explanatory notes and the committee report both state that the amendment reinstates the understanding of the position prior to the judgement in Miers v Blewett. However, my understanding is that the position prior to Miers v Blewett was the decision of the High Court in Di Simoni and Washband, which was overturned by the Court of Appeal, went even wider.

Debate, on motion of Mrs D'Ath, adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 12.59 pm to 2.30 pm.

FAMILY RESPONSIBILITIES COMMISSION AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction

Hon. GW ELMES (Noosa—LNP) (Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander and Multicultural Affairs and Minister Assisting the Premier) (2.30 pm): I present a bill for an act to amend the Family Responsibilities Commission Act 2008 for particular purposes. I table the bill and the explanatory notes. I nominate the Health and Community Services Committee to consider the bill.

Tabled paper: Family Responsibilities Commission Amendment Bill 2014 [5626].

Tabled paper: Family Responsibilities Commission Amendment Bill 2014, explanatory notes [5627].

I am pleased to introduce the Family Responsibilities Commission Amendment Bill 2014 to ensure that welfare reform and the operations of the Family Responsibilities Commission are extended into the future for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities. The Family Responsibilities Commission is established under the Family Responsibilities Commission Act 2008. The main objects of the act are: to support the restoration of socially responsible standards of behaviour and local authority in welfare reform community areas; and to help people in welfare reform community areas to resume primary responsibility for the wellbeing of their community and the individuals and families of the community. The proposed amendments are: removing the sunset clause, with the act currently due to expire on 1 January 2015; adding further justice triggers to notifications to the commission from District, Supreme and Children's courts; and moving from the act to the Family Responsibilities Commission Regulation the description of welfare reform communities.

The need for an integrated government framework to address disadvantage in discrete communities is clear. All have poorer outcomes than the rest of Queensland on most measures of social and economic development. The challenges facing these communities are significant, and it must be recognised that resolving disadvantage will take time.

Welfare reform efforts in Hope Vale, Aurukun, Coen, and Mossman Gorge commenced in 2008 as the Cape York Welfare Reform Trial—a tripartite initiative of the Queensland and Australian governments and the Cape York Institute. The legislative changes, if passed, will allow us to build on the benefits achieved by Cape York Welfare Reform. They will provide flexibility to extend welfare reform to other Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities to address dysfunction and disadvantage. The community of Doomadgee is under active consideration as the first new community to join welfare reform. It is anticipated that other communities will be considered for inclusion once the new legislation comes into force. Which communities might be included and when will be based on regular assessment of need.

Likewise, the amendments also provide for communities to move out from under the FRC umbrella should it be assessed that social norms have been re-established to a level to make that an option. The independent evaluation of Cape York Welfare Reform released in April 2013 noted there have been positive outcomes to date. Fundamental behavioural changes in money management were detected, and positive changes were noted around the responsibility for children, school attendance, educational attainment and attitudes to work.

Within the welfare reform framework, the commission works with communities to reduce levels of dysfunction by focusing on individual responsibility to engage in socially responsible behaviours. The commission is constituted by a commissioner, deputy commissioner and, currently, 19 local commissioners who play a key role in the acceptance and success of the initiative. Local commissioners are respected persons in their communities who have demonstrated leadership and conviction to the visions of the commission.

The 2013 evaluation mentioned previously also noted the success of the local commissioners in rebuilding Indigenous authority to tackle antisocial behaviour. The commissioners will continue to be a valuable resource of support and leadership in their communities as they transition through welfare reform in the future.

The success of the Family Responsibilities Commission model was highlighted in the Forrest report into Indigenous employment which was released last week. Mr Forrest praised the FRC on the work it had done, particularly in helping to restore local leadership and authority in communities. He said lessons learned from and innovation shown by the commission could be adopted for a national model to restore function and social cohesion in communities where it had broken down. Underlying the FRC model is the belief that communities can take responsibility for addressing social dysfunction and are best placed to do so.

People living in the nominated communities who receive a welfare payment are currently referred to the commission through a notification due to: failing to enrol or send a child to school; conviction of an offence in the Magistrates Court; receiving a child safety notification; or breaching a social housing tenancy agreement or use of premises for an illegal purpose. Once referred, the commission works with clients through a combination of case conferencing and referrals to services either by voluntary agreement or through an order of the commission.

Complementing the commission are referral services and economic development, education, employment and housing initiatives to build individual and family capabilities and promote self-reliance and responsibility. The operation of wellbeing centres, parenting programs, drug, alcohol and antiviolence services, and the creation of school attendance case manager roles are important in achieving successful outcomes for clients. If a client fails to attend conferencing or referral services, the commission can order that 60, 75 or 90 per cent of that person's welfare support payment be income managed.

Between 1 July 2012 and 30 June 2013 the commission held 1,686 conferences. That resulted in 12½ per cent of clients on case plans, 304 orders issued and 339 referrals to community support services. The act, the commission's operations, family responsibility plans and orders for income management will expire on 1 January 2015 without the proposed amendments. The program and the initiative's momentum, in that case, would be lost.

The Queensland government approved funding of $8 million in this year's state budget to continue welfare reform to 31 December 2015. If the bill is passed and the proposed extension to Doomadgee approved, the costs of the expanded program will be met through to the end of 2015 within the current funding allocation.

It is also proposed to add more justice triggers to the commission's notifications—namely, convictions in the District, Supreme and Children's courts, in addition to the current provision for convictions in the Magistrates Court. In extending the triggers to include the Children's Court, it will be the parents or carers of the young person who will be required to attend conferencing. This will enable referral of the young person and family to support services and case planning.

If the government is to make a real difference to the level of dysfunction and disadvantage experienced by Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities in Queensland, new approaches are needed to ensure welfare reform aims are achieved in as many communities as possible. In considering the extension of welfare reform, my department undertook consultations with state and Australian government agencies, stakeholders and communities in Coen, Mossman Gorge, Hope

Vale and Aurukun earlier this year. We also consulted with Doomadgee, as the community area was identified as having the potential to benefit significantly from joining welfare reform. The results were positive, with all communities indicating their support for welfare reform in their community areas. It was regarded by many as important for improving school attendance and restoring local order.

Many people in this year's consultations and in the 2013 consultations opposed the annual extensions of Cape York Welfare Reform, preferring a long-term strategy instead. Work remains to consolidate the welfare reform gains we have made so far and to progress other aims.

The 2013 evaluation report noted that genuine economic opportunities need to be available and further work is needed to remove barriers to homeownership. I am pleased to report that the Queensland government has made significant improvements with land tenure and town planning. We will continue to work with Minister Cripps and his department to support the implementation of proposals under the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Land Legislation (Providing Freehold) Amendment Bill 2014.

In a practical sense, the community survey project has commenced and we will see implementation of greatly enhanced land survey networks and individually described lots registered over the 34 discrete communities, including Aurukun and Hope Vale. Additionally, town planning schemes for Aurukun and Hope Vale should be completed shortly. The schemes have captured community aspirations for desired development and future growth, and will improve the economic independence of Indigenous communities.

I will also continue to work with my federal colleagues to roll out the FRC model where necessary to support Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities to be positive places where people can feel safe and children can look forward to receiving the care and education to which they are entitled. The feeling I get as I move around the communities is a belief that better living conditions and a more normalised lifestyle are within reach. I meet young community leaders and community elders who have had enough of the 'bad old days' of dysfunction, neglect and abuse, and are prepared to work with governments and non-government service providers to put those days and that reputation behind them.

Under welfare reform, this government has also supported a number of economic development opportunities including: funding Myuma in the state's north west to provide accredited, industry based training and employment support in mining and construction to young people in Cape York and the gulf; development of the Coen cultural centre to a visitor information centre; completion of a new retail centre for Hope Vale; construction of an arts workshop in Mossman Gorge to supply the gateway centre with local art; providing business development officers and a women's enterprise facilitator; and funding for viability assessment and business planning for projects such as tourism trails and quarrying.

Another Cape York Welfare Reform project, the Hope Vale banana farm, was established in 2012 and supports 17 local jobs. The first commercial harvest of 28,000 cartons of bananas took place in 2013. While Tropical Cyclone Ita caused major destruction to the farm in April this year, the Queensland and Australian and local governments are working with the banana farm and other partners to ensure that the project recovers quickly.

The legislative amendments in this bill align with the Queensland Plan, which includes the following aims: education is highly valued by all Queenslanders; we celebrate, embrace and respect diversity; localised and more flexible decision making; and more effective and efficient government. By restoring social norms in welfare reform communities, we are reducing dependency on welfare income and supporting real improvements in school attendance and retention and employment opportunities.

The removal of the act's sunset clause will allow the significant resources and effort spent every year since 2011—developing submissions, undertaking consultations and seeking parliamentary approval to extend the time frame of the act—to be focused instead on innovation and strengthening of the welfare reform initiative. This will be a much more cost-effective use of our investment in departmental resources.

To ensure the continued operation of the commission and the validity of its agreements and orders currently in force, amendments to the act need to be passed and given assent or proclaimed prior to its current expiry date of 1 January 2015. The reappointments of the FRC commissioner, deputy commissioner and local commissioners must also be approved by Governor in Council before 1 January 2015.

I look forward to continuing to work with the commission, the welfare reform communities and our partners to ensure that Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people have the same opportunities as other Queenslanders to fulfil their aspirations and reach their full potential. The Family Responsibilities Commission Amendment Bill 2014 is a necessary precondition for extending the act to support welfare reform. I commend the bill to the House.

First Reading

Hon. GW ELMES (Noosa—LNP) (Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander and Multicultural Affairs and Minister Assisting the Premier) (2.43 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 Health and Community Services Committee

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mrs Cunningham): Order! In accordance with standing order 131, the bill is now referred to the Health and Community Services Committee.

CRIMINAL LAW AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Resumed from p. 2364, on motion of Mr Bleijie—

That the bill be now read a second time.

Mrs D'ATH (Redcliffe—ALP) (2.44 pm), continuing: Before the debate was adjourned, I was taking the House to amendments to the Criminal Law Amendment Bill and particularly the explanatory notes and the committee report, both stating that the amendment reinstates the understanding of the position prior to the judgement in Miers v Blewett. However, my understanding is that the position prior to Miers v Blewett was that of the decision of the High Court and De Simoni. Washband, which was overturned by the Court of Appeal, went even wider and did not allow any prior convictions to be taken into account.

I would ask the Attorney-General to please explain whether these amendments change the law as enunciated by the High Court in De Simoni in 1981. If they do, then the statement in the explanatory notes that the amendment reinstates the understanding of the position prior to the judgement in Miers v Blewett cannot be accurate. The opposition does not necessarily oppose the amendments, but we do have some considerable concern about the accuracy of the explanatory notes.

It is imperative that explanatory notes accurately reflect the content of legislation because explanatory notes are referred to by the courts as an aid to statutory interpretation. This is perfectly illustrated in the Washband decision that I have referred to earlier. The District Court, in hearing the appeal from the magistrate, referred extensively to the explanatory notes to the amendments moved to the Justices Act in 1997 and 2003. Those explanatory notes assisted the court in discerning the intention of the legislature.

These explanatory notes would not be able to assist a court in interpreting these amendments because they are not an accurate reflection of the effect of the amendments. They also do not provide any assistance to persons seeking to make a submission to the committee on the effect of the legislation. This is not the first time the opposition has had to raise inaccuracies in the explanatory notes as a significant issue. During debate on the Child Protection (Offender Reporting) Act, the member for Rockhampton raised the issue that the description of the effect of the amendments contained in the explanatory notes was misleading.

I ask the Attorney-General to please clarify whether the explanatory notes contain an accurate statement as to the effect of the amendments and, if not, if he could clarify that fact for the parliamentary record so that any future court seeking to discern the intention of the legislature has an accurate record on which to rely.

In conclusion, there are various other uncontentious amendments contained in the bill which I do not intend to specifically address. These are matters which are rightly contained in an omnibus bill because they are of a technical nature or they clarify or simplify procedural matters.

Mr BERRY (Ipswich—LNP) (2.47 pm): It is certainly a pleasure for me to be able to stand here today and not only espouse the reasons it is important for this bill to proceed through this House unhindered but also make some comment upon the shadow Attorney-General's summation of some of the important matters relating to the bill. Perhaps I might start with the story.

About six or seven years ago I was a solicitor for a young man. He was slightly built, probably 50 or 60 kilograms, probably five foot five. He went out with a friend to Tinbilly's in Brisbane. His object for the night as a young man of 18 or 19 was simply to enjoy himself. So he went there and he had been there for a little while when a dispute happened between him and the duty manager. Whether the duty manager was off duty or on duty one does not really know. But effectively an altercation occurred to the point where the person involved took him to a place where he would be not seen by video cameras and he absolutely pummelled this young man wantonly and without any respect for his person. It just so happened though that outside Tinbilly's—and this is probably at 11 o'clock at night—there was a bus driver having his lunch and he recorded it all. So ultimately the man was arrested. But that is where the story finished because the bar manager was an Irish national. He went to court I think once, maybe twice, but he left for Ireland and was never seen again. So that is justice unresolved.

This is six or seven years ago. This is not uncommon. I have heard of a couple of instances in my short history in dealing with these sorts of matters where accused offenders have returned to their home country. I wonder why this law was not made six years ago or five years ago. Clearly, there was a need for it, but it did not happen because the previous government was asleep at the wheel. It did not understand that these things were going on. It did not understand that there needed to be a mechanism in place for this sort of conduct to desist. We need to bring perpetrators to justice and to do that we need for them to be in person in court.

The member for Redcliffe indicated that perhaps other measures should be used. For instance, why not simply have a mechanism in place where we block all the airports outside the country—for that matter, maybe the shipping terminals as well? That was open to the opposition. They could have done that if they saw fit, keeping in mind of course that the Queensland parliament only has the jurisdiction to deal with Queensland law. But you could have done it through SCAG. The next member for Woodridge, Cameron Dick, could have made that law. Nothing prevented him from doing it. In a unicameral parliament he had the power to do it, but they slept at the wheel. They did not know what options they had available. They could have drafted this simple amendment that we have done but they opted not to do so.

There is the other argument that an offender could have two passports so if he surrenders a passport he might only surrender one and not the other. If any level of investigation occurred you would realise from the police check whether there is one, two or three passports. It just so happens that my daughter has three passports. But they check and as a result of that check they will find out whether or not there are two passports and he would be required to produce two.

There seems to be an anomaly here, because we are saying it is pretty tough to spend two or three days in incarceration while a passport is found. A passport is a valuable document. If it is around it would be brought in. That is a very simple matter and such a simple solution. To suggest otherwise is to again adopt red tape and convoluted processes. It is virtually using a sledgehammer to crack a nut. It is implausible to suggest that they are reasonable suggestions for why this procedure ought not to happen.

With regard to the rule against double jeopardy, there seems to be a conflict, to my way of thinking, against mandatory sentencing. On the one hand, the opposition is against mandatory sentencing on the basis that there could be so many occurrences for which the magistrate or judge will not have a solution but he must give 12 months even though that might be the appropriate sentence. But, on the other hand, with regard to the double jeopardy law we cannot make it retrospective because it is going to cover things that we are not sure about. I cannot quite understand the reasoning. I notice in reading the report, for which I congratulate my members of the committee, the member for Nicklin introduced retrospectivity back in 2006 or 2007. Perhaps not necessarily being a favourite son of the Labor Party it was not adopted. The reality is that we do not know what happens in a rule against double jeopardy. We do not know whether that hair that was lost in the Carroll case will ever show up. We do not know whether there is a confession or something that was

made that might come to light. Who knows? The reason this rule needs to be put in place is, with the way that science and technology is advancing today, the courts ought to have an open system allowing for justice to be done.

After all, the Director of Public Prosecutions needs to have the available evidence. It is for him to decide whether there is sufficient evidence for a charge to be laid and that will be assessed. If he says yes and it goes to court, it is then for the jury or a judge alone, however that may proceed. It is for them to determine whether there is sufficient evidence for there to be a conviction. Our justice system has many measures of checks and balances. As a result, there is no justifiable reason for this not to be double jeopardy. Quite frankly, an opportunity has been lost. I certainly feel very much for the Kennedy family for what they have gone through but this law is for other matters, not only the Kennedy case. It is for those matters where science will dictate as to whether charges can be laid, whether there is sufficient evidence to prosecute a case. For instance, in terms of the progress of DNA I remember in Wisconsin the Governor called a moratorium on the death penalty. I think there were 40 people ready to be put to death, but DNA found out that for probably 20 or 30 the DNA was against those people being convicted. The reality of life is that we do not know how science is going to progress. What is beyond DNA only time will tell. It is a measured view and one which could have been adopted a number of years ago if the then Labor government thought about the situation and put some faith in the juries and judges in our system.

It is for me a welcome stand for there to be serious animal cruelty laws put in place and not before long. After all, we have had the commemoration day of World War I. My grandfather was in the 2nd Light Horse Regiment and I remember the story where they put their horses to death—this is in Palestine—because they did not want the horses to fall into the hands of Arabs because they were particularly cruel. The thing about animals in our psyche in Australia is that we have a different approach. This country was built on animals and still is if we take into account sheep and cattle. It is important for that psyche to continue. I have been involved in a few cases in my legal career concerning cruelty to animals. Quite frankly, it is sad to see and hear that through the last 20 or 30 years we have instances of animal cruelty. I am talking about those on a mass scale. I remember at Lone Pine when somebody went in and started clubbing kangaroos. I do not know whether anybody in the House remembers that, but I clearly remember because the carnage was quite severe. I remember a cat was strung up at Chelmer station. I remember the blooding of greyhounds. These things are not tolerated, certainly not in today's community, and I do not think they have been tolerated for quite some time. It really is against our moral fibre to condone something such as that. These laws are really doing what the public requires of us. They want people to be fair to animals, and this simply enforces what the people of Queensland have asked for and have been asking for a number of years.

Some criticism was made of the match-fixing laws in the sense that every other state has done it except us. Maybe the reason for that is that we have not really had any instance of match fixing of which I am aware. I know there was a soccer team or soccer teams in Melbourne, in Victoria. I know there was the Fine Cotton affair in Sydney and many other instances about match conditions and so forth.

The reality of life is that this government is reacting at an appropriate time. We do not want these matters to occur in Queensland. We are taking it to the point that we are taking preventive measures not because we have the evidence to suggest that it needs to be done, but that the evidence from other states clearly indicates that it is on the rise and steps need to be taken.

I want to touch upon two matters which really are the lesser gain, the minor league, compared to the real thrust of what this bill is doing. They need to be mentioned because the member for Redcliffe just mentioned them. One is the omnibus approach to the bill. If the approach using omnibus bills is so undemocratic or unfair, then why the heck did the previous Labor government do it for 20 years? I cannot believe that the member opposite can actually stand up here and put up an argument to say, 'I'm against omnibus bills,' when they had them down to an art form. Unbelievable! I suppose arguments are arguments and you have to put up whatever you can if you are a bit short on them.

The other thing is the 'chairperson' argument. I cannot understand why such a small topic absorbs so much time in the media. It was certainly one of the first topics that the shadow Attorney-General mentioned. Personally, I would have put it last in the argument because, quite frankly, the substance of it is fairly minor. Call it what you will. I like 'chair', but do I want to impose my values on others? It was 'chairman' at one stage but somebody changed the law. What happens in reality is that people change the language. It is not parliamentarians; people change the language.

For instance, do I hear the opposition coming to us to say 'Midwife—we should legislate against that. Manhole—that's getting pretty close to the mark'? Where do we stop with this? The reality of life is that, whether it is chair, chairman or chairwoman, it is up to the person or the committee to decide.

The bill does a number of things to put in perspective the policy of this Newman government in getting on with the business of making sure that Queenslanders are safe. This is only one part of the bill that really has to be mentioned, but it does a lot of good work and, quite frankly, not before time. I wish to pay my compliments to my committee. I think this was a report of 81 pages. I know it was a long one. Quite frankly, the detail of it is really quite succinct. On that point, I wish to make a particular point of thanking my secretariat. They have been working tremendously hard over the last two years. The amount of work they are doing as well as the fact that we now have the crime inquiry up and running proves that they are doing a tremendous job. I think they ought to be congratulated and publicly acknowledged as punching above their weight when it comes to the commitment to producing the amount of work that they do and for getting these reports out. I support the bill.

Hon. DF CRISAFULLI (Mundingburra—LNP) (Minister for Local Government, Community Recovery and Resilience) (3.02 pm): I might start by saying that I will be speaking in support of the Criminal Law Amendment Bill. I do not intend to go into it in depth. I think the chairman of the committee did an outstanding job in summarising the valuable work that his committee did in ploughing through the detail. I do wish to speak to one part of it, and that is the changes that remove any doubt and extends the offence of stealing by looting to include stealing committed in an area post its declaration as a disaster zone. As someone who has lived and breathed those sorts of conditions for a large part of my time in public life and certainly in my current role as Minister for Community Recovery, I really want to make a contribution to this and applaud the Attorney as well as the committee for pushing ahead with this, boots and all. When we are in a disaster situation or are recovering from a disaster situation, we see the very best of the Queensland spirit. We see the very best of community spirit. We see the very best of our emergency services, of neighbours helping neighbours, strangers helping strangers, but we also see the very worst of mankind from a very small portion of the community. I have a couple of things in my mind that I always remember.

Those members in this House will remember well that, after the 2011 floods in South-East Queensland, over 10 people were found to have offended in terms of looting. I remember several examples in Bundaberg including one person from Millbank. I certainly will not call him a gentleman. There are many other terms I would like to use, but they are unparliamentary. When somebody goes and steals a refrigerator, which is the only piece of working equipment, from somebody's house and they take it when it is the only thing that is still running because they see some value for themselves in being a leach, in being a parasite, at a time when the owner is in their hour of need, that is disgusting and we as a community must act. I saw the best of mankind during this disaster of 2013 and the one in 2014. I saw SES volunteers who were prepared to leave their houses to the wrath of Mother Nature while they went and helped their fellow man. To know that there were those whose own property was high and dry but who chose to prey on their fellow man, quite frankly, is a disgrace.

These changes give people like that nowhere to hide. There is a penalty of 10 years imprisonment that already applies to stealing and looting. That is punishment in special cases, proposed new section 13, but this bill extends the offence of stealing by looting to include stealing committed in an area that is, or was immediately before the offence was committed, a declared area for a disaster situation. This clears up any ambiguity. It sends the clearest of messages, and the message is simple: we as a community will rally behind the vast majority of people who are there to get on with their lives, but we will be prepared to come down like a tonne of bricks on those who do the wrong thing.

In closing, I will say that the government has done a fantastic job in the 2½ years it has been in office in reversing the record of the previous government of being soft on crime and soft on law and order. We have changed the Youth Justice Act. We have made several changes to make sure that the scales of justice have swung back towards the innocent, away from the criminal. This bill does further good work in that space. I throw my wholehearted support behind the Attorney-General's bill.

Mr GULLEY (Murrumba—LNP) (3.07 pm): I rise to represent the good people of Murrumba and to express my support for the Criminal Law Amendment Bill 2014. I applaud the Attorney-General, the Hon. Jarrod Bleijie, for his efforts in introducing another bill that delivers on this government's commitment to get tough on crime. This bill is about ensuring that Queensland criminal law reflects the standards of justice that the people of Queensland demand. There are many sections of this bill and I will attempt to touch on some of them.

Part 4 of the bill amends the Bail Act 1980. Clause 20 inserts new subsection 4A into section 11 to provide for a court or police officer to consider imposing a special condition for the surrender of a defendant's passport and prohibiting an application for a new passport when granting bail to a nonresident. This change reduces flight risk and makes it more difficult for individuals to abscond their jurisdiction to escape penalty.

I move to part 5 of the bill, being the amendment of the Criminal Code. This part amends the Criminal Code on a number of very important topics as outlined by the Attorney-General in his explanatory speech. These changes to the Criminal Code address, amongst other items, match fixing. We Queenslanders love our sport. We will not allow dishonest groups or individuals to interfere or to cheat in relation to sporting events. A person found guilty of an offence under proposed new section 443 will face a maximum penalty of 10 years imprisonment for the match-fixing conduct offence and two years imprisonment for using insider knowledge. Procuring engagement in prostitution where a person is a child or is mentally impaired is a disgraceful act. The offence outlined in proposed section 229G(2) is horrific. Increasing the penalty for this crime from 14 years to 20 years under clause 26 is well in line with community expectations.

In relation to looting laws, I applaud the prior comments from the member for Mundingburra. Clause 29 of the bill extends item 13 under section 398 so that stealing immediately before or after a devastated area is declared is included as an offence of looting. As Queensland faces disaster almost every year, I along with many other Queenslanders welcome this change.

In relation to animal torture laws, clause 27 makes another change to the Criminal Code by introducing a new section 242, making it an offence to cause serious or prolonged suffering to an animal. The maximum penalty for this new offence is seven years imprisonment, which is justified by the moral importance of animals and the standards of justice for animals that the people of Queensland demand. At this point I refer to part 3 of the bill, which proposes changes to the Animal Care and Protection Act 2001 that are incidental to part 5.

I move to part 6, Amendment of Criminal Proceeds Confiscation Act 2002. Clause 38 amends section 237, Charge on property subject to filed interstate restraining order. This removes the requirement that interstate restraining orders and pecuniary penalty orders be based on a criminal charge or conviction.

Part 7 of the bill amends the Dangerous Prisoners (Sexual Offenders) Act 2003. The monitoring of sex offenders is very important to the safety of Queenslanders and requires a strong response to deter offenders from contravening a condition of a supervised release order. Clause 40 replaces section 43AA, and under this section the maximum penalty for tampering or removing a tracking device will be five years imprisonment with a mandatory minimum period of one year's imprisonment to be served wholly in a corrective service facility. I note that I have had many conversations with my wife—and, importantly, the mother of my three daughters—who is not alone in our community in welcoming the Attorney's tough action in protecting society from these dangerous sex offenders.

Clause 47 in part 9 of the bill amends section 134A of the Drugs Misuse Act 1986 to insert a new subsection allowing the minister to declare a drug as dangerous if immediate action is necessary. This is so the government can respond immediately to any drug related dangers rather than being slowed by the process of section 134A.

Part 10 of this bill amends the Evidence Act 1977 by establishing a rebuttable presumption that expert witnesses may give their testimony in a court proceeding by audio or audio visual link. This is a modern law for a modern society by a modern government. This will result in reduced costs and disruption to court proceedings as well as allow a greater participation by skilled witnesses in the justice system.

Part 11 of the bill amends the Justices Act 1886 and will greatly improve the efficiency and processing of minor offences by allowing the courts to better allocate resources and manage their schedules. The bill's amendments are made to complement the implementation of web based portals for electronic pleas of guilty in the Magistrates Court. This is a modern change by a modern government for a modern society.

Finally, I would like to quickly address the amendments in part 13 to the Youth Justice Act 1992. Staff at youth detention centres are currently only permitted to give directions to maintain order. Clause 74 inserts a new section permitting staff to use proportionate force, and I stress that this is not being taken lightly.

Before closing, I would like to acknowledge my colleagues on the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee, and I thank them for their hard work in regards to this bill. I acknowledge the fine work of the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice, the Hon. Jarrod Bleijie.

I represent Murrumba, the Aboriginal word for 'good place'. Each morning I wake and challenge myself to make Murrumba a great place. I believe this bill supports my objective. Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker, and I commend the bill to the House.

Mr CHOAT (Ipswich West—LNP) (3.14 pm): I rise also to contribute to this important debate on the Criminal Law Amendment Bill 2014. The bill represents a continuation of the government's law reform agenda to ensure that Queensland has a system of law and justice that is fair and just, but is also reflective of the expectations of Queenslanders, including those in my community of Ipswich West. Indeed, this government has made a genuine commitment to reverse Labor's record of being soft on crime, to tip the scales of justice back in favour the victim and to reflect the ideals of everyday people.

The government has already done much to achieve this including: increasing the mandatory non-parole period for murder from 15 years to 20 years imprisonment; introducing the 'two strikes' policy for repeat child sex offenders; ensuring drug traffickers serve at least 80 per cent of their sentence; ensuring that a court must allow a victim to read their victim impact statement if they wish; and providing a free copy of court transcripts to victims of violent crime. Indeed, I could list many more reforms that are delivering unprecedented reductions in crime and seeing more criminals brought to account. Within my own community we have seen dramatic decreases in crime and some very effective clear-up rates by local police.

Queensland is a much safer place today than it was three years ago. As an electorate with a number of major road networks, the news to my people in Ipswich West that we are in the midst of the largest reduction in the road toll in history means a great deal. I note indeed we have also seen a reduction in illegal mobile phone usage, which I know is a comfort to the many parents of young drivers such as me. The reforms contained in this bill continue the important work of this government to make Queensland the safest place in Australia to live, work and, importantly, raise a family. I will speak briefly on just a few areas addressed by the bill which are of interest and concern to my community.

The bill amends 12 pieces of legislation with productive changes which will modernise aspects of Queensland's legal system to enable the state to better deal with crime and criminals. A significant roadblock to justice will be removed under reforms to Queensland's double jeopardy defence. I heard my colleague, the member for Ipswich, make references to the Deidre Kennedy case and many, many people across Ipswich have a great deal of respect and compassion for the Kennedy family and what they have had to endure. The reforms will stop offenders from potentially and actually getting away with murder. The double jeopardy rule prevents a defendant from being tried again on the same or similar charges following an acquittal or conviction, even if new evidence becomes available. With modern advances in science and technology, particularly DNA testing, this means that crucial additional evidence can become available years after a trial. It would be a serious injustice if such new evidence could not be considered by the courts. Up until now Queensland has been the only jurisdiction in Australia to not make its amendments retrospective. Hypothetically it means that a criminal who got away with committing a serious crime some years ago would not face justice, even if new forensic evidence came to light. This bill removes that barrier to justice for victims and their families. Through provisions, a retrial will be allowed for a past charge of murder when there is fresh and compelling evidence. As is appropriate, the Queensland Police Service and the Director of Public Prosecutions will be responsible for assessing the merits of any proposed retrial application and decisions on reinvestigation.

Another area my people—and indeed all Queenslanders—will be pleased to see changes in is the area concerning penalties for those convicted of cruelty to animals. As a result of the passing of this legislation, animal torturers will face up to seven years jail under a tough new offence designed to protect those who cannot speak up for themselves: Queensland's animals and other creatures. As the keeper of many animals myself, I know that they experience fear and pain just like people do, and purposely inflicting suffering on them is inexcusable. I know it is condemned strongly in my community. As with many thousands of families across Queensland, our family pets—be they our dogs, poultry, livestock, and of course my beloved pigeons—are part of the family and deserve to be protected from people who think it is acceptable to kill and maim them for pleasure or just through neglect.

Government members interjected.

Mr CHOAT: I take all of those interjections in the faith and spirit that they were offered.

Under the bill an indictable offence of serious animal cruelty will carry a maximum penalty of seven years imprisonment. It will target people who intentionally inflict severe pain and suffering upon an animal. The government has shared the community's frustration at seeing offenders who have done terrible things to animals walking from court without serving any jail time. I am sure that, sadly, we can all recall news stories of callous cruelty inflicted on helpless animals by what can only be referred to as monsters. These new laws will send a clear message to these monsters that serious animal cruelty will not be tolerated. The new offence is built upon already increased penalties for existing animal cruelty offences, as late last year the Newman government increased the maximum penalty for animal cruelty from two years imprisonment or a $110,000 fine to four years imprisonment or a $220,000 fine.

Earlier today I had the pleasure of speaking with Mr Michael Beatty, whom Queenslanders know well as the face of the Queensland RSPCA. Michael related to me that the RSPCA was relieved to see serious laws enacted to help protect animals. Michael brought Jasmine, a lovely dog, for me to meet. Sadly, through neglect, and possibly direct mistreatment, Jasmine has lost a leg. Thanks to the great work of the RSPCA she has learned to get along on three legs and is now looking for a loving home. We already have three dogs, so unfortunately Jasmine will not be the latest addition to our menagerie. The RSPCA and the wider community have said that violence against animals is abhorrent and should not be tolerated. Indeed, the government has listened and acted.

The final area of the bill I want to talk about today is the aspect which will see dangerous sex offenders face mandatory jail time if they remove or tamper with their electronic monitoring bracelet. These tough new laws are designed to prevent the worst of the worst from reoffending. I have spoken many times in this House about the likes of Mr Fardon and others who were inflicted—I use that word deliberately—on my community of Ipswich West in the past. As a parent of three children I worry, just as I am sure other parents do, about my own children coming to harm. I just cannot imagine the anguish of parents who have discovered that their children have fallen victim to a child sex predator.

This legislative change is about protecting families in our community and coming down hard on dangerous offenders who think they can escape the supervision and scrutiny the bracelet devices represent. Dangerous sex offenders who are released on supervision orders are fitted with GPS bracelets for very good reasons. The devices enable us to keep a close eye on them—24 hours a day, seven days a week—to ensure the community, and indeed some of the most vulnerable in our community, are kept safe. Under the bill's reforms, sex offenders who remove or tamper with their bracelets will be sentenced to one year's mandatory jail time, with a maximum penalty of five years in prison. This will be a strong deterrent for offenders who abscond, and it will ensure those who break the conditions of their orders will go back to prison. This bill sends a strong message to sex offenders that we are watching them and that we will not tolerate any attempts to breach their conditions.

There are other aspects of the bill which will ensure a safer, more secure Queensland for all of us, so I am pleased to lend my support to its passage through the House today. I thank the Attorney-General and his staff, along with my committee colleagues and the secretariat for the great work they have done to prepare the report and to review this legislation, which I believe will make a big difference.

Mr DILLAWAY (Bulimba—LNP) (3.23 pm): I rise this afternoon to contribute to the debate on the Criminal Law Amendment Bill 2014. I congratulate the Attorney-General on the introduction of this bill, reinforcing our government's tough stance on crime prevention and community safety and ensuring that Queensland is the safest place to live, work and raise a family. I acknowledge the work of my colleagues on the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee on the examination of this bill and thank all who were part of the reporting process.

This bill contains a number of amendments to the Criminal Code and other acts and is a reflection of the Newman government's continuing commitment to get tough on crime. Today I will focus mainly on the more significant changes that will ensue.

The bill provides for the double jeopardy exception regime to be applied retrospectively, thus aligning Queensland with other Australian jurisdictions. With technology forever evolving, new evidence can come to light in long-term investigations, in complex cases or in cases that have gone cold. This amendment is made in light of allowing for the exception regime to be applied to all acquittals of relevant offences, irrespective of when the alleged offence was committed and irrespective of the timing of the acquittal.

The bill introduces six new offences of match fixing as part of the government's commitment to the National Policy on Match-Fixing in Sport. These changes will mean that cheats may face up to 10 years imprisonment. The introduction of match-fixing offences in the Criminal Code is an important step to ensure the maintenance of a lawful and transparent online-betting market across Australia and to discourage criminal activity in relation to match-fixing activities and cheating at gambling. These amendments will result in greater public confidence in the integrity of sporting outcomes and the expectation that having a bet on a sporting event will be unencumbered by corrupt influences.

With the growing sports-betting market, particularly online betting, the preservation of a safe and lawful market is imperative. This new set of offences removes any current ambiguity surrounding the application of existing offences to types of match-fixing conduct, allowing for the courts and enforcement agencies to address such behaviours efficiently and effectively.

The bill also and rightly introduces the new offence of serious animal cruelty under the Animal Care and Protection Act 2001, the Criminal Code and the Justices Act 1886. This offence carries a maximum penalty of seven years imprisonment, targeting persons who torture an animal. I note that it is designed to protect all of Queensland's creatures, great and small. Animal cruelty is inexcusable, and this is a clear message that it will not be tolerated in this state.

The reforms will also see the RSPCA play a vital role in bringing offenders to justice. Inspectors will be able to investigate and begin proceedings against someone accused of serious animal cruelty. The creation of this new offence was seen as necessary in order to meet community expectations with respect to animal cruelty offending. Far too often we have seen such behaviour, and it must be stamped out.

The Bail Act 1980 is amended to introduce the surrender of an accused person's passport as a bail condition. This is supported by the Queensland police union who, in their submission to the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee, stated that the change appropriately recognises the community's expectation that alleged offenders comply with the conditions of their bail and remain in the jurisdiction until the completion of their matter.

The maximum penalty for procuring a child for engagement in prostitution will increase from 14 years to 20 years imprisonment when that child or person has an impairment of mind to better reflect the seriousness of the offence. This increase is warranted due to the significant depravity and gross breach of trust experienced by the victim. This amendment is consistent with the overall approach contained in the Criminal Code to protect the young and vulnerable from sexual predators and from exploitation and is consistent with our government's objective to make our communities the safest places to live, work and raise a family.

Continuing with this objective, recently our government introduced changes to the reporting requirements of child sex offenders. The Criminal Law Amendment Bill, in addition to these recent changes, amends the Dangerous Prisoners (Sexual Offenders) Act 2003 to increase the penalty for offences of contravening a condition of a supervised release order. It creates a new circumstance of aggravation where a prisoner removes or tampers with a monitoring device such as a GPS tracking monitor. The maximum penalty for this offence will be five years imprisonment and will involve a mandatory minimum penalty of one year's actual imprisonment.

The bill also extends the Dangerous Prisoners (Sexual Offenders) Act 2003 to apply to a child sex offence involving a fictitious child. This amendment will allow offenders to be convicted if they use the internet for the procurement of a child under 16 where the 'child' is in fact an undercover police officer. This proactive approach will allow our Police Service to further protect our children from online threats and enhance overall internet safety.

I note that the bill has the support of the Queensland police union, who recognise that its implementation will expand the rights of victims of crime and their families as well as improve overall community safety. It once again exemplifies the government's unwavering commitment to protecting the most vulnerable of our community—our children—and ensuring Queensland is the safest place to live, work and raise a family.

I once again congratulate our Attorney-General for listening to the community and for bringing this bill to the House. I commend the bill to the House.

Miss BARTON (Broadwater—LNP) (3.28 pm): I rise to make a brief contribution to the debate on the Criminal Law Amendment Bill. At the outset I say that I fully support this amendment bill and congratulate the Attorney-General on the great work that he has done. There are just a couple of

issues I wanted to touch on briefly, and the first issue that I want to speak about is the change to the Bail Act that will allow courts to mandate the surrendering of a passport for a nonresident as a condition of bail. One of the things that is often said to first-year law students when they are doing their introduction to law subject is that one of the most important things about justice is that it must be seen to be done. Unfortunately in the past we have seen that, in circumstances where a passport is not surrendered, an accused absconds and victims and their families do not get the opportunity to see justice be done. It is not only devastating for the community to not see justice be done, but it is of course particularly devastating to the victims and their families. One thing that I am particularly keen to see out of this legislation is not only that justice is seen to be done but that it is seen to be done effectively. I am sure that many in the community will support this particular amendment.

Another issue I want to quickly and briefly touch on relates to changes to match-fixing provisions. I am sure we would all agree that cheating at any level of sport is abhorrent. Whether it is the local under-10s football game or whether it is the Wallabies playing the All Blacks, there must be integrity maintained in sport, particularly when people place bets on serious high-level international games and particularly when we consider that a number of professional sportspeople are role models for young boys and girls as they grow up. Last night I was at a school event at Coombabah State High School and one student who had won an award was talking about who one of her role models was, and her role model was Billy Slater. That just goes to show how much these professional sportspeople—whatever code they play and whatever sport they play—really do have an impact on the lives of young people. Anything that we can do to ensure that integrity is maintained particularly at that high level of sport is a good thing. It is also important to note that this is just completing what is now, in effect, uniform legislation across all Commonwealth jurisdictions.

Another issue I want to briefly touch on is the changes with regard to the animal cruelty provisions. The chair of the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee and member for Ipswich spoke about a particular incident at the Lone Pine sanctuary where there was a horrible incident involving kangaroos. Of course I am sure we would all remember that about 18 months ago there was an horrific incident involving—I believe they were—llamas, and I am sure the Attorney-General would remember because he appealed the sentence in the case. Many in the community were absolutely outraged that where there was intentional cruelty and torture and really quite disgusting behaviour that is abhorred by all members of the community there was not really an effective punishment measure available. By ensuring that we have an appropriate measure and an appropriate punishment and penalty, not only will it send a strong message about our view when it comes to animal cruelty and what it means but it sends a very strong message to the community. One of the things that the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee has been hearing as part of its crime inquiry is the importance of sentencing and appropriate sentencing when it comes to deterrents, and making this an aggravated offence will certainly go a long way towards that. I note that the RSPCA visited Parliament House earlier today so that it could talk about the importance of the changes contained in this legislation and share its support for the changes in the law that are coming hopefully this afternoon.

There are two other issues that I want to quickly touch on, and the first is the definitional change when it comes to what a serious sexual offence is. Often times we see police officers use new and emerging technologies like the internet and social media to engage with people who would intend to groom young children. Unfortunately because of the way the legislation was worded and defined previously, there was a loophole that someone had sought to take advantage of when it came to the grooming of a child under 13 where the person who is effectively the respondent is a police officer and not a child. I am sure all members of the community would welcome this change. I do not think it matters whether the person you are communicating with is a 50-year-old male police officer sitting in a police station in Brisbane or a 12-year-old girl sitting at her computer in her bedroom. What matters is the horrific intention of the person who is doing the grooming, and this particular definitional change supports that particular philosophy and ensures that there are not going to be loopholes for people who have intended to do the wrong thing and have wanted to do some very horrible things to some of the most vulnerable in our society.

Speaking of vulnerable people, that is a very nice segue into the changes that we have made with regard to looting, particularly when it comes to disaster management areas, and the Minister for Local Government, Community Recovery and Resilience spoke to this particular amendment very well. Making looting in these circumstances an aggravated offence not only sends a message to those people who are at very desperate times in their lives, whether it is a flood, whether it is a

bushfire, whether it is a cyclone or whether, for whatever reason, there has been a burst water main and their entire house has been flooded. We are saying to them that when you are at a very desperate time in your lives if someone does something like go into your flooded home and steal the only working appliance like your fridge we want to ensure that we not only protect you but that we send a message to those in our community who would consider committing such an abhorrent offence.

The member for Bulimba spoke about, as many members of this House do, this government's commitment to making Queensland the safest place to live and raise a family. Over the past 2½ years this government has been incredibly committed to this goal. The Attorney-General has done great work in this area. We only have to look at the changes that have been made with regard to the two-strike child sex offenders legislation and the like, and of course the police minister is also doing a fantastic job working hand in hand with the Attorney-General. Over the next eight months and beyond this government will be committed and is continually committed to ensuring that we do everything we can to make this state the safest place to live and raise a family, because it is this government that has a strong plan for a bright future and making this state a very safe place for our families is a key component of that. I look forward to working with the Attorney-General on the strategies to reduce crime inquiry and what it is that we can do to help Queenslanders and working to continue the great work on that goal. I thank the Attorney-General for this bill and for the measures contained in it when it comes to looking after the vulnerable in our society. I look forward to continuing to support the bill as it passes through the House.

Ms TRAD (South Brisbane—ALP) (3.37 pm): I rise to make a brief contribution to the debate on the Criminal Law Amendment Bill 2014. I will confine my comments to the recent amendments that have been circulated by the Attorney-General in relation to the Crime and Misconduct and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2014. I think it has been interesting to note that a number of government members have risen to speak on this bill before the House and not many of them have addressed the amendments that have been circulated just today by the Attorney-General which go to the heart of the appointment process of the chair of the former CMC—that is, a reinstatement of the previous bipartisanship arrangement in relation to the appointment of the chair of the former CMC and now CCC. I think we know exactly why it is that government members have not been addressing these amendments, and that is because this is a complete backflip by this government—a complete backflip over something that should never have happened. We should never have been confronted in this state with the proposition that the government of the day with its massive majority without an upper house in this state should come into this place and should change the laws to ensure that the person who led the former Crime and Misconduct Commission and now Crime and Corruption Commission—the independent anticorruption commission in this state—should be appointed solely by the government of the day to become an extension of the government of the day. We should never have been put in that position.

What we have here before us is an amendment to revert it back to what it was previously. But, of course, there have been a number of changes that have occurred since that Crime and Misconduct and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. I think it is important that we reflect on why the government has backflipped on this very important matter and that is primarily because of the 19 per cent swing that it received at the Stafford by-election just recently.

At this point I take this opportunity to welcome Dr Anthony Lynham to the House. I know that he will make a fantastic contribution. He is a well-known community activist. He is a surgeon at the top of his field. He will make a great contribution in this House because he cares about what happens to Queenslanders and I am glad that he has joined Labor in this House to do exactly that.

Mr Crandon: He's going to raise the drinking age to 21, isn't he?

Ms TRAD: I am not sure the member for Coomera actually got the memo from the leadership team to watch his behaviour in this House. We know that 'Operation Boring' was in full swing here this morning during question time. We know that instead of doing the morning rounds and collecting coffee along the way the members of the LNP went and got chamomile tea to soothe their nerves before they entered the chamber this morning, because we did have quite a calm response—not something that we are usually used to from those members opposite. But it was refreshing to have a bit of temperance from those opposite.

The reason we have this backflip before us is that the government received a 19 per cent swing against its agenda in the seat of Stafford. It was a huge vote of no confidence in the government's agenda. One of the key issues that was canvassed in the lead-up to the by-election, in the lead-up to

the resignation of the former member for Stafford, Dr Chris Davis, was, in fact, the changes that the government was proposing in relation to the appointment of the chair of the CMC. I will quote directly from a *Courier-Mail* article of May this year, where Dr Chris Davis said—

'I want our Government to be responsive to reasonable public perceptions,' Dr Davis said. 'I'm just flagging it as an area of great sensitivity within the electorate because the electorate wants governments to be accountable and to be seen as accountable.'

'We need to be very careful that we are not actually, or seen to be, reducing our transparency and accountability.'

He, of course, was talking about the changes to the appointment process for the chair of the CMC.

Let me tell members that this government has come in here and has tried, I think, to soothe the electorate around this terrible change that it inflicted upon the state and the independent crime commission just a couple of months ago. It has tried, but let me outline why exactly this backflip does not go far enough. Madam Deputy Speaker, you were with me on the PCMC before you were sacked, as was I—another terrible action by those opposite. You and I both were on the Parliamentary Crime and Misconduct Committee when we inquired into the destruction and release of Fitzgerald inquiry documents last year. We both scrutinised and made recommendations to this place about how—

Mrs MENKENS: I rise to a point of order. Madam Deputy Speaker, I question the relevance to the bill.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mrs Cunningham): Thank you, member. I am listening very carefully, because the member has said that it is to do with the bipartisan appointment of the chair. So I remind the member of relevance.

Ms TRAD: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. The relevance is, in fact, the issue of bipartisanship appointment, to help the member for Burdekin. It does not extend to the CEO of the CCC. Madam Deputy Speaker, as you and I both know, the original recommendation to appoint a CEO of the CMC as it was known back then came from report No. 90, if my memory serves me correctly, of the inquiry into how documents relating to the Fitzgerald inquiry were released and some destroyed. That was one of the original recommendations.

Since then, the government has taken that recommendation and it will be appointing a CEO. There are a lot of question marks as to whether that CEO will, in fact, be the current chair of the CMC and the government has done nothing at all to respond to that query. Given all of the amendments contained in the Crime and Misconduct and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2014, a number of powers were transferred from the commission to the CEO. A number of powers were transferred from the chair to the CEO. The CEO now has a vote on the commission. So the CEO is a new position, created by this government, which has extraordinary powers in terms of the Crime and Corruption Commission and this is a position that will be wholly and solely determined by the government of the day. Every other person who sits on the commission will, in fact, be subject to a bipartisan appointment as per the amendments circulated by the Attorney-General today—every single one of them except the CEO. This is part of a backflip. It is not a full backflip. It does not go far enough.

We have read the comments made recently today by Tony Fitzgerald in relation to some criticisms that were levelled at him by Tony Morris yesterday. I will read those, because they are very relevant to the debate here before us. My proposition is that this government has not gone far enough in terms of these amendments. If it were absolutely fair dinkum about having listened and having heard the message from the Stafford by-election, it would extend the bipartisan appointment process to the CEO of the CCC. It is that plain and simple. But today Tony Fitzgerald said that this government, he suspects, will probably be 'more circumspect' in its appointments process, that it will tone down some of its rhetoric and that—

Its previous belligerence will be replaced by something unintelligible but soothing.

We have seen that today in their performance in question time. But we also see it today in these amendments circulated by the Attorney-General. They do not go far enough. They tone down the rhetoric and they are less belligerent, but they are unintelligible because they do not go to the heart of the matter, and they should.

Mr GRIMWADE (Morayfield—LNP) (3.47 pm): I rise today to speak in support of the Criminal Law Amendment Bill 2014. I think it is fair to start my speech today by acknowledging some of the hard work that this government has done in regard to cracking down on criminals in our local areas,

and more so in my electorate of Morayfield, where there are a lot of young families who expect us as a government to be cracking down on crime to make sure that those communities are a safe place to raise a family.

The Attorney-General has introduced a very large number of bills into this place. A lot of the legislation that has been introduced has been very much welcomed by the people in my local area. So far we have increased the mandatory non-parole period for murder from 15 years to 20 years. We have introduced a two-strikes policy for repeat child sex offenders—something that has been really welcomed in my local area—to protect our children. As a father of three children, that was something that was welcomed by me and it was something that I spoke about in this place as well. We have introduced laws in regard to drug traffickers, hooning laws, a whole range of firearm laws and, of course, we have reformed the Youth Justice Act in regard to boot camps—something else that I have spoken about in my local area.

In my opinion, this bill clears up a lot of matters in relation to community expectation. A lot of the clauses in this legislation clear up a lot of ambiguity. People in the community will often hear something in the media, such as cruelty towards animals and people walking free and sex offenders ripping off GPS trackers, and there will be a massive outrage about that.

I will keep my speech as brief as I can, but I want to touch on a few areas in regard to the main points that I see will benefit our local area and the further legislation that will make our communities a safer place to raise a family. The first area is the increased maximum penalty, from 14 years to 20 years imprisonment, in section 229G, procuring engagement in prostitution, where the person procured is a child or a person with an impairment of the mind. This protects the children in our local area and those who have a disability or an impairment. It is not on for anyone to be able to procure a child or someone with an impairment and to perform these most heinous crimes in our community. We have seen scenarios where vulnerable people in our community have been taken advantage of and the penalty has not been up to community expectations.

The second point I wish to raise is the amending of section 398, which is a special clause for stealing and looting in areas that are declared natural disasters in and around our state. Down my way there is a street, Dale Street, that we are fixing with a flood levee. That would be a good local example of what I am talking about. It is on a much smaller scale than what happens in Queensland. When there is a natural disaster or something happens and residents in that street have to be evacuated it could be the case that people come in and loot people's houses and take their possessions. I stand in this place as a bit of a knock-around, mum-and-dad sort of guy. It is not the Queensland spirit to take advantage of people when the chips are down. It is not the Queensland spirit for people to come into these streets and kick people in the guts when the chips are down. The looting provision will be welcomed.

The third point I want to refer to is creating the circumstance of aggravation where a prisoner removes or tampers with a GPS tracking device. There are provisions in the act where people can be fitted with GPS tracking devices. There have been one or two scenarios that have made the media and angered people, in particular around the electorate that I represent. People are required to wear these devices for good reason. They may have been convicted of sexual offences, in particular against children. When these people try to rip these things off so they can get around the law and live what would be described as a normal life, it angers people in the local community. I can see why. People need to know that these things are fitted to people's bodies to make our community safe.

The fourth point I wanted to talk about was the serious sex offence against a person involving a police officer acting as a fictitious child. This basically means where a police officer is acting online in the role of a child in their job to see what sex predators are out there with the intent to lure or groom our children. Police sit in their command post and act as if they are a 12-year-old girl to catch the people at the other end who are trying to groom our young children. That is doing their job to catch these sexual predators. This was tested in court and the person was let off because there was a person who was not a child although they were acting in their role as a law enforcer to catch predators. Again this amendment will be welcomed so that our police can get on with the job of weeding out these grubs of society who are trying to groom our young children online.

The fifth issue I wanted to talk about, and the one I wanted to talk most about, is animal cruelty. There is a provision in this legislation that has taken the maximum penalty to seven years imprisonment for those who torture animals. This morning the Attorney-General was doing some media in regard to this piece of legislation. The RSPCA were there as well. I took it upon myself to have a chat with the lovely lady controlling the little dog called Cannon. For those around my

electorate, there are photos on my local Facebook page. At Caboolture State High School there was an act that this legislation is aimed at targeting. People in my electorate will remember this, as will other local members in the area, particularly the member for Pumicestone, Lisa France. Gentlemen went in and killed some alpacas that were part of the agricultural program at Caboolture State High School. This caused immense outrage in our local community. People were not happy that when these people went through the legal system they got very lenient sentences for the damage they had done to these poor innocent animals. I want to finish tonight by saying that this bill will be welcomed by our local community. It is about time that we got stuck into these people who go out there to intentionally commit these crimes. It is fair to say that if you are the type of person who walks around the community and your intention is to kill and behead animals, generally you are not going to be a very nice person in society. It is time this government got tough. To summarise, I welcome this legislation to the parliament. It will be welcomed in our area for a wide variety of reasons, as outlined in my contribution tonight, particularly in relation to allowing police to get on with their job of weeding out people on the internet who are grooming our children and closing the loophole and imposing a maximum penalty for those who hurt our precious animals, whether it be dogs, alpacas, fish or anything else in our community. I recommend that all other members support me tonight in the passing of this bill.

Mrs CUNNINGHAM (Gladstone—Ind) (3.57 pm): I rise to speak to the Criminal Law Amendment Bill 2014. In the first instance I would like to deal, if I could, with the amendment that has been circulated that reinstates the bipartisan support for the appointment of the chair of the Crime and Corruption Commission. The removal of that need for bipartisanship was a fight that was unnecessary to have. In the history of the CMC, formerly the CJC, I have not been able to identify any formal conflict, in terms of public conflict, for the appointment of that position. The process is to provide the committee with potential appointments and if there is genuine concern amongst the committee from either quarter about that person that is communicated back to the Attorney-General who then will nominate an alternate. That has worked wonderfully well over the years.

The chair of the CCC is a very responsible role. The CCC is an organisation with incredible power, both overt and covert, and the chair needs to know that they have the support of this parliament, that they will not be subject to political jibe or political comment. With bipartisan support that is more greatly assured. It is not 100 per cent guaranteed but it is more greatly assured. The member for South Brisbane gave a little bit of background to the split in the CCC where the commission will now have a CEO to handle the administration of the organisation. The former PCMC recommended that structure, seeing that one of the great problems with the structure of the CMC was that the chair had to be particularly qualified legally, but that that qualification did not necessarily, and often did not, mean they had great administrative experience. The idea was to split the two.

In the proposed new structure, the CEO is to receive a vote on the board or on the commission, which therefore raises the genuine spectre of the need for that person to also have bipartisan support. Often the CEO does not have a vote on the board and if that had been the case I could understand the lack of bipartisanship. However, in this case they will have a significant influence on the commission and, therefore, that bipartisan support would strengthen not only the relationship with the oversight committee but also the confidence that the community can have in that person. I would ask the Attorney-General to give consideration to that.

I want to address a few other issues in the order that they appear in the bill and not in their order of importance, as has been alleged. I would like to make a short comment on the changes to the Acts Interpretation Act in relation to chair and deputy chair. The change that was made earlier this year, only a few months ago, was unnecessary. As a community I believe we had matured and we were quite comfortable in our skins in relation to the appropriate title for people. It is disappointing that much resources have been committed to the former amendment and now to this clarification to the Acts Interpretation Act, even though it may only be a small topic as a previous speaker said. They said they could not understand why such a small topic has received so much attention; I cannot believe that such a small topic was even dealt with originally.

I believe that the majority in our community would support the surrendering of passports. They would see the probability or the opportunity for people to abscond from justice as being very real if passports were still held. Whilst we have good electronic communication, the fact is that it is not infallible. While ever a person holds a current passport, they can leave the vicinity. Therefore, the relinquishment of that passport, whether it is a single passport or dual passports, would have to be clarified and monitored very closely. Certainly, that is a welcome change.

The retrospective application of the changes to the double jeopardy rules is also welcome. During the last debate I commented on the Kennedy case in relation to double jeopardy, although not because it is the only case where this change will be beneficial. It is a most tragic case. The mother was particularly tormented by the alleged offender, who would go to her workplace and jeer her. The pain she endured was added to because she had no closure in relation to the loss of her daughter and because of the terrible manner in which she lost that child, and the alleged perpetrator taking the time to add to her sorrow and to the tragedy was reprehensible. This may apply not only to that case but also, I am sure, for many families where our methods of justice, DNA testing and other things may prove beneficial and may give them some closure.

I want to quickly talk about the new match-fixing offences. While I acknowledge they are necessary, I think that it is really regrettable that sport has become such a big business that for many families the fun has gone out of it. Young ones learn very quickly that it is all about money, when indeed it should be about fun, extending your abilities, learning new skills, getting to know new people and enjoying oneself. While this legislation will not do it, I hope that on some level we will remember that even the Ashes—as serious as it is to get that little wooden jar back—is still a game. It is sport. We need to be able to engender that sense of freedom in our children.

I welcome the changes to the looting legislation to increase the penalties for those caught looting during natural disasters. We went through the 1974 flood here in Brisbane. My sister and brother-in-law lost their van at the Gailes caravan park. Many of the vans were washed down the creek. One of the most heart-wrenching things was to see people, and often it was the husbands, sitting on the side of the creek, if they had been able to identify where the wrecks of their vans were, to protect them from looters. There were mongrels who dived into the water to try to get from the vans whatever they could. It was stealing in the worst possible circumstances. Therefore, I welcome these amendments.

Finally, although my time is just about up, I wish to talk about the changes to the definition of 'serious sexual offence'. It does not matter whether a person on the internet is grooming an actual child or someone they think is a child; the intent is no less acceptable and is abhorrent. I do not care if it is a police officer posing as a child or a minor. If somebody is so base and morally bankrupt that they will groom anyone on the internet whom they think is a minor, real or not, they deserve the full strength of the law. I would defy anyone to say that the vast majority of people, other than those sorts of perpetrators, would disagree with that. I say full strength to the Police Service and may they catch many perpetrators. May it not be real children being groomed; may it be police officers posing as children, because that will reduce the damage to our young ones.

I also welcome the changes to offences against people with diminished capacity. To offend against somebody who does not have the capacity to understand or respond to those advances is reprehensible beyond belief. The changes that strengthen the law are welcomed by our community. I certainly hope that the matters in relation to the CCC are further refined to ensure accountability.

(Time expired)

Mr WELLINGTON (Nicklin—Ind) (4.07 pm): It gives me a great deal of pleasure to rise to participate in the debate on the Criminal Law Amendment Bill 2014. I start with comments in relation to the amendment to the Crime and Corruption Commission. I note a proposed amendment to the bill states—

If the proposed appointment is of a commissioner other than the chief executive officer, the Minister may nominate a person for appointment only if the person's nomination is made with the bipartisan support of the parliamentary committee.

Under the heading of 'Consultation', the explanatory notes to the amendments state—

No consultation on the amendments has been undertaken because the proposal to amend the CC Act was publicly announced by the Government on 21 July 2014.

My recollection is that the publicised reason for the government making this change is because, in the Premier's words, 'We have listened to the voters of Stafford. We have listened and we are going to make some changes. We are going to give you bipartisan requirements for the appointment of the Crime and Corruption Commission chairman and executives, and we are going to make sure that some prisoners no longer wear their pink jumpsuits.'

If that is what is needed for this government to listen to Queenslanders, how many by-elections do we need in a three-year term? We have had two. Do we need more by-elections so that the government can listen to the real concerns of Queenslanders? On the issue of consultation, this shows how the government's community cabinet meetings are not real community cabinet meetings,

because there is no capacity for anyone to stand up at those community cabinet meetings and ask a question of the Premier or any minister, as they used to be able to do of Premier Peter Beattie or Premier Anna Bligh. If we had had returned to Queensland the sort of community consultation that we had under Peter Beattie and Anna Bligh so that any member of the community could have attended a public hall, stood up and asked a question of Premier Newman, the Attorney-General Bleijie or anyone else, I would assume that the government would have overturned this decision well and truly before the Stafford by-election.

The Premier says, 'Blame the former member for Stafford, Dr Chris Davis, for the by-election.' I say, 'Thank you, Dr Davis, for stepping down so there was a by-election and all of a sudden the government can see how wrong they are.' Clearly it shows that the government is not listening. They only listen when they think they have to.

When we compare Premier Newman's community cabinet meetings with those of former Premiers Peter Beattie and Anna Bligh, clearly there is a stark difference. They used to be a real opportunity for members of the community to ask questions of the Premier which are not vetted. Look at how it is done at the moment. That is not possible under this government. That is one reason I believe this government needs to be voted out as soon as we have the opportunity.

Now back to the bill before the House. I note that there are proposed changes to the looting provisions. That is another great change. Guess what? I think that was modelled on a proposal put forward by the member for Yeerongpilly. He came forward with a similar idea, but the government did not like what he wanted to say. I do not mind where the government gets the good ideas from. At least we are seeing some changes.

Another change that I will be supporting is the changes to the double jeopardy rule. Guess what? This follows on from changes that the now opposition spoke about in 2007. Anna Bligh, the then Premier, and Kerry Shine, the then Attorney-General, and I were able to have discussions about amending the law of double jeopardy. If my recollection is correct, I remember speaking with senior police at the time. We discussed this issue and the Deidre Kennedy case. They assured me that even if the legislation were retrospective there would be no capacity whatsoever to revisit any of the evidence that had already been presented.

I am concerned that our Attorney-General is building an expectation that all of a sudden we can go back and revisit the Deidre Kennedy case when my understanding is that the evidence that has been presented cannot be revisited. There is no security of that evidence. I will be supporting the provision.

I also listened intently to the member for Redcliffe when she spoke about the problems with omnibus legislation. We see a whole range of amendments introduced in one bill. When I look at the opening pages of the bill I find that these are the acts proposed to be amended by this bill: the Acts Interpretation Act 1954, the Animal Care and Protection Act 2001, the Bail Act 1980, the Criminal Code, the Criminal Proceeds Confiscation Act 2002, the Dangerous Prisoners (Sexual Offenders) Act 2003, the Director of Public Prosecutions Act 1984, the Drugs Misuse Act 1986, the Evidence Act 1977, the Justices Act 1886, the Penalties and Sentences Act 1992 and the Youth Justice Act 1992 for particular purposes. A series of important acts are all being amended.

I think the member for Redcliffe was spot on when she reminded members of the consistent criticism of omnibus legislation from all sides and the inappropriateness of bringing amendments to a wide range of acts before the House in one bill. When a member stands up and votes for a bill, they vote for the good provisions, the bad provisions and all those in between.

I will be supporting this bill because there is the retrospective component. I note the opposition is on the record outlining why they are not prepared to support the retrospective component of the double jeopardy provisions. I will certainly be supporting that because that is consistent with the bill I originally introduced when Anna Bligh was the Premier and Kerry Shine was the Attorney-General. I think that is a good step.

I am disappointed that the member for Yeerongpilly was not able to be here to participate in this debate. As I have said, I thought he showed great foresight in introducing his bill and capturing the anger in Queensland regarding looting. He proposed to increase the penalty for people who loot during periods of devastation.

I also reflect on the opposition's comments and the member for Gladstone's comments that they do not believe the Attorney-General and the Premier have gone far enough. We believe that the chief executive officer of the Crime and Corruption Commission also needs to have the support of the

opposition and crossbenches. Be that as it may, my views are on the record. I look forward to this proceeding to a vote. More importantly, I look forward to the day the Premier comes in here or goes and visits the Queensland Governor and announces the date for the next election.

Hon. JJ McVEIGH (Toowoomba South—LNP) (Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry) (4.14 pm): I rise to make a brief contribution on the Criminal Law Amendment Bill 2014. I must say at the outset that the Attorney-General's Criminal Law Amendment Bill 2014 is certainly another example of how this government is determined to make Queensland the safest place to live, work and raise a family. This government refuses to be soft on crime. I strongly believe that it is time that the victims had a say.

Making our community safe is important to me in my role as Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry, my role as the member for Toowoomba South—particularly given that that is located in the beautiful city of Toowoomba, recognised as one of the most, if not the most, family friendly cities in Australia—and in my most important role as a husband and a father of five daughters and one son.

Increasing the mandatory, non-parole period for murder from 15 to 20 years imprisonment, introducing a two-strikes policy for repeat child sex offenders, ensuring drug traffickers serve at least 80 per cent of their sentence, ensuring that a court must allow a victim to read out their victim impact statement, if they wish—unless it is not in the interests of justice—and providing a free copy of court transcripts to victims of violent crime are just a few ways that this amendment is helping to keep Queensland's streets safe.

From my perspective as Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry, I am very pleased about the amendments in the bill in relation to increasing the penalties for animal cruelty. The relatively low penalties applied to animal cruelty offenders by the courts through the Animal Care and Protection Act 2001 have been the subject of public criticism for several years. Late last year we increased the maximum penalty for animal cruelty from two years imprisonment or a $110,000 fine to four years imprisonment and a $220,000 fine. With these amendments, people who purposely harm and torture animals will face up to seven years jail under a tough new offence designed to protect all Queensland's creatures, both great and small. These new penalties will nearly double the penalty for existing animal cruelty offences. Animals are a valued and respected part of our society and, of course, they deserve to be protected from those people who think for some reason that it is okay to harm them. We have shared the community's frustration when offenders, who have done some terrible things to animals, walk from courts without serving any jail time. These changes acknowledge that acts of cruelty to animals are abhorrent and that the community expects much tougher penalties to be given to perpetrators of these acts.

The Newman government is serious about stopping animal cruelty. These measures send a very clear message to the community and courts that severe penalties should apply to both punish and deter such terrible behaviour. I am pleased that the RSPCA will be able to continue to investigate and commence proceedings against someone accused of such new offences. The 'can-do' LNP government is determined to make Queensland a safer place to work, live and, of course, raise a family. Only the LNP has a strong plan for such a future. I congratulate the Attorney-General for leading the charge in this regard.

Dr DOUGLAS (Gaven—PUP) (4.18 pm): These legislative amendments demonstrate many things about the government in the twilight phase before its lights are extinguished. Certainly there are some parts of this legislation that are eminently worthy of support. I would like to say how happy I was to see the looting changes that mirror those legislative changes, as was indicated by the member for Nicklin, proposed as a private member's bill by the member for Yeerongpilly, who unfortunately is ill, having had an operation yesterday, and will be joining us back in parliament in a very short time. Plagiarism is the very best form of compliment one can take regarding anything much in life, and he will certainly be very happy to see that these changes have come in this bill today.

The changes to the double jeopardy ruling are long and well overdue and they are much deserved. The problem is, as has been raised by the member for Nicklin, that evidence cannot be revisited, as in the Deidre Kennedy case. If this legislation is trying to give that family false hope, then the government and the Attorney-General stand condemned for it. There will be cases where these changes will be beneficial over time. It is for this and other reasons that this change will benefit those people. The retrospective component will be supported by the PUP. I have heard the discussion by the representative of the Leader of the Opposition today, but we will support it for the reasons that the member for Nicklin proposed.

I, too, would like to speak on the issue of match fixing. As most people know, I am very interested in gaming because I believe it is a very significant income that is generated for the state for a whole variety of reasons. I do not know whether they are all good. But having said that, sadly enough, betting on sports games and certainly online betting is a massive growth area both in Australia and globally. The great tragedy of course is that a lot of this betting is in fact not always done within the country and that makes it very difficult to regulate.

The problem with match fixing itself is very troublesome, and changes to the law correcting this legislation are very timely and very important. The two major significant instances that come to mind are a significant match that occurred in Sydney over 12 months ago and another match in the last 12 months involving soccer players, largely from overseas, who were playing in a very low-order match in Victoria and the betting was extensive globally. In fact, there was a significant amount of betting in this state. It is very important that we stamp out this activity because every time people try to set the field—whether it is a football match, horse racing, dog racing, whatever—when you load the dice in a certain way where one side cannot lose and the other side is definitely going to lose every time, what you are going to end up doing is getting a terribly disordered result and ultimately you will end up cutting your nose off to spite your face.

The reality is that legislation that addresses the issue of match fixing in a very comprehensive way, particularly with significant penalties including jail penalties, is at least the best type of deterrent that we have to stop the major growth in an area where the growth in that type of betting is growing exponentially. I do not know what the current multiple is, but it is extremely significant. It probably represents a multiple of nearly five times that of horse racing currently going on both in Australia and overseas. That is because the majority of people are actually watching these matches all the time on local TV, Foxtel, other types of cable and of course via satellite. To do anything to correct that is worthwhile.

I would also like to say I support the changes relating to animal cruelty. I just heard the Minister for Agriculture and a variety of members talking about the laws. I, too, have great concerns where you have animals being intentionally preyed upon by a variety of people. Interestingly enough, there is compelling evidence medically that people who prey on animals—and this is not just small animals but a variety of animals—go on to commit fairly significant offences when they are older. They are opportunistic offenders. When their history is examined much later in life—20 years later or whatever—you find these people are not just the old style hedgerow burners. These people were being intentionally cruel to animals and then they progress to commit more serious crimes. In fact, there is a strong element of prevention when you deal with people who have these types of animals. So small changes in areas like this will yield large changes over time, and that is the implication of these laws.

Certainly there does appear to be some change that is going on in the government. I do not think it is all significant change. But certainly these types of things have only come along because the government has moved after what has occurred in the two previous by-elections. More significant changes are going to occur over the next six to nine months up until whenever the election is held. But what I can say is that if people believe that these types of changes alone will save this government they are fooling themselves. I would urge you all to reconsider your very, very negative views about what is going on in this state and change and start supporting the public interest, because to date that has not occurred, and under three years ago you were all voted in on a much different platform.

Hon. JP BLEIJIE (Kawana—LNP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice) (4.25 pm), in reply: I start by acknowledging all honourable members' contributions to the debate today. I also highlight a couple of the bigger issues in this bill—and that is of course dealing with the new animal cruelty laws which put a seven-year maximum penalty in place for serious animal cruelty in the Criminal Code. We have upped the ante in the Criminal Code because we do not have an offence in the Criminal Code that deals with these types of offences. I know under the animal care and protection legislation we have certain provisions but nothing as severe as serious animal cruelty. I note that once the parliament passes these provisions we will have the strongest laws dealing with animal cruelty in the country, because the violence against animals has to stop.

We have seen some great advocacy work from the likes of the RSPCA. On that note, can I thank the RSPCA for coming to Parliament House today with Cannon and Jasmine. Cannon is a little puppy dog and Jasmine is a three-legged dog. They highlight the great work the RSPCA does in terms of providing support to those animals that have been abandoned or assaulted or damaged

physically by their owners. Mark from the RSPCA was telling me that at any given time they can have 600 animals. They do great work in adopting the animals out to families who can love and care for these types of animals. I think Queenslanders take a pretty dim view of animal cruelty.

I will talk about two cases. We had the alpaca case at Caboolture where two alpacas were viciously killed. No school student should have to go through that distress, as those alpacas grew up as part of their farming project which teaches about caring for animals. The other case I refer to was last week in Ipswich, if memory serves me correctly. A puppy was beaten and left for dead, but saved fortunately. So it was important that the RSPCA, in anticipation of the bill passing tonight, were here. They certainly have been a great supporter of these laws with respect to the change. Of course the change is to insert a new offence in the Criminal Code dealing with serious animal cruelty which can attract a seven-year maximum sentence.

The other thing it does is gives the courts a better sentencing regime. It gives the courts and the judges more options to deal with the worst of the worst offenders. I rightly agree with the community when they are up in arms when they read about cases of animal cruelty and a lot of people say they get slaps on the wrist. The reason for that is it has been very difficult for our courts to be able to apply the relevant penalties because they have not had an offence like this in the Criminal Code. Now we do, and that offence will be there following the passage of this legislation. I thank Cannon and Jasmine from the RSPCA for coming down. Incidentally, I am told Jasmine is a dog that has lost her leg but is available to be adopted out. If these animals have an orange scarf, that means that they are able to be adopted out to loving and caring families.

The other issue I want to deal with is the double jeopardy laws where we have made retrospective those provisions that the Labor Party made in 2007. Queensland, with the Labor Party in government, was the only jurisdiction in Australia not to make those provisions retrospective at the time. Quite unsatisfactorily, and I think in a very disrespectful manner, the member for Nicklin raised the issue in this House about the Kennedy case and said that he would hope that the government is not giving false hope to the Kennedy family in terms of this particular provision.

I can recall a press conference when I was asked about these double jeopardy law reforms, and I specifically said that there is no intention for these laws to apply to any particular case; it would always have to be based on the facts and the evidence at the time. In these particular provisions, the Court of Appeal has to be convinced that there is fresh and compelling evidence for the prosecution to even take place. The shadow Attorney-General talked about the double jeopardy provisions, that they are concerned that people might make certain decisions based on an acquittal and might, for example, destroy relevant evidence. The Labor Party is ignoring the inbuilt safeguards whereby the Court of Appeal must be satisfied that there is fresh and compelling evidence, as I said.

This is a part of the government's reform package to revitalise front-line services, putting victims first and rebalancing the scales of justice. I thank all honourable members for their contributions to the debate tonight.

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

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a second time.

Consideration in Detail

Clause 1, as read, agreed to.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Miss Barton): Order! I note the Attorney-General's amendment No. 1 proposes to insert a new commencement clause 1A, which relates to proposed new clauses in amendment No. 2, which is outside the long title. Therefore consideration of the proposed new commencement clause is postponed until after the other clauses and amendments have been considered.

Clauses 2 to 23, as read, agreed to.

Insertion of new clauses—

Mr BLEIJIE (4.31 pm): I seek leave to move an amendment outside the long title of the bill.

Leave granted.

Mr BLEIJIE: I move the following amendment—

2 After clause 23

Page 17, after line 30—

insert—

Part 4A Amendment of Crime and Corruption Act 2001

23A Act amended

This part amends the *Crime and Corruption Act 2001*.

23B Amendment of s 228 (Consultation before nominating persons for appointment)

(1) Section 228—

insert—

(1A) If the proposed appointment is of a commissioner other than the chief executive officer, the Minister may nominate a person for appointment only if the person's nomination is made with the bipartisan support of the parliamentary committee.

(2) Section 228(2), 'The'—

omit, insert—

If the proposed appointment is of the chief executive officer, the

(3) Section 228(3), 'a commissioner'—

omit, insert—

the chief executive officer

(4) Section 228(1A) to (3)—

renumber as section 228(2) to (4).

I table the explanatory notes to the amendments.

Tabled paper: Criminal Law Amendment Bill 2014, explanatory notes to Hon. Jarrod Bleijie's amendments [5628].

Ms PALASZCZUK: First of all, I want to say that this amendment introduced by the Attorney-General does not go far enough. If this government was listening after what happened in Stafford, this government would be in here this afternoon making it very clear that there would be a bipartisan appointment process for not just the commissioners, including the chair, but also the CEO. This bungling Attorney-General refuses to listen. I can remember standing in this House with the Attorney-General talking about why we had to do away with bipartisanship, how we had to get away from it because it simply was not working. We know what had happened. This government wanted to tightly control the anticorruption watchdog in this state. Queenslanders do not wear it. They do not wear it at all. As I said previously, the current chair should stand down immediately—today. The Premier made it very clear after the Stafford by-election that he would accept nothing less now than the bipartisan support of the chair. The current chair is there for August, September and October. It is clearly not acceptable. If you want to talk about integrity and accountability, let's go to the heart of the matter. The heart of the matter is that this government has a plan, and it is a cunning, secret plan. Let me tell Queenslanders what the plan is. The plan is to move the current chair out of the position and sneak him into the CEO position. Go on, deny that. That is the plan.

Mr Bleijie: I deny that.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I am quite sure Queenslanders know that is the plan.

Mr Bleijie: I deny that.

Ms PALASZCZUK: So you deny that plan?

Mr Bleijie: I deny that.

Ms PALASZCZUK: So it is not going to happen?

Mr Bleijie: I deny that.

Ms PALASZCZUK: So the Attorney-General denies that that is going to happen?

Mr Bleijie interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: You can't help yourself.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Leader of the Opposition, I ask that you direct your comments through the chair.

Ms PALASZCZUK: If the Premier stands by his words, the current embattled chair will stand down today. He does not have my support. He does not have the bipartisan support to continue as the chair of the anticorruption watchdog in this state. He must go. If he is serious, the newly appointed CEO will also have bipartisan support, and I will accept nothing less. I will be out there in the media, I

will be here in the parliament and I will be talking about it all the time because this goes to the heart of their credibility in this state. If they have listened after Stafford, if they have learnt anything, they will stand down the chair of the anticorruption watchdog in this state today, and we will accept nothing less.

Ms TRAD: I made a contribution during the second reading speech in relation to this issue and I will elaborate on the points I made during that session. The CEO, as was moved during debate on the Crime and Corruption Act earlier this year, is responsible for the administration of the commission and the financial accountability of the commission. The CEO is responsible also for essentially the appointment of senior officers—these appointments were previously made by the Governor in Council—the employment of commission staff, the engagement of agents' consultants to assist the commission, the financial administration of the commission and has responsibility for the commission of inquiry documents and all public records of the commission, presumably under the Public Records Act. The CEO also has powers under section 40 of the act, which is where the commission issues directions to agencies about which matters need to be referred to the commission immediately without action taken by the agency and which can be advised to the commission on a monthly schedule.

It is very clear that the CEO of the Crime and Corruption Commission has significant powers bequeathed to that position as per the Crime and Corruption Act. It makes no sense that we extend the provision of bipartisan appointment to every single commissioner of the CCC and not to the CEO, who has enormous powers in terms of the crime and corruption functions of this state. If this government were fair dinkum, if it had heard—not only listened, but heard—what the message was from the Stafford by-election, they would extend the bipartisan appointment process to the CEO and not just the chair. This is a gaping, big hole in their approach to convince Queenslanders they are no longer wolves, that they are actually wearing sheep's clothing, that they have changed their ways and they are prepared to listen. This is the anomaly in their argument and in their approach. Queenslanders will quite rightly see through it because they have seen through all of their rhetoric to date and we will be out there campaigning for greater transparency, greater accountability and greater integrity in this state.

A government member: Hypocrite, Jackie.

Ms TRAD: I find that language completely unparliamentary. Again, I think that not everyone has read the memo coming from the leadership group to behave and to try to convince Queenslanders that they are no longer the animals that they have shown themselves to be over the past two years. This is outrageous. This amendment does not go far enough.

(Time expired)

Mr BLEIJIE: I would make two points in relation to the opposition's comments. The first is with respect to the acting chairman position defined under the legislation. The legislation is exactly the same as it was under the Labor Party. The legislation drafted by the Labor Party when the Crime and Misconduct Act was introduced in the parliament said the acting chairman can be appointed by Governor in Council without consultation, without bipartisanship. That is what the Labor Party drafted when the Crime and Misconduct Act was introduced into parliament in the mid-2000s. There is no change in relation to the acting chairman, whoever fills that role. I understand the opposition has issues with who is in the role at the moment. Put the person aside, the position of acting chairman was always, as it was under the Labor Party, appointed by Governor in Council without consultation, without bipartisanship support. So the current person continues in that role as they would have under the Labor Party.

The second point I would make is that in relation to the CEO position, the CEO position of the CMC as it was and the CCC have never had to have bipartisanship appointment. We said that we would restore the bipartisanship appointment for the chairman. We have gone further than that and we have restored it for the deputy chairman and also the two part-time commissioners.

Mrs CUNNINGHAM: I certainly welcome the reintroduction of bipartisan support, but I would like to comment on the Attorney-General's contribution just now. It is true that the legislation under which the current acting chair was appointed was the same as under Labor, but it is my understanding that the Acts Interpretation Act clarifies that a part-time acting appointment in that position is only for a period of 12 months. The current acting chair of the CCC has overstayed that 12-month period; therefore, to that extent the current appointment of the acting chair does not agree with the ALP's legislation but does indeed transgress against the Acts Interpretation Act.

I believe the current government got around that by legislating in the changes most recently passed through parliament to extend the appointment of Dr Levy in the acting position. It does not make it right; it makes it allowable and perhaps lawful. Certainly it is not in accordance with the spirit of the Acts Interpretation Act, which defines 'acting' as 12 months. The Attorney-General is correct to the extent that acting positions do not require bipartisan support. I would have to say, however, that the spirit of that legislation has not been met, and certainly the intent of the legislation to have acting appointments in such an important role was only intended for extenuating circumstances—not for a period that has now extended past 12 months and will, I think, be 18 months by the time it is concluded.

Mr BYRNE: I move the following amendment to the Attorney-General's amendment—

1 Amendment to Attorney-General's amendment No. 2—

23B Amendment of s 228 (Consultation before nominating persons for appointment)

Omit (1) to (4)—

Insert—

Section 228(2) and (3)—

Omit, Insert—

(2) The Minister may nominate a person for appointment as a commissioner only if the person's nomination is made with the bipartisan support of the parliamentary committee.

Tabled paper: Criminal Law Amendment Bill 2014, explanatory notes to Mrs Yvette D'Ath's amendments [5629].

This amendment is all about ensuring that all of the commissioners, including the CEO, are selected on the basis of bipartisan support. How hard can it be for the government to understand that if they are genuine about listening to Queenslanders and if they are genuine about restoring integrity and belief in the CCC, then this matter should not be contested. This matter should be very simple for the government to understand if there is no other agenda operating underneath this.

It is on the basis of the 19 per cent swing in the Stafford by-election, where Queenslanders said they did not accept the arrangements that have been put in place, that we have seen these amendments put by the Attorney-General to the House today. That by-election said that Queenslanders do not support the measures taken by this government in a number of areas, particularly the CCC. I am not sure what else Queenslanders can do to voice their displeasure with this government and the way in which they crafted this legislation and their response to the CCC.

It goes further than that, because even in the body of the debate today we heard ministers and others talk about this government's record on crime. Part of the supposed rollback of the measures brought by the government involved things like pink jumpsuits. When he was asked at estimates, the Attorney-General could not even explain how many people are in pink jumpsuits in the prison system because he did not want to be on the record as saying 'none'. So it is not a very big measure for the government to remove pink jumpsuit requirements, because there has been virtually nobody in pink jumpsuits in the system since this shemozzle started.

The bipartisan component of this legislation needs to be extended, but I would say it needs to go even further. Let us not forget what happened with the parliamentary oversight committee when we first convened this parliament when the government saw fit to go against all of the conventions and normal practices that had been established about the appointment of chairs. Over the entire 2½ years that this government has been in power it has sought to undermine and control the Crime and Misconduct Commission, now the CCC, to its own ends. It stands absolutely condemned by Queenslanders, as evidenced by the Stafford by-election, and I hope that somebody in the backbench is finally starting to listen to what is happening in this state.

Mrs MILLER: In my view, it is very important that this parliament does not accept any half measures in relation to what we are debating here this afternoon, and I totally support the amendment moved by my colleague, the member for Rockhampton. I believe that there must be bipartisan support for the chair, the CEO and all of the commissioners. We need to have bipartisan support because we need the people of Queensland to have confidence in the Crime and Corruption Commission.

Let's have a look at the situation if applicants are being called for in local papers or papers right across Queensland. There will be very few applicants, in my opinion, if they believe that these positions are going to be filled in a way that is not bipartisan. I believe that there will be few applicants if they believe that they will be seen as toadies of Campbell Newman's government. If we opened it up so that people could apply and obviously go through due process with a selection committee, an

interview process and discussions at the very end of it, and that the best person would be appointed to those positions in a bipartisan way, it is my view that a much broader and wider selection of people would apply for these positions.

I believe also that we have seen a position in the last few months where Ken Levy, the acting chair of the Crime and Corruption Commission, is a partisan appointment to the CCC. He is a former director-general of the Department of Justice and Attorney-General and he has been a senior officer for a long time, but to finish off his career in such a way is not good because he has been appointed only by the LNP government. Today I reiterate that it is my view that Ken Levy should resign because he is not a bipartisan appointment to the chairmanship of the CCC. When we are looking at confidence in the CCC, we need to ensure that the people of Queensland have confidence. We need to ensure that the very best possible people are appointed and that they are appointed in a bipartisan way.

Mr WELLINGTON: I rise to participate in the debate on this amendment. I think that if the government was genuine in wanting to show Queenslanders that they want to have a bipartisan approach to the appointment of people in the leadership team, then this would not be an unreasonable request. Yet here we are in the ditches effectively arguing over whether the CEO of the CCC is going to be appointed with the support of the opposition. That is what we are effectively arguing over. Will the government allow the opposition to be involved in the appointment of the CEO? That is all we are arguing over.

Quite frankly, if the government was genuine in saying 'We want to engage with the opposition and the crossbenchers on the appointment of the most appropriate people to this all-powerful committee'—bearing in mind this is the most powerful committee in Queensland which will be there irrespective of who is in government—we need to have bipartisan support.

If the government is not prepared to resile from its position or compromise, I think it shows that the Premier's words about the government listening are hollow. When they had the opportunity to have dialogue with the non-government members and to have them involved in the selection of all people to this leadership team, they walked away. They refused. I think that is simply wrong.

We know that the government have the numbers. They have the power. They can do whatever they want to. They can ignore the comments of the crossbenchers and opposition members. They will do it their way. Hopefully, as a result of comments made by opposition members and crossbenchers on this proposal, the Attorney-General will reconsider. Perhaps if he has a short adjournment this matter can be held over until after the meal break so that he might have dialogue with the Premier or other ministers. The bottom line is: while this government is promoted as the Premier's government, every minister of this government is responsible for the proposals this Attorney-General wants to push through. So every minister of the Newman government is jointly responsible and every member of the LNP government is jointly responsible for what the Attorney-General is saying. I urge the more moderate members of the LNP to use the power they have so that the Attorney-General has to compromise and has to see common sense. We know that, quite clearly, he is not able to do that.

Division: Question put—That Mr Byrne's amendment to the Attorney-General's amendment No. 2 be agreed to.

AYES, 14:

ALP, 8—Byrne, Lynham, Miller, Mulherin, Palaszczuk, Pitt, Scott, Trad.

KAP, 3—Hopper, Katter, Knuth.

PUP, 1—Douglas.

INDEPENDENTS, 2—Cunningham, Wellington.

NOES, 67:

LNP, 67—Bates, Bennett, Berry, Bleijie, Boothman, Cavallucci, Choat, Costigan, Cox, Crandon, Cripps, Crisafulli, Davies, T Davis, Dempsey, Dickson, Dillaway, Dowling, Elmes, Emerson, Flegg, France, Frecklington, Gibson, Grant, Grimwade, Gulley, Hart, Hobbs, Holswich, Johnson, Kaye, Kempton, King, Krause, Langbroek, Latter, Maddern, Malone, Mander, McArdle, McVeigh, Menkens, Minnikin, Molhoek, Newman, Nicholls, Ostapovitch, Powell, Pucci, Rice, Rickuss, Ruthenberg, Seeney, Shorten, Shuttleworth, Smith, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stewart, Symes, Trout, Walker, Watts, Woodforth, Young.

Resolved in the negative.

Non-government amendment (Mr Byrne) negatived.

Amendment agreed to.

Clauses 24 to 39, as read, agreed to.

Clause 40—

Ms PALASZCZUK (4.57 pm): This bill changes the offence of 'contravention of relevant order' from a summary offence to an indictable offence. It then creates an aggravated offence of contravening the relevant order without a reasonable excuse by removing or tampering with a stated device for the purpose of preventing the location of the released prisoner being monitored. The new aggravated offence is a crime punishable by a maximum penalty of five years imprisonment, with a mandatory minimum period of one year's imprisonment to be served wholly in a corrective services facility.

The opposition does not support mandatory sentencing. The former Chief Justice has written to the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee setting out his views on the matter, because of the resource implications on the court. Mandatory terms of imprisonment mean that people are less likely to plead guilty because the sentencing judges and magistrates have their discretion fettered and are unable to impose a penalty that might be fair given the circumstances of each individual case.

Division: Question put—That clause 40 stand part of the bill.

AYES, 73:

LNP, 67—Bates, Bennett, Berry, Bleijie, Boothman, Cavallucci, Choat, Costigan, Cox, Crandon, Cripps, Crisafulli, Davies, T Davis, Dempsey, Dickson, Dillaway, Dowling, Elmes, Emerson, Flegg, France, Frecklington, Gibson, Grant, Grimwade, Gulley, Hart, Hobbs, Holswich, Johnson, Kaye, Kempton, King, Krause, Langbroek, Latter, Maddern, Malone, Mander, McArdle, McVeigh, Menkens, Minnikin, Molhoek, Newman, Nicholls, Ostapovitch, Powell, Pucci, Rice, Rickuss, Ruthenberg, Seeney, Shorten, Shuttleworth, Smith, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stewart, Symes, Trout, Walker, Watts, Woodforth, Young.

KAP, 3—Hopper, Katter, Knuth.

PUP, 1—Douglas.

INDEPENDENTS, 2—Cunningham, Wellington.

NOES, 8:

ALP, 8—Byrne, Lynham, Miller, Mulherin, Palaszczuk, Pitt, Scott, Trad.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clause 40, as read, agreed to.

Clause 41, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 42 to 74, as read, agreed to.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Miss Barton): Order! The House will now consider the postponed proposed new clause.

Insertion of new clause—

Mr BLEIJIE (5.03 pm): I seek leave to move an amendment outside the long title of the bill.

Leave granted.

Mr BLEIJIE: I move the following amendment—

1 After clause 1

Page 8, after line 5—

insert—

1A Commencement

Part 4A is taken to have commenced on 1 July 2014 immediately after the commencement of the *Crime and Misconduct and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2014*.

Amendment agreed to.

Third Reading

Mr BLEIJIE (Kawana—LNP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice) (5.04 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. JP BLEIJIE (Kawana—LNP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice) (5.04 pm): I move the following amendment—

3 Long title

Long title, after '*Bail Act 1980*,'—

insert—

the *Crime and Corruption Act 2001*,

Amendment agreed to.

Question put—That the long title, as amended, be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

STATE DEVELOPMENT, INFRASTRUCTURE AND PLANNING (RED TAPE REDUCTION) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

Resumed from 3 June (see p. 1939).

Second Reading

Hon. JW SEENEY (Callide—LNP) (Deputy Premier and Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning) (5.05 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a second time.

I thank the State Development, Infrastructure and Industry Committee for its detailed consideration of the bill and I table a copy of the government's response to the committee's report.

Tabled paper: State Development, Infrastructure and Industry Committee: Report No. 44—State Development, Infrastructure and Planning (Red Tape Reduction) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2014, government response [5630].

I am pleased to advise the House that our government supports all of the committee's recommendations. The committee's second and third recommendations require that I provide additional information and clarification regarding aspects of the bill, which I will now do. In response to recommendation 2, I wish to advise the House that prior to declaring a priority development area I am required in my capacity as minister for Economic Development Queensland to consult with an affected local government. It is the practice of this government to ensure that requests for the declaration of priority development areas either come from local governments or have local government support. I am pleased to advise that the government is working in partnership with a number of local governments which have requested priority development areas. In fact, the requests for priority development areas have far exceeded our government's expectation and the process for declaring priority development areas in consultation with local councils stands in stark contrast to the declaration of the previous government's UDAs that were the forerunner of our PDAs.

The councils that have requested declarations of priority development areas include the Sunshine Coast council for the Maroochydore City Centre PDA, the Redland City Council for the Toondah Harbour and Weinam Creek PDAs, the city of the Gold Coast for the Southport PDA and the Central Highlands Regional Council for the Blackwater East PDA. We are also considering other PDA applications from other councils. My department is involved in discussions with local governments regarding the declaration of more priority development areas in other parts of Queensland where complex site issues are evident and development and jobs need to be facilitated expeditiously. The Queensland government is committed to a strong partnership with local government which can only mean better outcomes for the community, including economic development in local communities. The local governments we are working with have praised this government for the work we are doing with them to build stronger economies and create jobs.

In response to the committee's third recommendation which relates to infrastructure charges, I can advise that the purpose of the infrastructure expenses recoupment charge is to recoup those expenses that are reasonably expected to be incurred for the provision of planned infrastructure. Therefore, when financing costs are reasonably and properly incurred for the provision of planned infrastructure these costs could be recouped, provided the quantum of the charge is reasonable and does not impose an unreasonable burden on landholders or stifle development.

In response to the committee's fourth recommendation, I can assure members that the government will continue its ongoing commitment to work alongside stakeholders to ensure appropriate consultation on legislative proposals.

Finally, the government supports the committee's fifth and final recommendation that the party house provisions contained in the bill be reviewed after 12 months. We will ensure that an appropriate review occurs. I am sure that the member for Mermaid Beach will make sure that I am made well aware of any deficiencies that may become evident in our approach to addressing that longstanding issue of party houses. I would also like to thank the committee for convening a specific roundtable discussion at the Gold Coast to listen directly to residents affected by party houses. I am pleased to advise that my department will work with local governments that choose to opt in and regulate party houses through amendments to its planning scheme or by making a temporary planning instrument. As part of this process the government will seek feedback on the party house provisions from local government. Affected residents and stakeholders are able to provide direct feedback to my department. The proposed party house provisions will not address offensive and antisocial behaviour, but complement existing police powers to empower local government to regulate a party house as a land use as defined in the Sustainable Planning Act 2009.

In addition to its recommendations, the committee has asked for five points of clarification. In regard to the first point of clarification, as the planning authority for priority development areas the bill permits me in my capacity as Minister for Economic Development Queensland to make and levy the infrastructure expenses recoupment charge to recoup the cost of planned infrastructure. In the event that the priority development area is revoked, the infrastructure expenses recoupment charge is taken to have been made and levied by the superseding public sector entity. A superseding public sector entity is defined broadly and includes both local government and water distributor-retailers. The superseding public sector entity may continue to make and levy the infrastructure expenses recoupment charge. However, the superseding public sector entity is not authorised to make and levy the charge to recoup or provide for expenses other than for the provision of the planned infrastructure.

In relation to the State Development and Public Works Organisation Act 1971 amendments, there is no doubt that this bill delivers on the government's commitment to reduce red tape. The bill will contribute to removing the existing legislative duplication and remove impediments to timely decision making, allowing the Coordinator-General to more efficiently control the environmental impact process for coordinated projects and development in state development areas in Queensland.

The committee suggests through its second point for clarification that, in making a decision to declare a coordinated project requiring an impact assessment report, or an IAR, rather than an environmental impact statement, or an EIS, the Coordinator-General should be given more prescriptive criteria. The Coordinator-General declares only a relatively small number of coordinated projects in a given year, although they are generally large, complex and highly significant to the state. The average capital value of coordinated projects over the past five years has been approximately $1.8 billion and 10 or fewer projects have been declared each year over that period.

The proposed IAR assessment process is intended to be a streamlined version of an EIS process, but will continue to result in a detailed evaluation of the project's environmental effects. Precise criteria for the use of the IAR process would be difficult to formulate because of the unique nature of each coordinated project and its degree of complexity. Instead, the bill makes it clear that an IAR process is appropriate only for the relatively smaller projects with lower potential impacts that still meet the criteria to be declared as a coordinated project.

The committee sought clarification regarding the reasons for not requiring mandatory public notification for a draft IAR. The bill clearly specified mandatory public notification of the draft IAR where needed by subsequent statutory approvals. There is no intent to bypass or override statutory processes and no opportunity provided to do so. In limited circumstances, public notification of the draft IAR is not necessary. In these cases, proponents would not have been required to notify in making a standard application for a development approval. The Coordinator-General may choose to require public notification. However, sometimes it may not be warranted. In the same way as the Sustainable Planning Act 2009 and the Environmental Protection Act 1994 operate, there is no need for mandatory public notification in every case and the bill has been drafted to be consistent with that approach in the other two acts.

Both the committee's point of clarification No. 4 and the member for Mackay's dissenting report asked how the IAR process would deal with a project proposing broadscale clearing for agricultural purposes. The environmental effects of broadscale clearing would need to be addressed in an IAR

and considered in the Coordinator-General's evaluation report. The bill requires that the IAR and the Coordinator-General's assessment report must address all environmental effects of a project and that the report is made publicly available. Consequently, the IAR assessment process is accountable and open to scrutiny of the Coordinator-General's evaluation of the potential impacts of any proposal, including broadscale agricultural land development. Furthermore, there will be no departure from the current approach adopted for EIS assessment reports. Such matters are tightly controlled by conditions set by the Coordinator-General.

Point 5 for clarification questions whether the proposed amendments to the Water Resource (Great Artesian Basin) Plan 2006 under part 5 of the bill would result in a reduction in the scrutiny of matters that need to be considered by the Coordinator-General or the chief executive. Currently, the Water Resource (Great Artesian Basin) Plan 2006 allows the Coordinator-General to decide on a project of regional significance. The proposed amendments would transfer decision-making responsibility to the chief executive of the agency administering the Water Act 2000 as well as providing new criteria. The proposed criteria for the chief executive to determine whether a project is regionally significant would not result in a reduction in the scrutiny of matters considered within the Great Artesian Basin catchment. The proposed criteria would differentiate the considerations to those for a project of state significance. The proposed regional significance criteria under part 5 of the bill replicate those for other water resource plans.

I note that the member for Mackay in his dissenting report expressed a number of reservations on behalf of the opposition. I look forward to dealing with some of those issues during the debate in this House later tonight. But one of the reservations was the somewhat ridiculous assertion that this government had not consulted enough and that there was a lack of community support for repealing the Wild Rivers Act. I struggle to remember a more absurd claim being made in this House. Apart from the Queensland Plan consultation process, I do not think that I have ever been involved in or can remember a more detailed and comprehensive consultation process that has been under taken in regard to the Cape York Regional Plan in particular and the Regional Planning Interests Act, which has provided all of the regulation from the Wild Rivers Act.

It has been 2½ years in the consultation where Indigenous communities in particular have been provided with an opportunity to have an input, the likes of which they were never provided under the previous government. They were never consulted about the Wild Rivers Act. They were never consulted about the wild rivers declarations. In fact, those people challenged the declarations under that act in the Federal Court. That was the extent of the consultation.

Members who have been here for a while will remember that time and time again we came back into this House after an election and the government introduced another amendment to the Wild Rivers Act in a pay-off to the left faction for Greens preferences. That is what the Wild Rivers Act was. It was a political football. It was a political convenience for the left of the Labor Party. It had nothing to do at all with the Indigenous communities on the cape. The Indigenous communities on the cape were never consulted, first of all, about the legislation itself when it was introduced or any of those changes that were made that we saw come through this House year after year.

In contrast, when we came to government we made it very clear that we were committed to providing a future for the people on Cape York. We were committed to providing a future for people who did not see a future as they were being regulated.

We put in place a consultation process that involved them directly in a regional planning committee that looked at a regional plan for Cape York that gave them the same ability to have an input into planning decisions as every other Queenslander enjoys. Yet the left of the Labor Party still oppose that. They would rather use the Indigenous people of Cape York as political pay-offs rather than make any sort of attempt to provide them with a reasonable future.

As we did in the other two areas where regional plans have been completed, in the Darling Downs and in Central Queensland, we put in place a regional planning committee that consisted of representatives of all of the Indigenous councils in the cape, as well as the Cook Shire Council. We had in excess of 30 people on the committee. We had a number of formal meetings. More importantly, officers of my department travelled to every single one of those communities and consulted with every single one of them in their own environment.

Mr Mulherin: Did you?

Mr SEENEY: Yes, I did. We eventually released a draft Cape York regional plan which included land use maps which were generated by the government departments using the information that they had. It is a matter of record that those maps were not well received by the communities in Cape York.

What did we do then? We changed it. We listened to the input that the local people provided to us in that consultation process and we changed it. We did exactly what the local people wanted. We did exactly what the local people told us that they wanted us to do in the regional planning committee. We have put in place land use maps which exactly mirror the land use maps in the wild rivers legislation, with one exception: we have added the Steve Irwin Wildlife Reserve to give it the protection that the Labor government would never give it. We have added that. That is the only exception. Otherwise, all of the areas that were regulated under the Wild Rivers Act are now regulated under the Regional Planning Interests Act and the Cape York Regional Plan in a way that gives the local communities an input into their future. For the opposition in this place to somehow conclude that there has not been appropriate consultation is the height of absurdity.

Mr Cripps: And hypocrisy.

Mr SEENEY: The height of absurdity and hypocrisy. I will take the interjection. It is clear that the opposition in this place want to continue the conflict that has characterised these planning decisions, in Cape York in particular, for too long. A very gratifying feature of the process that we have gone through is that there was unanimous support in the regional planning committee for the changes in regulation. There was unanimous support even from the conservation groups that are active in that area and that were represented on that committee. The Labor Party in this parliament are the only people in Queensland who oppose the changes that this bill brings into place. They are the only people in Queensland who oppose the transition of the regulations that were previously in the Wild Rivers Act into a modern planning instrument the same as every other Queenslander has access to. The only people who oppose providing an opportunity for the Indigenous communities on Cape York to have a say in their future, the only people who oppose the opportunity for those people on Cape York to have a real economic future, are the Queensland Labor Party, the members who sit across the chamber. Nobody else opposes it. Nobody else on the regional planning committee opposed it. They worked together over a period of 2½ years of consultation to find a position that everybody supported. Yet the Labor Party come in here and say that the consultation process was not appropriate and they are going to oppose it. It is the height of absurdity. The truth, of course, is that this was a political instrument for the Labor left. The Labor left control the agenda over there and they cannot see past that philosophical blindness.

I have been involved in a lot of processes since I have been a member of this parliament. The consultation process around the Regional Planning Interests Act and the Cape York Regional Plan in particular has, I will suggest, been one of the most gratifying. It has been one of the most gratifying because it has been able to resolve longstanding issues of conflict in a way that has put everybody in a position where they are content with the situation—if not entirely happy, they have been able to compromise and be content with the situation. That was clearly the outcome we achieved with the land use issues on the Darling Downs in regard to the resources industry and the agricultural industry, and it is clearly the outcome that we have been able to achieve in Cape York in relation to the Indigenous communities and their desire to both protect the special environmental areas and to provide themselves and their children and grandchildren with an economic future. To be able to resolve those two longstanding issues of conflict with a piece of legislation and the subsequent regulation has been a very gratifying experience indeed for me, my colleagues in this parliament who represent those areas and the officers in my department. It has been a very gratifying experience indeed. It is a great shame that the Labor Party opposition in this parliament have not had the strength of character to be able to recognise the contribution that has been made by so many people to resolve those conflicts that they created and were never able to resolve.

The bill before the House is the final step in that process. It does not introduce any new elements to that process. Those were introduced with the passage of the Regional Planning Interests Bill and the Regional Planning Interests Regulation, both of which are now gazetted and are law. The bill before the House simply removes the old provisions of the Wild Rivers Act which have been made redundant because of the fact that all of that regulation has been transferred in its entirety into a modern planning instrument. Yet the Labor Party will, I have no doubt, try to make something of an issue of it here tonight. I commend the bill to the House.

Hon. TS MULHERIN (Mackay—ALP) (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (5.27 pm): I rise to contribute to the debate on the State Development, Infrastructure and Planning (Red Tape Reduction) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2014. The opposition will not be supporting this bill which has little to do with its short title of red-tape reduction. The government is convinced that repealing old legislation that has no material impact on businesses counts as cutting red tape. It has an obsession with counting pages of legislation rather than a focus on actual regulatory impost and getting the

balance right between protecting the interests of the community and the businesses to operate. This government rejected the advice of its own Office of Best Practice Regulation not to focus on counting pages of legislation. In its issues paper entitled *Measuring and reducing the burden of regulation,* the Office of Best Practice Regulation advises that—

The number of pages of regulatory Acts and Statutory Rules is considered to be too crude a measure and it is proposed that it not be used …

The Deputy Premier's claim in his introductory speech that this bill is a red-tape reduction bill is incongruous with many aspects of it. The bill is better described as an omnibus accountability reduction bill containing a wide range of amendments to various acts in order to minimise parliamentary scrutiny. It should be noted that this bill was introduced during the budget sitting week with less than a month afforded to the lodgement of submissions to the State Development, Infrastructure and Industry Committee. The committee was also required to report back prior to this sitting week so the bill could be passed in the next available sitting after estimates. As the committee reports at page 4—

The LGAQ expressed to the committee that they were 'disappointed no meaningful discussion or analysis was offered prior to the introduction of the bill given the importance of these matters to the financial sustainability of local government and the resource implications.'

Debate, on motion of Mr Mulherin, adjourned.

MOTION

Social Housing

Mr BYRNE (Rockhampton—ALP) (5.30 pm): I move—

That this House:

- notes that the Newman government has been attacking the rights of public and social housing tenants on multiple fronts since it was elected in March 2012;
- notes that the government's latest attack is forcing ordinary Queenslanders to apply for permission to be absent from their homes for any period;
- condemns this practice as a restriction on a person's freedom of movement within a free and democratic society; and
- calls on the housing minister to immediately rescind this restrictive and discriminatory policy.

It is disappointing but not surprising that I rise in this chamber tonight exactly 756 days after the opposition's first motion against this government regarding its deplorable and callous actions against Queensland public and social housing tenants to once again call on it to stop its arbitrary and insensitive attacks on the most marginalised members of our communities. We thought that things would change and that a new leaf would be turned once the new minister assumed his ministerial responsibilities. Alas, the disruptive and frankly mean attacks continue under the second Minister for Housing, the member for Everton.

Let us take this opportunity to have a bit of a flash back and take a quick look at how this government has taken a wrecking ball to the public housing system in this state. We have seen those opposite, via two successive ministers, instil fear in the public housing community as the government's first act upon being elected was to send out thousands of letters to public housing tenants outlining myriad changes, such as public housing tenants potentially sharing their accommodation, paying extra rent or being forced to move out of their residences. The government has scrapped the garden awards program that was run through the tenant participation program, which was an excellent program that was heavily supported in my electorate. The government has de-funded the long running and successful tenant advisory and advocacy service that provided vital and independent advice and, most importantly, advocacy services to our most marginal constituents. It has made sweeping changes to the Residential Tenancies and Rooming Accommodation Act, virtually creating a two-class rental system, with those residing in public and community housing under stricter conditions than those in the private sector, including new section 290A that allows public housing tenants to be evicted on the mere suspicion of an illegal activity, throwing out the old adage of innocent until proven guilty.

But wait, there is more! And no, it does not include a free set of steak knives, although it very well could as once again the Minister for Housing is flicking knives at the backs of public housing tenants right across Queensland by introducing a further discriminatory policy, the temporary absence

policy. This thought bubble of a policy from the minister is the icing on the cake when it comes to this government. The policy will put a four-week cap on the number of weeks that ordinary Queenslanders residing in public housing can go on holiday. The policy treats our public housing tenants who pay their rent on time, who maintain their properties and who, in most cases, add value to their properties like they are employees of the government who are entitled to only four weeks leave of absence a year. The minister can spin this any way he wants, but his own department's website states, 'The department will consider your request to be absent from the property ... '. The website goes on to state, 'We will advise you of the outcome of your application.' I table that for the benefit of members.

Tabled paper: Queensland government document titled 'Going away from your home' [5631].

This means that ordinary Queenslanders living in public housing will have to go cap in hand, by-your-leave, like serfs to the lord of the manor to request permission to go away. Many tories sitting in this chamber may find that appropriate, but we on this side of the House certainly do not. There is a temporary absence application form. I table a copy of that form for the benefit of the House.

Tabled paper: Queensland government, Department of Housing and Public Works, Temporary Absence Application Form [5632].

At the top, the form states—

This form must can be completed to request permission if you intend to be absent from your Department of Housing and Public Works property for any period of time.

I repeat: 'for any period'. That means that, despite the government's mantra of reducing red tape, public housing tenants will have to fill out a form, drop it off at their local housing office and wait for it to be approved even if they want to go away for only a day or so. What happens if they need to go away on the weekend? Will they be trapped in their home because the housing centre is not open?

This policy is already affecting many ordinary Queenslanders who are law-abiding citizens who pay their rent on time every time. On learning of this ridiculous policy by a so-called compassionate minister, I alerted my constituents to it. I might add that many did not know anything about it, which goes to the lack of communication from the department and the minister to his own tenants. However, I digress. One public housing tenant, in particular, contacted me. She is an 85-year-old woman. I will not mention her name here today, because she is very fearful of retribution from the government and the department. That would never happen in this state with this government, would it? There is no chance that that would happen! For the benefit of the House, I will call her Mary.

I am informed that Mary has been living in public housing for approximately two decades and, by her own admission, states that she does not have long to go. That means that she is wrapped in the mortal coils in which we all live. Mary has an only son and family in the United States and for many years, while living on the pension, she has been saving, paying her rent on time every time, for the airfare to go to the United States. Upon hearing about this policy, Mary did the right thing: she attended the housing office where she was informed that she could go away for only one month instead of the three months that she had planned. After some apparent negotiations, Mary was granted two months leave, but under the proviso that four weeks leave would come out of this current year's allocation and a further four weeks out of the following year's allocation, meaning that technically Mary cannot go anywhere in the year after she comes back from the United States.

This is absolutely disgraceful and ludicrous on so many levels. We need to keep in mind that this will probably be Mary's last opportunity to go overseas and visit her only son and extended family, the department has showed limited compassion, made her reduce the leave from three months to two months and docked her leave from the next year. This new policy is a restriction on a person's freedom of movement within a free and democratic society. There is no way that a tenant living in private rental accommodation would put up with their landlord saying that they can only go away for four weeks a year. The opposition understands that there is a need for rules to be in place to prevent public housing tenants from going away for long periods or on multiple occasions, which is in effect abusing the system. We accept that. However, under the former government there were procedures in place to deal with that situation.

This new policy is just a nail in the coffin of the LNP government and those opposite should be hanging their heads in shame. Guess what? The pensioners who have approached me are the very demographic that supports conservative politics in a majority! The government is attacking its own constituency with this. The member for Everton has been the Minister for Public Works for 625 days but, alas, he is just as out of touch as his predecessor. He talks about working with people on the margins of society as being something that he has been passionate about for many years, but his

actions do not back up those words. He talks the talk, but he does not walk the walk. We need only look at a recent episode of *A Current Affair* where I am informed the minister indicated that the average rental for Brisbane was $420, that the gap between public and private rentals was big and that that needed to be addressed. There is a reason that that gap exists: it is because those in public housing cannot afford to be in the private rental market. That is not rocket science. However, just because they cannot afford to be in the private rental market does not mean that the basic rights that every Queenslander holds dear and is afforded should be taken from them. Public housing tenants are not peasants or serfs. They are not convicts being transported in prison hulks and certainly they are not employees of this government. They are ordinary Queenslanders who go about their business and on the whole pay their rent on time and abide by all the rules.

After massive by-election defeats the Premier has twice promised that he is listening. It is time for the Premier and the minister to really start listening, to stop these inept and moronic attacks on public housing tenants, to stop these restrictive and undemocratic policies being applied which have been specifically targeting a section of the community that does not warrant it and to actually start governing with some grace, humility and dignity.

The first step is to immediately rescind this restrictive and discriminatory temporary absence policy and to start treating our public housing tenants—our ordinary men, women and children and many pensioners who reside in public housing—with the respect that they deserve. I will spell that out for members—r-e-s-p-e-c-t. Perhaps this government might like to start quoting that in some of their legislation and displaying that in some of their actions rather than the draconian and stupid way they are going about things now. I have not heard one minister or one member of this House talk about the effort they should be making with the Commonwealth government to address this shortfall in public housing in Queensland. This government has much to be held accountable for.

Mrs SCOTT (Woodridge—ALP) (5.40 pm): I second the motion moved by the member for Rockhampton. I rise to support the opposition motion. It is hard to believe that we are in the second decade of the 21st century when governments introduce ridiculous requirements such as the temporary absence policy. This is the type of policy that would be more at home in the feudal societies of the Middle Ages. Perhaps it would have been tolerated in the 19th century when significant limitations on civil rights were still in existence in some jurisdictions. But practices such as this one being imposed on ordinary Queenslanders by the Newman government have no place in modern society.

The Newman government has justified its disgraceful temporary absence policy by claiming that public housing tenants are rorting the supposed generosity of the state by leaving their homes absent for long periods of time. The rationale is that by being absent from their home they are somehow ripping off taxpayers.

The LNP believes that public housing tenants should be more grateful for the roof over their heads—so grateful that they should never leave the place. This is patently ridiculous. Yet the temporary absence application form spells out this ridiculousness. The form states that tenants must 'request permission' for 'any period of time'. Imagine if this practice were applied in the wider world. What would the response of landlords be if they had to provide approval every time one of their tenants wanted to spent a night or two visiting family? They would be screaming about the ridiculous amount of red tape they have to fill out to meet the government's requirements.

What if a public housing tenant wants to go to the coast for the weekend? They now have to seek the permission of their landlord—the housing minister—just to have a weekend away. It sounds silly and that is because it is silly. It would not be tolerated in broader society and it should not be tolerated in these circumstances.

As we know, this is a cruel and callous government that is determined to stigmatise public housing tenants. This government has abandoned its responsibility to show compassion towards those in our society who are disadvantaged or marginalised. The Newman government prefers to put profits ahead of people and judges the success of its public housing policy on how much money it can save, not by how many people it can help. This is a very sad position.

But it is part of the systematic degradation of public housing services that are being provided under the Newman government. The government was not satisfied when it tried to evict residents from the low-cost accommodation available in three caravan parks. It was not satisfied when it shut down the advisory service that tenants relied upon if they needed assistance with a housing issue or had a dispute that needed resolving. It still was not satisfied when it raised the income threshold for

tenants, including counting the income earned by children as part of the household income. Now it is restricting the capacity of tenants to determine when and how long they can be absent from their accommodation. It is sickening, particularly when we consider ourselves a free society.

I have just a couple of things regarding my own area. People in public housing no longer feel secure. They feel under siege and others in need are being turned away every day. My office recently had a call from a pregnant mother, a victim of domestic violence, who lost her rental home because her husband had not paid the rent. She now sleeps on the floor of a garage. Her two children sleep in a small crowded bedroom. Upon approaching the department, she was told she is adequately housed, not eligible for an application and sent off to RentConnect.

In conclusion, the temporary absence policy is the Newman government's latest attack on public housing tenants. Labor is calling on the housing minister to immediately rescind this discriminatory practice. All sensible members of this House will support Labor's motion and vote to overturn this silly policy.

Hon. TL MANDER (Everton—LNP) (Minister for Housing and Public Works) (5.45 pm): I move—

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

'notes that the Newman government has made significant progress helping those with the highest needs to be accommodated in social housing, including:

- placing 14,800 households into a social housing property;
- assisting over 5,000 households into a National Rental Affordability Scheme property;
- providing over 50,000 bonds loans and assisting over 9,000 households with RentConnect; and
- as a result the Newman government has reduced the public housing waiting list to under 18,600 from 30,000 under the previous Labor government.

In 2012 the public housing system was a complete and utter basket case. We had a waiting list blow out of over 30,000. There was an incredible increase of 50 per cent in the few years prior to 2012. We had a $100 million a year shortfall in the social housing sector. We had antisocial and destructive behaviour going totally unchecked. We had houses sitting empty for up to a year, with tenants holidaying overseas and, in some cases, serving prison terms.

Over the past 2½ years we have been systematically working through the public housing system to make sure those with the greatest need are those who are housed. Today, as a result of the policies of this government, we have reduced the social housing waiting list by 40 per cent. It is now down to below 18,600. We have implemented the three-strikes policy, which I mentioned today. This has finally made people who do not respect their property or who do not respect their neighbours accountable. The policy is working. We have now introduced a far fairer temporary absence policy.

As I travelled around the state and as I heard from local members, more and more people on the social housing waiting list were frustrated when they saw government property left vacant. They were wondering why that was the case when they were left wallowing on the social housing waiting list, desperately in need of accommodation.

After we did a bit of investigation we found out that the former government's policy was to allow up to 12 months leave. People were able to leave their property vacant for 12 months. A person could be imprisoned and the property would be maintained and held for you for 12 months. They would pay less than $11 per week in rent and they could have a caretaker come and look after the property for them. That was a patently ridiculous policy. That was while we had over 30,000 on the public housing waiting list. Every year hundreds and hundreds of tenants spent between three to 12 months away from their social housing property, with the average being six months. Something had to be done.

The member for Rockhampton mentioned a lady from his area and he used the pseudonym, Mary. Let me tell members a bit of background about Mary. She wants to take another three-month holiday. In the last four years she has spent a total of 12 months travelling overseas. This is a regular occurrence with Mary. It is not something that has just come out now. She is frequently away from her property. This is not about being tough. This is about being fair to those who are on the social housing waiting list and looking to get a place.

It is unfair to the people on the waiting list. It is also unfair to pensioners. Ninety-seven per cent of pensioners are not in the public housing sector. Many of them are on the same amount of money that people in public housing sector are on. Pensioners in the public housing sector are paying an average of $125 a week. Those out in the community are paying double and triple that amount. What do you think they think when they see people in social housing having three, six and nine months leave when they have heavily subsidised rent? This policy is about being fair to those within the system and those outside of the system. It is not about being tough; it is about being fair.

When you get that level of subsidy from the government there are certain conditions that need to apply, and that is all we are doing—making sure that people in public housing understand that there are conditions when you do get heavily subsidised housing. That is the only thing that is fair for those within the system and those outside of it.

(Time expired)

Mr GRANT (Springwood—LNP) (5.50 pm): I am very happy to rise tonight to support the minister's amendment to this motion. I speak from my heart as a person who has represented folk who have lived in public housing for decades throughout their lives. I say to members tonight that I have doorknocked the streets of my division of Logan City Council before being elected to this House and found far too many public houses completely empty. I am talking from firsthand experience, not statistics.

I want to speak to support our policy every day of the week compared to the practices that have been in place over the years under Labor. I would represent neighbours, themselves living in public houses, who could not cope with the behaviours of those antisocial tenants who were just getting off scot-free month in month out, year in year out. Our policies have brought a significant improvement to this type of occurrence and an improvement to the lives of a significantly larger number of public housing tenants than those who misbehave, whereas before under Labor they could just get away with their behaviours week in week out, month in month out.

The statistics speak for themselves with respect to the policies of one strike, two strikes and three strikes—1,277 first strikes, only 291 second strikes and way down to 51 third strikes. That just shows that people are learning that we mean business. They have to bring their behaviours into line with what is reasonable for those who live around them.

I want to speak to the overall effect of our policy. We want to house people. A housed person in a secure tenure is much more able to hold down secure employment than the trauma of those who are not safe and securely housed. I wish to draw attention again to the unbelievably large waiting list under Labor. Yet in our short time in office 14,800 households have been placed in social housing properties. In addition to that, 50,000—50,000—bond loans have been issued.

I want to support our policies and practices over Labor every day of the week. Yes, they can trot out the one-off stories and then the minister brings home the truth—the other half of the story. They can trot out the one-offs, make it sound good for a good show. We are about housing people. We care about the fact that houses are abused and left empty by people off gallivanting who should not rob those who deserve a home, those who are more needy than the person who can have that many holidays over the course of three years whom the minister mentioned. I absolutely support the minister in the notion that this ain't getting tough; this is just being fair—fair to whom? Fair to the broad array of public housing tenants, fair to the people who are waiting to get a public house tenancy.

I wish to share a few pieces of valuable information that could come under the heading of statistics. Under Labor's old policy people could have 12 months off overseas. I ask you: in the real world, in a private enterprise world, how many landlords and how many individuals can afford to have their house sitting vacant? How many tenants could rent a home and just leave it for 12 months? Every year hundreds of tenants took breaks of between three and 12 months. I just want to say that our policy is fair to those Australians right across-the-board who have to subsidise housing tenancies to the tune of approximately $8,000 every year. So my support is 100 per cent behind the minister's amendment.

Mr PITT (Mulgrave—ALP) (5.55 pm): Before I go too far, I want to pick up on the minister's comments that under the previous government housing was a basket case. We had the then shadow Treasurer, Tim Nicholls, talking about the basket case of the economy under the previous government. When he said it was a basket case, we were growing at four per cent. Now we are

growing at three per cent. When he said it was a basket case, unemployment was at 5.5 per cent. That is obviously far better than 6.3 per cent under this government! So whenever I hear the term 'basket case' used by those opposite, forgive me if I get a bit concerned that they might be using it out of context.

As the member for Rockhampton has clearly stated, the government have had an axe to grind against public housing tenants in Queensland ever since they came to office. Whether it was sending what many public housing residents thought were threatening letters to them, indicating a raft of changes to their rental conditions, to selling government owned caravan parks, to axing front-line TAAS services, this government has constantly beaten up on Queensland public housing tenants.

Any thought of a fresh approach, a more compassionate approach, to public housing when we got a new minister was quickly dashed. The minister has continued the tried and true LNP approach of treating public housing tenants like second-class citizens. And there is no greater example to prove this than the minister's new temporary absence policy. As other speakers from the opposition have stated, this policy is bordering on an infringement of the right to free movement in our state. You only have to look at the temporary absence application form to see that people have to 'request permission' when a public housing tenant wants to be away from their property 'for any period of time'. How absurd!

Public housing tenants are ordinary Queenslanders who pay their rent on time, who maintain their properties, who take pride in their homes by spending their savings on gardens, water tanks and even solar panels. They are not second-class citizens. When I first heard of this preposterous policy, I had to check that I had not woken up in King's Landing, with Joffrey Baratheon at the helm, and commoners of the land having to request the permission of the Lannisters to leave for a holiday. This is not *Game of Thrones*! Who is advising you, Minister? Is it Lord Varys?

Public housing tenants are not pieces on a chessboard. They are not playthings of the LNP. They are ordinary Queenslanders who deserve respect and do not deserve to be treated the way that they have been by this arrogant government. What would happen if we came into this place and changed the legislation to empower landlords in the private rental market to insert into a tenant's tenancy agreement that they could only go away from their premises, which they legally pay rent for, for a maximum of four weeks in a calendar year and that they had to seek approval by them at every request? There would be outrage right across Queensland and this would not happen. What the government is doing by this policy is in effect creating a two-class rental market, with those who have to apply to leave their premises and those that are able to come and go as they please without the need to request leave.

The opposition has heard of many disturbing stories across the state, including in my local area, with many public housing tenants who have been saving up for a holiday or a trip to see their relatives for years, but when it comes time for them to go they are being restricted to only four weeks leave. Couple this with the attacks on public housing that have already occurred under this government and the so-called achievement by those opposite that they have reduced the public housing waiting list. In fact, the opposition has heard that there has not been a dramatic increase in placement of people on the public housing waiting list into housing. Indeed, what the government has done is undertaken a massive cleanse of the public housing waiting list, dropping people off the list if they do not contact the department when they write to them asking if they still want to be on the list, or actively discouraging people from applying to go on the public housing waiting list when they visit public housing centres.

What happens if someone does not receive the correspondence? What happens if they have moved or the mail never reaches the person as they are sleeping rough on a friend's or a family member's couch? The person is still in need of housing but will most likely be cut off the list under this government, thus reducing the public housing waiting list on paper but not in reality. Those opposite unfortunately do not understand that public housing tenants are people as well. They are Queenslanders who have families, who pay their taxes and who have a right to travel and see Queensland if they are paying the rent on their properties and not breaking any rules.

The opposition understands that there are some public housing tenants who flout the rules of the system. They may push the boundaries by leaving their properties for extensive periods of time, and they should be dealt with accordingly. However, the LNP's temporary absence policy has not been thought through properly and will affect every single public housing tenant in Queensland as they will need to request permission to leave their properties, even for an overnight stay.

I join my colleagues in condemning the Newman government's actions on public housing tenants and I call on the minister to rescind his temporary absence policy immediately to ensure that public housing tenants are treated with the dignity that they deserve. We should not forget that, of the people who are in public housing in Queensland, a large percentage are people with a disability, seniors or people with mental health concerns. These are people who need our support, housing stability and some flexibility, not the arrogance of this Newman government.

Mr PUCCI (Logan—LNP) (6.00 pm): I rise to speak against the private member's motion moved by the opposition and support the amendments of the minister. In just two years this government has put runs on the board when it comes to helping those with the highest need in social housing. Now 14,800 more households have a roof over their head thanks to a social housing property. A total of 5,000 households have been assisted through the National Rental Affordability Scheme. There have been 50,000 bond loans to those most in need and over 9,000 households have been assisted by RentConnect. As a result, the Newman government has reduced the public housing waiting list to under 18,600, nearly a 40 per cent reduction from the 30,000 who were on the list under the previous Labor government—under the bad old days of the previous Labor government.

Our track record shows that this government's policy on social housing is not about getting tough; it is about getting fair. Under Labor's old, unfair policy, properties sat vacant for up to a year because tenants were either on extended holidays or possibly serving prison terms. These houses are there to support the most vulnerable members of our society. They do no-one any good sitting there empty, idle or unused. But Labor, the 'no position' party, would have us return to the policy that saw hundreds and hundreds of tenants every year taking breaks of up to 12 months and were away for an average of six months. Labor left the public housing system in a shambles. The waiting list for housing had blown out to over 30,000 households many of whom were homeless or at risk of homelessness. Under this government's new policy, public housing tenants are entitled to take up to four weeks holiday each year. However, longer absences can be approved on a case-by-case basis for other things like health issues, domestic violence or family crisis.

These are the facts. In my area of Logan, the waiting list has dropped by 50 per cent since the LNP government was elected, but there are still more than 1,200 households on the waiting list. Maybe if properties were not sitting there empty for up to 12 months we would not have women sleeping in garages with their children racked up in the rooms together. The majority of those people are on exactly the same kind of low incomes as those who are in public housing. How do you think they feel when they see houses sitting there empty for months on end? Public housing tenancies are subsidised to the tune of $8,000 a year. The average public housing rent in Logan is about $134 per week. The median private rent is about $335 per week—a big difference. The overwhelming majority of pensioners do not live in public housing. Is it too much to expect Labor to have compassion for pensioners struggling just to keep a roof over their head in the private market? Instead, those opposite are more worried about making sure that people who are already receiving taxpayers' subsidised housing can take good, long holidays whenever they feel like it. The Logan City Council website says that Logan is home to 300,000 people from more than 215 cultures with 50 per cent of residents under the age of 30, a young city. It is a city with a large growth area such as in areas like Yarrabilba, the greater Flagstone area, Greenbank and Park Ridge. With such large growth in Logan happening so quickly, residents want to be assured that any social initiative includes systems that improve tenant outcomes, protect vulnerable tenants and enhance confidence for persons including investors and financiers who have dealings with registered community providers.

We have heard the minister tell us that, under the three-strike policy, there have been 1,277 first strikes issued to occupants of public housing. But then there has been a dramatic reduction in repeat offenders with only 25 per cent of those receiving a second strike, and only 51 of those 1,277 people who were issued a first strike received three strikes. A small minority of people were giving people who need the most help with social housing a bad name. This government is about being fair and helping the people most in need when it comes to public housing. I support the minister's amendment to the motion.

Hon. A PALASZCZUK (Inala—ALP) (Leader of the Opposition) (6.05 pm): I rise to support the motion moved by the member for Rockhampton, which notes the constant attacks by the Newman LNP government on Queensland's public housing tenants and calls on the minister to immediately rescind the restrictive and discriminatory new temporary absence policy. This new policy clearly demonstrates, once again, how out of touch this government is and how it is simply incapable of listening. This is a discriminatory practice. This should be torn up immediately and thrown into the waste bin.

I joined the Labor Party because of its values: the values of the Labor Party in relation to equality, opportunity and fairness. What does that equality mean? It means that no matter your background, where you are from, your position in life or where you work, you are treated equally. I joined the Labor Party because I believe in fairness, that people in this state should be treated with dignity and respect. Over the last two years I have seen no humility, I have seen little dignity and I have seen no respect.

I represent the seat of Inala. The seat of Inala has a large social housing component. I meet people all the time in my electorate—

Government members: Do you live there?

A government member: You don't live there.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Here we go, the arrogance is starting again. Members opposite are not listening. These people are proud people. They are proud people who go to work to earn a decent wage and they do not need to be treated like second-class citizens. This is retrograde; it is discriminatory. I encourage anyone in social housing to go in and see your LNP member and raise your concerns directly with them.

Last Friday I was out visiting Marguerite. She has had a tough life. If she wants to go and visit a sick relative or care for someone, she now has to go in and apply for that leave. That is not the same policy that is applied in the private rental market. People in social housing deserve respect. They deserve to be treated with compassion because they need a helping hand. This policy sets the benchmark about what Labor stands for and what the LNP stands for. Every day I will stand up for people in social housing who are doing it tough, who are paying their rent and who are doing the right thing. Now we have a government that wants to restrict their freedom of movement, a basic fundamental right. It is good that they are all hanging their heads in shame because it is a disgraceful policy. The housing minister—and people had high hopes for him—should hang his head in shame because it is disrespectful and the policy needs to be abandoned immediately.

I think that this says a lot about the LNP and their hypocrisy: they say that they will listen, but they are incapable of listening. After the Redcliffe by-election they said, 'We are going to listen more.' We heard it again most recently after the Stafford by-election, 'Yes, we are going to listen more. We will make a few changes here and there.' Madam Speaker, it is all smoke and mirrors. This government is incapable of change, and this restrictive and discriminatory new temporary absence policy should be abandoned. There is no way that any decent person in this state would support what this government has done. Deputy Premier, here is your next challenge if you want to listen: tear up this policy and treat people with the dignity and respect they deserve—

(Time expired)

Hon. TE DAVIS (Aspley—LNP) (Minister for Communities, Child Safety and Disability Services) (6.10 pm): Madam Speaker, this government is committed to a fair public housing system that means accommodation is available for those who need it most when they need it most. Our government has made some significant progress, and the excellent work of Minister Mander has resulted in reducing the long-term social housing waiting list by 39 per cent across the state. In my own area in the northern suburbs of Brisbane the waitlist has decreased by 41 per cent—not as much as Logan, but it is still an amazing result. Well done, Minister Mander. However, there is still more to be done. There are still around 18,000 vulnerable Queensland families doing it tough who are waiting to access social housing, and this government has made the right changes to make public housing fairer for these vulnerable families to access.

Under the Labor system, public housing tenants could be away from their home for up to a year without putting their tenancy at risk, and this simply is not fair to those 18,000 households who are waiting to get into a home. To address this unfair situation the government changed the policy to cap absences from the property at up to four weeks in a calendar year. Of course if the person has a legitimate reason for an extension to the four weeks, like going into hospital for an extended period of time, alternate arrangements can be made on a case-by-case basis. This policy is about ensuring that public housing tenants are actually residing in the public housing to which they have access.

I have met some of those people who may want to access accommodation. When I had the homelessness portfolio before the MOG changes early in my term I visited Kurilpa Point Park, where I met a number of homeless young people who were looking for sustainable accommodation. They told me that they were looking for housing so they could look ahead and get their life back on track, but

they could not do that because every day they were looking for another couch to sleep on. These young people were homeless for a number of reasons: some had mental health problems; some had family conflicts so they could not stay at home; some had substance abuse problems—but the one thing that all of these young people had in common was that they needed to access sustainable affordable housing.

Another area of my portfolio where vulnerable Queenslanders are trying to access affordable housing is in the area of domestic and family violence. The decision to leave a dangerous relationship is a very difficult one, and it is made even more difficult when the victim has nowhere to live outside of that abusive family home. In fact, it can often be the inhibiting factor in making the decision to leave. If I could just take a moment to share a story about a woman that I met in my electorate who had made that very brave decision to leave an abusive and unsafe relationship. I was at one of my community corner booths on a Saturday morning when a lady and her four children pulled up in a white Pajero in a very desperate situation: this lady and her children had been living out of the car and had no place to go. She had tried to get into the private rental market but, being a single mum with four kids in a tight rental market, it was proving very difficult for her to get a house. Stories like these really reinforce that public housing should be available to help vulnerable Queenslanders like this mum through difficult times; it is about having households available for those who need it most when they need it most. It is about giving them that hand up rather than a handout. Sadly, some of these stories of domestic violence are all too common, and I am very excited that Minister Mander's department is trialling a Housing Assistance Triage Service on the Gold Coast to further assist vulnerable Queenslanders such as victims of domestic and family violence to access social housing sooner.

This government's strong plan for a brighter future is all about putting real people in real homes. We are making public housing fairer and assisting vulnerable Queenslanders to access vital services such as housing sooner so that we can make Queensland the safest place to live, work and raise a family.

Ms TRAD (South Brisbane—ALP) (6.15 pm): It has been said here tonight in this debate that the true test of a civilised society is how it treats its most vulnerable citizens. Let me put on the record that this government is treating the most vulnerable and at-risk people in our community with utter disrespect and contempt. I would also say from the outset that I was very interested to hear the member for Logan get up and talk about the success of a whole range of programs that were established, funded and initiated by former federal and state Labor governments to address the issue of homelessness in this country and this state. I notice that the member for Logan did not acknowledge in any way, shape or form the contribution of any of the previous Labor governments that were responsible for those fantastic programs like NRAS or RentConnect. While we are at it, one of the first things that this government did was to abolish TAAS(Q). That was the most outrageous decision that any government could make in terms of helping at-risk Queenslanders who faced being kicked out of private rental accommodation and into the streets. The first thing that this government did was cut assistance to keep them in their homes in private rental accommodation. The reason why they are cutting the waiting list is because they are just cutting people off the waiting list. The reason why the waiting list is being reduced is because you are just taking people off of it. It does not mean that their needs have gone away; it means that you are just scratching them off the list. It is reprehensible!

Let's talk about this temporary absence policy. The minister likes to use a couple of examples to illustrate what is happening across-the-board in terms of public housing, and that is an absolute outright misrepresentation of what is going on. Let me give you some examples. Since this policy has come on board I have never had so many public housing tenants come into my office who are completely distressed and anxious about whether or not they are going to be kicked out of their public housing accommodation. One family needed to go overseas for five weeks to tend to a family member who has since died, and they were put through the hoops and treated disrespectfully before they could travel overseas. This policy is the framework with which to put them down and make them feel like dirt. As the opposition leader said, this is a free country where people are entitled to freedom of movement. This government is saying, 'If you expect to be in public housing, you are accountable to us and all of your movements have to be accountable to us.' That is an absolute disgrace!

Another example is a constituent of mine who is an elder, and every year he goes to country to pass on traditions and work with local Indigenous youth. He is a very elderly man, and he was completely and utterly out of his mind with anxiety because of the way that he was treated by this policy. This policy is completely and utterly shameful. It is outrageous, but this is completely and

utterly the way that this government treats Queenslanders. Another woman was put in social housing after being abused in her home. After spending some time in social housing she found a part-time job, had enrolled in adult education courses and was getting her life back on track. This lady had paid her rent on time, and now she is being told that because she is a model social housing tenant, she needs to leave because social housing in this state is transitionary and it is up to the department to decide when she is ready to leave.

This is happening. This is what the minister needs to be aware of. This is outrageous. The minister will create more at-risk Queenslanders because of exactly these policies. You want to abolish TAAS(Q), you want to force people out of social housing before they are ready and you basically want to take social housing away from people if they are trying to live a life that is not within your parameters. It is a disgrace.

Hon. DF CRISAFULLI (Mundingburra—LNP) (Minister for Local Government, Community Recovery and Resilience) (6.20 pm): I am very glad to be able to make a contribution to the debate of the motion. I should start by saying that I have listened to each and every speech this evening. I am not going to do the other side a disservice and for one moment say that there has been anything but compassion in what they have said, but I honestly believe that the compassion is misdirected. I say that because it is easy when you are dealing with an issue to see it through only one prism, but I ask people to view the issue through another prism—that is, the one of the person who will never be able to have a roof over their head because of somebody who is abusing the privilege of having that right. I say with the utmost sincerity that I believe that there is sincerity in what is being said but it is misdirected and it is misguided. Good government is about being able to look at an entire issue, not just picking one part of the issue.

What those opposite call tough I call fair and balanced. The minister has struck a very good balance on this issue. It is about achieving outcomes, not about numbers. That has been the hallmark of his time as minister. You can chop it up any way you like, but under the administration of the member for Everton, more progress has been made in a short period of time than we saw in this state over a long time. As someone with a strong social conscience that makes me very happy, because fewer people will spend a night couch surfing, or spend a night on the floor of a relative's house or spend a night telling their kids that maybe the next night will be the one they are not spending in the back seat of their car. The majority of pensioners and battlers are not in public housing.

I will take a minute to quickly go through some of the contributions made to the debate tonight. The member for Inala spoke about the high percentage of public housing tenants in her electorate. I share a similar story in my electorate. In fact, the suburb of Vincent has a very high proportion of public housing tenants, and they are proud of that.

Ms Palaszczuk: They know what you are doing.

Mr CRISAFULLI: Member for Inala, I have spent a lot of time in that area, and they do know what I am doing. When a person comes to me complaining about a public housing matter and I know that their complaint is not based on fact but on a value judgement, I will always push back. But where there are people who are abusing the right, I will stand shoulder to shoulder with the neighbour who is being put through hell and with the person who will never have the right to live in that home because someone is abusing the privilege. Again, I do not doubt the compassion of the member for Inala on the issue one iota, but I do believe that it is misguided.

The member for South Brisbane spoke about waiting lists and said that somehow the waiting list is not a good barometer. It is the same waiting list that you were judged by. The guidelines are the same. Therefore, the minister's progress must be viewed in that regard and he must be commended.

You will have to excuse me for a second, Madam Speaker, but I have to say that the contribution of the member for Rockhampton was an own goal of the biggest proportions. He turned around and put it past the goalkeeper in the pigeonhole. He raised an issue concerning a lady named Mary. Unfortunately, the minister had done a little bit more homework. It turns out that Mary has been away for a year of the last four years, including an eight-month stint overseas. Hats off to the minister, who did more research than the bloke who asked the question from the adviser, who loaded the bullet. With the greatest of respect, I suggest that if somebody is capable of being overseas for eight months then that house would be best used helping somebody put a roof over their head.

In closing, public housing is not a holiday home where you can live between multiple places. I have many examples in my electorate of this happening, and the result has been either a place that has been vacant and caused to be overrun with vermin and debris or a place that people have used as a drop-in. We have made great progress. This is another step on the journey towards equality for those living in social housing.

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

AYES, 69:

LNP, 67—Barton, Bates, Bennett, Berry, Bleijie, Boothman, Cavallucci, Choat, Costigan, Cox, Crandon, Cripps, Crisafulli, Davies, T Davis, Dempsey, Dillaway, Dowling, Elmes, Emerson, Flegg, France, Frecklington, Gibson, Grant, Grimwade, Gulley, Hart, Hobbs, Holswich, Johnson, Kaye, Kempton, King, Krause, Langbroek, Latter, Maddern, Malone, Mander, McArdle, McVeigh, Menkens, Millard, Minnikin, Molhoek, Newman, Nicholls, Ostapovitch, Powell, Pucci, Rickuss, Ruthenberg, Seeney, Shorten, Shuttleworth, Smith, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stewart, Symes, Trout, Walker, Watts, Woodforth, Young.

PUP, 1—Douglas.

INDEPENDENTS, 1—Wellington.

NOES, 8:

ALP, 8—Byrne, Lynham, Miller, Mulherin, Palaszczuk, Pitt, Scott, Trad.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Madam SPEAKER: For any future divisions on this issue, the bells will ring for one minute.

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

AYES, 69:

LNP, 68—Barton, Bates, Bennett, Berry, Bleijie, Boothman, Cavallucci, Choat, Costigan, Cox, Crandon, Cripps, Crisafulli, Davies, T Davis, Dempsey, Dickson, Dillaway, Dowling, Elmes, Emerson, Flegg, France, Frecklington, Gibson, Grant, Grimwade, Gulley, Hart, Hobbs, Holswich, Johnson, Kaye, Kempton, King, Krause, Langbroek, Latter, Maddern, Malone, Mander, McArdle, McVeigh, Menkens, Millard, Minnikin, Molhoek, Newman, Nicholls, Ostapovitch, Powell, Pucci, Rickuss, Ruthenberg, Seeney, Shorten, Shuttleworth, Smith, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stewart, Symes, Trout, Walker, Watts, Woodforth, Young.

PUP, 1—Douglas.

NOES, 9:

ALP, 8—Byrne, Lynham, Miller, Mulherin, Palaszczuk, Pitt, Scott, Trad.

INDEPENDENTS, 1—Wellington.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Motion, as agreed—

That this House notes that the Newman government has made significant progress helping those with the highest needs to be accommodated in social housing, including:

- placing 14,800 households into a social housing property;
- assisting over 5,000 households into a National Rental Affordability Scheme property;
- providing over 50,000 bonds loans and assisting over 9,000 households with RentConnect; and
- as a result the Newman government has reduced the public housing waiting list to under 18,600 from 30,000 under the previous Labor government.

Sitting suspended from 6.33 pm to 7.30 pm.

COMMITTEE OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

Auditor-General's Reports, Referral to Portfolio Committee; Portfolio Committees, Reporting Dates

Mr STEVENS (Mermaid Beach—LNP) (Leader of the House) (7.30 pm): I advise the House of determinations made by the Committee of the Legislative Assembly at its meeting today. The committee has resolved that, pursuant to standing order 194B, the Auditor-General's report to parliament No. 18 of 2013-14 titled *Monitoring and reporting performance* be referred to the Finance and Administration Committee for consideration and the Auditor-General's report to parliament No. 1

of 2014-15 titled *Results of audits: internal control systems 2013-14* be referred to the Finance and Administration Committee for consideration. The committee has also resolved pursuant to standing order 136 that the Health and Community Services Committee report on the Family Responsibilities Commission Amendment Bill by 1 October 2014 and to vary the time for the State Development, Infrastructure and Industry Committee to report on the Liquid Fuel Supply (Ethanol) Amendment Bill from 3 October 2014 to 24 October 2014.

SPEAKER'S RULING

Same Question Rule

Madam SPEAKER: Honourable members, standing order 87 provides the general rule of Westminster parliamentary practice that once the House has resolved a matter in the affirmative or negative the same question shall not again be proposed in the same session. Similarly, standing order 150 provides for the application of the same question rule in relation to amendments, new clauses or schedules of a bill. It states—

No amendment, new clause or schedule to a Bill shall be at any time moved which is substantially the same as one already negatived by the House, or which is inconsistent with one that has already been agreed to by the House, unless there has been an order of the House to reconsider the Bill.

As I and previous Speakers have noted, the matters do not have to be identical but merely the same in substance as the previous matter. In other words, it is a question of substance, not form.

The member for Yeerongpilly introduced the Criminal Code (Cheating at Gambling) Amendment Bill on 31 October 2013 and the Criminal Code (Looting in Declared Areas) Amendment Bill on 13 February 2014. The Attorney-General and Minister for Justice introduced the Criminal Law Amendment Bill on 8 May 2014. The bill deals with a variety of matters but relevantly includes matters dealt with in the member for Yeerongpilly's bills. The relevant provisions of the Criminal Law Amendment Bill and the Criminal Code (Cheating at Gambling) Amendment Bill introduce offences in relation to match fixing or cheating, albeit with different language. In substance, the Criminal Code (Cheating at Gambling) Amendment Bill seeks to deal with the same issues as clauses 25 and 30 of the Criminal Law Amendment Bill. Therefore, the same question rule is enlivened. The relevant provisions of the Criminal Law Amendment Bill and the Criminal Code (Looting in Declared Areas) Amendment Bill seek to ensure that looting in a declared area for disaster situations falls under punishment in special cases under the Criminal Code. In substance, the Criminal Code (Looting in Declared Areas) Amendment Bill seeks the same outcome as clauses 29 and 53 of the Criminal Law Amendment Bill. Therefore, the same question is enlivened.

As the House has passed the Criminal Law Amendment Bill, the same question rule is enlivened in relation to the member for Yeerongpilly's bills. Therefore, under standing order 87, the Criminal Code (Cheating at Gambling) Amendment Bill and the Criminal Code (Looting in Declared Areas) Amendment Bill cannot proceed and are discharged from the *Notice Paper*. The referral of the Criminal Code (Looting in Declared Areas) Amendment Bill to the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee is also consequently discharged.

STATE DEVELOPMENT, INFRASTRUCTURE AND PLANNING (RED TAPE REDUCTION) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Resumed from p. 2394, on motion of Mr Seeney—

That the bill be now read a second time.

Hon. TS MULHERIN (Mackay—ALP) (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (7.34 pm), continuing: It was similarly noted that a large number of submissions had expressed disappointment with the lack of public policy discussion around the repeal of the Wild Rivers Act 2005 and concerns were expressed with the lack of consultation on proposed party house provisions. At this point I want to acknowledge the work of the parliamentary staff and the chair, the member for Gympie, for their work in making recommendations and points of clarification to improve this bill. This bill will introduce a new layer of regulation for party houses which the opposition contends has been rushed and improperly thought through. The government would have been far better served by taking the time to get these amendments right. This bill also introduces a far more complicated and less transparent regulatory

framework for our state's wild rivers through their replacement with strategic environmental areas. The opposition does not support this bill and in particular clause 95 which repeals the Wild Rivers Act 2005. As the State Development, Infrastructure and Industry Committee report notes at page 28—

> Approximately 80 per cent of the submissions received on the Bill opposed the repeal of the Wild Rivers Act 2005.

Not only does this repeal not have community support, but it also represents another broken election promise by the Newman LNP government. Before the election the current environment minister said that the LNP had no plans to repeal or replace any of the wild river declarations in Western Queensland. The Newman government then announced it was breaking this promise within six months of the election. Significant concerns have been expressed in submissions in relation to the repeal of the Wild Rivers Act. The North Queensland Conservation Council states in its submission—

> The alternative 'Strategic Environmental Area' ... approach to rivers protection in Queensland being put forward by the government is too weak in its approach to restricting mining and other destructive development in sensitive river areas, and loses the capacity under Wild Rivers to ensure comprehensive management of whole river systems.

Similarly, the Wilderness Society in its submission states—

> The Bill will in our view lead to the removal of vital river protections that have been in place in Queensland for the past ten years, even though the case for such removal has not been successfully made, and the alternatives currently proposed are weak, complex and lack transparency.

The Environmental Defenders Office in its submission also states that—

> ... the RPI Act has a lower standard of protection than the Wild Rivers Act.

Despite questioning from the opposition, no reassurance has been provided in relation to the ability of the department to amend the boundaries of strategic environmental areas unilaterally with no prior public consultation. This approach contrasts with that under the Wild Rivers Act 2005 under which a wild river declaration, including relevant maps, is a statutory document. The department also advised in response to opposition questioning that there was no specific internal process for amending the maps of strategic environmental areas. The strategic environmental areas maps can be amended internally by the department and on request with no prior public notification. The lack of any specific internal process for managing requests for amendments to strategic environmental areas provides no certainty to communities across Queensland and there is no reason why the government could not have followed the same model of enshrining maps in the legislation in order to provide certainty. The refusal of the government to contemplate including maps of wild rivers in legislation contrasts with the government's legislation of mining lease maps provided by the sandmining company Sibelco in the North Stradbroke Island Protection and Sustainability and Another Amendment Act. If a mining company contributes in electoral support to the LNP at the 2012 election, it seems that it can get its maps of mining lease areas enshrined in legislation at the expense of local native title holders. However, when it comes to the Indigenous people in Cape York, no maps protecting wild rivers can be enshrined in legislation according to the government.

What do the maps of strategic environmental areas currently detail? They detail a significant reduction in environmental protection, just as concerned stakeholders had feared. The wild rivers as originally declared covered 34.6 per cent of the state, or more than 59 million hectares including declarations at Cape York, Cooper Creek, the Georgina and Diamantina rivers, Fraser Island, Hinchinbrook and the gulf rivers. After the Federal Court decision on 17 June 2014, the total wild rivers area across the state was still 33.5 per cent, or more than 57 million hectares. Under the maps of replacement strategic environmental areas proposed by this bill, the area protected will fall to 9.3 per cent of the state, or less than 16 million hectares. That means that, following the passage of this bill, 41 million hectares, or 24 per cent of the state, will no longer be protected as part of wild rivers areas.

The bill is not merely transitioning wild rivers into a new regulatory framework as claimed by the government; it is about a significant watering down of environmental protection across Queensland. This information was not detailed anywhere in the explanatory notes accompanying this bill. The opposition only has access to these figures because of questions taken on notice by the department during hearings of the State Development, Infrastructure and Industry Committee. The department also advised that the government decided not to consult separately on the strategic environmental areas that will replace wild rivers. That follows a refusal by the Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection to release submissions on the revocation of wild river declarations. The minister will not release the submissions, because they will show what the submissions on this bill demonstrated—that there are many, including Indigenous communities, who do not support the repeal of the Wild Rivers Act 2005 or the removal of environmental protections over nearly a quarter of the state. That is

not to say that this land was locked up, but merely that there was a process whereby local communities would be involved in decision making as to what economic development would proceed in their local area.

It is important to place on record the reasons the opposition did not initially vote against the establishment of the strategic environmental areas in the Regional Planning Interests Bill 2013. At the time that legislation was passed, the opposition had no access to the accompanying regulation that details how strategic environmental areas are to be determined. I made this position clear in my speech during the second reading debate, discussing at length the request from submissions ranging from AgForce and the Queensland Farmers Federation to the Queensland Exploration Council and the Planning Institute of Australia for the regulation to be considered alongside the framework legislation. As I said during that debate—

> While I welcome the Deputy Premier tabling draft regulations during the second reading debate, this simply does not provide enough time for the opposition to review and consult on these regulations for the purpose of debating this bill. As such, the opposition reserves its right to publicly oppose, after the passage of the bill, any part of this bill that enlivens powers in these regulations that are not in the interests of landholders, environmental protection and regional communities or, conversely, imposes unreasonable demands and red tape on the resource sector.

After being afforded the opportunity to review the Regional Planning Interests Regulation 2014, the opposition is not able to support the strategic environmental area framework as it is an inadequate replacement of the Wild Rivers Act 2005. Queensland Labor takes the protection of pristine waterways seriously. We also recognise that many of our pristine waterways are in areas where there are high Indigenous populations, such as Cape York and the Gulf of Carpentaria. That means that the regulations protecting pristine waterways are felt disproportionately by traditional owners. Therefore, we are cognisant of the need to work closely with traditional owners in developing those protections. That is why the opposition undertook extensive consultation in relation to the repeal of the Wild Rivers Act 2005 and in light of the High Court decision to invalidate the wild river declarations for the Archer, Stewart and Lockhart rivers. It should be noted that these court decisions changed the wild declaration areas from 34.6 per cent to 33.5 per cent of the state, whereas this bill will see the area go down to 9.3 per cent of the state.

The Leader of the Opposition, the Manager of Opposition Business, the member for South Brisbane and I met with a number of interested parties to discuss this issue. The week after the estimates hearings we travelled to Cairns to meet with the Balkanu Cape York Development Corporation, the Carpentaria land council and Far North Queensland conservation groups, including the Australian Conservation Foundation and the Cairns and Far North Environment Centre. We had also planned to travel to Lockhart River to talk directly with affected traditional owners. However, we changed those plans at the request of Mayor Wayne Butcher after a death in the community. We extend our sympathies to the Lockhart River community and we hope to visit the community in the near future. Opposition members have also consulted with traditional owners and graziers from the western Channel Country and the Wilderness Society. We conducted this consultation because, unlike the Newman government, we understand the benefits that consultation brings. It delivers better policy outcomes and gives communities and stakeholders a sense of ownership over the decision-making process.

Despite differing views on the value of the Wild Rivers Act 2005, the people to whom we spoke praised the consultation process under that framework. Numerous stakeholders also expressed to us their disappointment with the consultation conducted by the government in regard to the regional planning framework. It is evident that the Deputy Premier's consultation process has been designed deliberately to exclude interested parties. This will result in ongoing acrimony and division over this issue.

It is already obvious that this government does not care about the views of traditional owners that clash with their own. The wild rivers declarations in the gulf have never been the source of any controversy and are supported by traditional owners and the Carpentaria land council. The wild rivers declarations in the western Channel Country were welcomed by traditional owners, graziers and the wider community. When Labor introduced the wild rivers framework, it was never envisaged that Cooper Creek and the Diamantina and Georgina rivers would be declared. However, after calls from the community and conservation groups, the framework was flexible enough to allow them to be declared. Indeed, the declarations in western Queensland were so popular that the LNP promised that it would not touch them prior to the 2012 election.

Labor acknowledges that the declaration of the Archer, Stewart and Lockhart rivers did not have widespread community support, particularly among traditional owners, and that would have been desirable. We recognise and respect the Federal Court decision that invalidated them. However,

it is sheer arrogance for this government to conclude that the controversy over those three river systems invalidates the entire wild rivers framework. The government has been presented with clear evidence that the framework has support among traditional owners in the gulf and Channel Country. Despite that continued support, it is disappointing that the government has chosen to make a political point by repealing the entire legislation.

Another concerning part of this bill is the establishment of the new impact assessment report, or IAR process. Clause 29 of the bill will amend section 26 of the State Development and Public Works Organisation Act 1971 to allow a coordinated project to go through an IAR process instead of requiring an environmental impact statement, or EIS. Under existing section 26 of the act, the Coordinator-General can declare a coordinated project exempt from an EIS process only if the Coordinator-General is satisfied that there is an appropriate environmental assessment under another act such as the Sustainable Planning Act 2009 or the Environmental Protection Act 1999. Moreover, the Coordinator-General cannot exempt a coordinated project from the EIS process if it involves broadscale clearing for agricultural purposes. This bill will remove that requirement and replace it with an IAR process whereby the proponent will be required to notify in a draft IAR if a development approval under the Sustainable Planning Act or an environmental approval under the Environmental Protection Act or any other approval is required.

These amendments also leave the decision over whether a coordinated project is exempt from the EIS process at the discretion of the Coordinator-General if satisfied the environmental effects of the project do not, having regard to their scale and extent, require assessment through the EIS process. The criteria for determining whether a project will go through an IAR process is vague and not directly linked to the Coordinator-General being satisfied that there is another appropriate environmental approval process under separate legislation for the coordinated project as exists currently.

The opposition supports the point of clarification from the committee as to whether the criteria for declaring a coordinated project for which an IAR is required should be more prescriptive. The opposition is also concerned with the proposed section 34H of the bill as introduced that left the public notification process for a draft IAR at the discretion of the Coordinator-General. The Environmental Defender's Office argued in its submission that the IAR provisions are 'essentially a weaker, less transparent, less accountable process than the EIS process by removing public notification and input into the draft terms of reference and the draft EIS'. Amendment 16 to be moved during consideration in detail does not appear to address this issue as the Coordinator-General's decision for a draft IAR to be publicly notified remains discretionary. For these reasons the opposition is unable to support the establishment of the draft IAR process at clause 29.

The State Development, Infrastructure and Industry Committee has sensibly recommended that the party house provisions in this bill be reviewed within 12 months of commencement. However, the opposition believes that these provisions are so unworkable and impractical in their current form that they should be referred back to the committee for further work. As the department advised the committee—

> It is acknowledged that the 'party house' definition may be circumvented if an owner or an operator of the premise ensures that the use of the premise is for more than 10 days. This issue, combined with a lack of enforcement powers, will make it very challenging for local governments to make these laws workable.

The opposition supports the committee's recommendation 3 that the Deputy Premier clarifies in his second reading that the intent of the provisions in this bill are not to exclude financing costs from being recouped by an infrastructure expenses recoupment charge. I note the Deputy Premier has expressed some views that go some way to clarifying this position. At the end of the day it is the definition around what is fair that concerns local government when trying to recoup these financing costs. The opposition has been contacted by a local government that is concerned at being left with the tab for financing costs. It has been further requested that consideration be given to amending section 116B at clause 17 to make it explicit that financing costs can be recovered. I ask that the Deputy Premier further consider amending section 116B as it would provide a greater level of certainty for local government. The opposition has also received representation from local government in relation to its ability to recover their infrastructure costs incurred in a priority development area. This was also the first point of clarification from the committee. It is entirely reasonable for local governments to ask for certainty in relation to the recovery of their costs in a priority development area which the bill, as introduced, failed to provide. Amendment 2 to be moved during the consideration in detail will make amendments to clarify that a charging entity can be a local government via a rates notice. I welcome this amendment.

The LGAQ has also raised concerns with clauses 5 and 6 of this bill which allows for a provisional priority development area to be declared which is inconsistent with a relevant local government's planning scheme. It is interesting to note that since the passage of the Economic Development Bill 2012 no provisional priority development areas have been declared. The LGAQ submission states that the rationale for this amendment is insufficient. The LGAQ seeks detailed justification as to why it is necessary to allow PPDAs that are inconsistent with a local planning instrument and community expectations. The amendments contrast with the commitments made by the LNP at the election that it was going to 'work with councils to create a more efficient council-led planning and development assessment system' and that 'an LNP government will cut unnecessary bureaucratic requirements and interference from state government'. The opposition shares the concerns of the LGAQ in relation to these new powers and notes that they conflict with the LNP's pre-election promises to empower local government as well as the Premier's criticism of the previous urban land development area model.

To conclude, the opposition is unable to support this bill primarily because of the repeal of the Wild Rivers Act 2005. We are also unable to support the new IAR process in this bill and have strong reservations with new powers to declare provisional priority development areas that are inconsistent with relevant local planning schemes. I ask that the Deputy Premier consider further amendments to section 116B at clause 17 to provide local government with greater certainty in relation to recovering their financing costs from an infrastructure expenses recoupment charge. The opposition further contends that party house provisions in this bill, while well intended, are unworkable in their current form and should go back to the committee for further work. It is disappointing that the Deputy Premier has decided to throw out the entire Wild Rivers Act without at least looking to retain the best parts of it, including the inclusion of maps in declarations as statutory documents that provide certainty to the community. Unlike this government, the Labor Party will consult and work with local communities across the state to strike the right balance between economic development and the protection of our state wild rivers.

Mr GIBSON (Gympie—LNP) (7.56 pm): I rise to make a contribution on the State Development, Infrastructure and Planning (Red Tape Reduction) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. Having personally great respect for the member for Mackay, I cannot help but note that somehow he missed the intent of this bill. If you were to listen to the Labor Party, this bill is all about the revocation of wild rivers. The majority of the member's time was spent bemoaning the fact that we were revoking wild rivers, despite the fact that we had a clear mandate to do that. I would remind the member for Mackay—

Ms Trad interjected.

Mr GIBSON: I would remind the member for South Brisbane, I would remind them very clearly of the 2009 election when groups like the Wilderness Society would not take the Labor Party to task over its failed policy to threaten endangered species in the Mary River. Indeed, I believe that the Wilderness Society put out one press release that was so tame that it was almost like being beaten up by a wet lettuce leaf. What did they get in return for their support of the Labor Party shortly after the 2009 election? A wild rivers declaration. We know very clearly that what we are seeing tonight is nothing more than the Labor Party trying to get in favour again with the extreme greens. We know that they have been ostracised because of their failure. Sensible thinking environmentalists have recognised the Labor Party for what it is, a fraud. Anyone who would take an endangered species—not one, not two, but those on threatened species list—and put them at risk with a failed dam on the Mary River and then get up in this House and say that they are concerned about our waterways is a fraud. I would say to the people of Queensland and those true environmentalists, look at the Labor Party for what it is: a fraud when it comes to its environmental credentials. This bill very clearly shows what can be done when you work with people in a sensible and mature framework, not when you are hostage to extreme environmental groups, when you need their vote, when you need them out there handing out how-to-vote cards for you. That is what we saw very clearly in the 2009 election.

However, this bill is about far more than just the wild rivers declaration. I need to correct the record on a couple of what I will call sins of omission by the member for Mackay. He quite correctly said that 80 per cent of submissions received on the bill opposed the repeal of the Wild Rivers Act. That is stated at page 28 of the committee's report. However, he failed to read the very next sentence in the report, which clearly states—

However, the committee notes that most of the submissions received on this topic were provided in a proforma letter format.

So 80 per cent of people were concerned, but they could not be bothered to actually put it in their own words. They were happy to fill out a proforma letter, but they did not really care about the issue. We know how the extreme green groups operate: they send out an email to their supporters saying, 'Quick, we need you to act. Don't worry, you don't need to think about it. Just download this form, sign the bottom of it and email it through.' That is what this committee saw. That is what we can get when we conduct these inquiries. We may not get people who are genuinely concerned and put their pen to paper, but people who simply say, 'Oh, I got the email. I'd better download it, sign it and send it off,' with no thought behind it. Over 80 per cent of submissions were pro forma. How should we address people who did not consider this matter important enough to put their concerns in their own words? Should we address them in the same way that the Labor Party addressed 15,000 people who signed a petition saying, 'Don't dam the Mary River'? We should listen to those people who are willing to step up and not those who are willing to respond just by clicking on an email.

I will pick up on a few areas that have already been addressed by the Deputy Premier, who talked about increases in the strategic environmental areas. This government has been prepared to do something that the Labor Party was not prepared to do and there has been a great degree of support for that. As I have said, the bill is about more than just wild rivers. It also quite rightly addresses the issue of party houses. I note comments from the Labor Party that these proposals are unworkable. I put on the record that at least the LNP is doing something. At least the LNP is trying to address the party house issue. Despite being aware of it when in power, Labor did nothing. The committee quite freely and openly recognised that in terms of party houses this bill may not be perfect, which is why recommendation No. 5 is that there be a review of the party house provisions within 12 months of commencement to ensure that the intent of the bill is achieved. Why was that the case? We did not receive one submission from any operator of a party house, despite the fact that this bill has the potential to have a major impact on their business operations. That raised concerns because we began to think, 'What is it that those party house operators will be looking at?' We recognised that utilising the planning instruments, as this bill does, is but one way to address the issue of party houses.

As the Deputy Premier mentioned—and we were very happy to do this—the committee conducted a round-table discussion on the Gold Coast because we wanted to hear from people face to face. We wanted to understand the impact when you have a party house in your street. I thank those people who came to the round-table discussion to present on and discuss the issue. They shared stories of lives of misery and said that under the Labor government nothing improved. Nothing was done. In fact, they felt that the Labor Party had closed the door on the issue of party houses. They understood that this would not be a perfect solution, but it was a step in the right direction. We must still use the powers that are contained under the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act to deal with guests at a party house who conduct themselves in an antisocial manner. This is not an excuse for councils to walk away from the issue and say that it is not their responsibility. Indeed, the committee heard from the Cairns Regional Council, which said, 'We can deal with party houses under our local laws.' That council is able and willing to do that.

This legislation is a step in the right direction. Is it the final solution? Does it present all the options? Time will tell. However, we want to do something. As the committee heard, there will be some concerns with regards to enforcement and there will be some issues around definitions. That is why we put forward the recommendation for a review in 12 months time. Unlike the Labor Party, which year after year had its head in the sand on this issue and did not even bother to talk to the people affected, the LNP government is saying, here and now, 'This is our effort, but we are willing to come back.' We heard that from the Deputy Premier. I commend him for accepting the committee's recommendation in that area.

In regard to other issues brought forward in this bill, overall there were no concerns. The committee received very few submissions on any other areas, despite some of them being quite controversial. We know that the community is concerned about coal seam gas and the changes we are making to the Environmental Protection Act, the Gasfields Commission Act, the Land Title Act, the Queensland Industry Participation Policy Act and other acts that are amended by this bill. However, overall those matters did not receive anywhere near the attention that we saw with regards to wild rivers and party houses.

This bill is evidence of a government that is making an effort, a government that is willing to listen and a government that is not afraid to try something new and if it makes a mistake to then make a correction. That is unlike the arrogance we saw from the Labor Party during the years it was in government. It showed its arrogance in ignoring the best scientific evidence that was put forward

which said that if it was to dam the Mary River it would be putting endangered species at risk. The Labor government thought that it knew better. That was the arrogant way of the Labor Party when in government. We saw the Labor Party's supreme arrogance in refusing to deal with the party house issue when in government. Through this bill, this government is making an effort to address these important issues. I commend this bill to the House.

Hon. AC POWELL (Glass House—LNP) (Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection) (8.06 pm): I, too, rise to support the State Development, Infrastructure and Planning (Red Tape Reduction) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2014. This bill will assist the government to meet its target of reducing red tape by 20 per cent by 2018. It will repeal five acts and amend a number of others to improve existing processes and, contrary to views expressed by those opposite, it will do so without watering down environmental standards. Before the last election, the LNP committed to reset the imbalance created by the Wild Rivers Act, particularly on Cape York. Since then it is a matter of public record that those laws have been found to be invalid by the Federal Court. The Federal Court determination proves that those flawed laws were all about politics and not about protecting the environment.

Recently, this parliament passed the Regional Planning Interests Act 2014, which included a new framework for considering development in areas of regional interest, including strategic environmental areas or SEAs. Those areas are places of significant ecological value. Importantly, all—and I stress, all—of the areas that were formerly declared within the flawed Wild Rivers Act will be declared strategic environmental areas under the Regional Planning Interests Act, with one exception. As the Deputy Premier explained, that exception is an addition, not a reduction. It is the significant addition of the Steve Irwin Wildlife Reserve. With its political approach to protecting the environment, rather than a scientific or rational planning approach, that is something the Labor Party could not achieve. The Regional Planning Interests Act will ensure that those iconic Queensland sites remain protected for future generations.

In complete contrast, the imposition of the Wild Rivers Act is yet again a perfect example of the way the former Labor government operated. It was hastily conceived and poorly structured, had little consultation and pretend concern for Indigenous and community groups, all the while cutting green preference deals behind closed doors in Brisbane.

The Newman government is instead protecting the most significant environmental areas under a considered planning framework which also takes into account the concerns of local communities. Planning decisions in strategic environmental areas will best consider how to protect environmental attributes through either a local government planning scheme or a regional interest development approval at the state level. By consolidating the legislation used to regulate regional land use, the new planning framework will reduce the regulatory complexity for development in local communities and maintain environmental values. Under the framework, dams and weirs in strategic environmental areas will require a regional interest development approval, so too will resource activities and broadacre cropping.

The repeal of the Wild Rivers Act in this bill represents a significant milestone for a great many stakeholders that have been involved in the wild rivers area since they were introduced by the Labor government in 2005. I am pleased to finally move forward with a new framework that better manages regional land use with protection for these important areas of Queensland.

The bill also repeals the Gurulmundi Secure Landfill Agreement Act 1992 which is administered by my department, the Department of Environment and Heritage Protection. The repeal of this act is great news for a wide variety of stakeholder interest groups. Since 1992 this act has restricted the use of this site to hazardous waste disposal by the Brisbane City Council. The repeal of this piece of legislation will allow the site to be opened up for other uses, including resource recovery operations.

I am pleased to support a bill that makes sensible changes to a wide variety of legislation, restores the balance and provides a significant contribution to reducing red tape. It is clear that Labor has no plans and no policies to take our state forward. Only this government has a strong plan for a brighter future for all Queenslanders. I commend this bill to the House.

Ms TRAD (South Brisbane—ALP) (8.11 pm): I rise to make a contribution on the State Development, Infrastructure and Planning (Red Tape Reduction) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. I will be confining my contribution to this debate to the repeal of the Wild Rivers Act 2005. However, I say from the outset that I endorse the concerns raised by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, particularly in relation to the new impact assessment report process and the party house provisions of the bill.

It is not lost on me at all that this LNP government has taken every opportunity to mislead, demonise and destroy the wild rivers protection system in this state. We have heard exactly that from the environment minister this evening, who preceeded me in this debate and gave what was a disgraceful contribution to this debate.

It was disgraceful because he was misrepresenting the Federal Court determination in relation to the three rivers in Cape York. The Federal Court did not say these laws were invalid, as the minister purported. The Federal Court said that the declaration of three rivers was invalid. It was not that the act or the laws themselves were invalid. That was a disgraceful misrepresentation by the environment minister who does know better but chooses not to behave better.

Let me go through a bit of a history lesson for those in the House. When Queensland Labor went to the state election in 2004 it went with a pledge—a pledge to increase protections for Queensland's pristine rivers. That pledge was telegraphed to all in the state, but it was particularly telegraphed to traditional owners, including the Cape York Land Council, before it was publicly announced. Labor won the 2004 election and the Wild Rivers Act 2005 was the first step taken by Labor in increasing river protections.

In relation to the declarations for the Gregory River, Staaten River, Settlement Creek, Morning Inlet, Hinchinbrook and Fraser Island streams, there has never been any dispute about the worth of those declarations. Likewise, there has never been any community controversy over the declarations for the Wenlock River in 2010 or the Cooper Creek, Georgina River and Diamantina River in 2011.

In the case of the Wenlock River, this government had to scramble to create a new protection framework to ensure it did not cop a backlash from the Irwin family and their supporters. I note that the environment minister is the local member for the area which contains Australia Zoo. That was one river they ensured had statutory protection going forward. I do not think the irony is lost on anyone.

With regard to the Channel Country declarations, the government committed to continuing those protections before it was elected, but reversed that promise just a few months later. It was in fact the Minister for Environment who made that commitment whilst in opposition and then reneged on the promise to Queenslanders.

The opposition understands that there has been more disquiet about the declarations on Cape York and we respect in full the recent Federal Court decision which annulled those declarations. But, as I have said previously, it is important to recognise that the court decision did not overturn the Wild Rivers Act, as the government has attempted to claim. Instead, it identified process issues with the declaration of those three rivers themselves. The decision does not undermine the declarations for the Wenlock, the gulf, Channel Country and the Hinchinbrook and Fraser islands.

It should also be made clear that an important component to Labor's river protection policy was the introduction of Indigenous wild ranger river jobs. These jobs have helped to build real capacity in Indigenous communities. When the Leader of the Opposition, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, the Manager of Opposition Business and I met with the Carpentaria Land Council to discuss this issue, it was reinforced to us just how important these jobs have been for traditional owners. It is undeniable that Labor's river protection framework has opened up new economic opportunities for remote Indigenous communities rather than shutting out economic development as has been claimed.

We also met with Balkanu and other Indigenous leaders in the cape. Not one of them said that the consultation process leading to the passage of the Wild Rivers Act 2005 was wanting. They thought the consultation process was good. Some people did not get what they wanted out of the ultimate legislation and that is why some traditional owner groups ended up in the Federal Court.

It is undeniable that the LNP's position on wild rivers has been unclear and haphazard, both before it was elected and in the 2½ years since. The then Liberal-National coalition did not oppose the Wild Rivers Act 2005 when it was brought into this parliament. The member for Moggill should well know that. He was leader of the Liberal-National coalition at the time.

Prior to the 2012 election the LNP committed to keep the declarations in Western Queensland. Since being elected it has reneged on that promise and first launched a consultation process for the revocation of the declarations for the Channel Country and Cape York rivers. Instead of following through on the revocation process, the government is now seeking to overturn the entire act without releasing the results of that consultation process.

When the Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection was asked to release information on that consultation process in an estimates question on notice he point blank refused to do so. He refused to provide information that had been collected under Queensland legislation to a parliamentary committee. For that he should hang his head in shame.

Let us be really clear. When it comes to Minister Powell I know that he has been complaining quite loudly—bleating, in fact—that he does not get many questions from me or members of the opposition in question time. It is no wonder when that is his attitude. When he refuses to furnish a parliamentary committee with information gathered as a result of legislation passed by this House it is an outrage.

Quite frankly, why would I ask Minister Powell anything to do with the environment when everything he touches gets taken away from him? The bioregional planning process was absorbed by the Deputy Premier. The assessment and approvals for development in this state have been absorbed by SARA and the Deputy Premier. Even powers that reside under the EPBC Act and will be referred to the Queensland government will not go to the environment minister. They currently reside with the Commonwealth environment minister. Minister Powell cannot be trusted with the environmental assessment and approval powers under the EPBC Act. They will instead go to the Coordinator-General of this state. If the Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection wants to understand why in fact we do not ask him any questions, it is because he has no responsibilities when it comes to the environment, and that is pretty clear from what has happened to date.

While I have touched on the EPBC Act, I will take the comments made by the member for Gympie in relation to Traveston Dam. It should be noted that the member for Gympie did not actually say how the Traveston Dam was stopped. It was actually stopped by a federal Labor government with powers under the EPBC Act. The complete and utter irony here is that, if the Abbott-Newman bilateral laws change, Traveston Dam would go ahead. That is an irony that I note the member for Gympie does not articulate.

While we are talking about the member for Gympie, he took some exception with all the proforma letters apparently that came in in support of the wild rivers legislation. Let us talk about all of the proforma letters that came in during the Vegetation Management Amendment Bill, which was a bill that was sent to the state development parliamentary committee, which the member for Gympie was chairing at the time. He seemed to have no objection at the time with all of the proforma letters that came from landowners supporting changes to the Vegetation Management Act, but he seemed to have a lot of problems with the proforma letters coming in in support of wild rivers, and that is a disgrace.

Let's be really clear why the Wild Rivers Act had to come into effect. It is because, and I think the Wilderness Society has put it best when they said—

Freshwater ecosystems are under increasing ecological threat at both global and national scales. Many of Australia's river systems are seriously degraded due to over-extraction, pollution, catchment modification and lack of effective river regulation, the most severe and prominent example being the Murray-Darling Basin.

Labor responded by pulling together statutory protections for pristine wild rivers in this state. And what is happening is the LNP government, despite a commitment at the election, is winding them back. It is a complete and utter disgrace and Queenslanders will not forget.

Mr HART (Burleigh—LNP) (8.21 pm): It is always a pleasure to follow the member for South Brisbane and bring some sense back to the debate. I rise to add to the debate on this important piece of legislation. I will get to the member for South Brisbane later. In particular, I want to bring to the attention of the House the positive impacts that this legislation will have for my electorate of Burleigh with the amendments to the Sustainable Planning Act to give the Gold Coast City Council and other Queensland councils the power to deal with out-of-control events and behaviours that happen in party houses.

This bill deals directly with two things: firstly, red tape. The latest report card on red-tape reduction shows the government is on track to deliver its commitment to reduce red tape by 20 per cent over six years, and this legislation furthers that agenda. We have already started work on more than 500 reforms, 350 of which have already been implemented and have successfully removed over 9,000 regulatory requirements imposed on business by the former Labor government. While considerable progress has been made in the fight against red tape, much more needs to be done, and I will continue to look for ways to make doing business in Queensland easier. This bill contributes to our agenda by reducing the statute book by repealing five acts: the repeal of the Clean Coal Technology Special Agreement Act 2007, the repeal of the Eagle Farm Racecourse Act 1998, the repeal of the Gurulmundi Secure Landfill Agreement Act 1992, the repeal of the Racing Venues Development Act 1972 and the repeal of the Wild Rivers Act 2005.

Secondly, this bill will drive economic growth. For the benefit of those on the other side of the House who do not understand what economic growth is, this government has a strong plan for a brighter future. The Leader of the Opposition's admission last month that she is 'not going to

guarantee jobs growth' if elected confirms that Labor has no plans and no policies to take Queensland forward. In contrast, the Newman LNP government has focused on building the four pillars of Queensland—tourism, agriculture, resources and construction. Only the LNP has a strong plan that will see Queensland continue to pull ahead of other states by creating the right environment for business to grow and create jobs.

I would just like to comment on a few things that the member for South Brisbane said. The member was actually present during our committee hearing on 12 June when we took evidence from the Department of State Development, Infrastructure and Planning. The member quite clearly to my recollection asked the department why the wild rivers legislation was in fact being repealed. The reason that the Wild Rivers Act was being repealed—and I asked this question myself as a follow-up question just to make sure that everybody was on the same page—is that it is no longer required. It is no longer required because all of the items, all of the policy decisions, that were in the Wild Rivers Act are now contained in other legislation. Under the strategic environmental areas under the Sustainable Planning Act, the Regional Planning Interests Act and this bill, all of those policy outcomes are all being met. Hence, there is no requirement for the Wild Rivers Act. There is no conspiracy here at all, as the member for South Brisbane and her green mates would have you believe. This act is no longer required. It is covered by the other acts that this government has brought in over the last couple of years.

It gives me a great deal of pleasure to be standing here today as part of a government that is committed to improving the lives of all Queenslanders, particularly in relation to tackling the ongoing problem that is party houses. As I said before, I am from the Gold Coast. It is a major issue there. Party houses create unwarranted disturbances on the Gold Coast, and I am hearing from my community that this problem was swept under the rug by the former Labor government and put in the too-hard basket. It was too hard for them. I am proud to say today that this government is not afraid of making the tough decisions, and the people of my electorate of Burleigh strongly support the government in making these strong, sometimes hard, decisions.

The committee travelled to the Gold Coast and we sat at a round table with a group of people who are heavily affected by party houses. They are in one particular street on the Gold Coast—and I am sure we will hear from other LNP members on the Gold Coast about these particular party houses. We heard where there was one house that had, I think, 22 rooms. They had 30 or 40—

Ms Bates interjected.

Mr HART: The member for Mudgeeraba, I am sure, will have some more to say about that shortly. The people who live near that house are putting up with people wandering the streets, with people breaking into their houses, with people cavorting—

Ms Bates: Nude tennis.

Mr HART: I will take that interjection from the member for Mudgeeraba—nude tennis. Does everybody have a picture of that? Anyway, we will move on.

Mr Costigan: Where's the member for Bennelong?

Mr HART: I will take that interjection as well. You can imagine the sorts of problems these people are having with these sorts of things happening in their backyard. And it is their backyard. They are out on their back patio, watching across the valley or looking across to the house next door and they are seeing these things happen. It is out of control.

The police have the powers to deal with some of these things, but there are some things they cannot deal with. So we really need to put these sorts of planning provisions in place to give the council the power to act and to stop these party houses from happening. As I said, we heard from a group of people on the Gold Coast. They were very concerned. We stepped through every part of this legislation. They had some concerns about how long people might stay in the house because, if they rented out their houses for more than 10 days, it was no longer deemed to be a party house.

We have to start somewhere. We have to give our local councillors the power to start this process. If it means that we have to come back and look at this and tweak it in some way, I am sure that we will. In fact, with the Leader of the House being a keen advocate of this particular piece of legislation, I am sure we will come back and look at it. That is one of the reasons that the committee recommended that we review this part of the legislation within 12 months.

The provisions of the bill actually complement the police powers that are already in place to deal with behavioural issues related to party houses. The provision proposes that the bill will empower the local governments, including the city of the Gold Coast, to regulate party houses from a planning and development perspective, that is, if they choose to act—and they do not have to act.

This is an opt-in piece of legislation. The council actually has to decide that they want to opt in, they have to put the designation in place that this particular area is not designated for party houses or is designated for party houses. Then people have to apply under the planning regulations to have a party house in those particular designated areas. Outside of those areas, they are simply not allowed. It will be completely up to the council as to whether they decide to opt in or they think that they can take care of it. We have heard from our local councillors down there—and I am sure every other member on the Gold Coast has heard the same thing numerous times from their councillors—that something needed to be done about this. We have heard from our councillors. We have taken action. This is the start of the process.

I commend the minister for bringing this forward in the manner that he has. The party house restriction area is not intended to remove development rights. The underlying principle is that a residential dwelling can be used to host parties. This does not stop parties per se. It stops the business of party houses where somebody finds a property and they decide they can make more money renting it out on a nightly basis as a party house than renting it out full time. As I said, the provision will mean that local government can decide if and how to regulate a party house as a use in a way that is locally appropriate. It is important to point out that the proposal will not prevent the owner of a residential dwelling from leasing their premises or a property owner or tenant from hosting celebrations. The proposal will not regulate behaviour on the premises as this is outside the scope of the land use, planning and development. The amendment is to enable local government to regulate party houses so that a lawful party house must have development approval to operate.

I would like to thank the committee members for the way that they dealt with this particular piece of legislation. Our recommendation was something that we talked long and hard about. I must say that I was very happy again to see that, when the Deputy Premier stood up and gave his speech today, he accepted the five recommendations that the committee made and that he gave very concise replies to the five points of clarification that the committee asked for. Once again, this reinforces to me—and it should reinforce to every other member of this House—that our committee system is working. When our ministers accept all the recommendations that our committees put forward or they give constructive reasons why they do not, the committee system is working. With those few words, I commend the bill to the House.

Ms BATES (Mudgeeraba—LNP) (8.33 pm): I rise this evening to make a short contribution to the State Development, Infrastructure and Planning (Red Tape Reduction) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2014. I thank the Deputy Premier on behalf of the long-suffering residents in the Mudgeeraba electorate who have had to put up with party houses and the distress they cause, particularly for those residents in Red Oak Drive and The Panorama in Tallai. I have lodged various petitions in this parliament in relation to this matter. I know that my constituents will be ecstatic this evening to find that finally there is relief in sight.

The provisions in this bill will help the police deal with behavioural issues related to party houses. The bill will empower our local governments to regulate party houses from a planning and development perspective. These provisions are not mandatory. I am sure that the Gold Coast City Council will definitely opt in by amending our local planning scheme or make a temporary local planning instrument. Tonight we are providing a new mechanism for local governments such as the Gold Coast City Council, and they have needed it for quite some time. The amendments provide a definition of party house, a separate and distinct definition from other uses such as short-term accommodation. This will mean that a defined party house may be an assessable development which will require development approval in order to operate.

The Gold Coast City Council already knows which areas in my electorate should be designated as a party house restriction area in their planning scheme. The effect of this party house restriction area is to make clear that any residential dwelling in that area does not have, and never had, approval to operate as a party house unless otherwise approved by local government. The provisions will mean that a local government can decide if and how to regulate a party house as a use in a way that is locally appropriate. In my case, the problems only relate to very small pockets where the activities repeatedly occur, such as in Tallai. The aim of the amendments is to enable local governments to regulate these party houses so that a lawful party house must have development approval to operate.

I thank my local councillor in Division 9 in Mudgeeraba, Councillor Glenn Tozer, for taking the time to come to parliament and meet with the Deputy Premier in relation to this matter. I thank him for his contribution, particularly in recommending that fines are just not enough to stop the problem. The fines have to actually be large enough to ensure it is a disincentive. I will give an example. For one of

the houses up in Tallai they regularly charge $7,000 to $10,000 a weekend. A fine of about $200 or $2,000 every time they have a party—every weekend—is no dint in their profits and is not a disincentive to stop the practice.

I thank my friend and colleague Ray Stevens, the member for Mermaid Beach, for his support on this issue and for standing up for his residents in his local area who have the same issues as mine; his are just on the water. I thank the Kane family for their persistence in relation to this matter and for garnering the support of locals to get in behind them and make their opinions count. Tonight I hope the residents on The Panorama in Tallai have popped the champagne corks, for tonight is the start of them getting their lives back, getting their homes back and having their peace of mind return. I commend the bill to the House.

Mr MOLHOEK (Southport—LNP) (8.36 pm): I rise to speak in support of the State Development, Infrastructure and Planning (Red Tape Reduction) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2014. The package of reforms presented in this bill reduces unnecessary red and green tape and avoids legislative duplication. The bill proposes a number of important repeals, firstly, the repeal of the Clean Coal Technology Special Agreement Act 2007. Secondly, the bill, if enacted, will repeal the Eagle Farm Racecourse Act 1998. Next up, it is proposed to repeal the Gurulmundi Secure Landfill Agreement Act 1992 to free up an unused and wasted parcel of land located near Miles. Finally, the bill proposes the repeal of the Racing Venues Development Act 1982, which was established to provide racing venues be placed under the control of trustees.

On 1 July 2003 the former government approved the transfer of responsibility for the Parklands Gold Coast venue to trustees appointed under the racing venues act. Since then, Economic Development Queensland has taken over responsibility for the site for the purpose of constructing the Commonwealth Games athletes village and the Parklands Trust established under the racing venues act has been wound up. As Parklands Gold Coast was the only remaining racing venue on lands held by the state, the racing venues act is no longer required and may be repealed.

In addition to repealing redundant acts, the bill will streamline processes for industry wanting to develop in Queensland. These streamlined processes are proof this government is committed to Queensland's economic growth. For example, the amendments to just one act, the Economic Development Act, will make a substantial number of improvements to the development processes in Queensland that will more than undoubtedly be welcomed by industry. These amendments will clarify the role of the economic development fund to clear up confusion about the role of the fund in terms of who is required to pay certain moneys into the fund. The ability to declare provisional priority development areas will be improved by removing the impediment that the provisional area has to be consistent with the local government planning scheme. The bill also includes provisions that allow a community infrastructure designation to be made in a priority development area to support the purpose of the Economic Development Act and provides development for community purposes. It also provides provisions that will allow land use plans for the relevant priority development area in the development scheme to be amended. Currently, the Minister for Economic Development Queensland is able to make land use plans but can only amend these land use plans down the track if it is necessary to ensure the implementation of the development scheme complies with the Economic Development Act or to prevent or minimise the significant risk of environmental harm or serious adverse cultural, economic or social conditions occurring in that relevant priority development area.

Finally, the proposed amendments to the Economic Development Act provide a mechanism to fund infrastructure costs which are required to support priority development. I am particularly pleased to note also that the bill addresses the ongoing problem that has been experienced at the Gold Coast in respect of party houses. This bill includes amendments to the Sustainable Planning Act 2009 to allow local governments to regulate party houses in land use planning and development.

The incidence of party houses and their effects on neighbouring communities has been reported to occur not only on the Gold Coast, but also on the Sunshine Coast, Noosa, Stradbroke Island and Cairns. This issue has been raised repeatedly by local members of parliament and members of the public and media. Over the past few years there have been a number of state and local government interventions commenced, actioned or implemented to curb the occurrence of party houses or to address associated behaviour. For example, the Gold Coast City Council established the Short Term Accommodation Task Force in 2010 and made various local laws, for example, noise laws and a licensing regime for short-term accommodation. The state has already undertaken the following actions in this regard. The Police Powers and Responsibilities and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2014 now provides additional police powers to deal with out-of-control events and out-of-control behaviour. Similar events and behaviour may occur at party houses, and the Local

Government and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2012 provided new powers for local governments to introduce local laws that may make the owner of a residential property liable to a penalty because of excessive noise regularly emanating from the property.

The holiday letting industry has also recognised this issue, introducing a self-regulatory code of conduct which prevents the advertisement of party houses, amongst other things. While commendable, this also means that it is difficult to accurately quantify the number of party houses actually in operation as there is no official or unofficial record. In late 2013 the Department of State Development, Infrastructure and Planning commenced work to identify how party houses could be better regulated in land use planning and development. To inform this work discussions were held with the Queensland Tourism Industry Council, the Local Government Association of Queensland and affected South-East Queensland local governments including Gold Coast City Council, Redland City Council, Sunshine Coast Council and Noosa Shire Council.

The provisions in this bill complement police powers that are already in place to deal with behavioural issues related to party houses. The provisions proposed in this bill will empower local governments to regulate party houses from a planning and development perspective—that is, where local governments choose to act, party houses will require development approvals to operate. These provisions are not mandatory. A local government can 'opt in' by amending its planning scheme or by making a temporary local planning instrument. The state is not imposing unnecessary new regulation but providing councils with a mechanism if they need it.

I am confident that the proposed laws will not affect people who are doing the right thing. People renting out premises for the specific purpose of holding parties are in effect running a booming business. Everyone else who runs a business has to get approval, and so should they. The amendments provide a definition of party house which is a separate and distinct definition from other uses such as short-term accommodation. This will mean that a defined party house may be assessable development which will require development approval in order to operate. A local government will be able to identify a party house restriction area in its planning scheme. The effect of this party house restriction area is to make it clear that any residential dwelling in that area that does not, and should never have had, the right to operate as a party house will no longer be allowed to unless otherwise approved by that local government authority.

The party house restriction area is not intended to remove development rights; rather, the underlying principle is that a residential dwelling can be lawfully used to host parties and events. However, a residential dwelling is not intended to be a function centre or an event centre as we have seen with some properties, particularly in the member for Mudgeeraba's electorate and the member for Mermaid Beach's electorate. Those venues are quite separate and distinct and require separate development approval—as they should. These provisions mean that local governments can decide if and how to regulate a party house as a use in a way that is locally appropriate. A local government can determine to apply these provisions to all or part of its planning scheme. In some cases the problems may only relate to small pockets where the activities repeatedly occur. Given the local government has the ability to apply the provisions to just part of its planning scheme area, it can and will be 'business as usual' for the rest of its area.

I am pleased to stand in the House tonight to speak in support of this legislation. I am particularly pleased that, after some 18 months of negotiation and discussion with the member for Mermaid Beach and more particularly the member for Mudgeeraba across a number of departments and other councils, we have been able to come up with a very strong and practical solution to this issue, particularly as it has had a significant impact on amenity for other residents in the area who work hard. It is only right and proper that we as a government should respect the rights of others. I am pleased to be part of a government that is finally doing something to tackle these issues. I am also pleased that we as a government are tackling a whole range of issues that we saw created by the previous government: layer upon layer of red and green tape unnecessarily placed upon the development industry such that the construction industry in Queensland just about came to a halt. The word that we are getting now from all over Queensland is that our planning reform agenda is working. Industry is delighted with the changes that this government has brought, and so it is my great pleasure to support the bill this evening.

Mr YOUNG (Keppel—LNP) (8.45 pm): I rise to speak briefly in support of the State Development, Infrastructure and Planning (Red Tape Reduction) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2014. This bill is a continuation of the government's commitment to reducing red tape in line with our goal to reduce red tape in government processes by 20 per cent by 2018. Another important policy objective of this bill is to amend legislation to drive economic development in Queensland. This

bill proposes to amend the Economic Development Act 2012 with the goal to improve procedures for the declaration of provisional priority areas along with streamlining the revocation of priority development areas and provide provisions for community infrastructure designations within a priority development area. These amendments will remove the confusion as to who obtains funding from the Economic Development Fund.

Another business initiative is the amendment to the Queensland Industry Participation Policy Act 2011. Introduced in 1999 to increase business participation between suppliers of goods and services to procuring government contracts, the beneficiaries will be local business who will now be able to comply with the procurement policies and procedures of government agencies. The new charter of local content meets the requirements of the Australian and New Zealand Government Procurement Agreement. The new charter applies best practice, minimising government compliance burdens and ensures full, fair and reasonable opportunities for local suppliers. I am hopeful that this will be beneficial to a local horticulture supplier in my area, but the big winner will undoubtedly be those firms vying for the supply of goods and services to the Gold Coast Commonwealth Games in 2018.

I can say with some pleasure that I do not have any party houses in Yeppoon or the coast at this point in time. I do, however, recognise they are becoming a very real problem in areas such as the north coast and especially the Gold Coast and the hinterland. At a public briefing on 12 June, much discussion around party houses was had. The Cairns Regional Council felt that existing rules could manage party houses; however, southern councils flagged significant community concerns associated with party houses.

I will define 'party house' for the benefit of the House. They are generally residential dwellings that are regularly leased, hired or rented for social events such as weddings, birthday parties, bucks parties, hens nights and raves. Party houses in residential areas are associated with generating nuisance for neighbours with traffic hazards, excessive noise, offensive social behaviour, littering and illegal activities. The provisions of this bill complement police powers that are already in place to deal with antisocial behaviour, enhanced even further with the out-of-control parties policy addressed in the Police Powers and Responsibilities and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2013. The provisions proposed in this bill will empower local governments to regulate party houses from a planning and development perspective. It provides the mechanisms through the development approval process for a council to decide if a defined party house is to be approved or not approved in a residential area. Councils can also choose through a development assessment process to identify a party house restriction area in their planning scheme.

I support local government working cooperatively with government to address this emerging behavioural problem in neighbourhoods, residential areas and high-rise apartments. Of note is that the committee did not receive one submission from anyone who identified themselves as the owner of a party house. I was quite impressed with that.

This bill also repeals the Wild Rivers Act 2005, the Racing Venues Development Act 1982, the Gurulmundi Secure Landfill Agreement Act 1992, the Clean Coal Technology Special Agreement Act 2007 and the Eagle Farm Racecourse Act 1998. The committee received 96 submissions, mostly generic submissions around the wild rivers provisions. However, the most comprehensive submissions were in relation to the party house provisions.

I thank the Deputy Premier, departmental staff, the secretariat and chair of the committee and my fellow committee members. I support the passage of this bill through the House.

Mrs CUNNINGHAM (Gladstone—Ind) (8.50 pm): I rise to speak to the State Development, Infrastructure and Planning (Red Tape Reduction) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2014. In particular, I wish to speak to the section of the bill that seeks to amend the Economic Development Act 2012. The Economic Development Act, which came into effect on 1 February, sought to facilitate economic development and development for community purposes in Queensland. I note that the declaration of a provisional priority development area or priority development area is one way of achieving the Economic Development Act's purposes.

This bill amends the act to clarify the role of the Economic Development Fund; improve the ability to declare a PPDA; clarify and improve procedures for revocation of a priority development area; provide provisions for community infrastructure designations to be made within a priority development area; provide for land-use plans to be amended; and impose a mechanism to fund the infrastructure costs required to support a priority development area. I note that all of the powers,

particularly in terms of imposing infrastructure costs, are vested in the Minister for Economic Development Queensland, albeit the bill allows for delegation where the minister sees it is appropriate.

I wish to raise what could be seen by some as a contradiction in this legislation. I am not saying that to oppose the legislation. I know that the Deputy Premier is well aware of the sense of frustration that the Gladstone Regional Council is feeling in terms of funding infrastructure. Clauses 15 to 18 of the bill amend the Economic Development Act to enable the Minister for Economic Development Queensland to create charge areas where he or she—we might have a lady one day—may make and levy an infrastructure expenses recoupment charge on owners of the rateable land. The committee report states—

The explanatory notes state that the purpose of the provisions is to ensure that infrastructure costs are funded in an equitable manner and ensure economic development in PDAs.

That is, priority development areas. The report goes on—

The explanatory notes state that the infrastructure expenses recoupment charge will:

... recoup the expenses incurred, or reasonably expected to be incurred, by the MEDQ—

the Minister for Economic Development Queensland—

in exercising its functions to facilitate economic development and development for community purposes.

So in this bill the minister is rightly requiring those people who will benefit from the economic development to pay for the cost of the development. The report states—

New section 116B enables the MEDQ, by an authorising instrument, to make and levy an infrastructure expenses recoupment charge on owners of rateable land in the charge area to recoup, or provide for payment of, the expense for the provision of infrastructure in relation to the land in the charge area.

The MEDQ may make and levy the charge, even if the MEDQ incurred, or reasonably expected to incur, the expense on the land before the land was in a charge area.

There is a broad power in this bill to ensure that the costs of development are appropriately gathered. Councils in a not dissimilar situation are now being told that unless they charge the fair-value charges they cannot be considered for Royalties for the Regions—again, an intention to assist in developing areas similar to this. I know that Gladstone Regional Council is sweating over what to do to fairly deal with the community of Gladstone in relation to development, particularly community infrastructure, where the government is tying both its hands behind its back by, I think, blackmailing it—'If you don't charge fair-value charges, you will not get any Royalties for the Regions'—when the council has been unsuccessful in much of its application for community infrastructure under Royalties for the Regions and it does not know which path to take.

I think it is appropriate that a priority development area be paid for by those who will benefit from it. It is not appropriate for councils like the Gladstone council and for the community of Gladstone to be left without essential community infrastructure because the constraints on funds like Royalties for the Regions are so politically motivated that it makes it impossible for the council to access the funds. Recommendation 2 states—

The committee recommends the Deputy Premier and Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning reinforces in his second reading speech that it is his strong preference that PPDAs are only requested by local governments.

I heard some of the Deputy Premier's contribution—I have to apologise: I did not hear it all—and I would like to believe that that has been done. Any intense development creates unique pressures on not only councils, local governments and state governments but also on the community. Therefore, if local government is working hand in hand with the state government—I would have to say that, under the local government minister, this government has done much to empower councils and to work alongside councils to make them feel much more valued and part of the process. I think a great deal of that success has to be attributed to the Minister for Local Government. Therefore, it would be consistent with that drive to re-empower local governments and not treat them as they were treated by the former government, which was appalling, for the PPDAs to be developed, as the committee recommends, only at the request of local governments. It is then that local councils and government—state and federal—can truly work as partners in successful development.

Dr DOUGLAS (Gaven—PUP) (8.58 pm): This legislation is being sold again as a red-tape-reduction bill and comes with a hefty dose of 'we have listened to local governments and this change is what they want'. In nearly all cases this should be read as, 'We in the LNP state government have decided what is good for local government planning and this is what you will get.'

The minister has attempted to sell it as a priority development application innovative change to work through a range of acts, the subtext to his argument being that he is just cutting through to give worthy projects the capacity to gain rapid approval. Maybe they are not always worthy. Every time the Deputy Premier moves his lips one needs to be very cautious, but when he uses the words 'simplify', 'cutting through' and 'listening', any member needs to seriously start checking just who is getting a supernumerary benefit or a commission of sorts. Generally the decision is also a disaster in the making. He is certainly not one to be sitting in judgement, as he did earlier tonight, of the Labor Party or anyone else.

At best this legislation will reduce some pages of legislation; at worst the legislation is a blatant attempt to prevent this parliament from one part of its major job—that is, scrutinise legislation and scrutinise projects. To be considered as a credible government, one must be consistent as a first step. The most recent example of the Premier's visit to the Sunshine Coast headquarters is probably the best example of what is going on and how a government operates live. The Premier openly criticised the mayor and the council as being laggard and needlessly delaying certain proposals which he personally seemed to have an almost unbelievable micromanagement knowledge of. The major one of these was Sekisui House, a Japanese owned developer that has made some very curious donations to a variety of political groups, including the current Ipswich mayor, and was one that the Premier appeared to take very serious interest in.

The Deputy Premier likes to use the word 'absurd' regularly—he used it tonight a number of times—and seeks to use the 'roll on' technique to march through contentious legislation which, in part, this legislation is. That then implies the government is today seeking to ram through this legislation before the heat gets too much. The polling out in the public domain is so dreadful for the government and more than likely the media might finally come to its senses and apply the type of scrutiny to this legislation as it should. Specifically, the first critical issue that draws the attention of anyone looking at the PDA—and I will not go through it all—is that the PDA will apply to the Sunshine Coast, the Ipswich City Council and the Gold Coast City Council specifically. There are others, but they are the main ones.

The concern that I have regarding the PPDAs is that they are specifically being said to quickly enable development that facilitates economic development and have a three-year time frame. My concern is that this is all well and good when the intention of the players is all honourable. The truth of many of these situations is that they are not always so. At that time we were all left with less than nothing for a process that has been taken over by the Coordinator-General, whose intentions are neither always independent nor economically reasonable, and that happens far too frequently. I would have expected the Property Council of Australia and the UDI to support it but, having said that, that does not mean to say that it is right and, critically, the LGAQ opposed the amendment and questioned the rationale. It is to be applauded for doing so. It made the very reasonable observation, which is detailed in the committee's report which I have here, that the PPDA would be inconsistent with both the regional planning instruments and what is good for the local councils.

The legislation does address party houses. It has been discussed here tonight. It is very important legislation, especially to the Gold Coast, because of excessive behaviour. I will not go into details; I have heard all sorts of things being said tonight. Basically, those people neighbouring those houses have to live in a terrible situation. It is almost unbearable. Council has had its hands tied. Fortunately, I have only had one or two of these issues in my electorate, but most of my neighbouring members have people like these and it is very interesting that they do make large amounts of money. The police cannot handle anything too much. They can only intervene so much. We are a holiday destination and we want to encourage that, but to use residential urban communities as a place where you can have continuous parties has really reached its life span and needs to be stopped.

I also support the repeal of the Wild Rivers Act 2005. This was a dreadful act of a legislative instrument. You cannot defend it. It was used by the former Labor government against the legitimate interests critically of many Indigenous people and groups and others as well. However, it was used to satisfy the whim of distant green groups that had little knowledge or experience of the areas beyond their television and their internet chat groups. I would say that most of them had never travelled further north than Brisbane, and Brisbane is a long way from where these people are. I think that that was the shame of that legislation.

Beyond that, it is almost impossible to trust anything that the Deputy Premier says or does. However, it is consistent with that of the Premier and the government, whom he properly represents. If that is so, then this directly implies that almost any legislative instruments he is part of should be treated with great suspicion and a view that if it looks and smells like something it should not be then

by and large it probably is. It is a dreadful legacy for any minister or government to have nearly everything that they propose treated with such contempt, but that is the position that the government and the Deputy Premier find themselves in. If you do not believe me, read any of the latest polls. Only the member for Kawana is loathed more than the Deputy Premier. To give members a clue what the Deputy Premier really believes regarding listening, I think people should consider what was written in the report for the amendments to the EPA 1994 and the SPA—which are critical parts of the bill—2009. He spoke for the departments when he said—

> The departments deemed that no consultation with external stakeholders was required.

That is LNP consultation. It does not occur.

Hon. GW ELMES (Noosa—LNP) (Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander and Multicultural Affairs and Minister Assisting the Premier) (9.04 pm): I rise to speak in support of the State Development, Infrastructure and Planning (Red Tape Reduction) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. My comments will be confined to those elements of the bill dealing with the issue of party houses, which have been a growing problem for parts of my electorate. It is an issue that the member for Mermaid Beach, whose electorate shares a similar problem, and I have been campaigning for on and off for about four years. This bill enables the new Noosa Council and any other local council where these nuisance premises are a problem to develop a local solution to this distressing problem which meets the needs of local communities. By investing power in the local council, this bill invests power in the local community.

It is worthwhile just going over the history of my contact in terms of this issue, because it does show very clearly that the previous administration in this state either did not want to address the problem or had no interest in the problem and it does show how quickly we have come to where we are tonight. This was first raised in my electorate as far back as September 2009 when a local English language college was placing students collectively in residential areas designed for family accommodation. At the time I discussed it with the Sunshine Coast Council which investigated it but found it had no power to act under the Noosa Plan. Then the party house issue started to grow, promoted by sales and letting practices. The Sunshine Coast Council took one company operating in Caloundra to the Planning and Environment Court in June 2010 and won, but the decision was overturned on appeal by the Supreme Court. It was clear by this time that residential properties were being purchased by entrepreneurs and either heavily renovated or newly constructed after demolition of an existing property to meet the needs of this emerging market. That gave these operators a considerable cost advantage over legitimate accommodation providers given the raft of safety requirements mandated for tourist accommodation.

In May 2010 I wrote to the then minister for infrastructure and planning, Stirling Hinchliffe, and received a reply which put the issue on hold until the new Sunshine Coast Planning Scheme evolved. In March 2011 then tourism and small business minister Jan Jarratt promoted party houses via Tourism Queensland by running a competition for a free holiday in one of these party houses. In March 2011 complaints from Witta Circle and other Noosa areas started to be received in my electorate office. In May of that year I wrote to the then deputy premier and Attorney-General and minister for local government and special minister of state, Paul Lucas, who advised that the issue could not be controlled by the planning scheme. In 2011 Campbell Newman committed to giving local government the power to deal with the issue backed up by the Queensland Police Service. The Premier said—

> We'd make sure that local government had the necessary power to actually regulate where and when they could be set up ... there might be some locations they should be able to exist, but local government needs the control mechanism to actually regulate it properly ...

In September 2012 my colleague the Minister for Local Government introduced legislation into the parliament to do just that. In November that year this parliament passed the Local Government and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. This bill today removes the final anomalies to clarify and specify that local authorities now have all of the power they need to deal with the issue in a way appropriate to local circumstances. I am very pleased that councils now have the power to regulate the operations of party houses. These party houses come in where they are not wanted and compete most unfairly with legitimate holiday accommodation providers who do the right thing. This is a win for local neighbourhoods and it is a win for their quality of life. The new council powers honour an election promise I made to help target the problem in Noosa of large homes being converted into mass rentals. It has been an issue of great concern to residents unfortunate enough to live adjacent to one. I would be more than happy to give the new Noosa Council all of the support its needs to see the new legislation applied once it is passed through the parliament.

Hon. AP CRIPPS (Hinchinbrook—LNP) (Minister for Natural Resources and Mines) (9.09 pm): I rise to speak in support of the State Development, Infrastructure and Planning (Red Tape Reduction) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2014. Included in this bill is a clause to repeal the Wild Rivers Act 2005 and I intend to confine my contribution to this particular amendment.

I welcome this provision in the bill very warmly indeed. As the Deputy Premier alluded to during his earlier contribution, for some of us in this parliament the significance of this clause is considerable. The wild rivers legislation and associated declarations are one of the most glaring examples of the dodgy preference deals done between the Greens and the previous Labor government in return for flawed, ideologically driven legislation. It locked rural and remote Queensland communities into economic straitjackets, shutting out any real opportunities for new or diversified industries that could provide jobs for local people and opportunities for the regions.

The Newman government, through its alternative policy framework, has sought to provide rural and remote Queensland communities with the same opportunities for economic development that are available to Queenslanders in other parts of the state. In the 21st century, economic development and the protection of the environment are not mutually exclusive outcomes. Labor was prepared to condemn these communities including, tragically, many Indigenous communities to existing within the confines of an economic museum to satisfy the demands of the Greens in return for their preferences at state elections.

My interest in the Wild Rivers Act goes right back to the very first round of declarations of wild river areas in February 2007, which included the declaration of Hinchinbrook Island in my electorate as a wild river area. There has been no doubt that the Wild Rivers Act has always been a political tool of the Queensland Labor Party. One of the best examples of this was the ridiculous declaration of Hinchinbrook Island. Hinchinbrook Island sits just off the coast of my electorate, with its northernmost point adjacent to the town of Cardwell and its southernmost point adjacent to the town of Lucinda. It is about 39 square kilometres in size and, as such, it is Australia's largest island national park. The island has been separated from the mainland by the Hinchinbrook Channel for about 100,000 years and has remained in a relatively pristine condition. It is this unique environment that has resulted in state and federal governments choosing to make a range of conservation declarations on and around the island to preserve its natural values.

The environmental value of Hinchinbrook Island was quite correctly and rightly recognised early. The island was declared a national park in 1932. In addition, Hinchinbrook Island is surrounded by World Heritage declared areas: on one side by the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park and on the other side by the Wet Tropics. How much more protected can you get than being a declared national park and then being surrounded by two World Heritage declared areas? It beggars belief why Hinchinbrook Island was declared in the first round of wild river declarations in February 2007 when its declaration was so obviously and completely superfluous to the ongoing preservation of the conservation values of the island. The answer is politics: pure, cynical and blatant politics designed to benefit the Queensland Labor Party at the ballot box. Labor, in fact, needed to deliver an agreed number of wild river declarations to secure the preferences of the Greens at the 2006 and 2009 state elections to hold on to power.

There has always been a range of issues associated with the Wild Rivers Act that need to be put on the record. For example, the wild river declarations were not able to be scrutinised by the Queensland parliament and were determined only by the relevant minister. There was no provision for an appeal or a review of a wild river declaration under the act. The relevant minister was the only person who nominated and declared a wild river. No debate about the merits or otherwise of an individual declared area took place in the Queensland parliament and no declaration was subject to a disallowance motion in this place. This was a blatant and arrogant subjugation of the parliament and yet another example of the rank hypocrisy that is so regularly on display by the Labor opposition.

I take this opportunity to draw to the attention of those members who may not have been here for as long as others an example to appreciate why some of us despair and get so frustrated by the glib rhetoric that is so often forthcoming from those opposite. My Department of Natural Resources and Mines has led the development of an alternative strategy to protect Queensland's western rivers. I established the Western Rivers Advisory Panel, which comprised local representatives from within the Lake Eyre Basin, to provide advice on the development of these alternative strategies. The alternative strategies were finalised late last year and provide for limited water trading in the Cooper Creek catchment to allow for small scale commercial opportunities to grow fodder and increase the viability of existing pastoral operations without increasing the volume of water able to be taken.

The new framework provides for the establishment of a Channel Country protection area. It will prevent open-cut mining and, with the exception of low-risk activities subject to existing eligibility and standard conditions, it will ensure that any petroleum and gas development is subject to site-specific assessment and mandatory conditions. The implementation of this strategy has occurred through the Cooper Creek Resource Operations Plan and the Regional Planning Interests Act and associated regulations. It should be noted that, despite being in office for 12 years, following the enactment of the Water Act 2000 the former Labor government took no steps to develop a comprehensive water resource plan for Cape York Peninsula.

With wild river declarations on Cape York being replaced by strategic environmental areas through the Cape York Regional Plan, my department has developed a strategy for delivering water resource management on Cape York to provide a pathway for delivering responsible and productive water management and allocation for the region. The final strategy was released in July this year following the consideration of submissions on the draft, which was released late last year alongside the draft Cape York Regional Plan.

The strategy allows for the revocation of the Cape York Peninsula moratorium and deals with water licence applications where the impacts of the proposed development are minimal or have been demonstrated to have manageable impacts on the environment and existing water uses. It also paves the way for a water resource planning process in Cape York to support the responsible and productive use of water resources and sets a goal to align water rights in special agreement acts with the provisions of the Water Act to bring water resource management on Cape York under a single legislative framework.

When you put these water reforms next to this government's rural land and vegetation management reforms, you have a comprehensive plan to get Cape York and other formerly declared areas under the Wild Rivers Act out of the economic straitjacket that they were placed in by Labor and the Greens. It is the LNP that is looking to give these communities the opportunity to emerge from the economic museum that they were condemned to dwell in by Labor and the Greens.

Wild rivers are part of the same grubby political agreements that led to a whole raft of vindictive, onerous, prescriptive and oppressive regulations that were imposed particularly on North Queensland by the Beattie and Bligh Labor governments. They were supposedly to protect the environment but, in truth, their real purpose was to protect the previous majority of the Queensland Labor Party in this parliament. The Wild Rivers Act was a cynical, political farce and I am personally delighted to see it repealed. It removes an appalling stain from our statute books and disposes of a very sorry chapter in public policy in Queensland.

Finally, I would reflect on the point that was made earlier by the Deputy Premier in his contribution to this debate and that is the disingenuous claim made by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition in his statement of reservation, included in the committee report, about the lack of consultation involved. The people who he claims support wild rivers in Cape York Peninsula, in fact, took it to the Federal Court because they were not satisfied with the consultation process and the Federal Court upheld their claims. That is the reality of the situation. I thank the Deputy Premier for his actions today in this regard. We are rid of it and I could not be more pleased.

Hon. JW SEENEY (Callide—LNP) (Deputy Premier and Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning) (9.19 pm), in reply: I begin by thanking all of the honourable members who have made contributions to the debate this afternoon and this evening. I extend my special thanks to the Minister for Natural Resources and Mines for the contribution that he has just completed. I think it was a comprehensive contribution for anybody who wants to understand the wild rivers legislation and the way that it became a political instrument in this parliament and the history of it under the Labor Party.

Over the last 2½ years of consultation there has been nobody who has mounted any sort of an argument that it should not be repealed. For all of the reasons that the member for Hinchinbrook spoke about, everybody has understood over the last 2½ years that it needed to be repealed. We have spoken about the fact that we were going to do that many, many times. We entered into a negotiation, a consultation process, that extended for 2½ years. The regional planning committee for Cape York recognised and supported its repeal. But yesterday the Wilderness Society put out a press release and all of a sudden the nine members of the ALP in this place became the only people in Queensland who were prepared to stand up and oppose the action that has been 2½ years in the negotiation. It is rather strange that they did that, because this House has considered the alternative legislative instruments that were negotiated and consulted on to provide alternative regulatory frameworks to the wild rivers regulation. That was the Regional Planning Interests Bill that went

through this House. It was supported by the Labor Party opposition. They supported the alternative in the debate. Not only that, but they supported the regulation that sets out the detail of it. They had an opportunity to move to disallow that, but they did not. Not only that, for 2½ years we have talked about this and not once has a member of the opposition risen in this House to ask me a question about it. In any of the searches that I have done, not once has there been a statement from any of them about the fact that the path that we have negotiated patiently and consistently for 2½ years with the Indigenous communities was the wrong one to take: no questions, no comments, no opinions expressed.

There was unanimous agreement from all of the stakeholders in the RPC and yet the Labor Party come in here tonight on the hunt for a cheap headline tomorrow, once again using the Wild Rivers Act as a political opportunity. How appropriate it is, because that is what it has been from the Labor Party from day one: a rank political opportunity. I would suggest that anyone in the community or the media who is tempted to provide the Labor Party with what they want, which is a cheap headline tomorrow, read and consider the contribution that was made by the member for Hinchinbrook because I can do no better in summing up this debate than the member for Hinchinbrook did. The trite nonsense that comes from over there, the absolute absurdities that have been mouthed over there tonight, do those people no credit. They do the intellectual debate in this House no credit because they completely ignore all that has happened in this House over the last 2½ years and they completely ignore the consultation and the participation of the Indigenous communities in North Queensland who have put their heart and soul into negotiating what is for them their hope for the future. I am very pleased to say that I am very confident that that future has been assured. In protecting the environmental values of the cape that future has been assured and advanced by the passage of the Regional Planning Interests Act which actually passed the House six weeks ago. The Labor opposition did not oppose it then. The member for Gaven did not even oppose it then. It passed six weeks ago. What we are doing tonight is repealing the legislation that it replaced. Those opposite supported the passage of the legislation and now they want to oppose the repeal of the legislation that it seeks to replace. How does that make any sense or reflect any credit on those who sit opposite? Of course it does not.

Can I place on record very clearly some of the facts about what has happened over the last 2½ years and why the act needs to be repealed tonight? I do that because it is obvious that a number of people who spoke in the debate about this have no idea. In fact, I think that is misleading. It is not the people who spoke in the debate, it is the people who wrote the speeches for them who have no idea—absolutely no idea—of what has happened over the last 2½ years in what I think has been one of the best consultation and engagement processes that I have ever been involved in. I think it has been one of the best processes that has resolved conflict. It would appear to me, listening tonight, that the Wilderness Society and their mouthpieces in here do not want to resolve conflict. They want conflict between the Indigenous groups and people who are interested in conservation. They want the conflict because organisations like the Wilderness Society thrive on conflict. They depend on conflict for their very existence. We have resolved that conflict. We have resolved that conflict in a way that has given Indigenous communities hope and the real conservation groups on the cape confidence that the issues that they are concerned about can be addressed.

The Wild Rivers Act can be repealed tonight because its policy objectives are now more effectively implemented through mechanisms such as the new Regional Planning Interests Act 2014, known as the RPI Act, and Queensland's existing land use planning and development assessment framework, which has come a long way since the Wild Rivers Act was introduced. The mechanism for the RPI Act to carry forward wild rivers policy objectives is through the use of strategic environmental areas, or SEAs. Five SEAs and their associated environmental attributes have been prescribed in the RPI regulation. I say again that the opposition in this place supported the passage of the RPI Act and it supported the RPI regulation. Those SEAs are Cape York, the Channel Country, the gulf rivers, Fraser Island and Hinchinbrook Island. The environmental attributes of these areas broadly relate to riparian processes, wildlife corridors, water quality, hydrologic processes, geomorphic processes and beneficial flooding and all are identified in the regulations. If a resource activity or regulated activity is proposed in an SEA it will be subject to the provisions of the RPI Act. In all SEAs, water storage dams and broadacre cropping have been prescribed as regulated activities and the provision exists to prescribe other activities. If a regional interest development approval is required the proposed activity will be assessed against the SEA assessment criteria contained in the RPI regulation. The required outcome of these criteria is that the activity will not result in any widespread or irreversible impact on the environmental attributes of the SEA.

Queensland's land use planning framework comprises the Sustainable Planning Act and a number of instruments and policies including the state planning policy, regional plans and local government planning schemes all of which have been reformed in the last 2½ years. The key tool within Queensland's land use planning framework that gives effect to wild rivers policy objectives is the state planning policy. The state planning policy contains the state's interest in biodiversity which is that matters of environmental significance are valued and protected and the health and resilience of biodiversity is maintained or enhanced to support ecological integrity. Matters of state environmental significance, or MSES as we know them, are a component of the biodiversity state interest. The wild river high preservation areas are a component of MSES and protection of these areas is carried forward in their entirety into the RPI Act and the RPI regulation.

The state planning policy requires local governments, when making or amending a planning scheme, to integrate the biodiversity state interest by, amongst other things, considering matters of national environmental significance in the local government area and the requirements of the Environmental Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999, by identifying MSES, by locating development in areas that avoid significant adverse impacts on MSES, by facilitating the protection and enhancement of MSES and by maintaining or enhancing ecological connectivity. The state planning policy also contains interim development assessment requirements for those cases where a local government planning scheme has not yet appropriately integrated the state's interest in biodiversity. Other aspects of the wild river policy objectives are achieved through a range of other existing frameworks, including the Water Act 2000 through water allocations and riverine protection permits; the Environmental Protection Act 1994 as environmentally relevant activities such as intensive agriculture, cattle feedlots, pig farming, extraction, screening and manufacturing; the Vegetation Management Act 1991 through the use of clearing permits for native vegetation clearing; and by amendments to the Forestry Act 1959 code of practice for getting forest products.

The Cape York SEA has been informed by the work to date on the Cape York Regional Plan. The draft regional plan was released for public comment on 20 November 2013 with formal public consultation taking place for 80 days from 25 November 2013 to 25 March 2014, which exceeded the statutory 60-day period. The draft plan included SEAs that were substantially different to the four wild river areas in the region. The community's views on the proposed SEAs varied wildly, with the majority of the 6,071 submissions received on the draft plan focusing on the extent and the locations of the SEAs. As a result, it was decided to change the original proposal and prescribe an SEA that carried forward in its entirety the existing wild river areas and add to that area the Steve Irwin reserve, and to continue with further consultation about the SEAs to be identified in the region. That is 80 days of formal consultation after a long period of informal consultation with the regional planning group, 6,071 submissions and a complete change to the original draft, yet still these people come in here and suggest that there has not been proper consultation.

The Cape York Regional Planning Committee, which includes all mayors from the region as well as the Indigenous stakeholder groups of Cape York Partnership and Balkanu Cape York Development Corporation, was consulted on this transitional approach. At the fourth meeting of the RPC in Cairns on 14 May this year, the RPC strongly supported the transition of wild river areas into SEAs under the Regional Planning Interests Act in an ongoing process of review of these areas through the Cape York Regional Plan. It is only right that those communities have a say in what land is protected for environmental and cultural purposes and that they also have a say in economic development opportunities for themselves and their future generations and communities. It is a say that they never had under the previous government.

In relation to consultation about the other wild rivers areas, the Channel Country strategic environmental area, known as the SEA, replaces the Cooper Creek Basin wild river area and the Georgina and Diamantina basins wild river area. This SEA draws on the government's core principles to protect Queensland's western rivers, as was announced by the Hon. Andrew Cripps, the Minister for Natural Resources and Mines, on 31 June 2013. The core principles underlying the Channel Country SEA were developed following the work of the Western Rivers Advisory Panel, the WRAP, in 2012-13. The panel comprised representatives of traditional owners, local governments, natural resource management groups, the Lake Eyre Basin Community Advisory Committee and Scientific Advisory Panel, AgForce and the resources sector. The targeted consultation built on 10 years of previous community consultation relevant to river protection and responsible development by collating and presenting previously identified desired outcomes and concerns. The panel identified alternative strategies for the area and finalised its report to the government in June 2013. That report was subsequently publicly released by the Minister for Natural Resources and Mines.

The remaining six wild river areas—Morning Inlet, Settlement Creek, Staaton River, Gregory River, Fraser Island and Hinchinbrook Island—have been carried forward to the gulf rivers, Fraser Island and Hinchinbrook Island SEAs in their entirety. Those areas carry forward the policy objectives of the respective wild river declarations in their current form, which were subject to public consultation at the time of the declaration of each wild river area. In the case of the gulf rivers SEA, we undertook additional consultation. We met with the shire councils and the Carpentaria Land Council, all of which have agreed to and understand the changes that were made six weeks ago to the legislation, which even the Labor Party supported. Similar to the approach for the Cape York SEA, these areas have been transitioned into the RPI Act framework as an interim approach until regional plans are prepared for those regions. As part of the regional planning process, the SEA will be reviewed with an opportunity to include new areas or to remove existing areas, and the local communities will have a big say in any such decision. When regional plans are developed for those areas, there will be community consultation through the formation of regional planning committees and through statutory notification periods set out in the legislation, just as we have done in the Darling Downs regional planning exercise, the Central Queensland regional planning exercise and the Cape York regional planning exercise. It was always the case that the Labor Party opposition would try to grandstand on the repeal of the wild rivers legislation, just as it has been grandstanding on the act ever since its inception. The folly and the absurdity of the statements that opposition members have made tonight are clear to anybody who wants to consider either the contribution the member for Hinchinbrook made or the detailed outline that I have just gone through.

In relation to other aspects of the bill, I reiterate that the government is committed to reducing the regulatory burden in Queensland, to removing provisions that are unnecessary or unclear and to clarifying and improving legislation where there is confusion about how it applies or where existing processes can be streamlined. In many contexts, time is money. By removing unnecessary requirements and making legislation clearer and easier to understand and apply, Queensland businesses and community organisations are able to spend less time focused on unnecessary compliance and more time on developing their businesses. As we know, this bill will repeal five redundant acts and remove unnecessary provisions to reduce red tape. It will further tidy up the statute books and also improve Queensland's legislation by amending a number of different acts across various portfolios, so that legislative provisions are clear and are easily understood and applied.

It is easy to understate the significance of these repeals, as the member for Mackay did this evening. In doing so, he has demonstrated his lack of understanding of both the full text of the report of the Office of Best Practice Regulation, the OBPR, and the consequences of maintaining unnecessary regulation and red tape. Had the member for Mackay or any other member read the report less selectively and taken account of the government's response and final form of the regulatory impact statement system, they would have realised that the government and the OBPR rely on a basket of measures to track progress in reducing the red-tape burden, page count being the least important consideration. Every redundant act or ineffective provision removed from our statute book has the potential to reduce the time spent administering legislation, the cost of unnecessary legal advice and time wasted in compliance activities. For this reason, the government will continue to pursue a broad range of red-tape reforms, including the kinds of amendments included in this bill. Importantly, however, the government will also pursue the kinds of significant reforms that we have already seen driving balanced economic growth with the Economic Development Act, the Regional Planning Interests Act and the legislation that we can expect to see in relation to the planning and development assessment system. Our government is justifiably proud of its record of reducing the red tape that was so often created by the member opposite.

For the second time in as many bills, the opposition has objected to the use of omnibus legislation. There is little point canvassing this objection in detail and I suggest that anybody who is concerned about it should look at the record of the former Labor government. As the State Development, Infrastructure and Industry Committee has proven when examining this bill, committees are able to scrutinise legislation, including omnibus bills, in detail and to consult widely before making recommendations.

As I said when I was speaking to the Sustainable Planning (Infrastructure Charges) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2014, a key difference between our approach to omnibus bills and that of those opposite is that our omnibus legislation deals with a manageable number of amendments. By contrast, the Labor Party when in government would routinely present omnibus legislation containing large numbers of amendments that had no connection whatever.

I thank the member for Mackay for his comments relating to the committee's response to party houses. I thank the members who made contributions on that provision who represent those areas where party houses are a problem. I note that the only recommendation the committee made in this regard is that the provisions be reviewed after 12 months. The government is happy to agree to that.

I note, however, that the member for Mackay is now asking us to set this aside. It is apparent that the member for Mackay does not realise that no additional red tape is introduced. The provisions are only utilised if a local government opts in. This would only happen where a council has identified the need to use these provisions to resolve problems in their community.

The party house issue is not new. It has been a problem for many years. Residents have had their peace and quiet disrupted over a long period of time. The opposition when in government ignored the problem, expecting that it would be handled through enforcement. This was a bit like locking the gate after the horse had bolted. Just ask the unfortunate residents who have had to suffer week after week the loutish behaviour of party house occupants.

This bill provides a planning tool to control this land use before it becomes a problem. If anything will cut down on unnecessary bureaucratic processes and administrative burden it is these party house provisions. These provisions provide councils with a way of preventing a problem before it occurs and dealing with a problem that has, up until now, seemed to be intractable.

The amendments to the State Development and Public Works Organisation Act create a streamlined, alternative impact assessment report process that will allow the Coordinator-General to evaluate a coordinated project without necessarily requiring a comprehensive environmental impact statement, having regard to the scale and extent of the potential effects. The proposed new assessment process will facilitate a detailed assessment of a coordinated project's environmental effects, although in a streamlined manner compared to an EIS process.

The key difference between the EIS and impact assessment report process is that an IAR does not require a full terms of reference for the EIS. Nonetheless, the impact assess report process allows the Coordinator-General to seek public comment and/or agency or expert advice on the scope of the IAR. It is anticipated that the scope of the information requirements needed to prepare an adequate impact assessment report may be more focused and risk based than for an EIS.

Although the amendments do propose to permit the Coordinator-General to evaluate an impact assessment report without public notification, the new provisions also state that public notification must occur where subsequent approvals require it. Therefore essential consultation processes through acts such as the Environmental Protection Act 1994 and the Sustainable Planning Act 2009 are not intended to be circumvented by the proposed impact assessment report option and it provides no option to do so.

It is anticipated that requirements for subsequent statutory approvals following the EIS will mean that a draft impact assessment report would typically be required to be advertised. Therefore, it is not intended that essential consultation processes are to be circumvented by the proposed IAR option.

Particular amendments proposed to the Economic Development Act 2012 relate to improving the processes to declare provision priority development areas. Prior to declaring a PDA I am required to consult with the relevant local council. It is the practice of this government to ensure that requests for PDAs, including provisional priority development areas or PPDAs either come from local government or have local government support. The PPDAs are intended to apply in very limited circumstances, only where development can be brought to the market quickly. The requirement for a PPDA to be consistent with the relevant local government's planning scheme has meant that opportunities to declare a PPDA were not realised and hence much needed economic development has been frustrated and councils' ambitions and aims have been frustrated.

The proposed requirement that the declaration of a PPDA not compromise the implementation of any planning instrument applying to the land is consistent with a test used in the Sustainable Planning Act 2009 for the making of a state planning regulatory provision. This works in conjunction with other robust tests for a PPDA declaration, such as a PPDA declaration may only be made if there is an overriding economic or community need to start the proposed development quickly and regard must be had to the main purpose of the Economic Development Act, which is to facilitate economic development and development for community purposes. In addition, a PPDA ceases three years after declaration. These very sensible checks and balances are considered appropriate tests in conjunction with the requirement for consultation with local government.

The amendments relating to the infrastructure expenses recoupment charge reflect the purpose of the charge which is to recover those expenses that are reasonably expected to be incurred for the provision of planned infrastructure. These expenses—for example, financing costs—where reasonably and properly incurred for the provision of planned infrastructure can be recouped provided the quantum of the charge is reasonable and does not impose an unreasonable burden on landholders or stifle development.

I would conclude by once again thanking all honourable members for their contributions to the debate. I commend the bill to the House.

Division: Question put—That the bill be now read a second time.

AYES, 69:

LNP, 65—Barton, Bates, Bennett, Berry, Bleijie, Boothman, Cavallucci, Choat, Costigan, Cox, Crandon, Cripps, Crisafulli, Davies, T Davis, Dempsey, Dickson, Dillaway, Dowling, Elmes, Emerson, Flegg, Frecklington, Gibson, Grant, Grimwade, Gulley, Hart, Hathaway, Hobbs, Holswich, Johnson, Kaye, Kempton, King, Krause, Latter, Maddern, Malone, Mander, McArdle, McVeigh, Menkens, Millard, Minnikin, Molhoek, Newman, Nicholls, Ostapovitch, Powell, Pucci, Rickuss, Ruthenberg, Seeney, Shorten, Shuttleworth, Smith, Sorensen, Stevens, Stewart, Symes, Trout, Walker, Woodforth, Young.

KAP, 3—Hopper, Katter, Knuth.

INDEPENDENTS, 1—Cunningham.

NOES, 10:

ALP, 8—Byrne, D'Ath, Lynham, Mulherin, Palaszczuk, Pitt, Scott, Trad.

PUP, 1—Douglas.

INDEPENDENTS, 1—Wellington.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Bill read a second time.

Consideration in Detail

Clauses 1 to 94—

Mr SEENEY (9.52 pm): I seek leave to move my amendments en bloc.

Leave granted.

Mr SEENEY: I move the following amendments—

1 Clause 17 (Insertion of new ch 3, pt 6, div 2, new ch 6, pt 6, div 3, hdg and new ss 116F and 116G)

Page 27, line 17—

omit.

2 Clause 17 (Insertion of new ch 3, pt 6, div 2, new ch 6, pt 6, div 3, hdg and new ss 116F and 116G)

Page 32, after line 20—

insert—

(3) The charge notice may form part of another notice given by the charging entity to the owner of the land.

Example of another notice given by a charging entity—

a rate notice given by a local government

3 After clause 25

Page 38, after line 17—

insert—

25A Amendment of s 16 (Saving of existing local industry policy)

(1) Section 16, from 'published' to 'Act'—

omit, insert—

in force immediately before the commencement of this section was taken to be the local industry policy for this Act from 1 July 2011 to 3 April 2014

(2) Section 16, editor's note—

omit.

4 Clause 27 (Amendment of s 24 (Definitions for pt 4))

Page 39, lines 13 to 15—

omit.

5 Clause 30 (Amendment of s 27AB (Requirements for application))

Page 41, line 20, '34J(2)(c)'—

omit, insert—

34J(2)(b)

6 Clause 31 (Replacement of s 27A (Lapsing of declaration))

Page 42, lines 2 to 20—

omit, insert—

section 34A(1)(b), accepted a draft EIS for the project as the final EIS.

(3) Despite subsection (2), if before the

7 Clause 34 (Replacement of s 32 (Preparation of EIS))

Page 43, lines 21 to 26, page 44, lines 1 to 29 and page 45, lines 1 to 21—

omit, insert—

(1) The proponent of the project must prepare a draft EIS for the project.

(2) The draft EIS prepared by the proponent must address, for the whole project, the terms of reference to the satisfaction of the Coordinator-General.

8 Clause 37 (Insertion of new ss 34A–34D and new pt 4, div 3, sdiv 2)

Page 47, lines 1 to 12—

omit, insert—

(iii) any other material the Coordinator-General considers is relevant to the project; and

(b) decide whether or not to accept the draft EIS as the final EIS for the project.

(2) The Coordinator-General may decide not to accept the draft EIS as the final EIS if satisfied

9 Clause 37 (Insertion of new ss 34A–34D and new pt 4, div 3, sdiv 2)

Page 47, line 22, 'as a'—

omit, insert—

as the

10 Clause 37 (Insertion of new ss 34A–34D and new pt 4, div 3, sdiv 2)

Page 47, lines 29 and 30—

omit, insert—

(d) the period within which a draft EIS that includes or attaches the additional information (a ***revised draft EIS***) must be given to the Coordinator-General.

11 Clause 37 (Insertion of new ss 34A–34D and new pt 4, div 3, sdiv 2)

Page 48, line 4, 'a final'—

omit, insert—

the final

12 Clause 37 (Insertion of new ss 34A–34D and new pt 4, div 3, sdiv 2)

Page 48, lines 8 to 12—

omit, insert—

period stated in the notice, give the Coordinator-General a revised draft EIS.

13 Clause 37 (Insertion of new ss 34A–34D and new pt 4, div 3, sdiv 2)

Page 48, lines 21 to 24—

omit, insert—

(b) give the Coordinator-General a revised draft EIS.

14 Clause 37 (Insertion of new ss 34A–34D and new pt 4, div 3, sdiv 2)

Page 48, after line 27—

insert—

(5) If the Coordinator-General receives a revised draft EIS under subsection (2) or (3), sections 34A and 34B apply to the revised draft EIS—

(a) as if a reference in section 34A(1) to the end of the submission period for the draft EIS were a reference to the day the Coordinator-General receives the revised draft EIS; and

(b) as if a reference in section 34A(1)(a)(ii) to a properly made submission for the draft EIS were a reference to a properly made submission for the additional information; and

(c) with any other necessary changes.

15 Clause 37 (Insertion of new ss 34A–34D and new pt 4, div 3, sdiv 2)

Page 48, line 31, 'a final'—

omit, insert—

the final

16 Clause 37 (Insertion of new ss 34A–34D and new pt 4, div 3, sdiv 2)

Page 51, lines 4 and 5—

omit, insert—

(1) This section applies if—

(a) a notifiable approval is required for the project; or

(b) the Coordinator-General gives the proponent a written notice stating that the draft IAR for the project must be publicly notified under this section.

17 Clause 37 (Insertion of new ss 34A–34D and new pt 4, div 3, sdiv 2)

Page 51, lines 25 to 27—

omit, insert—

(iii) any other material the

18 Clause 37 (Insertion of new ss 34A–34D and new pt 4, div 3, sdiv 2)

Page 52, lines 12 to 21—

omit, insert—

satisfied additional information is needed about—

(a) an environmental effect of the project; or

(b) any other matter the Coordinator-General considers relevant to the project.

19 Clause 37 (Insertion of new ss 34A–34D and new pt 4, div 3, sdiv 2)

Page 53, lines 5 to 13—

omit, insert—

(b) the additional information required;

(c) whether or not public notification of the draft IAR as amended to include or attach the additional information (the ***revised draft IAR***) is required;

(d) the period within which the revised draft IAR must be given to the Coordinator-General.

20 Clause 37 (Insertion of new ss 34A–34D and new pt 4, div 3, sdiv 2)

Page 53, line 14, 'publicly notify draft IAR or'—

omit.

21 Clause 37 (Insertion of new ss 34A–34D and new pt 4, div 3, sdiv 2)

Page 53, lines 19 to 30 and page 54, lines 1 to 7—

omit, insert—

(2) If the notice given under section 34J states that public notification of the revised draft IAR is not required, the proponent must, within the period stated in the notice, give the Coordinator-General the revised draft IAR.

(3) If the notice given under section 34J states that public notification of the revised draft IAR is required, the proponent must, within the period stated in the notice—

(a) comply with section 33 as if a reference in that section to a draft EIS were a reference to the revised draft IAR; and

(b) give the Coordinator-General the revised draft IAR.

(4) Submissions about the revised draft IAR may be made under section 34 as if the revised draft IAR were a draft EIS.

(5) If the Coordinator-General receives a revised draft IAR under subsection (2) or (3), sections 34I and 34J apply to the revised draft IAR.

22 Clause 40 (Amendment of s 35AA (Amendment of Coordinator-General's report))

Page 55, lines 13 to 15—

omit, insert—

Section 35AA(1), after 'EIS'—

insert—

or IAR

23 Clause 41 (Replacement of s 35A (Lapsing of Coordinator-General's report))

Page 55, line 21, 'an EIS'—

omit, insert—

the EIS

24 Clause 41 (Replacement of s 35A (Lapsing of Coordinator-General's report))

Page 56, lines 4 to 25—

omit, insert—

(2) Subsection (3) applies if—

(a) the project the subject of the Coordinator-General's report requires 1 or more relevant approvals; and

(b) the proponent applies for each relevant approval before the Coordinator-General's report would otherwise lapse under subsection (1).

(3) Despite subsection (1), the

25 Clause 41 (Replacement of s 35A (Lapsing of Coordinator-General's report))

Page 57, lines 3 to 20—

omit, insert—

(4) Subsection (5) applies if, before the report would otherwise lapse under subsection (1) or (3), the Coordinator-General gives the proponent written notice stating a later time for the report to lapse.

(5) Despite subsections (1) and (3), the Coordinator-General's report does not lapse until the later time stated in the notice.

(6) Subsection (7) applies if—

(a) division 8 applies to the project; and

(b) the undertaking of the project substantially starts before the Coordinator-General's report would otherwise lapse under subsection (1), (3) or (5).

(7) Despite subsections (1), (3) and (5), the Coordinator-General's report does not lapse and continues to have effect to the extent it imposes conditions for the undertaking of the project.

(8) In this section—

26 Clause 42 (Amendment of s 35H (Criteria for evaluating))

Page 58, lines 13 to 15—

omit, insert—

(2) Section 35H(b), after 'EIS'—

insert—

or IAR

27 Clause 43 (Replacement of s 35L (Lapsing of Coordinator-General's change report))

Page 59, lines 10 and 17, 'an EIS'—

omit, insert—

the EIS

28 Clause 44 (Amendment of s 36 (Application of sdiv 1))

Page 59, lines 27 to 29—

omit, insert—

Section 36(b), after 'EIS'—

insert—

or IAR

29 Clause 45 (Amendment of s 37 (Applications for material change of use or requiring impact assessment))

Page 60, lines 3 to 9—

omit, insert—

(1) Section 37(1)(c)—

omit, insert—

(c) a properly made submission about the following is taken to be a properly made submission about the application under IDAS—

(i) a draft EIS or draft IAR for the project;

(ii) any additional information required for the project that was publicly notified under section 34C(3); and

(2) Section 37(1)(d)(i), after 'report'—

insert—

for the EIS or IAR for the project

30 Clause 46 (Amendment of s 38 (When the decision stage for the project starts under IDAS))

Page 61, lines 1 to 8—

omit, insert—

(a) if the project requires an EIS—the Coordinator-General's report for the EIS; or

(b) if the project requires an IAR—the

31 Clause 59 (Amendment of s 153AA (Application for approval of project as a private infrastructure facility and for Coordinator-General to take land))

Page 71, lines 4 to 12—

omit.

32 Clause 65 (Replacement of s 161 (Power as to roads))

Page 75, after line 10—

insert—

(3A) An authorisation under subsection (1) may be subject to conditions imposed by the Coordinator-General.

(3B) Despite subsection (1)(c), the relevant land may be entered and occupied only if—

(a) the owner or occupier of the relevant land has been given written notice of the proposed entry and occupation, including the day the proposed entry and occupation will commence (the ***proposed entry day***); and

(b) the entry and occupation of the relevant land does not commence until the proposed entry day or a later day agreed with the owner or occupier of the land.

(3C) The proposed entry day stated in a notice given under subsection (3B)(a) must be a day that is at least 7 days after the day the notice is given.

33 Clause 65 (Replacement of s 161 (Power as to roads))

Page 76, after line 5—

insert—

160B Compensation for exercise of power under s 160A

(1) This section applies if the Coordinator-General, or a person authorised by the Coordinator-General, enters and occupies land under section 160A(1)(c).

(2) The owner or occupier of the land may give the Coordinator-General a written notice that claims compensation for damage caused by the entry or occupation of the land, or the carrying out of an activity on the land.

(3) A claim under subsection (2) must be made—

(a) within 1 year after the occupation or activity has ended; or

(b) by the later time allowed by the Coordinator-General.

(4) The amount of compensation, if any, payable under the claim is—

(a) the amount agreed between the Coordinator-General and the person that gave the notice under subsection (2); or

(b) if the Coordinator-General and the person can not agree, the amount decided by the Land Court.

(5) However, the amount of compensation must not be more than the compensation that would have been awarded if the land had been acquired under the *Acquisition of Land Act 1967*.

34 Clause 68 (Amendment of sch 2 (Dictionary))

Page 84, line 3, '*EIS*,'—

omit.

35 Clause 68 (Amendment of sch 2 (Dictionary))

Page 85, lines 14 to 18—

omit.

36 Clause 68 (Amendment of sch 2 (Dictionary))

Page 86, after line 19—

insert—

revised draft EIS see section 34B(2)(d).

revised draft IAR see section 34J(2)(c).

37 Clause 68 (Amendment of sch 2 (Dictionary))

Page 87, lines 16 to 19—

omit.

38 Clause 68 (Amendment of sch 2 (Dictionary))

Page 87, line 30, 'an EIS'—

omit, insert—

the EIS

39 After clause 70

Page 88, after line 17—

insert—

70A Amendment of s 249 (When assessment manager also has jurisdiction as concurrence agency)

Section 249—

insert—

(2) Despite subsection (1)(a), the entity's fee under section 260(1)(d) for a development application is taken to include the fee that would have been payable under section 272(1)(c) for the application if the entity were a concurrence agency for the application.

70B Amendment of s 260 (Applying for development approval)

Section 260(1)(d)—

insert—

Note—

See also section 249(2).

I table the explanatory notes for those amendments.

Tabled paper: State Development, Infrastructure and Planning (Red Tape Reduction) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2014, explanatory notes to Hon. Jeff Seeney's amendments [5633].

These amendments have been canvassed in the second reading debate. They are in response to the recommendations of the committee. I commend them to the House.

Amendments agreed to.

Clauses 1 to 94, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 95—

Mr MULHERIN (9.53 pm): This clause repeals the Wild Rivers Act 2005. As I outlined earlier in my speech on the second reading, the government has thrown away years of consultation and hard work that went into this legislation. The alternative model of strategic environmental areas will involve protection over a smaller area of the state, and there is no certainty for the community over amendments to the map for these areas. That is why the opposition does not support this clause and we are opposed to the bill.

Mr SEENEY: I have known the member for Mackay for a long time and he must be embarrassed to stand up and say that. He must be embarrassed. This was dealt with extensively in the second reading debate. The bill before the House tonight does nothing but repeal a bill that is no longer used because all of the provisions of that bill have been transferred to the Regional Planning Interests Act, which the member supported, which those opposite supported. They supported the alternative act. They supported the regulation giving effect to that act. The bill that is being repealed tonight is an empty vessel. All of its provisions have been transferred into a new piece of legislation. But it is a political icon for the Left and the member for Mackay has had to come in here and stand up and read words which he must find embarrassing in their absurdity.

Division: Question put—That clause 95 stand part of the bill.

AYES, 70:

LNP, 64—Barton, Bates, Bennett, Berry, Bleijie, Boothman, Cavallucci, Choat, Costigan, Cox, Crandon, Cripps, Crisafulli, Davies, T Davis, Dempsey, Dickson, Dillaway, Dowling, Elmes, Emerson, Flegg, Frecklington, Gibson, Grant, Grimwade, Gulley, Hart, Hathaway, Hobbs, Holswich, Johnson, Kaye, Kempton, King, Krause, Latter, Maddern, Malone, Mander, McArdle, McVeigh, Menkens, Millard, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, Ostapovitch, Powell, Pucci, Rickuss, Ruthenberg, Seeney, Shorten, Shuttleworth, Smith, Sorensen, Stevens, Stewart, Symes, Trout, Walker, Woodforth, Young.

KAP, 3—Hopper, Katter, Knuth.

PUP, 1—Douglas.

INDEPENDENTS, 2—Cunningham, Wellington.

NOES, 8:

ALP, 8—Byrne, D'Ath, Lynham, Mulherin, Palaszczuk, Pitt, Scott, Trad.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clause 95, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 96 to 154—

Mr SEENEY (10.00 pm): I seek leave to move the following amendments en bloc.

Leave granted.

Mr SEENEY: I move the following amendments—

40 Clause 103 (Insertion of new ch 13, pt 21)

Page 102, line 1, 'Transitional provision'—

omit, insert—

Saving and transitional provisions

41 Clause 103 (Insertion of new ch 13, pt 21)

Page 102, after line 7—

insert—

715A Definition for pt 21

In this part—

repealed Wild Rivers Act 2005 means the *Wild Rivers Act 2005* as in force immediately before its repeal.

715B Wild river references in existing environmental authorities

(1) This section applies if an environmental authority (an ***existing environmental authority***) given before the commencement refers to any of the following terms (a ***former term***) under the repealed *Wild Rivers Act 2005*—

(a) a nominated waterway;
(b) a wild river area;
(c) a wild river declaration;
(d) a wild river high preservation area;
(e) a wild river preservation area;
(f) a wild river floodplain management area;
(g) a wild river special floodplain management area;
(h) a wild river subartesian management area;
(i) the wild rivers code.

(2) For the existing environmental authority, the former term continues to have the meaning given under the repealed *Wild Rivers Act 2005* as if—

(a) that Act had not been repealed; and

(b) the following documents in force under the repealed *Wild Rivers Act 2005* were still in force—

(i) the wild river declaration for the land to which the environmental authority relates;

(ii) the wild rivers code.

(3) Subsection (2) applies despite the *Regional Planning Interests Act 2014*, section 107A.

(4) Despite chapter 5, part 6, the administering authority may amend the existing environmental authority to replace a condition that relates to a former term if the new condition imposes requirements that are equivalent to the replaced condition.

(5) As soon as practicable after amending an existing environmental authority under subsection (4), the administering authority must give written notice of the amendment to the environmental authority holder.

(6) This section expires 1 year after the commencement.

715C Wild river references in existing eligibility criteria and standard conditions

(1) This section applies if any of the following in force immediately before the commencement refer to a former term mentioned in section 715B(1)—

(a) eligibility criteria for an environmentally relevant activity (the ***existing eligibility criteria***);

(b) standard conditions for an environmental authority or environmentally relevant activity (the ***existing standard conditions***).

(2) For the existing eligibility criteria or existing standard conditions, the former term continues to have the meaning given under the repealed *Wild Rivers Act 2005* as if—

(a) that Act had not been repealed; and

(b) the following documents in force under the repealed *Wild Rivers Act 2005* were still in force—

(i) a wild river declaration;

(ii) the wild rivers code.

(3) Subsection (2) applies despite the *Regional Planning Interests Act 2014*, section 107A.

(4) Section 317 does not apply to an amendment to the existing eligibility criteria to replace a criterion that relates to a former term mentioned in section 715B(1) if the new criterion imposes requirements that are equivalent to the replaced criterion.

(5) Section 318C does not apply to an amendment to the existing standard conditions to replace a condition that relates to a former term mentioned in section 715B(1) if the new condition imposes requirements that are equivalent to the replaced condition.

(6) This section expires 1 year after the commencement.

715D Applications for environmental authorities and amendment applications for particular resource activities

(1) This section applies to an application for an environmental authority and an amendment application for an environmental authority (each an ***existing application***) if the existing application—

(a) was made, but not decided, before the commencement; and

(b) relates to a resource activity that is, or is proposed to be, carried out on land that—

(i) is in a strategic environmental area under the *Regional Planning Interests Act 2014*; and

(ii) was in a wild river area under the repealed *Wild Rivers Act 2005* immediately before the repeal of that Act.

(2) For assessing and deciding the existing application, the standard criteria is taken to include any relevant former wild river declaration as if the repealed *Wild Rivers Act 2005* and the former wild river declaration were still in force.

(3) In this section—

former wild river declaration means a wild river declaration in force under the repealed *Wild Rivers Act 2005* immediately before its repeal.

42 Clause 103 (Insertion of new ch 13, pt 21)

Page 102, line 20, 'part'—

omit, insert—

section

43 After clause 120

Page 109, after line 12—

insert—

120A Insertion of new s 24A

After section 24—

insert—

24A Exemption—wild river area under the repealed Wild Rivers Act 2005

(1) This section applies to a resource activity if the activity—

(a) is carried out on land that—

(i) is in a strategic environmental area; and

(ii) was in a wild river area under the repealed *Wild Rivers Act 2005* (a ***former wild river area***) immediately before the repeal of that Act; and

(b) is carried out under an environmental authority given, or applied for, before the repeal of the *Wild Rivers Act 2005*.

(2) To the extent the resource activity is carried out in the former wild river area, it is an ***exempt resource activity*** for the strategic environmental area.

(3) However, subsection (2) ceases to apply to the resource activity if—

(a) after the repeal of the *Wild Rivers Act 2005*, the authority holder makes an amendment application under the Environmental Protection Act, section 224 to amend the environmental authority; and

(b) the amendment application is approved; and

(c) the amendment involves either of the following—

(i) an increase in the area of land subject to expected surface impacts from the activity;

(ii) a change to the location of the land subject to expected surface impacts from the activity.

44 After clause 124

Page 111, after line 19—

insert—

124A Amendment of sch 1 (Dictionary)

Schedule 1, definition *exempt resource activity*, after '24(2)'—

insert—

, 24A(2)

45 Clause 127 (Insertion of new ch 10, pt 12, div 3)

Page 112, line 6, 'Provision'—

omit, insert—

Provisions

46 Clause 127 (Insertion of new ch 10, pt 12, div 3)

Page 112, after line 7—

insert—

994A Definition for div 3

In this division—

repealed Wild Rivers Act 2005 means the *Wild Rivers Act 2005* as in force immediately before its repeal.

994B Wild river references in existing development approvals

(1) This section applies if a development approval (an ***existing development approval***) given before the commencement refers to any of the following terms (a ***former term***) under the repealed *Wild Rivers Act 2005*—

(a) a nominated waterway;

(b) a wild river area;

(c) a wild river declaration;

(d) a wild river high preservation area;

(e) a wild river preservation area;

(f) a wild river floodplain management area;

(g) a wild river special floodplain management area;

(h) a wild river subartesian management area;

(i) the wild rivers code.

(2) For the existing development approval, the former term continues to have the meaning given under the repealed *Wild Rivers Act 2005* as if—

(a) that Act had not been repealed; and

(b) the following documents in force under the repealed *Wild Rivers Act 2005* were still in force—

(i) the wild river declaration for the land the subject of the development approval;

(ii) the wild river code.

(3) Subsection (2) applies despite the *Regional Planning Interests Act 2014*, section 107A.

(4) Despite chapter 6, part 8, the assessment manager for the development application to which the existing development approval relates may amend the approval to replace a condition that relates to a former term if the new condition imposes requirements that are equivalent to the replaced condition.

(5) As soon as practicable after amending an existing development approval under subsection (4), the assessment manager must give written notice of the amendment to the holder of the approval.

Note—

See section 995A for expiry of this section.

47 Clause 127 (Insertion of new ch 10, pt 12, div 3)

Page 112, lines 20 to 21—

omit, insert—

995A Expiry of div 3

This division and any transitional regulation made under section 995 expire 1 year after the commencement.

These amendments are consequential amendments, once again, fulfilling the recommendations of the committee. The issues have been dealt with in the second reading debate.

Amendments agreed to.

Clauses 96 to 154, as amended, agreed to.

Schedule—

Mr SEENEY (10.01 pm): I move the following amendments—

48 Schedule 1 (Minor, consequential and other amendments)

Page 121, line 13, 'each EIS or an IAR'—

omit, insert—

the EIS or IAR

49 Schedule 1 (Minor, consequential and other amendments)

Page 122, lines 20 to 29—

omit, insert—

(i) if an EIS was prepared for the project—the Coordinator-General's report for the EIS; or

(ii) if an IAR was prepared for the

50 Schedule 1 (Minor, consequential and other amendments)

Page 123, lines 7 and 18, 'an EIS'—

omit, insert—

the EIS

51 Schedule 1 (Minor, consequential and other amendments)

Page 124, lines 14 to 22—

omit, insert—

(a) if an EIS was prepared for the project—the Coordinator-General's report for the EIS prepared under the State Development Act, section 34D; or

(b) if an IAR was prepared for the project—the

52 Schedule 1 (Minor, consequential and other amendments)

Page 124, lines 30 and 31—

omit.

53 Schedule 1 (Minor, consequential and other amendments)

Page 125, lines 20 to 27 and page 126, line 1—

omit, insert—

(a) if an EIS was prepared for the project—the Coordinator-General's report for the EIS prepared under the State Development Act, section 34D; or

(b) if an IAR was prepared for the project—the

54 Schedule 1 (Minor, consequential and other amendments)

Page 126, lines 9 and 10—

omit.

55 Schedule 1 (Minor, consequential and other amendments)

Page 128, lines 5 to 15—

omit, insert—

(a) if an EIS was prepared under the State Development Act for the project—the Coordinator-General's report for the EIS prepared under the State Development Act, section 34D; or

(b) if an IAR was prepared under the State

56 Schedule 1 (Minor, consequential and other amendments)

Page 129, lines 1, 17 and 20 and page 130, lines 3 and 7, 'an EIS'—

omit, insert—

the EIS

57 Schedule 1 (Minor, consequential and other amendments)

Page 130, line 10, 'a draft'—

omit, insert—

the draft

58 Schedule 1 (Minor, consequential and other amendments)

Page 130, lines 11 to 13—

omit.

59 Schedule 1 (Minor, consequential and other amendments)

Page 130, lines 16 and 19, 'an EIS'—

omit, insert—

the EIS

60 Schedule 1 (Minor, consequential and other amendments)

Page 131, lines 11 to 13—

omit.

61 Schedule 1 (Minor, consequential and other amendments)

Page 132, line 29, '34K(2)'—

omit, insert—

34K(3)

Once again, these amendments are consequential amendments as we have discussed previously.

Amendments agreed to.

Schedule, as amended, agreed to.

Third Reading

Hon. JW SEENEY (Callide—LNP) (Deputy Premier and Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning) (10.02 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. JW SEENEY (Callide—LNP) (Deputy Premier and Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning) (10.02 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.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr STEVENS (Mermaid Beach—LNP) (Leader of the House) (10.03 pm): I move—

That the House do now adjourn.

Newman Government, Performance

Mr BYRNE (Rockhampton—ALP) (10.03 pm): The Premier is a man under pressure and he has not been handling it too well of late. The latest opinion polls confirm that the LNP government is becoming more unpopular by the day and even the loyal frontbenchers have apparently urged him to change his arrogant persona. Meanwhile, his backbenchers, fed up with never being listened to and scared witless by the polls that indicate most of them will be oncers after the next election, are increasingly gaff prone. The Premier's grasp on power is undermined by the arrogance and inexperience of his bungling Attorney-General and his one-trick pony Treasurer, who has failed to convince Queenslanders that he should be given permission to sell the state's valuable income-earning assets despite spending millions of taxpayer dollars to prosecute a political argument. Meanwhile, youth unemployment is hitting crisis levels and families are bemused at the ever-spiralling cost of living when the Premier had assured them of his plan to freeze taxes and cut utility bills. Four per cent unemployment is another nonsense that was always synthetic drivel. It has all gone terribly wrong and it is going to get much worse despite 'Operation Boring' being in place.

Nothing about this situation excuses the Premier's incredible attempt to claim credit for rescuing flood victims. In case any honourable members missed it, this is what the Premier told reporters in Brisbane as he implored people to recognise the leadership style he demonstrated. The article states—

"I'm the guy who got us through the Brisbane floods, The Gap storms in 2008, made sure that the people of Bundaberg were looked after, particularly got those people off those rooftops," he said.

"That is the sort of strong leadership you get from Campbell Newman.

"And you will continue to get from Campbell Newman—whether it is dealing with disasters that are man-made or natural ...

As shadow minister for emergency services, I cannot let this self-obsessed self-aggrandisement pass without comment.

A government member: Who wrote that for you, Bill? You're far better off writing it yourself, mate. That way it just flows off the tongue.

Mr BYRNE: In my opinion—I wrote it of course—it is inexcusable for any politician to claim the credit for the tireless and selfless devotion of the SES volunteers, the Queensland Police Service, the volunteer firefighters and armed forces personnel who actually risked their lives to rescue victims from these raging torrents. In the aftermath of these comments being made many professionals in these quarters have approached me. The Premier or the minister should apologise to these brave emergency service workers in this state because every one of them has taken it as an insult. Could you imagine Peter Cosgrove standing up and saying something like that about his efforts in Timor? It is a disgraceful misrepresentation and there should be an apology from this government

Sunshine Coast Arts, Convention and Entertainment Centre

Ms SIMPSON (Maroochydore—LNP) (10.06 pm): It is time to climb every mountain and turn the dream of a Sunshine Coast arts, convention and entertainment centre into reality. I welcome council's identification of the importance of the regional facility in the Maroochydore CBD and the setting aside of land, but I urge them to bring forward their road map to deliver it. As a keen musician and patron of local theatre and choir groups, I believe it is vital that council not leave its run too late but put together a comprehensive submission to seek funds from the proposed $8.6 billion Strong Choices Investment Program. Anyone who suggests that this facility can be delivered without council is dreaming. We need more than dreams; we need a road map. As this project is on council land and will be owned by council, they have to also own the process. That is important so that it does not burden ratepayers but helps them.

There is a great opportunity to seek funding for a properly scoped, rigorously planned arts, convention and entertainment centre. I am keen to work with council on their road map to deliver this and would urge them to make it a high priority as part of a vibrant future for the Maroochydore CBD and the whole of the Sunshine Coast. I believe the best way to sustainably fund this project is for co-investment from council, state and federal governments and, most importantly, the private sector, who are best placed to deliver an international five-star hotel which complements the site. A project such as this can be staged to grow, but first it must start.

The $8.6 billion Strong Choices Investment Program includes a proposed $100 million for cultural infrastructure, but there is also a proposed $500 million for projects with local government co-investment, which is a possible source. For the public to have their say about how they want the Strong Choices Investment Program funds spent, they can go to strongchoices.com.au. The government's plan is to cut the state's debt burden and reinvest funds from the sale or lease of up to 11 per cent of the state's assets. This would fund the investment program and reduce the state's $80 billion debt burden, which costs $450,000 per hour in interest payments. For the coast's state government MPs, our first priority for regional infrastructure is the duplication of the north coast rail line. This is necessary to unlock the public transport network and to get people off the road between the Sunshine Coast and Brisbane.

One of council's priorities is the Sunshine Coast airport upgrade, a very important project and one the state has already helped facilitate by contributing millions of dollars in strategically important land. However, the arts and convention centre is also important to the Sunshine Coast and must be driven by the project owner: the council. I am keen to work with them and urge their support to move this project up their list of priorities. Together we can make beautiful music for the Sunshine Coast.

Tertiary Transport Concession Card

Ms TRAD (South Brisbane—ALP) (10.09 pm): The introduction of the Tertiary Transport Concession Card is the latest example of a bungled project created by the transport minister. Whether it is the bungled South-East Queensland bus review, counting 300,000 trips on Gold Coast Light Rail before it has even opened, plummeting patronage figures or his failure to deliver Cross River Rail, everything this minister touches turns to a disaster. It is clear that students are the ones being punished for the minister's ineffective role in the rollout of the TTCC. We know that the minister was forced to revoke fines that were issued before the TTCC started. We know that some students have been waiting months for their TTCC to arrive. Other students have had their TTCC card arrive, only to have incorrect information printed on it.

But none of this seems to matter to an arrogant transport minister who refuses to listen to students who are pleading with him to rethink this scheme, so I want to place on record the concerns of Queensland students who have contacted my office. Rowan, an international student from UQ, said—

I am alarmed by the new requirements for a TTCC. This is an unreasonable administrative burden to place on tertiary students. I am committed to not owning a car for environmental reasons, but I can no longer afford the full fare in Brisbane, it has become so expensive.

Laura from QUT said—

Thank you for your concern regarding the Newman government's mess of the new TTCC scheme. I found it comforting to know that I was not the only one who was in the difficult situation of having lodged my application weeks before the change in laws, but weeks after the change in laws still hadn't received a new card. As you can imagine, this has caused me a great deal of trouble.

Elise from West End said—

Students live on a shoestring to begin with. No-one supports me except myself. To be given a fine like that, even though I am a full-time student with a disability, is ridiculous and downright wrong.

These are just three examples of the failed rollout of the TTCC. A petition started by the UQ student union calling on the transport minister to stop issuing fines until he cleans up this mess has attracted almost 4,000 signatures. Concerned students will be coming to Parliament House tomorrow to deliver their petition. I hope the transport minister takes the time to start listening to them as promised. I hope he actually comes out this time and meets with these students to listen to their concerns firsthand instead of sitting behind the protective walls of parliament during an estimates hearing and implying that students are merely raising concerns vexatiously or are untrustworthy—

(Time expired)

Aspley Electorate, Events

Hon. TE DAVIS (Aspley—LNP) (Minister for Communities, Child Safety and Disability Services) (10.12 pm): It gives me great pleasure to update the House on a few of the many great events that have taken place in the electorate of Aspley. Last Thursday night I attended the 2014 Bramble Bay school's music festival, which was proudly hosted by our own Bald Hills State School. The festival brought together 13 schools from around the region including Aspley East and Bald Hills state schools. The students were nothing short of sensational as the concert band, the string ensemble and the mass choir performed to a packed house. I would like to congratulate all students for putting on such an outstanding concert and also say a big 'thank you' to the staff, the music teachers and of course the parents for supporting and nurturing our young talent.

It was fantastic to have the Premier and minister for education officially launch the Education Accord at Aspley State School back in May. In preparation for the accord summit I hosted the Aspley Education Accord Forum at Aspley East State School with representatives from our local school communities coming together and articulating their vision for the future of Queensland education. It was a terrific evening with our principals, teachers, parents and students taking part in some very vibrant discussion on how we can deliver the best education outcomes for the next generation of students. It was a great group of people with some really great ideas, and I look forward to joining our three representatives at the summit in September.

Of course it is not all hard work and no play for our schools. Craigslea State School is hosting its bi-annual school carnival. As always, the carnival was a huge success and it was great to see so many families swing by and join in the fun. The day culminated with a suburban fireworks display, and I would like to congratulate the school community, but in particular the organising committee, for making the carnival such an enjoyable day for all.

It has been similarly exciting for our local seniors groups in Aspley. Last month I was pleased to join the Wavell Probus Club as it celebrated its 21st birthday with a special birthday lunch. It was a fantastic day of fellowship not only celebrating the club's coming of age, but also celebrating what has been another extraordinary year for this very friendly club.

More recently I had a great time when I opened the Multicap Aspley's All in Affair Festival. The day was filled with music and stalls. There was something for everyone. A big thank you to all the staff not only for bringing together our little community in such an inclusive way, but also for continuing to provide quality support to people with a disability in our local area.

Finally I would like to congratulate the Carseldine Markets for revitalising our Saturday mornings and putting on an incredibly successful farmers market. They have been an amazing success, with more than 10,000 visitors on their first weekend. I would encourage everyone to come along and enjoy—

(Time expired)

Whitsunday Electorate, Tourism

Mr COSTIGAN (Whitsunday—LNP) (10.16 pm): I would like to rise tonight to speak about the continuing revival of the tourism industry in my beloved Whitsundays. Of course a lot of that can be attributed to our plan for tourism: Destination Success, our 20-year plan for tourism in the great state of Queensland. In recent times we have seen some very encouraging signs in our part of the world, particularly in relation to the return of direct air services from our southern port and in fact Australia's biggest city: Sydney. We have Tigerair now running services from Sydney through to Proserpine airport—or Whitsunday Coast Airport, as we call it—and recently honourable members might be keen to learn of a decision by Qantas to bring back the flying kangaroo to Hamilton Island from Sydney after an 11-year hiatus. I was particularly delighted to join Lyell Strambi from Qantas, Glenn Bourke from Hamilton Island Enterprises, Guenter Gebhard from One&Only Hayman Island Resort and many others who are passionate about tourism when the flying kangaroo touched down on Hamilton Island recently. It was certainly a red-letter day for tourism in the place that I call paradise, because also that day we saw the official opening of the new look One&Only Hayman Island Resort after an $80 million redevelopment. I congratulate everyone involved in that refurbishment: the owners, management and staff at Hayman Island.

On the mainland it is also looking up. Last weekend we had the 'house full' sign go up at Airlie Beach. That is a shot in the arm for local people and it was on the back of our Reef Festival, which continues this week. Last week at the festival Airlie was pumping with fireworks thanks to the iconic Mackay based company Porters that has been serving our community since 1883. We had the Telstra Family Fun Day and we also had the street parade for the Reef Festival thanks to the Rotary Club of Airlie Beach.

On that note I would like to pay tribute to the likes of Allan Robinson, Merewyn Wright, Peter Jennings and John Powell, the man they call Mr Microphone, for putting on a good show. Also many thanks go to the children, teachers and parents from the local schools and community groups who took part in the street parade. It was a great day. Thanks also to Paula Bradley for the lollies that she fired at me sitting up there in the Hog's Breath Café. Not just any café too, I might add, but the café where the legend began. Don Algie himself set that restaurant up back in 1989, so this year is the 25th anniversary of the Hog's Breath chain and the legend that started in Airlie Beach.

On that note, congratulations are due on the 25th anniversary of Airlie Beach Race Week this year. I was delighted to represent Minister Stuckey at the official launch last week, and it all became a reality thanks to the dream of Don Algie all those years ago. Things are on the up in the place I call paradise.

Broadwater Electorate, Infrastructure

Miss BARTON (Broadwater—LNP) (10.19 pm): It gives me great pleasure to update the House on some of the fantastic announcements I was able to make in the electorate of Broadwater last week. Specifically, I want to talk about the $500,000 investment from the waterways management plan that I have been able to make at the Holly Avenue and Jasmine Avenue boat ramps. It gives me great pleasure to be able to invest half a million dollars in my electorate to upgrade these very important facilities.

One of the things this government has been committed to, in conjunction with the Gold Coast Waterways Authority, is making sure that the Broadwater is accessible to all boaties and is a navigable and safe area. We have spent a great amount of money making sure it is navigable, and now we need to make sure that people are actually able to get into the water. I am really excited that we have been able to see this money invested in this kind of infrastructure for the people of my electorate, particularly for those who like to get in the water up at Paradise Point. Not only will we see an upgrade and renewal of these boat ramps; we will also see a complete extension of them. This will mean that for larger boats or at low tide there will be increased accessibility, which is something I am really keen to deliver for the Broadwater.

Whilst they will be closed over the coming months, it is really important that I make sure, alongside the waterways authority, that these boat ramps are available for people to use in the summer months. As I am sure you would appreciate, Madam Speaker, as you yourself represent a coastal electorate, it is critically important to make sure that we are able to deliver not only quality infrastructure but also infrastructure at the right time and in the right place.

I also want to pay tribute and show my appreciation to the Minister for Fisheries while he is in the House and thank him for coming and visiting the great electorate of Broadwater the week before last to sit down with commercial and recreational fishers and talk about the fisheries management review that this government is undertaking. It shows again that this government is committed to going out and listening to the people of Queensland. I appreciate the minister taking time out of his busy schedule to come down and listen to those fishermen. The minister has committed to coming back down to the great electorate of Broadwater so that he can continue to meet with fishermen and fisherwomen. I thank him for making that commitment, because I know that the minister is very determined to make sure that people not only have the opportunity to have a say but are also well aware of our great plan.

This government has a strong plan for a brighter future. The Hon. Dr John McVeigh is doing a fantastic job in the area of fisheries and I look forward to welcoming him back to the great electorate of Broadwater in a couple of weeks time so that we can continue to talk about what we are going to do to make it easier for commercial and recreational fishermen to not only have a say but also participate in the process when it comes to reform in the area. I thank the minister.

(Time expired)

Heavy Vehicle Regulations

Mr KATTER (Mount Isa—KAP) (10.22 pm): I rise in the House to talk about driver fatigue laws. The rollout of the national laws has had some negative effects on a lot of operators in remote areas. This issue has been championed by Warren Bethel and Will Atwood from the Etheridge shire. At the LGAQ conference they moved a motion to amend these laws which was supported unanimously.

I refer to the drivers of particularly gravel trucks and water trucks. Because of monsoonal weather conditions, they get only one chance during the year to carry out works. A lot of contractors make a living off this work. It is something they have been managing well for years. To the best of our knowledge, there is no data to support the notion that fatigue has resulted in fatalities in remote areas in these types of vehicles. Gravel trucks or water trucks might be driving all day at 10 kilometres an hour. Under these laws it is mandatory that after nine days working there is five days rest, or after six days working there is one day rest, depending on which option is selected under the codes. If they opt for the five-day rest, operators who carry out their own maintenance are not allowed near the truck for five days. This makes it commercially unviable. It makes it more expensive for councils to operate. It makes it very difficult for these small contractors to operate. We are asking councils to do more with less. We need to revisit this issue and amend these laws as they apply to remote areas so that they can manage themselves—so that contractors can get in and do the work for the councils when it is dry. Taking five days off is just not feasible in these very remote areas.

A lot of the other heavy vehicle regulations may well work in larger companies in the city but are just unworkable in remote areas. There are now a number of checks that have to be carried out—checking all the tyres on a semi and so on. You cannot finish your checks before smoko! All this works out to more cost for council and reduced viability for contractors.

Through changes in policy a lot of savings can be made and better outcomes can be achieved. Once councils have more money—when they are not spending so much money complying with regulations—they will be able to spend more on what they should be spending on: roads, rubbish, water resources and so on. If government wants councils to do more with less, it should remove these regulations from remote areas. They do not work, they are impractical and there is no benefit from them in remote areas. They make no difference.

Capricorn Colour Festival

Mr YOUNG (Keppel—LNP) (10.25 pm): The DC Motors Capricorn Colour Festival is a three-day event that runs from Friday, 5 September to Sunday, 7 September 2014 at the Mercure Capricorn Resort Yeppoon. Popular Rockhampton hotelier Leigh Turnbull from the Criterion hotel is the chair and prime mover for the management committee. This is a large charity weekend, with

organisations receiving the benefit of this great event. Since the year 2000 they have been raising funds for Variety—the Children's Charity, the Royal Flying Doctor Service and the Capricorn Helicopter Rescue. This year they are planning a much larger event and will be including beyondblue, Mates4Mates and Relay for Life to the list of charity benefactors.

The weekend kicks off on the Friday with the Fawltee Golf Day. On Saturday there will be a high tea in the afternoon with guest speaker Em Rusciano, singer, songwriter and comedian. The beyondblue black-tie ball will follow that evening. The event wraps up on Sunday with hundreds of colourfully attired families walking, jogging or running in the Hillcrest Hospital Ramsay Health Care family fun run along Yeppoon's main beach. Other people who have committed are the Pops Orchestra and opera singer Mirusia Louwerse of Andre Rieu fame, and the Queensland Police Pipes & Drums will be making it to celebrate 150 years of policing.

It sounds like a great weekend. I would like to welcome my fellow members of the House to attend what will be a great weekend. All of the money goes to a very good cause.

Southern Freight Rail Corridor

Mr RICKUSS (Lockyer—LNP) (10.27 pm): I rise to table some documents in relation to the southern freight rail corridor that should have been tabled this morning.

Tabled paper: Documents regarding the southern freight rail corridor [5634].

Mount Emerald Wind Farm

Mr KNUTH (Dalrymple—KAP) (10.27 pm): Many residents of my electorate are questioning and are very upset about the Mount Emerald wind farm development proposal by Ratch, a Thailand based company, over an area of prime residential and agricultural land on the Atherton Tablelands. Residents' views are not being heard by the state as they have been given no legal right to object or even make submissions. Residents have been forced to do their own survey, and I now table a summary of that survey with transparent objections.

Tabled paper: Document titled 'Community says 'NO' to the Mount Emerald Wind Turbines—Community Survey Results' [5635].

I also have in my hand nearly 300 survey forms, only 10 of which are in favour of this development. I also table a petition, bearing over 1,000 signatures, opposing this massive wind farm development.

Tabled paper: Non-conforming petition regarding the proposed Mount Emerald Wind Farm [5636].

The community has overwhelmingly rejected this disaster in the making. It is a massive experiment over a prime wealthy farming area. Is the government intending to foist the development upon an unwilling public? Is the government listening? Nearly half of the survey respondents raised the issue of declining property values. Already, over $1.5 million has been wiped off property values in one lifestyle subdivision alone—a 30 per cent loss in some cases.

Ratch, a Thailand based company, hides behind Mount Emerald Wind Farm. It has made no commitment to the community, no commitment to compensation for lost property values, no commitment to compensation to ratepayers for road damage, no commitment to reimbursement of farmers for the losses incurred due to the inability to aerial spray and no commitment to residents suffering adverse health effects. Ratch has not assessed the economic loss to this farming community at all. Will the government take responsibility for this mess? These factors need to be taken into consideration before any decision is made.

Ratch is intending to subject residents to industrial noise much higher than would be allowed for any other project in rural Queensland. Questions are not being answered. Will residents be able to sleep? Council experts advised council to refuse the project and said that susceptible residents two to three kilometres away would be affected, and at greater distances also. This also puts the 1,200 Lotus Glen Correctional Centre inmates and staff right in the firing line. Will the government shut down the turbines or close the prison facility when there are noise problems? There are already two approved wind farm developments in Far North Queensland. Why would the government approve a third at huge cost to the community for very little benefit? This project will provide power only when the wind blows and massively increase electricity prices. The subsidies are ripped from electricity users pockets while profits are paid to foreign owned corporations. If the government wants green power, then it should support the Tully Millstream hydro—real power—baseload which has the

support of the community. Many thousands of people live and work within 10 kilometres of the project. This project will do a number of things—decrease property value, impact on prime agricultural land and increase electricity costs whilst profits go overseas according to the LNP senator—

(Time expired)

Pine Rivers Electorate, Public Transport

Mr HOLSWICH (Pine Rivers—LNP) (10.30 pm): The Newman government is delivering a better public transport system for Pine Rivers commuters and Pine Rivers commuters are saving money every week under the Newman government compared to what they would have been had the former Labor government continued in office. Cost of public transport is a massive issue for Pine Rivers commuters and it is a big strain on the average family budget. Our government understands that and our government has taken action. If we look at the price of a one-way fare at the moment from any of the stations in my electorate—Lawnton, Bray Park or Strathpine—into Brisbane Central, currently a go card adult fare is $6.28. If Labor had still been in office and if Labor's price path had still been in place, this would now be $7.19 per trip. That is a 91c saving that commuters have every time they jump on a train from Pine Rivers. But more than that, our government's successful initiative to allow free trips on public transport after the first nine trips each week means that regular commuters from Pine Rivers to Brisbane's CBD are saving that additional $6.28 every week. So a working mum from Bray Park is saving $15.38 each week on a trip from Pine Rivers to the CBD this year compared to what it would have been under the Labor government. If we expand that out over two years, over 2013 and 2014, that means a saving for each regular commuter in my electorate of over $1,200. That is an amazing saving that we have been able to achieve for commuters in Pine Rivers.

As we look forward to the next three years, we are continuing to do more with public transport fares in terms of capping the increases over the next three year to just 2.5 per cent per year. But more than that, we are also increasing the capacity of the rail network for Pine Rivers residents and beyond on the Caboolture line and also in the future for commuters on the Sunshine Coast line. At the moment our government has committed $168 million to build a new railway bridge over the North Pine River. This will give us two extra tracks and allow a lot more trains to actually use this line, particularly in peak hour. We will not have the problem anymore where trains have to stop at Lawnton station and wait as other trains come through that bottleneck, so it will allow increased services. That means that commuters from the CBD will be able to get home earlier in the afternoon to spend more time with their families because of the fantastic work of our government. We are also delivering on the Moreton Bay rail link which will be an absolute blessing and godsend for Pine Rivers residents. There is still more work to do. There is still more that we need to do to improve public transport and there are more things that I could mention that we have done, but our government is delivering for Pine Rivers commuters and we will continue to build a better public transport system for Pine Rivers.

Question put—That the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10.34 pm.

ATTENDANCE

Barton, Bates, Bennett, Berry, Bleijie, Boothman, Byrne, Cavallucci, Choat, Costigan, Cox, Crandon, Cripps, Crisafulli, Cunningham, D'Ath, Davies, T Davis, Dempsey, Dickson, Dillaway, Douglas, Dowling, Elmes, Emerson, Flegg, France, Frecklington, Gibson, Grant, Grimwade, Gulley, Hart, Hathaway, Hobbs, Holswich, Hopper, Johnson, Katter, Kaye, Kempton, King, Knuth, Krause, Langbroek, Latter, Lynham, Maddern, Malone, Mander, McArdle, McVeigh, Menkens, Millard, Miller, Minnikin, Molhoek, Mulherin, Newman, Nicholls, Ostapovitch, Palaszczuk, Pitt, Powell, Pucci, Rice, Rickuss, Ruthenberg, Scott, Seeney, Shorten, Shuttleworth, Simpson, Smith, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stewart, Symes, Trad, Trout, Walker, Watts, Wellington, Woodforth, Young