



RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Hansard Home Page: <http://www.parliament.qld.gov.au/work-of-assembly/hansard>
 Email: hansard@parliament.qld.gov.au
 Phone (07) 3553 6344 Fax (07) 3553 6369

FIRST SESSION OF THE FIFTY-FIFTH PARLIAMENT

Wednesday, 11 November 2015

| Subject | Page |
|---|------|
| PERSONAL EXPLANATION | 2745 |
| <i>Courier-Mail</i> Article..... | 2745 |
| COMMITTEE OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY | 2745 |
| Report..... | 2745 |
| <i>Tabled paper:</i> Committee of the Legislative Assembly: Report No. 16—Annual Reports of Former Committees 2014-2015..... | 2745 |
| PRIVILEGE | 2745 |
| Speaker's Ruling, Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House by a Member | 2745 |
| <i>Tabled paper:</i> Correspondence, various dates, relating to an alleged deliberate misleading of the House by the member for Glass House, Mr Andrew Powell MP..... | 2746 |
| TABLED PAPERS | 2746 |
| MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS | 2746 |
| Remembrance Day..... | 2746 |
| Advance Queensland..... | 2747 |
| Central Queensland University, Development..... | 2748 |
| Member for Mudgeeraba..... | 2748 |
| Advancing Education..... | 2751 |
| Advance Queensland, Science and Innovation..... | 2752 |
| Police, Body Worn Video Cameras..... | 2752 |
| Agriculture Industry, Drone Technology..... | 2753 |
| Spinal Cord Injury Awareness Week; National Injury Insurance Scheme..... | 2754 |
| MOTION | 2754 |
| Referral to the Communities, Disability Services and Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Committee..... | 2754 |
| TRANSPORT OPERATIONS (MARINE SAFETY—DOMESTIC COMMERCIAL VESSEL NATIONAL LAW APPLICATION) BILL; TRANSPORT OPERATIONS (MARINE SAFETY) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL | 2755 |
| Cognate Debate..... | 2755 |

Table of Contents – Wednesday, 11 November 2015

| | |
|--|-------------|
| NOTICE OF MOTION | 2755 |
| Organised Crime Commission of Inquiry | 2755 |
| PRIVATE MEMBERS' STATEMENTS | 2755 |
| Minister for Health | 2755 |
| Ethanol Industry | 2756 |
| Department of Science, Information Technology and Innovation, Director-General | 2758 |
| Public Service | 2759 |
| Queensland Tourism Investment Guide | 2759 |
| QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE | 2760 |
| Queensland Tourism Investment Guide, Cross River Rail | 2760 |
| Queensland Tourism Investment Guide, Gold Coast Light Rail | 2761 |
| Child Protection | 2761 |
| TAFE Queensland, Information Technology | 2762 |
| Advance Queensland | 2762 |
| TAFE Queensland, Information Technology | 2763 |
| <i>Tabled paper: Media statement, dated 10 November 2015, by TAFE Queensland regarding security breach of TAFE Queensland and Department of Education and Training websites.</i> | 2763 |
| Moreton Bay Rail Link | 2764 |
| Queensland Tourism Investment Guide | 2764 |
| Advance Queensland | 2765 |
| Information Technology | 2766 |
| Disability Services, Assistive Technologies | 2766 |
| Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Services | 2767 |
| <i>Tabled paper: Article from the Courier-Mail, dated 11 November 2015, titled 'Civil debate gets a crude awakening'</i> | 2767 |
| Mining Industry | 2768 |
| Rural Debt and Drought Taskforce | 2768 |
| Gold Coast Commonwealth Games, Investment | 2769 |
| RACQ, President | 2770 |
| Net-Free Zones | 2770 |
| Rural Debt and Drought Taskforce | 2771 |
| Drought | 2771 |
| Alcohol Fuelled Violence | 2772 |
| <i>Tabled paper: Document, undated, titled 'Trading Hour Push Ahead of Summer Drinks Toll'</i> | 2772 |
| PRIVILEGE | 2772 |
| Alleged Contempt of Parliament by a Minister | 2772 |
| SUSTAINABLE PORTS DEVELOPMENT BILL | 2773 |
| Second Reading | 2773 |
| Division: Question put—That the amendment be agreed to. | 2783 |
| Resolved in the negative..... | 2783 |
| MINISTERIAL STATEMENT | 2789 |
| Ethanol Industry | 2789 |
| MOTION | 2789 |
| Organised Crime Commission of Inquiry | 2789 |
| <i>Tabled paper: Article from the Australian, dated 1 May 2015, titled 'It's all on the table' in crime inquiry'</i> | 2790 |
| <i>Tabled paper: Extract of Commissions of Inquiry Act 1950, ss 9-10 regarding contempt of a commission</i> | 2792 |
| Division: Question put—That the motion be agreed to. | 2796 |
| Resolved in the negative..... | 2796 |
| SPEAKER'S RULING | 2796 |
| Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House by a Minister; Referral to Ethics Committee | 2796 |
| MINISTERIAL STATEMENT | 2796 |
| Alleged Contempt of Parliament by a Minister | 2796 |
| MOTION | 2797 |
| Order of Business | 2797 |
| COUNTER-TERRORISM AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL | 2797 |
| Second Reading | 2797 |
| <i>Tabled paper: Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee: Report No. 13, 55th Parliament—Counter-Terrorism and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2015, government response</i> | 2797 |
| Consideration in Detail | 2813 |
| Clauses 1 to 12, as read, agreed to. | 2813 |
| Insertion of new clause—..... | 2813 |
| <i>Tabled paper: Counter-Terrorism and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2015, explanatory notes to Hon. Miller's amendments</i> | 2814 |
| Amendment agreed to..... | 2814 |
| Clause 13, as read, agreed to. | 2814 |
| Clause 14—..... | 2814 |
| Clause 14, as amended, agreed to. | 2814 |
| Clauses 15 to 17, as read, agreed to. | 2814 |
| Third Reading | 2814 |
| Long Title | 2814 |

Table of Contents – Wednesday, 11 November 2015

| | |
|--|-------------|
| ADJOURNMENT | 2814 |
| Mount Coolool National Park, Facilities | 2815 |
| <i>Tabled paper:</i> Department of Environment: Queensland Parks and Wildlife Service – Mt Coolool National Park Management Plan, May 1998..... | 2815 |
| Pine Rivers RSL, Memorial Gates | 2815 |
| Stolen Wages Taskforce, Documents | 2816 |
| Ipswich Electorate, Australian Honours System | 2816 |
| Cleveland Electorate, Road Infrastructure | 2817 |
| Crush Festival Bundaberg | 2817 |
| Australian Transgender Support Association of Queensland | 2818 |
| Boyne Valley Lions Club | 2819 |
| Mount Isa Electorate | 2819 |
| Beenleigh Town Square | 2820 |
| ATTENDANCE | 2820 |

WEDNESDAY, 11 NOVEMBER 2015



The Legislative Assembly met at 2.00 pm.

Mr Speaker (Hon. Peter Wellington, Nicklin) read prayers and took the chair.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Courier-Mail Article



Ms BATES (Mudgeeraba—LNP) (2.01 pm): I rise to provide a personal explanation after reading a very peculiar article in today's paper about my recent accompaniment of the clinical team coordinators at Gold Coast University Hospital and Robina Hospital. Despite the claims of this article, during my time at these hospitals I did not perform any clinical role which required direct or indirect patient contact. I did do two shifts at Robina and Gold Coast University hospitals in an observatory role. I undertook an education, research, advisory and policy development role which is permitted within the conditions imposed on my continued registration as a registered nurse through the Australian Health Practitioner Regulation Agency, which I have already been in contact with this morning. These occasions were facilitated by the Chief Executive of the Gold Coast Hospital and Health Service after I wrote to the Minister for Health on 9 July. I also recall speaking to the Minister for Health in the stairwell here in parliament and thanked him for the opportunity to shadow the CTCs at Robina and Gold Coast hospitals.

In all honesty, I found today's article laughable and lacking any substance. In my 35 years of nursing I have never heard or used the phrase 'pulled shifts' and I am unsure where this terminology comes from. The use of the phrase 'moonlighting' is blatantly misleading as it suggests I was paid or somehow on the roster for these shifts, which I was not. The article seems to suggest that I had thrown on my scrubs and started practising as a nurse in my spare time. In reality, due to my casual attire, which included a pair of jeans, a tracksuit top and runners, I was mistaken a number of times for a patient, a relative and a visitor. I did not arrive at the hospitals to a red carpet, trumpets and a 21-gun salute. In fact, very few staff members even knew who I was. I observed the staff on the front line and I gained an accurate understanding of the challenges Health staff face. I will continue in a proactive role in health policy, and I look forward to more discussions with our Health staff. I look forward to the relevant media outlet correcting the public record.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Mudgeeraba, the order of business where I think your statement may have been more appropriate is a personal explanation, not a matter of privilege.

COMMITTEE OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

Report



Mr SPEAKER: I table report No. 16 of the Committee of the Legislative Assembly titled *Annual reports of former committees 2014-2015*, and I commend the report to the House.

Tabled paper: Committee of the Legislative Assembly: Report No. 16—Annual Reports of Former Committees 2014-2015 [[1608](#)].

PRIVILEGE

Speaker's Ruling, Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House by a Member



Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, on 21 September 2015 the Treasurer, Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations and Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships wrote to me alleging that the member for Glass House deliberately misled the House in a question without notice. I have circulated a ruling on this matter. I have decided that the matter does not warrant the further attention of the House via the Ethics Committee, and I will not be referring the matter. I seek leave to incorporate the ruling.

Leave granted.

On 21 September 2015, the Treasurer, Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations and Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships wrote to me alleging that the Member for Glass House deliberately misled the House in his question without notice when he asked:

My question without notice is to the Attorney-General. I refer to the National Union of Workers' electoral return for the 2015 state election, which declares a \$5,000 gift was given to candidate Curtis Pitt. Given the Treasurer's electoral disclosure return for the same period declares that he received gifts totalling nil dollars, can the Attorney-General advise under Queensland law what investigations are underway?

In his letter to me, the Treasurer stated that the question from the Member for Glass House was deliberately misleading because the Member for Glass House would have known the donation would be included in the ALP's return, which had not yet been made publicly available by the ECQ at the time the question was asked.

I sought further information from the Member for Glass House about the allegations made against him, in accordance with Standing Order 269(5).

The Member for Glass House referred to the National Union of Workers' electoral return for the 2015 state election which shows a gift of \$5000 to Curtis Pitt, and the electoral return of the Treasurer, which does not record the gift. The Member for Glass House also advised that he was not aware of the gift having been included in the ALP's electoral return, and had noted the return by the Attorney-General for the Redcliffe by-election as precedent of payments made directly to a candidate by a third party being declared by the candidate.

Standing Order 269(4) requires:

In considering whether the matter should be referred to the committee, the Speaker shall take account of the degree of importance of the matter which has been raised and whether an adequate apology or explanation has been made in respect of the matter. No matter should be referred to the ethics committee if the matter is technical or trivial and does not warrant the further attention of the House.

On the evidence before me I considered that the Member for Glass House's Question Without Notice consisted of three parts; two statements of fact and then a question. In my view, neither the statement regarding the National Union of Workers electoral return nor the statement regarding the Treasurer's electoral disclosure return were factually or apparently incorrect or misleading.

Had the third part of the Question Without Notice been a statement of fact (for example, that investigations were underway) it may well have been misleading, however, it wasn't, the third part was in the form of a question. To not allow questions as to whether the government is investigating a particular matter or not on the basis that some persons might jump to a false conclusion that something untoward has occurred would be contrary to the scrutiny function of question time.

I am satisfied with the Member for Glass House's explanation, and, therefore, I have decided that the matter does not warrant the further attention of the House via the Ethics Committee and I will not be referring the matter.

I table the correspondence in relation to this matter.

Tabled paper: Correspondence, various dates, relating to an alleged deliberate misleading of the House by the member for Glass House, Mr Andrew Powell MP [[1609](#)].

TABLED PAPERS

MINISTERIAL PAPER


The following ministerial paper was tabled by the Clerk—

Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection and Minister for National Parks and the Great Barrier Reef (Dr Miles)—

[1610](#) Response from the Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection and Minister for National Parks and the Great Barrier Reef (Dr Miles) to a paper petition (2483-15) presented by Ms Simpson, and an ePetition (2437-15) sponsored by Ms Simpson, requesting the House to provide public toilet facilities and better parking solutions for visitors to Mt Coolum National Park

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Remembrance Day


 **Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for the Arts) (2.05 pm): This morning I attended the state RSL Remembrance Day ceremony at Anzac Square along with the Leader of the Opposition. With Queenslanders across the state we marked in silence the moment when, after more than four years of relentless warfare, the guns of the western front fell silent 97 years ago. This moment in time represents the German call for an armistice which led to their acceptance of an unconditional surrender. Armistice Day, as it was then known, justifiably attained a special significance in the years following the First World War. After the end of the Second World War, Australia recognised the need to commemorate the service and sacrifice of all war dead and changed the name to Remembrance Day.

Since 1899 over one million Australians have served in numerous wars and conflicts, and more than 30,000 have served in over 50 peacekeeping operations. The impact has been significant, with over 101,000 Australian lives lost—over 101,000 men and women who were someone's brother,

someone's mother, someone's friend. Alongside this loss we also give thought to over 900,000 men and women who have returned from active service. They walk amongst us in our everyday lives, often carrying a heavy burden from their extraordinary experiences in operations—a weight that many struggle with as they transition back into civilian life.

On Remembrance Day I encourage all Queenslanders to remember all service men and women past and present, those who have returned and those who, sadly, did not. They each have a story—some big, some small—yet together these stories remain immensely significant in shaping our Australian identity. As we commemorate the centenary of the First World War between 2014-18, let us remember the events that have made us who we are so we may learn from history rather than repeat it. Let us not forget.

Advance Queensland

 **Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for the Arts) (2.06 pm): I have been clear that my government is committed to supporting economic growth and creating jobs for Queenslanders. That is why my government is investing \$180 million over four years in the Advance Queensland initiative, part of our plan to diversify the economy and create the knowledge based jobs of the future. Advance Queensland is a comprehensive suite of programs based on international evidence of what works. It will help position our state as a place where entrepreneurs, industry, universities and government work collaboratively together to turn great ideas into great products and growing businesses that create jobs of the future.

Advance Queensland includes a \$50 million best and brightest fund to develop, attract and retain world-class scientific and entrepreneurial talent; a \$46 million future jobs strategy to incentivise collaboration and mission driven R and D and deliver 10-year road maps for emerging industries; a \$76 million business investment attraction package to encourage a new wave of Queensland start-ups and improve access to finance and management support for start-ups and SMEs; and with \$8 million set aside to give us the flexibility to respond as new opportunities arise.

My government has been busy consulting with stakeholders about Advance Queensland, designing its individual programs and implementing those over the past few months. Since August we have launched the Advance Queensland research fellowships, PhD scholarships, the PhD Industry Experience Program, the Women's Academic Fund, the Knowledge Transfer Partnerships program, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander fellowships and PhD scholarships, Community Digital Champions program, and the Advance Queensland Johnson & Johnson Innovation Quick Fire Challenge.

We also released *Coding counts: a discussion paper on coding and robotics in Queensland schools*. This proposes that state schools co-design technology based learning with students and develop real world partnerships with industries or universities. This is all about preparing students for the jobs of the future. On 15 October my government announced the appointment of 16 high-level representatives from industry, tertiary and research sectors to the Advance Queensland Expert Panel. This panel, chaired by the Minister for Science and Innovation, the Hon. Leeanne Enoch, brings together a diverse range of people including highly respected scientists, business leaders and successful entrepreneurs to provide advice and direction to the Advance Queensland initiative.


At the Committee for Economic Development of Australia's State of the State luncheon on 20 October, I was pleased to announce the opening of the \$40 million Advance Queensland Business Development Fund to turn our great ideas into commercial realities. Queensland's start-up businesses have not always had access to the venture capital they need, and my government is changing that. The business development fund will ensure both start-up and established businesses have the funding they need and are supported by a co-investor who will provide invaluable expertise and advice to mentor and grow these ventures. This is an example of business and government working together to establish a much needed, mature venture capital market for start-ups in Queensland.

We also have embarked on a six-month, multimedia Advance Queensland engagement strategy. This will celebrate and highlight innovation taking place in our great state and encourage and promote community participation in Advance Queensland. We need fresh ideas and we must constantly evolve to stay ahead of the surge in technology that is shaping our everyday lives.

Tonight I will be hosting the Advance Queensland innovation and investment reception, the first of its kind in Queensland's Parliament House, and I have offered an invitation to the Leader of the Opposition and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to join my cabinet colleagues. Bringing together members of the start-up, research, ICT and investment communities in collaboration with government offers us the chance to sow the seeds of the innovation industry Queensland needs to prosper in this

era of unprecedented global technological change. Building an economy that provides jobs for all Queenslanders is my government's top priority, and my government will continue to work with entrepreneurs, industry and universities to deliver Advance Queensland and drive innovation in our state. By making innovation and knowledge based industries a key focus of this government, we are intent on delivering a new era of opportunity for Queenslanders. This is all part of my government's commitment to developing and nurturing an economy where Queenslanders, their children and grandchildren have great prospects long into the future.

Central Queensland University, Development

 **Hon. JA TRAD** (South Brisbane—ALP) (Deputy Premier, Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning and Minister for Trade) (2.10 pm): This week I am calling on developers to lodge expressions of interest to build a vibrant university village boasting more than 2,000 homes at the Central Queensland University campus in Rockhampton. The successful proponent will become joint venture partners with the Queensland government to transform 80 hectares of the university campus into a mix of residential, retail, community and recreational areas. This is an exciting major project for Rockhampton. Up to 4,000 people could call this part of the city home and, importantly, the project aims to have affordable housing within walking distance of the university.


The development will not only enhance the role of the Central Queensland University as an education destination, but also provide the broader Rockhampton community with a diverse range of housing options, including affordable housing and new retail and recreational amenities. It could also help attract more international students—an important export for Queensland. In fact, international education is already Queensland's second biggest service export and has contributed over \$2.5 billion to the Queensland economy, including over \$700 million to the regions.

The redevelopment of Central Queensland University will also boost the Central Queensland economy, as more than 470 jobs are expected to be generated across the life of the project, which will take between 10 and 15 years to complete. The next phase of the project follows the announcement of \$7.65 million in state investment for the provision of an intersection at the Bruce Highway and the new main street within stage 1 of the development. This is a great example of where catalyst infrastructure can help the next stage of a development get off the ground and shows how important it is for major projects to be pursued on a bipartisan basis. This is a project started under the Bligh government, continued by the LNP government and now delivered by the Palaszczuk government.

Central Queensland University Rockhampton was declared a priority development area in 2011. Since that time, Economic Development Queensland has been working closely with the university and the Rockhampton Regional Council on potential development opportunities. This project also shows how our Advance Queensland agenda to further diversify our economy and grow our knowledge industries will generate jobs now and jobs for the future. More information about the expression of interest process can be found on the QTenders website from tomorrow.

Mr SPEAKER: Before calling the Minister for Health, I am informed that we have student captains observing our proceedings in the public gallery from the Clover Hill State School in the electorate of Mudgeeraba.

Member for Mudgeeraba

 **Hon. CR DICK** (Woodridge—ALP) (Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services) (2.13 pm): I rise on a very important issue in this House today. All Queenslanders expect when they attend a Queensland public hospital that they will be treated by competent, qualified and registered clinicians. On this side of the House, we respect the rights of suitably qualified professionals to maintain their registration and skills while serving in this House.

Earlier this year, I received a letter dated 9 July from the member for Mudgeeraba requesting a 'visit' to Robina Hospital and Gold Coast University Hospital. On 15 October 2015 I approved Ms Bates's request, granting authority to attend the hospitals for 30 minutes as an observer on 24 October 2015. I am disturbed by reports, including statements from the member herself, that she has been working shifts as a registered nurse at Gold Coast hospitals. On 14 October in a committee hearing of the Health and Ambulance Services Committee, the member stated—

About three weeks ago I worked a night-duty shift—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr Bleijie interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order, members! Member for Kawana, if the member for Mudgeeraba wants to make an interjection, she is able to. She does not need your assistance.

Mr DICK: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I repeat: on 14 October in a committee hearing of the Health and Ambulance Services Committee, the member stated—

About three weeks ago I worked a night-duty shift at the Gold Coast University Hospital.

On 23 October 2015 in correspondence the member for Mudgeeraba claimed to have 'completed shifts' at the Gold Coast University Hospital and the Robina Hospital. She specifically stated that she was 'on night duty' at the Gold Coast University Hospital and referred to 'working' at the Robina Hospital. On 28 October 2015 Ms Bates made further remarks at a public hearing of the Health and Ambulance Services Committee stating, and I quote again—

I did an actual full shift at Robina Hospital a couple of weeks ago. I spent a lot of time in the mental health unit and the ED ...

The member for Mudgeeraba has repeatedly claimed that on around 23 September 2015 and again in mid-October she completed night duty and other shifts at the Gold Coast University Hospital and the Robina Hospital. Today she has claimed in the media that she 'undertook an education, research, advisory and policy development role'. It is unclear from her statement in the media and in the House this afternoon whom she was educating, what she was researching or whom she was advising.

I am advised that on 28 April 2014—more than 18 months ago—the Nursing and Midwifery Board of Australia placed restrictions on Ms Bates's registration as a nurse, such that she was not to undertake any role involving 'direct or indirect clinical patient contact unless approved to do so by the board or its delegate'. It is unclear to me how following clinical teams around a hospital does not amount to indirect clinical patient contact. The conduct and statements of the member for Mudgeeraba do not add up. The member for Mudgeeraba has either misled this parliament or breached her registration obligations as a registered health professional or she has done both. All Queenslanders expect when they attend a Queensland public hospital that their private health information is kept absolutely confidential.

Ms BATES: I rise to a point of order, Mr Speaker. The minister knows full well that he met me in the stairwell and I told him what I was doing and I thanked him for giving me the opportunity. I suggest, Mr Speaker, that the minister actually goes and does a shift himself at the hospital.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Members! Member for Mudgeeraba—

Mr Seeney interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Callide! Member for Mudgeeraba, if you have a point of order, if you find something offensive and you ask it to be withdrawn, you can do that. You can write to me if you choose. Do you find anything offensive that you wish to be withdrawn?

Ms BATES: Mr Speaker, I find absolutely everything that the minister says personally offensive and I ask that he withdraw the entire statement.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Members! Minister, under the conventions of the proceedings of the parliament, if a member finds something personally offensive the standard procedure is that it is withdrawn unconditionally.

Mr DICK: Mr Speaker, I withdraw, but I cannot change—

Mr SPEAKER: Minister, with respect—

Mr DICK: Mr Speaker, I withdraw.

Mr SPEAKER: It is the convention to have an unconditional withdrawal. Do you have anything further to add?

Mr DICK: I do, Mr Speaker. These are serious matters that affect the operation of public hospitals in Queensland. Let me say this. All Queenslanders expect when they attend a Queensland public hospital that their private health information—

Mr Bleijie interjected.

Mr Seeney interjected.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Members, you are all now warned to come to order—member for Kawana, member for Callide and everyone else. I call the minister.

Mr DICK: All Queenslanders expect that when they attend a Queensland public hospital their private health information is kept absolutely confidential. Confidential requirements are mandated in state law. Confidential requirements are mandated in federal law—

Ms BATES: I rise to a point of order. Mr Speaker, I have not received an unconditional withdrawal of all of the comments that the minister has previously made and will continue to make, and I ask that you ask him to withdraw them unconditionally.

Mr HINCHLIFFE: I rise to a point of order. The minister withdrew the matters that the member found offensive. The minister has continued to address other matters. He has not made further comments directly related to the member for Mudgeeraba.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Mudgeeraba, I believe the minister has provided an unconditional withdrawal. We will check *Hansard*. If that is not the case it will be rectified. Minister, do you have anything further to add?

Mr DICK: Yes, I do, Mr Speaker. All Queenslanders expect that when they attend a Queensland public hospital—a statement of fact—that their private health information is kept absolutely confidential. Confidential requirements are mandated in state law. Confidential requirements are mandated in federal law. Confidential requirements are mandated as part of the professional and ethical standards that apply to the experts who work in these most sensitive environments. The member opposite wanted to silence Queensland in the last three years, but I will not be silenced on this issue.

In remarks to the Health and Ambulance Services Committee on 14 October and again on 28 October, the member for Mudgeeraba provided detailed information about particular patients and particular clinical interactions that she had witnessed during her 'shifts' in these hospitals. This included patients attending the emergency department at Gold Coast hospitals as well as forensic health patients receiving treatments in the wards in which the member for Mudgeeraba says she was working. Significant proportions of this private, highly sensitive clinical information was then recounted through various public media outlets. The disclosure of this information—

Mr Minnikin interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Chatsworth, you are warned under standing order 253A. Please desist from further interjection.

Mr DICK: The disclosure of this information identifies highly vulnerable individual patients being treated in the Queensland public hospital system. These actions by the member for Mudgeeraba offend professional nursing standards as well as standards of basic decency. I have a number of serious concerns about this conduct: firstly, whether the member for Mudgeeraba's completion of shifts at the Gold Coast University Hospital and the Robina Hospital are in breach of the conditions placed on her registration; secondly, whether the member has inappropriately divulged confidential and identifying patient information she obtained while purporting to act as an unregistered health practitioner; thirdly, to what extent the member for Mudgeeraba—

Ms BATES: I rise to a point of order. I ask that the minister retract that statement. I am not an unregistered health worker. I am a registered general nurse with provisions on my registration which I take very seriously. I think that the minister is just grandstanding here. The minister knows full well that I spoke to him in the stairwell and he knew I was going to do those shifts before I did those shifts. I find it personally offensive and I want him to withdraw all of his comments unconditionally.

Mr DICK: I withdraw. I am concerned, as a second point, whether the member has inappropriately divulged confidential and identifying patient information she obtained while purporting to act as an unrestricted health practitioner; thirdly, to what extent the member—

Ms BATES: I rise to a point of order. The minister is deliberately misleading the House. I am not an unrestricted registered nurse. I have restrictions on my registration which I am very well aware of. I find the comments personally offensive and I ask that he withdraw.

Mr SPEAKER: You have asked for a withdrawal. Minister?

Mr DICK: I withdraw. Thirdly, I am concerned about to what extent the member for Mudgeeraba may have disrupted hospital operations which may have resulted—

Mr Rickuss interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Minister, one moment. Member for Lockyer, you are now warned under standing order 253A. If you continue I will act accordingly. I call the minister.

Mr DICK: Thirdly, I am concerned about to what extent the member for Mudgeeraba may have disrupted hospital operations which may have resulted in higher clinical risks for patients at the Gold Coast University and Robina hospitals; and, fourthly, if the member's statement that she is a 'registered nurse'—her words—of over 34 years is an accurate representation of her professional registration and, having regard to Ms Bates' recent interactions with the Australian Health Practitioner Regulation Agency, whether these are wilful breaches of the title protections of the health practitioner national law. I have today written to the Queensland Health Ombudsman in relation to these issues raised by the conduct of the member for Mudgeeraba.

Ms BATES: I rise to a point of order. I find the minister's comments offensive. I find the way that he is approaching this whole situation offensive. He is well aware that he knew I was going to be at that hospital and I ask that he withdraw.

Mr HINCHLIFFE: I rise to a point of order.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Mudgeeraba, it is not an opportunity for debate. You have asked for it to be withdrawn.

Ms BATES: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I ask him to withdraw.

Mr HINCHLIFFE: I rise to a point of order. The member for Mudgeeraba has not asked for these comments to be withdrawn. She has argued about it continually.

Mr SPEAKER: The member for Mudgeeraba has asked for a withdrawal on matters she finds personally offensive. Minister, will you withdraw?

Mr DICK: I withdraw. I make the point that I have today written to the Queensland Health Ombudsman in relation to these issues raised by the conduct of the member—

Mr Hart interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Minister, one moment. Member for Burleigh, you are now warned under standing order 253A. If you persist I will act accordingly. Minister, do you have anything further to add?

Mr DICK: I have written to the Queensland Health Ombudsman in relation to those matters raised by the conduct of the member for Mudgeeraba to seek a full independent investigation of these matters. Given the conduct of the member for Mudgeeraba, I have also instructed the director-general to urgently strengthen protocols governing the visits of parliamentarians to health facilities to protect members of the public and to prevent the politicisation of the health service and their staff.

Ms BATES: I rise to a point of order. I find the comments exceptionally offensive that a member of parliament is going to put anybody in danger in a public hospital facility and I would like him to withdraw.


Mr SPEAKER: Member for Mudgeeraba, it is not an opportunity for debate. You have asked for them to be withdrawn.

Ms BATES: Thank you, I ask him to withdraw.

Mr SPEAKER: Minister, will you withdraw?

Mr DICK: I withdraw. Clinical confidence and confidentiality represent the bare minimum that Queenslanders can expect from their public health system. I intend to make sure that these fundamental standards are not put at risk by the conduct of members of this House.

Advancing Education

 **Hon. KJ JONES** (Ashgrove—ALP) (Minister for Education and Minister for Tourism, Major Events, Small Business and the Commonwealth Games) (2.28 pm): Work has now started on the delivery of the Palaszczuk government's action plan for the future of education in Queensland. Advancing Education builds on the Premier's Advance Queensland plan. Last week while I was in Cairns for the North Queensland Economic Summit, I had the opportunity to attend the first Advancing Education forum at Trinity Bay State High School, and I know the member for Cairns was there with me as well. Through this action plan we will ensure that every state school has access to specialist science, technology, engineering and mathematics teachers, ensure every state school offers the digital technologies curriculum including coding and robotics and ensure all state schools offer languages other than English from prep with the focus on Asian languages. In total 19 forums—

Mr Watts interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Toowoomba North, who are you debating with?

Mr Watts: The opposition deputy whip and I were just having a discussion—


Mr SPEAKER: You are both now formally warned under standing order 253A.

Mr Power interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Logan, you are formally warned.

Ms JONES: In total 19 forums will be held across Queensland. We have already held them in Townsville, Toowoomba, Cairns, South Brisbane, Logan and Roma. At the forum teachers, principals, parents and students had the opportunity to share their views on the government's plan for the future of education. I can inform the House that so far the feedback has been overwhelmingly positive. We have particularly received very positive feedback with regard to STEM, coding and robotics and how this will future-proof our students' skills. In particular students are very welcoming of the new digital technologies curriculum and the fact that we are introducing that from next year. In the next couple of weeks there will also be forums held in Bundaberg, Rockhampton, Sunshine Coast, Maryborough, Ipswich, Charleville, Gold Coast, Mackay and Longreach.

Advance Queensland, Science and Innovation

 **Hon. LM ENOCH** (Algerie—ALP) (Minister for Housing and Public Works and Minister for Science and Innovation) (2.29 pm): It gives me great pleasure to update the House on the Palaszczuk government's \$180 million Advance Queensland initiative, because tonight I will be joining the Premier at the Advance Queensland Premier's innovation and investment reception here at Parliament House. This event will be attended by representatives of our state's innovation, start-up and investment communities as well as members of parliament. The evening will provide an opportunity to highlight innovation and the need to ingrain innovative thinking into our everyday lives.


Advance Queensland is creating an environment that welcomes and supports innovation and entrepreneurialism, which in turn encourages greater investment. We recognise that, while government support is important, industry is also able to achieve remarkable things independently. We know the best examples of innovation and entrepreneurialism emanate from those who are living and breathing it and that is why we are collaborating with industry as we develop our programs. Feedback and support during our co-design process with the start-up community in particular has been integral to creating a suite of programs that meet the sector's needs.

The Palaszczuk government recognises that digital disruption is already transforming our world at an ever-increasing pace. On Monday night I had the pleasure of attending the launch of a digital innovation course at QUT which aims to embrace and take advantage of digital disruption. I was joined at the event by the members for Murrumba and Mackay, and I acknowledge their strong interest in this area. Evidence of the importance of digital disruption can be found in the Committee for Economic Development of Australia's report *Australia's future workforce?*, which describes how the next wave of industrial revolution will fundamentally reshape global business. It notes the high probability that 40 per cent of Australia's workforce—more than five million people—could be replaced by automation within 10 to 20 years. These are staggering and challenging concepts. If Queensland is to maintain an internationally competitive economy we must act now to address the challenges and opportunities that we face.

Our vision is for Queensland to have a seamless innovation ecosystem where the best and brightest minds from around the country and across the world come together to generate great ideas and, crucially, get the support to translate them into compelling business cases for private investment. Advance Queensland will help us to do just that, and will help position Queensland as an attractive investment destination.

Mr SPEAKER: Before calling the Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Services, I am informed that we have students from the Jericho State School in the electorate of Gregory in the public gallery. We also have school leaders from the Earnshaw State College in the electorate of Nudgee observing our proceedings.

Police, Body Worn Video Cameras

 **Hon. JR MILLER** (Bundamba—ALP) (Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Services and Minister for Corrective Services) (2.32 pm): It was great to be with Commissioner of Police Ian Stewart and his officers this morning on the Gold Coast to mark the beginning of the rollout of body worn video


cameras for front-line officers working on the Gold Coast. The Palaszczuk government has invested some \$6 million over three years for body worn video and other safety equipment for police, and we are committed to ensuring that the Queensland Police Service is able to take advantage of new technology to make policing easier and more efficient. This rollout is not just an election commitment but also an important part of our four-point action plan to address cultural and other issues in the Gold Coast police district. In the action plan we committed to fast-tracking the rollout of 300 new body worn video cameras on the Gold Coast. The rollout also forms an important part of a comprehensive domestic violence package that was announced by the Premier. Body worn video will greatly assist front-line officers on the Gold Coast.

The Gold Coast district is one of the busiest in Queensland, with more than 1.5 million interactions between police and the public every year. Body worn video cameras will greatly assist our police in dealing with serious incidents like domestic and family violence by enhancing evidence gathering and giving victims extra reassurance that police will follow up with their complaints. Body worn video cameras will also provide greater reassurance to Queenslanders in their day-to-day dealings with officers. Whether it is the Road Policing Command or local general duties officers, officers across Queensland will benefit from these cameras to capture evidence, create a record of operational activity and record their interactions with offenders and the general public.

The use of evidence captured on body worn video cameras can lead to a reduction in the number of cases proceeding to court. For those that do, the clear and quality evidence captured by these cameras can also help establish the identity of offenders. Body worn video cameras will also help ensure the safety of officers when they go into dangerous and often confronting situations. The Palaszczuk government is committed to ensuring the safety of our police. Unlike the LNP, who sat idly by while police officers were left to purchase their own body worn video cameras, we are committed to ensuring that our hardworking and dedicated police are properly resourced to get on with the job of keeping Queenslanders safe.

It is also great to see that the member for Coomera is getting right behind this Labor initiative, tweeting about it earlier today. Can I thank the member for Coomera for his bipartisan support of this great initiative. The Palaszczuk Labor government is committed to keeping the people of Queensland safe, and this is just one way we are delivering on that commitment.

Agriculture Industry, Drone Technology

 **Hon. WS BYRNE** (Rockhampton—ALP) (Minister for Agriculture and Fisheries and Minister for Sport and Racing) (2.35 pm): There is a bright future for the use of drones right across the Department of Agriculture and Fisheries which will provide important information that will support Queensland's primary producers. These unmanned aerial vehicles are giving Queensland's primary producers a future that is very optimistic indeed. Demonstrable productivity dividends will be delivered. The use of new and emerging technologies like drones and robotics has great potential in our agricultural industries. The government is keeping pace with these changes, encouraging their use and working with other regulators to make sure the rules associated with their rollout are easier.


Drone technology has the potential to boost agricultural productivity tremendously. Scientists can mount advanced sensors on drones as part of farm trials to collect large amounts of information at very low cost. It means that scientists from the Department of Agriculture and Fisheries are spared from having to trek around fields for hours counting the number of heads or plants to determine the temperature of a crop during a drought. Instead, visual or thermal images from a drone can answer that question very easily.

In Queensland, drone technology is being developed to improve sorghum, wheat and barley varieties. Research began more than four years ago, but it has accelerated with the availability of new cheaper drones and sensor packs during the last two years. We are just beginning to realise the possibilities of drone technology in agriculture, fisheries and forestry. I can inform the House that my department has already experimented with drones to spot forest fires, which are far more effective than satellite remotes or flying helicopters in low-visibility circumstances. This drone technology could replace some outdated and obsolete fire towers. The safety of workers anywhere should also be at the forefront of our minds. On that point, the use of drones in rugged and remote areas is safer than low-flying aircraft.

There is more. Biosecurity Queensland believes that thermal imaging can help land managers control many forms of feral animals. This technology can spot wild pigs, deer and goats, reducing the need for expensive helicopter spotting flights. Processed data can identify feral pest locations which

would help with tracking, baiting and shooting programs. Agriculture and Fisheries will be evaluating the efficiency of drones in detecting feral cats. The use of drones will be good for agriculture and good for DAF and will ultimately provide real outcomes that will benefit Queensland agriculture.

Spinal Cord Injury Awareness Week; National Injury Insurance Scheme

 **Hon. CJ O'ROURKE** (Mundingburra—ALP) (Minister for Disability Services, Minister for Seniors and Minister Assisting the Premier on North Queensland) (2.39 pm): This week is Spinal Cord Injury Awareness Week, a national campaign to raise awareness about what it means to have a spinal cord injury. This week is all about creating a more inclusive and accessible community, showing that people who have a spinal cord injury are involved in all aspects of life.


To mark this week I visited the sporting wheelies headquarters in Brisbane to tour their complex and gym facilities to see firsthand how they are promoting opportunities for inclusion for people with disability. It was great to hear how the sporting wheelies have helped Queenslanders with disability to lead active, healthy lives for more than 35 years through sport, recreation and fitness. I am delighted that the Palaszczuk government provided a \$2½ thousand grant to the sporting wheelies this financial year to host their Fit for Life open day in September, during Disability Action Week.

The Palaszczuk government is committed to improving the lives of Queenslanders with disability and promoting opportunities for them to be involved in their communities. Our cross-departmental spinal cord injury response, involving my department and the departments of health and housing and public Works, helps people with newly acquired spinal cord injury to leave hospital in a timely way and return home with the right supports. In this year's budget we allocated \$3.2 million to support 27 people with spinal cord injury to return home from hospital with necessary supports. These include in-home support, home modifications, social housing and aids, equipment and assistive technologies.

Today the Treasurer and I also announced that the government is considering options to implement the National Injury Insurance Scheme to provide universal care and support for people catastrophically injured in road traffic crashes. Unless we act now, Queensland will be the only state or territory without a lifetime care and support scheme in place by 1 July next year. Implementation options for the scheme are being referred to the parliamentary committee for consideration. Today I hosted a morning tea with a range of stakeholders including spinal injuries Australia, Vision Australia and the Young People in Nursing Homes National Alliance, to name a few, who were very positive about this scheme. I commend the Treasurer, who is leading and overseeing this important work.

MOTION

Referral to the Communities, Disability Services and Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Committee

 **Hon. SJ HINCHLIFFE** (Sandgate—ALP) (Leader of the House) (2.42 pm), by leave, without notice: I move—

That the Communities, Disability Services and Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Committee inquire into and report, by 7 March 2016, on:

1. the most suitable model for implementing the National Injury Insurance Scheme (NIIS) for 1 July 2016 as entered into by Queensland in a heads of agreement with the Commonwealth in May 2013 with options including
 - (a) a no-fault lifetime care scheme; or
 - (b) a hybrid common law and no-fault care and support arrangement.
2. In undertaking its inquiry, the committee should consider:
 - (a) how the government can sustainably and affordably meet the NIIS minimum benchmarks for motor vehicle accidents;
 - (b) affordability for Queensland taxpayers and motorists;
 - (c) the long-term nature of liabilities in a NIIS; and
 - (d) the desire to target full funding of long-term liabilities in accordance with actuarial advice.
3. In undertaking its inquiry, the committee should:
 - (a) seek public submissions; and
 - (b) consult with key stakeholders and peak representative bodies from the health and disability care sectors, the insurance sector and the legal profession.


Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

TRANSPORT OPERATIONS (MARINE SAFETY—DOMESTIC COMMERCIAL VESSEL NATIONAL LAW APPLICATION) BILL

TRANSPORT OPERATIONS (MARINE SAFETY) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

Cognate Debate

 **Hon. SJ HINCHLIFFE** (Sandgate—ALP) (Leader of the House) (2.44 pm), by leave, without notice: I move—

That, in accordance with standing order 172, the Transport Operations (Marine Safety—Domestic Commercial Vessel National Law Application) Bill and the Transport Operations (Marine Safety) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill be treated as cognate bills for their remaining stages, as follows:


- (a) second reading debate, with separate questions being put in regard to the second readings;
- (b) the consideration of the bills in detail together; and
- (c) separate questions being put for the third readings and long titles.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

NOTICE OF MOTION

Organised Crime Commission of Inquiry


 **Mr WALKER** (Mansfield—LNP) (2.45 pm): I give notice that I will move—

That this House:

1. notes that the Queensland Organised Crime Commission of Inquiry held no public hearings during its investigations and deliberations, despite assurances to the contrary;
2. notes that the commission received 75 submissions, issued 105 requests for written information, issued 43 requests for the provision of documents, issued nine summonses for attendance at a hearing, held six in camera hearings and issued 25 requests for attendance to be interviewed;
3. notes that none of the information is publicly available; and
4. requests the Premier as the commissioning minister to provide submissions and testimony from the Queensland Organised Crime Commission of Inquiry to the parliament, for the information of members of the parliament and the Queensland public, except for that information that is deemed by the commission or Crown Law to be either confidential or information that could compromise the operational abilities of state and federal law enforcement agencies.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

Minister for Health

 **Mr LANGBROEK** (Surfers Paradise—LNP) (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (2.46 pm): At the outset I apologise to the young students from Clover Hill State School in the electorate of Mudgeeraba for what they just had to witness from the health minister in his ministerial statement. The triumph of politics over policy that we saw today typifies why this government is holding Queensland back. One of the most senior ministers in this government—repudiated by his electorate just three years ago and now back here in a senior position—was unable to, in a 10-minute speech, do anything but abuse the standing orders. What I am going to ask you to do, Mr Speaker—

Mr Dick interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Minister, this is not an opportunity for you to continually interject when the deputy leader is speaking.

Mr LANGBROEK: I say to those students from Clover Hill State School—student visitors to parliament are usually in year 6—who are here seeing how our parliament is supposed to operate, that the behaviour of the health minister in abusing the standing orders—

Mr DICK: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I take offence at that statement and I ask the deputy leader to withdraw.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order, members! The standard protocol is that if a member finds something personally offensive and asks for it to be withdrawn, it is withdrawn unconditionally.


Mr LANGBROEK: I withdraw. Let me make a very serious point. Standing orders 234 and 236 relate to the very serious matter of personal reflections on members. In the health minister's diatribe, which went for 10 minutes, he may potentially have offended standing order 236. I will ask the Leader of Opposition Business to analyse *Hansard*. Mr Speaker, we may actually write to you and seek a ruling about what was a clear distraction from those opposite and which is a reflection on how they are conducting government in this term. That is something that should not be reflected in this parliament and should not be reflected for young students who come here to see their member of parliament and to see the parliament in action. That is the example we are setting for them.

This is a member who has already been repudiated by his electorate. He has been given another chance by another electorate. Instead of coming in here and talking about the policies we want to see in the health department—the member made it clear to the minister that they wanted to go and visit a hospital, for which they were given permission. I understand that the member for Mudgeeraba has made comments about her own behaviour and whether it was okayed by the minister.

If those opposite had any information that is inappropriate, do not grandstand and go to the Health Ombudsman; come into this House and behave like a health minister should—someone who is responsible for the biggest part of any portfolio in our government, like the Leader of the Opposition was in our government, to make it work more efficiently, to not turn it into what it was under the Bligh administration under which he was the education minister and the Attorney-General. We deserve better. Those students from Clover Hill State School and all schools in Queensland deserve better. This government needs to get on with the job of providing a plan for Queensland, making sure that we get out of the mire that we were in under Labor and focusing on the things that are important to Queenslanders—jobs for Queenslanders and a better future.

Mr SPEAKER: Before I call the Minister for Main Roads, Minister for Health, I now warn you under 253A for your continuous interjections. There have been numerous warnings since I have been the Speaker to many members of the opposition. You are now formally warned under 253A. Please desist.

Ethanol Industry

 **Hon. MC BAILEY** (Yeerongpilly—ALP) (Minister for Main Roads, Road Safety and Ports and Minister for Energy and Water Supply) (2.50 pm): What a huffy, puffy performance from the member for Surfers Paradise. The Palaszczuk government is committed to building a biofuel production sector here in Queensland by expanding our ethanol industry and growing jobs in the regions. As members are aware, our ethanol mandate is proposed to commence at two per cent from 1 July next year. We acknowledge a longer term vision is needed to stabilise and expand the biofuels and biomanufacturing industries in Queensland to give investors confidence.

Mr STEVENS: I rise to a point of order. We have a biofuels bill before the House.

Mr BAILEY: This is not about the bill.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Minister, I would urge you not to refer to a bill that is before the House.

Mr BAILEY: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I am speaking about a longer term vision, if those opposite would actually like to listen to my speech. A longer term vision is one reason the Premier launched the *Queensland Biofutures 10-year Roadmap: Consultation paper* last week. Today I can advise the House that the Palaszczuk government is now seeking industry and community feedback on possible pathways for increasing the ethanol and biobased diesel mandates over time. Consistent with our approach to government to listen to industry—

Mr STEVENS: I rise to a point of order. Mr Speaker, that is very much in the bill to be debated in the House.

Mr BAILEY: It is not part of the bill. It is separate to the bill.

Mr SPEAKER: Minister, I have not studied the bill. I am being guided by your advice that this is not contained in the bill that is currently before the House. If it is contained in the bill that is currently before the House, you do run the risk of—

Mr BAILEY: I can assure you, Mr Speaker, that this is separate to the bill.

Mr SPEAKER: Okay.

Mr BAILEY: The public consultation will canvass two options for increasing the ethanol mandate between now and 2020. The first proposed option would see the mandate rise to four per cent by 2019. There would be a step change between 2018 and 2019 when the mandate would rise from two per cent to four per cent. The second option would see the mandate rise gradually, increasing by half a per cent annually, reaching four per cent in 2020. For biobased diesels, there are also two proposed pathway options canvassed. The first would see the mandate volume increase to two per cent by 2019, with a large step up from a half a per cent in 2018. Option 2 proposes a more gradual increase—

Mr POWELL: I rise to a point of order. My point of order is consistent with the point of order from the Leader of Opposition Business. This is consistent with the bill that is before the House. The minister is referring to elements of the public committee hearing that was held during the last sitting on the Wednesday, including discussions about where the mandate that is in the bill will be trending over the coming years. He is referring to the bill that is before the House.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Glass House. Minister, it is not appropriate for you to refer to a bill that is currently before the House.

Mr BAILEY: That is right.

Mr SPEAKER: If you are not referring to the bill that is before the House—

Mr BAILEY: Mr Speaker, I am speaking about a discussion paper that is launching today for public comment and input over the next four weeks. That clearly goes beyond the time frame of the bill. It is a very simple matter for the opposition to understand and it is separate from the bill in that it is asking for pathways.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, Minister. I invite you to continue if you believe that you are not contravening those principles, but no doubt members will be studying the *Hansard* when it is available.

Mr BAILEY: Thank you very much, Mr Speaker. Option 2 proposes a more gradual increase of half a per cent in July 2019 and July 2020, reaching 1.5 per cent in relation to biodiesels. There are of course other pathway options and I welcome the feedback on other alternatives through the consultation process. Consultation will be open for four weeks and I encourage industry and the community to share their views with us. The feedback provided will assist government in considering its options for supporting this important industry. Building a vibrant bioindustry in Queensland and the jobs that go with it is a priority for the Palaszczuk government. Those opposite had three years to advance in this area and yet we saw nothing from them. We are uniquely placed as a tropical and subtropical First World economy with considerable natural resources, first-rate skills and research capabilities and proximity to the increasingly prosperous growing Asian region.

Mr NICHOLLS: I rise to a point of order.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock.

Mr NICHOLLS: Mr Speaker, I can refer you to standing order 231 in relation to anticipating discussion. It states—

The Speaker when determining whether a discussion is out of order on the ground of anticipation, shall have regard to the probability of the matter anticipated being brought before the House within a reasonable time and the degree to which debate of that matter is likely to be anticipated.

Mr Speaker, in my submission to you on the standing order, the entire content of the minister's contribution has been all around an ethanol mandate, all of which can be reasonably considered to be the subject of debate on a bill which is on the *Notice Paper* of which the committee has had a hearing and which within a reasonable time will be debated by the House. Mr Speaker, in my submission to you, it is incumbent on you to make a ruling in relation to that standing order.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, members. I have already indicated that I have not studied the bill. The minister is familiar with the bill, more so than anyone else in this chamber. If it turns out that the member is contravening that principle, I have no doubt that someone from the opposition or I will make a ruling and decide the matter. At the moment I am being guided by the minister's assurance to me that he is not contravening those principles in the standing orders and we will all study the *Hansard*.

Mr NICHOLLS: I rise to a point of order.

Mr SPEAKER: Yes. What is your further point of order?

Mr NICHOLLS: I understand your comment there, but, Mr Speaker, your role, if I might suggest it, is that you are to determine the outcomes of points of order based on your understanding of it, not what the minister tells you might be in or out of the bill.

Mr SPEAKER: Yes.

Mr NICHOLLS: It is about the anticipation of the debate of a matter that is on the *Notice Paper* that is likely to be debated in the very near future. The *Notice Paper* clearly has on it a bill in relation to the ethanol mandate. The minister is clearly speaking about ethanol mandates. It is a matter that is reasonably likely to be discussed in the near future with respect to the matter on the *Notice Paper*. With respect, Mr Speaker, it is not up to the minister to say what is in the bill; it is in fact obviously within your realm to make that particular call. Even though you may not have yet studied the bill, it is reasonable to anticipate that the minister—


Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Clayfield. I have listened to all members' contributions this afternoon. I will study *Hansard*. The minister has given an assurance as the minister responsible for this bill. I will consider *Hansard* and I will make a considered decision. Minister, do you have anything further to add?

Mr BAILEY: Yes, Mr Speaker. Over 60 nations across the world have ethanol mandates. The bioindustry has the potential to deliver jobs for Queenslanders now and into the future and the Palaszczuk government is backing this industry and the jobs that go with it.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Members, I will certainly be studying *Hansard* and if the minister has breached that standing order appropriate action will be taken.

Department of Science, Information Technology and Innovation, Director-General

 **Dr McVEIGH** (Toowoomba South—LNP) (2.58 pm): In the nine months since this Labor government came to power, it has not yet seen fit to appoint a permanent director-general of the Department of Science, Information Technology and Innovation. Uncertainty is rife. The department is apparently rudderless and we now know the minister simply has no idea. This is very important for two reasons. Firstly, the opposition remains very concerned that the department supposedly responsible for rolling out this government's signature Advance Queensland policy still cannot find a director-general. That is the policy promoted by the Premier, the Deputy Premier and other cabinet ministers, including here in this parliament this afternoon, and yet we still do not have a director-general in place to implement that policy. Secondly and perhaps more importantly, we are seeing the emergence of a series of IT bungles which simply reminds us of the Labor of old. No-one knows who the boss is in terms of overcoming these bungles and certainly no-one knows who might prevent them in the future. So it begs the question: if we do not have a DG in charge, what is the minister up to?

Yesterday in this House, the member for Algester and the minister responsible for the Department of Science, Information Technology and Innovation was absolutely clueless regarding the overpayment of government contractors by some \$12 million. She had no idea and simply wished to blame it all on what she referred to—

Ms ENOCH: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I find that personally offensive and I ask the member to withdraw.


Mr SPEAKER: The minister has found those comments personally offensive and has asked them to be withdrawn. Will you withdraw?

Dr McVEIGH: I withdraw. Yesterday, the minister laid the blame on what she referred to as a conscientious public servant. Back some four months ago in estimates I asked the minister the same questions—why did we not have a permanent director-general in place, despite the claimed importance of Advance Queensland, and in particular at that stage when we found out about the IT bungle with regard to Child Safety information exchanged between Education and other agencies? The minister did not have any answers.

I am sad to say that the opposition's fears about IT management under this government continue to be realised. Just yesterday it came to our attention that there was the IT security breach with TAFE Queensland students' information. Apparently, as we understand it, the government had not become aware of it until it had received ransom notes. Again, Queenslanders should ask, in the absence of a DG, what is this minister doing? I fear that it is a case of bungle after bungle. I have to voice the very

serious concerns of Queenslanders that this is simply a precursor to another Health payroll debacle, another fake Tahitian prince debacle that cost Queenslanders millions of dollars. This is the stuff that Labor is renowned for.

Public Service

 **Hon. JA TRAD** (South Brisbane—ALP) (Deputy Premier, Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning and Minister for Trade) (3.01 pm): When those opposite come into this House and want to talk about directors-general, or want to talk about the Public Service, then I have a couple of words for them: Michael Caltabiano. If they want to come in here and talk about directors-general, let us talk about Michael Caltabiano. If they want to come in here and talk about the Public Service, let us talk about the 900—

Honourable members interjected.

Mr Powell interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Members, we are not going to have a shouting match in here. Member for Glass House, if you persist you will be warned under standing order 253A.

Ms TRAD: Let us talk about the 950 public servants who were sacked from the department of science and information technology. If the members opposite want to talk about the Public Service, why do we not talk about the 2,500—or the one in five—people who were sacked from the Department of Transport and Main Roads and Queensland Rail under their watch, under the leadership of Michael Caltabiano and the member for Indooroopilly? If they dare come into this place and want to talk about directors-general and the Public Service, they can stand by their record.

While I am talking about records, in terms of public transport, let me talk about Cross River Rail. There has been a bit of chatter about Cross River Rail. Let me say from the outset that, when we left office in 2012, Cross River Rail was a shovel-ready project. Infrastructure Australia said that there was no other infrastructure priority higher than Cross River Rail in Queensland. Those opposite have had a very chequered history when it comes to a second rail crossing in Queensland. First of all, I know that the former member for Ashgrove said that he could build a whole metro for South-East Queensland with only \$3 billion. That got dropped off the agenda. Then he said that he could drive the trains up and then turn them around and come back. Of course, that could not happen. Then there was the Cleveland solution. There was a whole range of solutions instead of Cross River Rail because he hated it so much.

Then he had an independent, hand-picked panel put together to assess Cross River Rail and that hand-picked panel came back and said, 'The panel supports the EIS conclusion that the Cross River Rail project provides a comprehensive solution to the core inner-city passenger and freight capacity issues.' The report went on to say further that this is such a significant project that those opposite, when they were in government, should lobby the federal government for funding support. At that time, the federal government was a federal Labor government, which put \$750 million on the table to get it started.

In fact, if the members opposite had decided not to play politics with Cross River Rail and not revert to some pie-in-the-sky Bus and Train tunnel—which they said after they lost the election that was never going to be built anyway—and stuck with the deal that they had put to the federal Labor government, there would be boots on the ground, there would be Queenslanders employed, we would be constructing Cross River Rail. Instead, they played politics.


We are not going to do that, because federal Labor has supported this project and the federal coalition is supporting it. We will not play politics. We will get it built.

Mr Emerson interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, Deputy Premier. Member for Indooroopilly, you will have ample opportunity to question the minister about that matter if you choose.

(Time expired)

Queensland Tourism Investment Guide

 **Mr SPRINGBORG** (Southern Downs—LNP) (Leader of the Opposition) (3.05 pm): Today, we heard from the Minister for Education that she is now working on an education blueprint for Queensland. As it comes hot on the heels of the Queensland Tourism Investment Guide, which she has been working on for the past nine months, one would hope that it is going to be a far more comprehensive and accurate document. One would hope that there is not going to be inkwells and slate pencils on the front page. One hopes that it is not going to be riddled with mistake after mistake after mistake.

I am referring to the Queensland Tourism Investment Guide 2015-16 iteration A, which was brought out six days ago after nine months of hard work by the Minister for Tourism in Queensland. Within about one day, that was then overtaken by iteration B, because they had left the Gold Coast off the front page—or a lot of the Gold Coast; it had bits of the Gold Coast going back to when it was a major dairy farming area some years ago. That has now been supplanted by iteration C. This is hot off the presses. It was launched only last evening. So we have three iterations in six days after nine months.

This all came about because we exposed the fact that the BaT tunnel, which had been ruled out by the Deputy Premier in March of this year, was still contained within this document. Great news: the BaT tunnel is no longer in there. But what else is not in there? Cross River Rail is not in there either. Neither is the Gold Coast Light Rail Stage 2. But what is in there is Wagner's airport, which this government has had nothing to do with. It trumpets the Legacy Way tunnel, which was an initiative of Campbell Newman when he was the Lord Mayor of Brisbane. It also trumpets the extra runway at the Brisbane Airport. I do not think we have had shares in Brisbane Airport Corporation for at least 10 years.

We have in this guide a whole range of things that the government has ruled out, and a whole range of things that the government is doing are not in there. After nine months, we have had three iterations in six days. One would hope that this education minister would do something as an education minister and that is proofread her document. She can learn that as education minister, because next week she is going to pack her bag and take this off to China. Which version? I can feel version 4 coming on.

(Time expired)

Mr SPEAKER: Question time will conclude at eight minutes past four.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Queensland Tourism Investment Guide, Cross River Rail



Mr SPRINGBORG (3.08 pm): My question without notice is to the Minister for Tourism. I refer to now version 3 of the Queensland government's Tourism Investment Guide and I ask: given that the government championed the Cross River Rail tunnel yesterday, can the minister point out on what page of the document this project is referred to?

Ms JONES: I thank the member for the question, because it gives me an opportunity to talk about the Tourism Investment Guide—the first of its kind ever produced in Queensland, because we are all about creating jobs. I can say that Jones Lang LaSalle, the contractors that put the guide together for the government, will have a meeting with my director-general. They will be sitting down and going through it to ensure that it is updated.

Clearly it needs to be improved and I said that yesterday. There is nothing new here. This was canvassed in discussion in great detail yesterday. I have been up-front about this, said that it was not good enough and had to be improved. That is exactly what I am doing. Just like I did when I discovered the IT bungle implemented by the former minister for education. I did not hide it under the carpet. I front-footed it and made public the mistake that was implemented in September 2013. What has also been revealed this parliamentary sitting is that the former minister for education on 14 October 2013 was advised that DET had incorrectly paid 362 offenders twice—\$6.4 million.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Minister, one moment. Minister, with respect, this is not an opportunity to debate the question. Do you have anything further to add that is relevant to the specific question?

An opposition member interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: I do not need your assistance, member for Gaven.

Ms JONES: I do, Mr Speaker, because what I am articulating is that there is a stark contrast with the way that we handle things versus them. We will not sweep it under the carpet.

Mr SPRINGBORG: I rise to a point of order.

Ms JONES: We will not pretend that this is not—

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Leader of the Opposition, what is your point of order?

Mr SPRINGBORG: A point of order on relevance to the question I asked. My question was very simply, given that the government championed Cross River Rail as a part of its economic investment strategy yesterday in relation to these questions, on what page does that particular project appear in the *Queensland Tourism Investment Guide 2015-16*.

Ms JONES: Mr Speaker, I answered that question when I said that the director-general is meeting with Jones Lang LaSalle, the people who put the guide together, to ensure that it reflects all the up-to-date information.


Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Members of the opposition, the way you are going you may all jolly well be warned. Minister, do you have anything further to add that is relevant to the question?

Ms JONES: No. I think I have answered the question very clearly.

Mr SPEAKER: Leader of the Opposition, I invite you to put your second question.

Queensland Tourism Investment Guide, Gold Coast Light Rail

 **Mr SPRINGBORG:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. I look forward to a similarly clear answer to this question. My second question without notice is to the Minister for Tourism. Minister, I refer now to version 3 of the *Queensland Tourism Investment Guide*, and the minister I think has flagged version 4 already this morning. Can the minister point out on what page does stage 2 of the Gold Coast Light Rail get a mention?

Ms JONES: Mr Speaker, I refer the honourable member to the answer I just gave where I said that the director-general will be meeting with Jones Lang LaSalle, the company that put together the investment guide, to go through the document to ensure that it has the most up-to-date information. But when it comes to Gold Coast Light Rail, thank God you are on board! It took them a long time to get on board. While we were talking to their mates in Canberra trying to get the money for Gold Coast Light Rail finally Lawrence has come to the table.

Mr SPEAKER: You have answered the question, Minister, thank you.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr Cripps interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, members. I do not need your assistance, member for Hinchinbrook.

Child Protection

Mr FURNER: My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier provide details to the House of any new initiatives in the crucial area of protecting Queensland's vulnerable children from exploitation?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for Ferny Grove very much for that important question. As members of this House would probably be aware, yesterday the police minister, myself and the Police Commissioner had the opportunity, along with the head of the Police Union, Ian Leavers, to see firsthand the work that Task Force Argos does down at Police Headquarters. On behalf of everyone in this House and all Queenslanders, I thank those men and women who are actually fulfilling an extremely difficult task. We saw very clearly in the commission of inquiry report that child exploitation was mentioned. I know there is a motion before the House and I will not go into details about that. However, my government, as well as I believe everyone in this House, takes these issues extremely seriously. That is why we immediately acted to quarantine the savings from the commission of inquiry report, that \$3.2 million, and allocate it towards making sure that we have extra resources. A new task force has been established that is called Taskforce Orion. There will be six dedicated men and women in that task force looking particularly at victim identification.

What we were also able to hear firsthand yesterday was that there is a hidden world of the darknet. There are images that these people are seeing day in, day out. They want to do everything they can to protect our most vulnerable people, and the most vulnerable people are our children. My government makes no apology for making sure that we get the policy parameters right. We will be looking at the outcomes of Taskforce Orion. We will be monitoring the implementation of that. We also know that the work of Task Force Argos is internationally renowned. They have world-class experts there, but where we can support and get that additional IT expertise working alongside those women it will bolster that unit and make sure that they will deliver.

Anyone who has read the report would have seen and read those horrific stories. I do not want to hear or see any more of those stories so we need to do everything we possibly can. We will monitor what happens with—

Mrs Frecklington interjected.

Mr Stevens interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: If you want to add something please do because this is a very serious issue, member for Nanango. I do not know why you are interjecting on me on this particular issue, I am sorry. I am taking this extremely seriously. Child exploitation is a serious issue in this state.

Mrs Frecklington: I said, 'Support the police force'.

Ms PALASZCZUK: See, here we go. Let me make it extremely clear that we support the police men and women who are doing this job. That is why I have allocated extra resources immediately to providing more front-line police men and women in this state and I will always stand by those police men and women.

TAFE Queensland, Information Technology

Mr LANGBROEK: My question without notice is to the Minister for Education. Can the minister confirm the TAFE IT security breach occurred prior to 30 October this year and it has taken the minister 10 days to disclose this breach to Queenslanders?

Ms JONES: I thank the honourable member for the question. Once again this is a very serious issue. Yesterday the Queensland Government Chief Information Officer released a statement saying that the Queensland government is working with security experts to assess a security breach of the TAFE Queensland and the Department of Education and Training websites following receipt of an email threat from an unknown source. This was a criminal act. This matter is now with the police. I will not act against the advice of the Queensland police and the Chief Information Officer and release information that may jeopardise their investigations into the crime. Queenslanders expect the government to act appropriately and take the advice of the Queensland police and the Chief Information Officer. I refer all members once again to the public statements that have been made, including from the Queensland Government Chief Information Officer, who said in his statement, 'For security reasons, the government will not be providing—'

Mr STEVENS: I rise to a point of order, Mr Speaker. In terms of the standing orders, I ask you to direct the minister to answer the question. The question clearly was about a date. It did not in any way involve any issues pertaining to the matter but about a date that the minister knew about it. Please get her to answer the question.

Mr SPEAKER: I call the minister.

Ms JONES: I reiterate what the Queensland Government Chief Information Officer has said—

For security reasons, the government will not be providing specific details of the information illegally accessed. We are confident that no financial data such as credit card information or bank details have been accessed.

I will not be acting against the advice that I have received from the Queensland police and the Chief Information Officer to confirm any further details on the public record. To do otherwise would be reckless.

Advance Queensland

Ms GRACE: My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier advise the House of any examples of medical research that exemplify the kind of innovation that the Queensland government is seeking to nurture and grow through its Advance Queensland strategy?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for Brisbane Central very much for this important question. As I mentioned to the House, this evening my government will be hosting the first ever Advance Queensland reception for the community. I was very pleased that my assistant minister, Stirling Hinchliffe, was able to attend the Northern Australian Investment Forum that was hosted by the federal government in Darwin just recently. Coming along to that reception tonight will be Frank Gannon from QIMR Berghofer. I am also pleased to advise the House that in a joint announcement on Sunday at the Northern Australia Investment Forum in Darwin and in Geneva, the worldwide Medicines for Malaria Venture announced a new \$10 million research project to be undertaken by QIMR Berghofer to accelerate the development of new antimalarial drugs.

The point is clear and simple: this research is happening here in Queensland. This groundbreaking research, which could improve the lives of millions of people throughout the tropical world, is happening right on our doorstep, here in Queensland. I express my thanks to the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, which is providing the funding for this very significant research grant. We all know what an amazing man Frank Gannon is and of the work that he is doing. QIMR Berghofer was

established 70 years ago to research tropical diseases that were afflicting people and holding back development in Northern Australia and throughout the tropics worldwide. Therefore, this partnership is vital; this partnership is absolutely crucial.

Over the coming years and decades, we will see groundbreaking research continue to evolve and develop right here in Queensland. I thank the medical profession that are doing that groundbreaking research. We know that great partnerships are also happening with our universities. Tonight gives us the opportunity to meet with researchers and hear firsthand what they are actually doing in this state. This is fantastic news for Queensland. Once again, I thank the assistant minister for making that announcement at the Northern Australia summit, hosted by the federal government.

TAFE Queensland, Information Technology

Mr MANDER: My question is to the Minister for Training and Skills. I refer to the TAFE IT security breach and I ask: what steps has the minister taken to notify people affected by the unauthorised release of their personal details and has the minister advised them of what details have been released?

Mrs D'ATH: I thank the member for his question. Yesterday, the member for Everton had an opportunity to show some leadership. He became aware of a potential criminal activity in relation to a cyber attack on a government agency and a potential threat. Having previously been a minister, he would know the significance of that and the sensitivities around it. The member for Everton chose to be opportunistic and to politicise this, instead of asking for a confidential briefing, which he could have done at any point, to ask about this issue. Yesterday, he walked into this chamber and asked for information to be publicly released about a criminal activity on a government—

Mr SPEAKER: Minister, just a moment. It is important that you do not engage in a debate with the member for Everton. He has asked a specific question. Can you please bring your answer back to that specific question?

Mrs D'ATH: I can confirm that an email threat from an unknown source has been received. Upon receipt, action was immediately taken to assess the credibility of the threat and all relevant authorities were notified. TAFE Queensland and the Department of Education and Training acted on this advice at all times in dealing with this matter. Again, I refer to the media statement from the Queensland Government Chief Information Officer, Andrew Mills, released yesterday, which stated—

The government has assessed the threat as credible but low-level.

The Queensland Government has immediately enacted protective measures to further strengthen its security protocols and my office is overseeing this work.

Yesterday, TAFE Queensland issued a media statement, stating—

We can confirm that our student systems have not been affected and no student records have been accessed. No financial data ie. credit card information or bank account details has been accessed.

I am happy to table a copy of TAFE Queensland's media statement, which was released yesterday.

Tabled paper: Media statement, dated 10 November 2015, by TAFE Queensland regarding security breach of TAFE Queensland and Department of Education and Training websites [\[1611\]](#).

Yesterday I tabled the statements of the Queensland Police Service and the Queensland Government Chief Information Officer.

Mr STEVENS: I rise to a point of order. The minister has been advising the House, in her answer, about what has not been done, but the question asked specifically about the people concerned—and I will read it again—and 'the unauthorised release of their personal details and has the minister advised them of what details have been released'. It is about the people who have been affected.

Mr SPEAKER: Minister, I ask you to make sure that your answer is relevant to the specific question.

Mrs D'ATH: This is a criminal matter that has been referred to state, national and international agencies. I will take the advice of the authorities and the experts in relation to what information I should release. Statements have been made. It is still a criminal investigation and it is a crime. It is a cyber attack on data of a government agency. I will take the advice to ensure that I do not compromise any investigations in relation to this matter. I will not compromise any investigations in relation to these matters.

Mr Mander interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Everton, you have asked the question. It is not appropriate for you to persist with interjections.

Moreton Bay Rail Link

Mr WHITING: My question is to the Deputy Premier. Will the Deputy Premier please update the House on the progress of construction for the Moreton Bay Rail Link and consultation on the draft timetables?

Ms TRAD: I thank the member for Murrumba for his question. Of course, the member was with me last week when I went to look at the first of the completed Moreton Bay Rail Link rail stations at Mango Hill. He was joined by other local state members of parliament, including the Attorney-General who shoulders a significant amount of credit for this project getting ahead when she was the federal member for Petrie. She was dogged in her determination to see this piece of infrastructure committed to under the former federal Labor government. I was also pleased to be joined by the member for Kallangur, who is in the chamber today, as well as the mayor for the Moreton Bay shire, Allan Sutherland. It was a great day. It was particularly pleasing to have the federal minister—

Mr Nicholls: Don't forget the member for Petrie. He was there as well. Paul Fletcher, the federal infrastructure minister, was there as well.

Ms TRAD: I will take the interjection from the member for Clayfield, because I know that when he was Treasurer he did not actually fund any infrastructure and there was no infrastructure plan. I know that he is quite keen and excited to talk about infrastructure projects now, but when his hand was on the till he did not fund any infrastructure for the state and there was no planning for infrastructure in this state.

Mr Hinchliffe interjected.


Mr SPEAKER: Order! Minister, one moment. Leader of the House, if you persist you will be warned under standing order 253A and join the others already on the list.

Ms TRAD: I was pleased to be joined by the federal minister, Paul Fletcher, to show him the first of the stations and the Moreton Bay Rail Link project itself. I know that the current federal government, under the leadership of Malcolm Turnbull, is unlike the former federal LNP government, under the leadership of Tony Abbott, and is quite sympathetic to major infrastructure projects of a mass-transit nature.

We are proceeding very well in terms of the consultation around the timetables. This project will take off the road some 600 cars travelling from Moreton Bay into the city. That is a fantastic outcome in terms of beating congestion. Additionally, in terms of services that the Moreton Bay Rail Link project will deliver, there will be over 600 train trips from the Moreton Bay region into the city every week, with express services daily and a 55-minute rail loop between Kippa-Ring station and Central station. That is a fantastic outcome for the people of Moreton Bay.

We are in the first week of a six-week survey of the new timetables. Those new timetables will mean an additional 127 bus trips for the region on a weekday basis. To date, the response has been incredibly positive, with a number of respondents who currently do not use public transport saying that they will turn to public transport because of this sort of project. That is what Labor delivers, unlike those opposite.

Queensland Tourism Investment Guide

 **Mrs STUCKEY:** My question without notice is to the Minister for Tourism. I refer to version 3 of the Queensland government's tourism investment guide which only minutes ago was taken off the department's website. Will the minister inform the House when Queenslanders can expect to see a mistake-free version of the guide?

Ms JONES: I thank the member for the question. As I said in answering the very first question in question time, I have directed the director-general to sit down with Jones Lang LaSalle and go through the document to ensure that it has the most up-to-date information in it. That is what I have committed to do. The former minister for tourism and small business put out a brochure advertising Small Business Week with year-old data in it. Remember that, 'Goldie'? What did small business say? The outdated figures just made it worthless—

Mrs STUCKEY: I rise to a point of order, Mr Speaker. My question was clearly about a tourism investment guide. I ask the minister to answer the question.

Mr SPEAKER: I call the minister.

Ms JONES: What I am saying is that, once again, there is a clear contrast here moving forward. What did we see in the past? A document with year-old data and businesses saying—

Mr SPEAKER: Minister, it is not—

Ms Trad interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, Deputy Premier.

Government members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, ministers. It is not an opportunity to debate the question with the member for Currumbin.

Ms JONES: There is an old saying, though, 'People who live in glass houses shouldn't throw stones.'

Mr SPEAKER: No, it is not an opportunity to debate the question. Do you have anything further to add to your answer?

Ms JONES: I am simply saying that the former minister also put out a guide which clearly contained out-of-date information.

Advance Queensland

Mr RUSSO: My question is directed to the Minister for Science and Innovation. Will the minister advise how the Advance Queensland initiative is encouraging everyday Queenslanders to become digitally savvy?

Ms ENOCH: I thank the member for the question. I know he will be particularly interested in hearing about the involvement of one of his constituents in an exciting new program which aims to ensure we do not leave anyone behind in our increasingly digital world.

The Palaszczuk government has recently named our first Advance Queensland Community Digital Champions to promote the work of Queenslanders who are helping others to reap the rewards of using technology in their everyday lives. Our first 10 champions are amazing advocates for digital technologies in their local communities and are inspiring improvement in digital literacy and digital adoption across the state.

From the electorate of Sunnybank, Ben Munford helps people over 50 improve their digital confidence and competency. Mr Munford has helped more than 200 seniors. So far, his oldest student has been 90-years-old—which just goes to show that one is never too old to learn something new. One of his first students was an 80-year-old housebound man who now surfs the web and uses Skype to keep in touch with his brother in Canada.

Our digital champions come from a range of business, industry and community groups. Take, for example, Wayne Denning who used digital technology to promote Aboriginal culture worldwide through television documentaries and children's shows.

Also among our list of worthy inaugural champions are Liz Hill, a farmer who created an online information hub for the people of the Balonne shire, and Brynlea Gibson, a 2015 Australian Youth Leadership Award winner, whose robotic project could help progress remote surgery. These champions are shining examples of digitally savvy Queenslanders who are using innovation, knowledge and a sense of community to help others keep pace with a fast-changing world.

The Palaszczuk government knows that technology can help us to improve our lifestyle, provide opportunities for new jobs and offer social connections. Our champions will work with their local communities to help improve digital literacy and adoption and share their inspirational stories and expertise.

We are looking for more champions to give back to their communities and teach others how to take on the digital age. I encourage members and their local communities to nominate worthy individuals to be recognised as digital champions.

The member for Toowoomba South asks what I am up to while the government is undertaking an open and transparent recruitment process for a director-general. My answer is that I am implementing our \$180 million Advanced Queensland initiative—a substantial investment in the future of Queensland. Let me tell the House that a highly qualified acting director-general has been getting on with the job of running the department. Any suggestion that there is a link between DG recruitment and ICT issues is misinformed and inaccurate. These are two entirely separate issues.

Let us contrast that with the actions of the opposition. We do not go through our contact list—A, B, C—and at C say, 'Caltabiano, that is an opportunity for a director-general.' We actually go through a selection process.

Information Technology

Dr McVEIGH: My question is directed to the Minister for Science and Innovation. With reference to the \$12 million IT bungle overpayment to contractors, is it true that it was first brought to the attention of the department by conscientious contractors themselves not by Queensland Shared Services or other departmental officials?

Ms ENOCH: I thank the member for the question. I pretty much answered this question in the House yesterday. I was informed by the department on 5 November when the incident occurred—in fact, within hours of the actual incident occurring; the very same day. I was informed by the department via the normal processes. The director-general called me directly and told me exactly what was occurring. I can confirm that 80 per cent of the duplicated amount, as at 9 am this morning, has been recovered.

Dr McVEIGH: I rise to a point of order, Mr Speaker. I ask you to rule on relevance. My question was: is it true that contractors themselves informed the department before departmental officials?

Mr SPEAKER: Minister, I ask you to ensure that your answer is relevant to the specific question.

Ms ENOCH: As I have said, I was informed via normal channels of a department. The director-general of the department informed me of the issue. That is the right and proper way to receive that information. I was informed by the director-general within hours of the incident.

When I was informed of the incident I directed the acting DG—a very capable person—to ensure that there were strategies in place to recover the funding and investigate the root cause of this particular issue. I have been informed, as I indicated yesterday, that it was a conscientious attempt to ensure that vendors were paid.

What I also revealed yesterday is that in 2013 the Department of Education and Training incorrectly paid 362 vendors twice—

Dr McVEIGH: I rise to a point of order, Mr Speaker. Again I ask for your guidance on relevance. The question was: did contractors advise the department first before departmental officials?

Mr SPEAKER: I call the minister.

Ms ENOCH: As I said, the right and proper way that a minister's office would be informed of incidents within a department is via the director-general.

Mr SPEAKER: Minister, I think you may have answered the question to my satisfaction.

Disability Services, Assistive Technologies

Mr POWER: My question is to the Minister for Disability Services. Will the minister update the House on how the Palaszczuk government is supporting the development of assistive technologies?

Mrs O'ROURKE: I thank the member for Logan for the question. I know he is very interested in initiatives that will support people with disability. Last month I had the honour of speaking at the NDIS 'New world conference—disability in the 21st century'. This conference was hosted by the NDIA. This three-day groundbreaking conference brought together some of the brightest minds, people with disabilities, service providers and IT professionals. We saw local innovators as well as global technology giants such as IBM and Apple gather to showcase innovative technologies that have been developed and will support and enhance the lives of people with disability.

If you think about the pace at which technology is moving, it is really great to see that the possibilities for technology that will improve the lives of people with disability are absolutely endless. Innovation is an absolutely crucial factor in reaching these possibilities, and the Palaszczuk government is committed to working with industry to turn great ideas into solutions.

Our government's Advance Queensland policy will support entrepreneurs, industry, universities and governments to grasp these opportunities in growing markets and to position the state as an attractive investment destination. Through Advance Queensland we will be ready and able to generate the big new ideas and technologies that will create quality of life for future generations, making a real difference to the lives of people with disability.

In addition to Advance Queensland, we have been working with service providers to promote assistive technologies, funding organisations to trial smart technologies with their clients. In September the member for Pine Rivers, Nikki Boyd, launched an exciting new online initiative called Community Care Smart AT Collaborative. The collaborative brings together service providers and people with disability in an online environment to learn about technologies, to communicate with experts and to share knowledge and expertise.

Another great example of our commitment to innovation is the Elderly Parent Carer Innovation Initiative, which creates jobs and embraces assistive technology through innovative housing solutions. I have had the privilege of visiting a number of these sites since becoming minister, including most recently in Bundaberg during community cabinet, and I have seen how the use of assistive technologies such as lighting control and temperature control through the use of smart phones and other remote devices can really support independence for a person with disability. I am excited that the NDIS is rolling out during the digital age, and the Advance Queensland program will help maximise opportunities for technology to assist people with disability.

Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Services

Mrs SMITH: My question is to the Premier. I refer to recent reports in the *Courier-Mail* of the police minister's behaviour in the chamber yesterday and I ask: as the victim targeted by this behaviour, does this meet the Premier's standards for ministerial conduct?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I have not seen that report that the member is referring to.

Mrs SMITH: Mr Speaker, for the benefit of the Premier, I table a copy of the *Courier-Mail* article indicating the police minister mimicked slitting my throat.

Tabled paper: Article from the *Courier-Mail*, dated 11 November 2015, titled 'Civil debate gets a crude awakening' [\[1612\]](#).

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for Mount Ommaney very much for the question. If the member has an issue about the standards of this House and if she does not like the way a particular member has reacted, there are provisions within this House about the way those matters are dealt with. What we have seen today is once again no questions about policy, personal attacks, the same LNP—

Opposition members interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: No, no—the same LNP—

Mr STEVENS: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The question was specifically about the behaviour of the Premier's minister in the House. Please keep the Premier relevant in her answer to that question about the minister.

Mr HINCHLIFFE: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The Premier clearly answered that question from the member in referring to the processes and opportunities that are available within the House. She now has the floor and the ability to comment further on the matters that have been raised by the member. I think there is a lot of 'protesting too much' about these issues of relevance.

Mr SPEAKER: I call the Premier.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Everybody knows in this House that if they have a complaint they can make a complaint to the Speaker. They can make a complaint to the CLA. There are rules and procedures around this House. You can take a point of order at the time.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Members, I am trying to hear the Premier.

Mrs SMITH: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I asked the Premier: did that behaviour meet the Premier's standards for the ministerial code of conduct?

Ms PALASZCZUK: If a member takes personal offence they can make a complaint. They are the processes of this parliament. Look at the behaviour of—

Mrs SMITH: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I clearly asked the Premier if that standard of behaviour was acceptable under the ministerial code of conduct.

Mr SPEAKER: The Premier has answered the question, as I understand it. Premier, do you have anything further to add?

Ms PALASZCZUK: No.

Mr CRIPPS: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. Can the Premier confirm that the standing rules and orders of the Legislative Assembly now stand as proxy for the behaviour of ministers under the ministerial code of conduct?

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Hinchinbrook, that is not a point of order. The Premier has answered the question.

Mining Industry

Mr KING: My question is to the Minister for State Development and Minister for Natural Resources and Mines. Will the minister please inform the House what the Palaszczuk government is doing to support innovation and productivity in the resources industry in Queensland?

Mr SPEAKER: I ask the member for Kallangur to repeat his question. I was not able to hear it because of distraction.

Mr KING: Certainly. My question is to the Minister for State Development and Minister for Natural Resources and Mines. Will the minister please inform the House what the Palaszczuk government is doing to support innovation and productivity in the resources industry in Queensland?

Dr LYNHAM: I thank the member for Kallangur for his question. The member is a great supporter of the resources industry. It is unknown that a lot of the mining, engineering and technology services that support our resources industry are right there in the member's electorate. The member is very proud of that.

Mr Cripps interjected.

Mr Hinchliffe interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Minister, one moment. I now warn the member for Hinchinbrook and the Leader of the House under standing order 253A.

Dr LYNHAM: Those within the House should know that in the electorate of Kallangur there are a lot of services that are supporting our resources sector in Central Queensland and other areas of Queensland.

As we all know, the resources industry plays a vital role in providing economic prosperity and jobs in Queensland, particularly in our regional areas. As Queensland's Minister for State Development and Minister for Natural Resources and Mines, I would like to talk about the progress of some of our initiatives that will ensure the sustainable and responsible development of the resources sector.

In 2014-15 the resources sector contributed more than \$64 billion to Queensland's economy. As I told the Mining Resources Convention at the Hilton this morning, governments around Australia acknowledge the sector is facing some big challenges. Here in Queensland the Palaszczuk government is investing heavily in innovation because that is what will underpin improved productivity and reduce costs.

We have recently provided \$6 million plus staffing support towards a new \$20 million national growth centre for mining equipment, technology and services at QUT. Queensland's mining technology services companies are part of the resources sector's global success, and we did not think twice about investing \$6 million to get the new growth centre here. The METS industry growth centre, along with the Queensland government's \$180 million Advance Queensland initiative, will cement Queensland's position as a METS innovation hotspot. Most importantly, it will draw more knowledge capital, more investment, greater productivity improvements and ultimately strengthen our resources sector. It will work with researchers and industry to find solutions to the mining industry's challenges, including reducing production costs and innovative approaches to mine site rehabilitation.

I can attest personally to the interest of the sector in innovation and Advance Queensland in particular. In my discussions with resource operators I always take the opportunity to highlight the benefits available to them. I have also invited the Acting Director-General of the Department of Science, Information Technology and Innovation to address the most recent resources round table. It is amazing that people in the resources sector, the agricultural sector and the natural resources sector are coming to understand just what a great benefit our Advance Queensland initiative is to those important sectors.

Rural Debt and Drought Taskforce

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: My question without notice is to the Minister for Agriculture. Can the minister guarantee that witnesses appearing before the Rural Debt and Drought Taskforce will be given full legal protection so they can talk candidly about their dealings with banks and financial institutions?

Mr BYRNE: I thank the member for the question. This is on the back of the motion that was moved yesterday. For the member's information, the rural debt task force has largely been put together by the Treasurer. Treasury has been intimately involved in working with the crossbench to move this proposal forward. As I said yesterday, I find it inconceivable that people giving evidence, if that evidence, material or commentary before the task force is accurate, should have anything to fear. They

do not need the protections of anonymity or lack of scrutiny. If these people who will be called to give evidence have substantive material to put before this task force, they will be able to do so with the confidence that those participating are doing so in good faith.

I find it simply ridiculous the line taken in the motion last night that this is somehow going to protect them from some unseen evil. The shadow minister for agriculture seems to be implying by this question that the banks generically are operating in such a fashion as to be questionable in their dealings. I have met with many rural banking agents and representatives. Despite the occasional moment of difficulty which has been ventilated in some media sources, the vast majority of the banking sector have been acting judiciously, prudently and within the law—precisely as you would expect of rural banks. I am not sure what the question is about. Is it about the fact that the opposition simply does not support commercial arrangements that exist in the agriculture sector? Do they want to undermine the foundations of agribusinesses? What is the suggestion that they are putting forward? Is the suggestion that this is a witch-hunt promoted by the LNP?

What the opposition needs to do is put the appropriate member on the task force. Let us get the appropriate member. I think everyone on this side of the House knows who on the opposition benches is most qualified, most able and most intimate with this issue, and I do not think it is the member for Clayfield, which seems to be what yesterday's motion was all about. Frankly, get on board with the task force, stop asking ridiculous questions and if you want us to nominate your member we will do it for you.

Gold Coast Commonwealth Games, Investment

Mr de BRENNI: My question is to the Minister for Tourism, Major Events, Small Business and the Commonwealth Games. Will the minister outline to the House how Commonwealth Games investments are ensuring a lasting legacy for the Gold Coast and for Queensland?

Ms JONES: I thank the honourable member for his question. I know he is just as excited as I am about the Commonwealth Games coming to Queensland in April 2018. There are 875 days to go until the Gold Coast Commonwealth Games. Construction is well underway. Last week I had the privilege of joining with the mayor, Tom Tate, on the Gold Coast to inspect construction on the new sound stage that is being built in conjunction with Village Roadshow at Oxenford. This new sound stage will be the largest sound stage in the Southern Hemisphere being built on the Gold Coast because of the money we are investing as part of our Commonwealth Games infrastructure funding.

This project will support up to 250 jobs during construction. More importantly, it will leave a lasting legacy when it comes to growing the film industry on the Gold Coast which is having a rejuvenation at the moment. This sound stage will be used next year for the next instalment of the movie *Thor*. We are working to ensure this can be delivered in time to ensure that *Thor* will be filmed there next year.

In addition, we have seen construction start—\$3.3 million—on the Broadbeach Bowls Club. Four South-East Queensland contractors are carrying out the work, creating more jobs for Gold Coast tradies. The upgrade is expected to be completed in mid-2016 and will feature four upgraded international competition standard lawn bowls greens. In terms of a legacy, this is already delivering additional events to the Gold Coast. We have secured the 2016 World Junior Championships and the 2020 World Bowls Championships as a result of this upgrade.

At the moment the \$1.5 billion investment in the Commonwealth Games, including hundreds of millions of dollars in new infrastructure, is delivering a long-term legacy and opportunities for the Gold Coast. Next month the Commonwealth Games Federation through the coordination commission will meet again on the Gold Coast to review planning and progress of the games, and I look forward to updating the House on that as I did last time. When I became the minister, the coordination commission report delivered under the last Newman government was very critical of its oversight of the Commonwealth Games. The midterm report delivered in the middle of this year was very positive in regard to moving through this change.

Mrs Stuckey interjected.

Ms JONES: I take the interjection from the member for Currumbin, because I would like to read into *Hansard* an email I got from the Gold Coast City Council when I became the Minister for the Commonwealth Games.

An honourable member interjected.

Ms JONES: Yes. It states—

We were all very excited at the prospect of greater involvement and partnership with the government following a challenging and tumultuous relationship with the former games minister and the former government.

RACQ, President

Mr KATTER: My question without notice is to the Minister for Main Roads, Road Safety and Ports and Minister for Energy and Water Supply. Will the minister confirm whether he is aware that the RACQ president, representing thousands of Queensland motorists, is also the CEO of one of Queensland's largest feedlot operators, North Australian Pastoral Company? Has the minister taken into account this person's dual roles when considering submissions within the minister's portfolio?

Mr BAILEY: I thank the honourable member for Mount Isa for his question. I was not aware of that dual role, but I can say that I have had plenty of dealings with the feedlot industry which has made submissions in terms of our proposed ethanol and biofuels legislation at nine public forums right across the state. I know that I have had discussions with them at more than one forum. And of course RACQ has raised with me its views on a range of things. I have dealt with both of those stakeholders in a variety of ways and have always found both groups to be honourable and to be representing their interests. I was not aware of that particular relationship, but it is not unusual, I would attest respectfully, that people involved in public life often have more than one hat and they will often go into bat on different matters depending on whom they are representing that day. That is not unusual, but I do thank the honourable member for informing me of that link which I was not aware of.

Net-Free Zones

Mrs GILBERT: My question is to the Minister for Agriculture and Fisheries. Will the minister update the House on the government's progress in implementing its net-free zones election commitment?

Mr BYRNE: I thank the member for the question. I am happy to inform the House that the government has followed through with the election commitment as outlined in our sustainable fishing policy. From 1 November three net-free fishing zones located in Cairns, Mackay and Rockhampton have come into effect in spite of the LNP's best efforts. This will represent a boon for local tourism and recreational and charter fishing.

The news that this government delivered on its commitment was widely welcomed by many in the community, as those opposite know. The Australian Marine Conservation Society was fulsome in its praise, stating—

The AMCS and our supporters are pleased that the Queensland government is now free to deliver critical protection zones for iconic and vulnerable Queensland wildlife.

Let us not forget tourism. The Association of Marine Park Tourism Operators noted, 'One only has to look at the successes of the recreational charter fishing industry in the Northern Territory to see what can be achieved here.' The Chairman of Mackay Tourism, which represents over 200 tourism businesses interests, said that this issue has been on the agenda since 2005. 'We certainly see the opportunity for an improved fishing environment as one that will stimulate further attractiveness in our region.' Caravanning Queensland congratulated the government for standing strong on our promise. It said, 'This is something that will not be forgotten in the tourism industry in Queensland.'

I do find it a little surprising that one tourism group has been ambivalent to the concept of net-free zones. That group is Capricorn Enterprises. The comments from the chair of Capricorn Enterprises, Mr Graham Scott, suggest that he supported both concepts—a concept of nets in net-free zones. This confused approach—strangely similar to that carried by the LNP—is very different to the strong support from the Rockhampton Regional Council Mayor, Margaret Strelow, and the regional council. She said—

We do not have any strong tourism element at the moment. Our accommodation houses are full Monday to Friday and that is the business market. We have almost no holiday or weekend destination tourism. This is our opportunity to have something that we currently do not have.

This policy is Labor standing up for regional Queensland. After the disallowance motion and the performance by those opposite, I am left to wonder just where the LNP sit on this issue. We have seen local members coming out now apparently supportive, and I am receiving a literal barrage of correspondence from LNP members opposite wanting to roll out these provisions in their sectors. I am quite amenable to that. All I need is for the Leader of the Opposition to get his party together and come to us in good faith, and I am happy to work with the opposition at any point in the future should their members wish to embrace these proposals going forward. This is simply a symptom of an opportunistic and disjointed opposition.

Rural Debt and Drought Taskforce

Mr NICHOLLS: My question is to the Minister for Agriculture. Can the minister outline what powers the rural debt task force will have to compel banks and other financial institutions to appear and provide relevant documents to the task force?

Mr BYRNE: I thank the member for the question. There seems to be some confusion here about who is the lead on this from the government. It was the Treasurer who announced this. It is the Treasurer's lead, as a minister of this government, in moving this matter forward. Again, I ask the member for Clayfield, why would an institution be required to be compelled? What is it that the opposition has that it thinks is going to be withheld? The fact is—

Mr Springborg interjected.

Mr BYRNE: I can only refer to the commentary made by Barry O'Sullivan in Longreach some time ago, when he ventilated this issue fairly effectively. He got up there and made it quite clear where the situation rested. I notice there was not a single member of the LNP in Queensland present at that meeting, but Barry O'Sullivan, rest his soul, got up and pretty much ventilated the situation we confront in regional Queensland.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr BYRNE: That is a fact. There is this idea that the opposition wants to turn this task force into a Spanish inquisition, that we are going to have some sort of power of interrogation. I can give the opposition some lessons on that if they want them. I can teach them how to do an interrogation where people spill the beans, but I am not sure that is appropriate here.

What I can say is that this task force will be well constructed. I am not aware of anybody who will be asked to present at that who will not come forward and do so in good faith. This idea that we are going to need mandatory imposition of powers is a complete nonsense. I ask the opposition to get on board with this task force. It is an absolute nonsense to suggest that these powers are needed to interrogate financial institutions. They have reputations at stake here. As if they are going to go in there and give false evidence or misleading evidence or try to misdirect the task force. You are making a joke of yourselves as an opposition. You trust nobody, do you? Absolutely nobody.

Ms Trad: Not even each other.

Mr BYRNE: Not even each other. I will make this offer to the Leader of the Opposition and the member who asked the question. If you have rural banks or financial institutions that you are concerned are going to give dishonest information to the task force, put their names on the record. Tell me one entity that the opposition thinks is going to come here and misinform the task force. Get on board.

(Time expired)

Drought

Mr PEARCE: My question is directed to the Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services. Will the minister outline to the House what actions the government is undertaking to better support Queenslanders suffering in drought conditions?

Mr DICK: I thank the member for Mirani for his question. He, along with all members of this House, knows that many parts of Queensland are in the grip of a very fierce and destructive drought and that is having an enormous impact not just on the economic wellbeing of our state but on individuals and families. I am pleased to receive a substantive question on health policy, and I am very pleased to respond to the member for Mirani, who has great affection for his very large and disparate community and electorate in our state.

Our government takes the plight of those strong and resilient Queenslanders who are facing that drought very seriously. We have put \$5 million into supporting the mental health and wellbeing of Queenslanders, particularly in the west of our state. That started with \$1½ million in the budget to support the Royal Flying Doctor Service's Drought Wellbeing Service. Just last week on Sunday I announced a \$3½ million assistance package to provide more targeted help. That comprises two parts. The first is \$2.9 million to expand our mental health scheme in rural parts of our state by basing additional clinicians in Cairns, Townsville, Mackay, Mount Isa, Longreach, Rockhampton, Bundaberg, Toowoomba and Roma. These additional clinicians will help serve that community by trying to identify people who have come to our hospital and health service before expressing concern about their mental health and wellbeing; they will try to identify those people already in contact and try to help them. The second part is \$600,000 to enable communities to develop and promote resilience building programs.

I have been out to the Central West a number of times. I have visited Isis and Longreach twice now, Barcardine twice and Roma. I have met with people like Jane Williams, who heads up the Central West Rural Wellness Network. These are community organisations that work with the community. They know what works best. I cannot praise people like Jane Williams enough. She is on our Central Queensland Hospital and Health Service board. She is very deeply engaged with her community. We are providing additional funding to those sorts of wellness groups. They deliberately call themselves 'wellness groups' because they provide support to the community. They are important for our government, and I am very pleased to support people just like Jane who are coming up with those innovative ideas. We will be trying to expand that and support other community organisations.

Regrettably, the Bureau of Meteorology has forecast a lower than normal probability of exceeding median summer rain. While there has been some rain in the west, it has hardly been drought breaking. We have a long road to go, but those people in the west of our state in particular know that this government stands with them. We will support them at this difficult time. In the mental health space, we will use that \$5 million very effectively to help them.

Alcohol Fuelled Violence

Mr McARDLE: My question is to the Minister for Health. Queensland Health data has been released that shows that in 2014-15 there were over 11,000 presentations to 28 EDs involving alcohol. That is a shocking figure, suggesting community-wide issues. For clarification, can the minister advise the House how many of these relate to alcohol fuelled violence in urban entertainment precincts? I table the data.

Tabled paper: Document, undated, titled 'Trading Hour Push Ahead of Summer Drinks Toll' [1613].

Mr SPEAKER: I call the minister for one minute.

Mr DICK: No, I do not have that data. I am happy to look at that further and see what information is contained there and has been tabled. What it does demonstrate quite clearly is that 11,000 people presenting in 28 EDs means we need a strong stance against alcohol fuelled violence, and it is this government that has developed a very significant package to support that. I do not know those figures off the top of my head and I am surprised that the member for Caloundra would expect me to know specific data like that in the parliament, but I am happy to look at that information he has tabled. I will interrogate that to make sure it is accurate and I will see what we need to do further.

Mr McARDLE: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. Will the minister come back into the House before the rise of the House this sitting week—

Mr HINCHLIFFE: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

Mr SPEAKER: It is not a point of order. It is not an opportunity to put a second question, member for Caloundra. What is your point of order, Leader of the House?


Mr HINCHLIFFE: I was drawing your attention to the fact that we do not have supplementary questions.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you. Minister, do you have anything further to add?

Mr DICK: No.

PRIVILEGE

Alleged Contempt of Parliament by a Minister

 **Mrs SMITH** (Mount Ommaney—LNP) (4.09 pm): I rise on a matter of privilege suddenly arising. At approximately midday yesterday the member for Bundamba, whilst in the chamber, made a throat-slitting motion towards me. The member for Bundamba then said, 'I'm going to get you,' and the member for Bundamba then repeated the throat-slitting motion and stated, 'You're a goner.' This threatening and intimidating behaviour was witnessed by the members for Nanango, Gaven and Chatsworth. I also believe members of the public gallery may have witnessed the events that took place.

Mr HINCHLIFFE: I rise to a point of order. Mr Speaker, the provision for matters of privilege suddenly arising are, indeed, matters that are suddenly arising. This is a matter that should have been raised with you yesterday in this format.

Mr SPEAKER: My understanding is that matters of privilege suddenly arising need to be raised immediately. The member for Mount Ommaney is referring to something that happened yesterday. Would you like to write to me about this matter and I can consider it?

Mrs SMITH: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I had asked the Premier a question. She directed or guided that we do this. If I could just finish my matter of privilege suddenly arising—it arose out of question time.

Mr HINCHLIFFE: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The member for Mount Ommaney should be taking her guidance from you, which you just provided to her.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, Leader of the House. There is no point of order.

Mrs SMITH: Mr Speaker, I believe that this arose out of question time.

Mr SPEAKER: You can write to me—

Mrs SMITH: If I can finish—

Mr HINCHLIFFE: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you.

Mrs SMITH: Mr Speaker, I intend to write to you—

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Ommaney, one moment. Leader of the House, what is your point of order, and I hope it is relevant?

Mr HINCHLIFFE: Mr Speaker, you have invited and instructed the member for Mount Ommaney to write to you. I suggest that is what she should be doing rather than allowing further opportunities for abuse of points of order to make arguments.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, Leader of the House.

Mrs SMITH: Mr Speaker, I intend to write to you requesting you investigate this matter and refer the member for Bundamba to the Ethics Committee for a contempt of the parliament; namely, breaching standing order 266(9), and give consideration to whether this matter should further be dealt with under section 60(1)(b) of the Criminal Code.

Mr HINCHLIFFE: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Mount Ommaney. I will look forward to your letter. Leader of the House, what is your point of order?

Mr HINCHLIFFE: My point of order is that we have just seen an abuse of the House.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Members, I have made my ruling. The member for Mount Ommaney will write to me about this matter.

SUSTAINABLE PORTS DEVELOPMENT BILL

Second Reading

Resumed from 10 November (see p. 2731), on motion of Dr Lynham—

That the bill be now read a second time.

Mr CRIPPS (Hinchinbrook—LNP) (4.12 pm), continuing: As I was saying prior to the adjournment of debate on this bill yesterday afternoon, I have lived in communities adjacent to the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage area for almost all of my life and I know that country very well. I do value that country and I respect it. As I was saying yesterday, I certainly want to protect it for future generations of Queenslanders and visitors to Queensland who come to enjoy it.

I might also say that in my opinion some of the information put into the public domain regarding the health of the Great Barrier Reef and the potential threats to its future have often been, at best, significantly exaggerated and, at worst, deliberately dishonest. It has been very well documented that I have not appreciated or been particularly complimentary to those efforts to purposefully mislead and unnecessarily alarm the general public. Having said that, the LNP, while not getting caught up in the hysteria and the rumour-mongering, have always taken a responsible and practical approach to managing the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage area adjacent to Queensland—Queensland's mainland I should say because it is certainly part of Queensland.

The LNP welcomed the decision earlier this year by UNESCO's World Heritage Committee not to place Queensland's Great Barrier Reef on the in-danger list. This was an uncommon win for common sense. Despite the inflammatory scaremongering and doomsday rhetoric of some irresponsible groups in the conservation sector, which had tried to demonise farmers and other job-creating industries in

Queensland, hard science prevailed earlier this year. Very clearly, the former LNP government did more than any previous administration in Queensland to protect the Great Barrier Reef through practical initiatives and proper planning across a range of portfolios.

The fact is that the reef was put on the watch list under state and federal Labor governments in 2011 and since then the hard work of Queensland and Commonwealth LNP governments saw the Great Barrier Reef avoid an in-danger listing. It was the LNP that drafted and developed the reef 2050 plan. It was the LNP that was investing \$35 million per year to improve water quality and stumped up \$1 million to help control excessive numbers of crown-of-thorns starfish. It was the LNP that introduced the toughest laws ever to protect the Great Barrier Reef by significantly increasing penalties for causing serious environmental harm and developed the Queensland ports strategy, which I will talk more about later.

In contrast, Labor left office in Queensland in early 2012 having approved a massive 38 million cubic metre at-sea dredge spoil disposal plan at Abbot Point and imposing mountains of meaningless paperwork on primary producers. For the Palaszczuk Labor government to claim credit for the Great Barrier Reef not being listed as in danger is a complete joke. The LNP's responsible and practical approach to managing the Great Barrier Reef was ultimately accepted by UNESCO's World Heritage Committee as the platform for the long-term management of this World Heritage area. This fact is no more evident than the legislation that we are currently debating.

While the Sustainable Ports Development Bill was introduced by the Minister for State Development and Minister for Natural Resources and Mines on 22 July 2015, in reality there is a significant number of similarities between this bill and the Ports Bill 2014, introduced by the former LNP government on 25 November 2014. For this reason, the LNP does not intend to oppose this bill. However, there are some key differences which I intend to discuss further, and this is also the reason why the LNP is not completely satisfied with this bill in its entirety and for which I will make some alternative proposals.

The Palaszczuk government has stated its commitment to the Reef 2050 Long-Term Sustainability Plan, also known as the Reef 2050 Plan, and to the implementation of a package of measures which it asserts will contribute to the protection of the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage area. The bill before the House proposes to give effect to the government's commitments made under the Reef 2050 Plan to better manage the impacts of port development on the environment, particularly on the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage area. It claims to be able to do so while allowing Queensland's economy, jobs and regions to grow.

The bill claims to protect greenfield areas by restricting new port development in and adjoining the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage area to within current port limits; restrict capital dredging for the development of new or expansion of existing port facilities to within the regulated port limits of Gladstone, Hay Point-Mackay, Abbot Point and Townsville ports to optimise the use of infrastructure at these long-established, major bulk commodity ports; prohibit the sea based disposal of material into the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage area generated by port related capital dredging; mandate the beneficial reuse of port related capital dredge material such as for land reclamation or disposal on land where it is environmentally safe to do so; and require master plans at the long-established major bulk commodity ports of Gladstone, Hay Point-Mackay, Abbot Point and Townsville to optimise the use of existing port infrastructure and address operational, economic, environmental and social relationships as well as supply chains and surrounding land uses.

The explanatory notes accompanying this bill claim that long-term master planning at the four priority ports of Gladstone, Hay Point-Mackay, Abbot Point and Townsville supports the Council of Australian Government's national port strategy, which was endorsed in July 2012. Of course, that means that the strategy was agreed to by the former LNP government, which is further evidence of the responsible and practical approach to managing the Great Barrier Reef consistently adopted by the LNP.

Some of the key policy similarities and differences between the Sustainable Ports Development Bill 2015, the 2015 bill, and the Ports Bill 2014, the 2014 bill, include the following: both the 2014 and 2015 bills concentrate port development in the long-established major industrial and bulk commodity ports of Abbot Point, Gladstone, Hay Point-Mackay and Townsville. In terms of the extent of the planning instruments required under each bill, the House may be very interested to know that the 2014 bill would have required long-term planning for all ports, whereas the 2015 bill only proposes to regulate planning for the four industrial and bulk commodity ports of Gladstone, Hay Point-Mackay, Abbot Point and Townsville. The protection of the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage Area is the stated primary

purpose of the 2015 bill, whereas the stated primary purpose of the 2014 bill was to stimulate Queensland's economic growth while protecting and managing Queensland's outstanding environmental assets, including the Great Barrier Reef.

The 2014 bill sought, and the 2015 bill seeks, to provide for port development that is consistent with the principles of ecologically sustainable development. Indeed, both bills intend for there to be long-term planning for ports; aim to recognise the diverse functions of the port network including trade, tourism and defence operations; aim to identify and protect land and infrastructure critical to the effective operation of the port network; aim to efficiently use existing port and supply chain infrastructure; and aim to expand port and supply chain capacity in a staged and incremental way to meet emergent demand for imports and exports. Furthermore, both the 2014 and 2015 bills involve a master planning concept and associated instruments to facilitate this planning. In the 2014 bill these instruments were priority port development areas and port land use plans, whereas the 2015 bill utilises the development of port overlays. Both the 2014 and the 2015 bills have special protections relating to the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage area, including the prohibition of dredging for certain purposes in certain areas while permitting dredging for certain other purposes such as ensuring the safe and effective operation of a port.

Another point which may be of particular interest to the House is that, unlike the 2014 bill, the 2015 bill does not set a time within which the responsible minister must have prepared a master plan for priority ports identified by the bill. Under the 2014 bill the minister may ask a supporting entity such as a chief executive, the Coordinator-General, a port entity or a local government for assistance in making or amending an instrument by preparing all or part of it. The 2015 bill does not have similar provisions regarding assistance being provided to the minister by supporting entities. The 2015 bill restricts future port development in the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage area to within existing port limits, whereas in the 2014 bill port development outside existing port limits was subject to ministerial discretion. Finally, the 2015 bill not only concentrates future port development to within the four priority ports, it further restricts the extent to which these ports can expand by excluding marine parks within those port limits. While the 2014 bill nominated the same four priority ports as priority port development areas, it do not exclude expansion into a marine park if that marine park was within port limits.

It is fair to say that there was a degree of disconcertion about the Cairns port not being listed as a priority port under the Ports Bill 2014. This disconcertion has become much more acute under the Sustainable Ports Development Bill 2015. The reason for that is as follows: while the former LNP government did not include the port of Cairns as a priority port in the 2014 legislation, the transitional arrangements in the 2014 bill did recognise the standing of the current EIS process, which is examining the potential for the expansion of the port of Cairns. I recognise that the 2015 bill also recognises the existing EIS process in terms of its transitional arrangements contained in the bill before the House.

The 2014 bill also had a review date for the legislation of 31 December 2022, and there was a level of comfort around the scenario that an EIS with wide terms of reference was in place and there was a commitment that the legislation itself would be reviewed after a suitable period of time. Unfortunately, since the election of the Palaszczuk government these circumstances have become much more uncertain and concerning for those who wish to see a reasonable and practical future for the port of Cairns. Firstly, in April this year we saw several ministers from the Palaszczuk government launch a premeditated attack to undermine the current EIS process, which is supposed to be examining the future development options for the port of Cairns. Labor's response to the draft EIS released in April this year was to try and pour cold water over a range of future development opportunities for the port of Cairns. Labor wanted to consign a number of those development opportunities for the port of Cairns to the dustbin and that, in my opinion, showed a blatant disregard for the local community in Cairns and Far North Queensland.

The draft EIS was supported by the former LNP government to comprehensively examine all options for the future development of the port of Cairns. This is more than Labor ever did during its 20 years in office for the port of Cairns. So when a number of ministers in the Palaszczuk government attacked the draft EIS as a waste of time, it was very clear to many people in Cairns and Far North Queensland that Labor wanted to limit the future options of the port of Cairns. The proposed development to be allowed under the EIS was intended to increase the port's capacity to accommodate cruise ships, expand cargo-handling opportunities and enhance its strategic role as a base for naval assets.

More recently we have seen the Palaszczuk government look to again interfere in what should be an independent and transparent process through its proposal to recalibrate the scope of the EIS. Unfortunately, we are yet to see much detail about what is meant by Labor in terms of this recalibration.

This was the first—but unfortunately, not the last—example of the Palaszczuk government's ever-changing position on the port of Cairns. Nevertheless, it was rather ironic that Labor tried to use the EIS—a document and process that it had mocked and decried in April—to manufacture a solution to their problem in August this year. Unfortunately once again, this government's interference with the EIS process before it was complete and its proposal to recalibrate the scope of works means that we may never know what all the future options for the port of Cairns are in terms of tourism, defence purposes and cargo and freight or what role it might have played in the current push by the Commonwealth government to develop Northern Queensland and Northern Australia.

The LNP acknowledges that there is a difficulty in balancing the current and future growth needs and expectations with respect to the port network on Queensland's east coast with the objectives and targets agreed to by the Commonwealth and Queensland governments with UNESCO in relation to the World Heritage Listing of the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage area. A very significant amount of work was done, primarily by former ministers—now the member for Glass House and the member for Callide—as well as others to ensure that the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage area was not listed as being in danger. It is generally accepted that such an outcome would be detrimental to Queensland's tourism industry and our international reputation. Nevertheless, on the other side of the equation the value of Queensland's east coast port network in terms of economic development, trade, tourism and defence purposes is very important to the local community in Cairns and the Far North Queensland region. This was made very clear during the Infrastructure, Planning and Natural Resources Committee's inquiry into the Sustainable Ports Development Bill 2015.

The Infrastructure, Planning and Natural Resources Committee of the Queensland parliament has tabled its report on the bill. Very interestingly, it contains a recommendation that the port of Cairns be considered by the minister for listing as a priority port. From the committee report it is very clear that the members of that committee—government, opposition and crossbench members of that committee—must have been profoundly influenced by the weight of arguments put forward by witnesses who appeared before that committee who argued that the port of Cairns needed to have opportunities for it to expand into the future, notwithstanding the EIS process that is currently underway.

Last week, in recognition, I would put to you, Mr Deputy Speaker, of the ongoing political pressure in Cairns and Far North Queensland, the Palaszczuk government announced what they described as compromise amendments on the future of the port of Cairns. These announcements come despite several ministers vowing and declaring that they would not compromise on the substance of the Reef 2050 Plan in terms of allowing capital works in non-priority ports in the future.

The Palaszczuk government has foreshadowed that it will move amendments during the consideration in detail of this bill to allow for limited and incremental capital works at the port of Cairns, over and above any capital works yet to be approved under the current EIS process, of a maximum of 50,000 cubic metres for a single project and a cumulative total of up to 150,000 cubic metres in any four-year period. Labor has also announced that it will review these volumes and cumulative volumes for the port of Cairns after four years. The reality is that these volumes are relatively small and will only allow for a limited and incremental increase in the capacity of the port of Cairns in the future, other than works that may be approved under the current EIS process.

I note that, although these so-called compromise amendments are not the preferred outcome, the announcement has been welcomed as a compromise by Advance Cairns and the Cairns Chamber of Commerce. At the same time, the announcement of the compromise amendments has been criticised by the mayor of Cairns as inadequate and effectively placing an economic cap on the development potential of the port of Cairns. The community based group Cairns Port Development Inc. has described the so-called compromise amendments as pathetic and condemning the port of Cairns to a future as a 'boutique port'.

While the announcement by the Palaszczuk government has been spun as a bit of a compromise as a result of consultation with local stakeholders, it is nevertheless a departure from the previously ironclad commitment by Labor not to allow any capital works at non-priority ports adjacent to the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage area, and this departure is very significant in terms of Labor's policy. It has effectively been drilled into everyone that any departure from the principles of the Reef 2050 Plan will imperil the decision by UNESCO to remove the Great Barrier Reef from the in-danger list. We have been told that there can be only four priority ports, as per the provisions of this bill, and that is it. The rest are to be designated as non-priority ports, and no capital works can occur in these ports going forward. That proposition went flying out the door last week with the announcement of these compromise amendments for the port of Cairns only. Now we will have three categories of ports on Queensland's east coast adjacent to the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage area. We will have priority

ports—and there will be four of those; we will have non-priority ports; and then we will have the port of Cairns, which is not a priority port but will be allowed to make application for capital works, albeit small and incremental capital works.

Yes, the local community in Cairns and Far North Queensland spoke very strongly in favour of a sensible and pragmatic accommodation of the future needs of the port of Cairns. And yes, the Palaszczuk government, in announcing these compromise amendments last week, have sought to claim that they have gone some way towards addressing these concerns. However, that does not explain how these amendments and the unique position of the port of Cairns are reconciled with the commitment of the Commonwealth and Queensland governments to UNESCO under the Reef 2050 Plan that there will be no capital works undertaken at any port adjacent to the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage area other than those four priority ports nominated in this particular bill before the House.

This was reiterated in the ministerial media statement issued by the Palaszczuk government last week, when its members were in Cairns. A very interesting definition was put forward by the Premier of Queensland in the ministerial statement. We saw a redefining of that commitment in terms of priority ports in Queensland and what it meant in terms of the agreement with UNESCO. The Premier said in her ministerial statement—

We will stand by our commitment under Reef 2050 Long Term Sustainability Plan to declare only the major industrial ports of Gladstone, Abbot Point, Townsville and Hay Point/Mackay as priority ports.

It is the four priority ports that are the cornerstone of the commitment to UNESCO in terms of managing the future health of the Great Barrier Reef. That is a very important point for all members to keep in mind. But that position is a clear inconsistency. The question then obviously follows: if the small, incremental capital expansion at the port of Cairns is acceptable under the Reef 2050 Plan, why is small, incremental capital expansion not acceptable at other non-priority ports on the east coast of Queensland adjacent to the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage area? That obvious question needs to be answered by this minister.

In that same ministerial press release, issued on 4 November, Minister Bailey, the ports minister, said when referring to those compromise amendments put forward by the Palaszczuk government last week that the dredging plan meant future development at the port could continue and not negatively impact the reef, with port material not to be disposed of at sea. Once again we see a redefinition of what is important—of the cornerstones of the commitment to UNESCO for the management of the health of the Great Barrier Reef. Minister Bailey is saying that the compromise amendments put forward by the Palaszczuk government—50,000 for any one project and a cap of 150,000 over four years—mean that future development could continue and not negatively impact the Great Barrier Reef as long as that port material is not disposed of at sea. That is also a very important point for all members to remember in their consideration of this bill.

In summary, it is not clear from the bill or the advice provided by the minister to this point in time that there is any justification for these compromise amendments, scientifically or otherwise. There is no justification for the volumes nominated by the minister and the government. There is no science behind it, apart from the fact that 50,000 cubic metres or less is consistent with the National Assessment Guidelines for Dredging for small projects. But those National Assessment Guidelines for Dredging for small projects are not relevant or associated with the management of the health of the Great Barrier Reef adjacent to the port network off the east coast of Queensland. They are national guidelines for dredging for small projects at a national level. They are not Queensland specific and they are not specific guidelines associated with managing port networks off the east coast of Queensland.

Certainly there is no equivalent justification, not even any national guidelines, for dredging for small projects to justify the 150,000 cubic metre cumulative cap over four years for the port of Cairns. We do not know where these volumes came from and we do not know how the government knows or can assert that they are appropriate. It does not know if these small caps for capital works at the port of Cairns are going to be adequate or appropriate for that particular port in the future. In any case, stakeholders in Cairns and the community in Far North Queensland are being asked to take on face value that the volumes are going to be adequate to accommodate the necessary capital expansion of the port of Cairns in the future, apart from that which will be apparently permitted by the current EIS process which is underway. So this leads us to the big question: what will be permitted under the current EIS that is underway? We do not know the answer to that question. A draft EIS was released earlier this year and now we know that the proponent, Ports North, is preparing additional information for the Coordinator-General, and this process is due to expire on 31 March 2016. Once again, this House is being asked to take on trust that the scope of works permissible under the EIS will be sufficient to meet the needs of the port of Cairns.

The House will have to forgive me if I am not prepared to extend that level of trust to the minister and the Palaszczuk government. That is why I will now foreshadow that I will move an amendment under standing order 141 which is an amendment to the second reading debate question that will have the effect of deferring this House's consideration of this bill until after the current period provided for the consideration of the EIS for the port of Cairns. I want to make it very clear to all members of this House that supporting this amendment will not result in the bill being defeated or rejected by the parliament. This amendment would only defer consideration of the bill until after the EIS has been finalised and we are better informed about its content and thus the adequacy of this bill and the amendments proposed by the minister and the government. This parliament should not be asked to consider this bill in full until we know the outcome of the EIS that is currently underway for the port of Cairns. The outcome of that EIS and the allowable scope of works permissible as a result of it being finalised has very significant implications for determining the adequacy of the compromised amendments that have been foreshadowed by the minister and the government.

With all of the assurances that we have heard from the minister and the government about how these compromised amendments will provide for the needs of the port of Cairns into the future, they should not be concerned about this proposal to subject that process to a bid of transparency and accountability. It will be more transparent because we will see the results of the EIS before we vote on the bill and it will be more accountable because we will be able to measure the claims of these ministers against the results of the EIS and what scope of works will be possible at the port of Cairns under that instrument. We should do this to keep faith with the more than 6,000 residents of Cairns and Far North Queensland who have expressed their concern about the future of the port of Cairns by signing the petition organised by the community based Cairns Port Development Inc. This petition was tabled by the Clerk on 15 September this year. The petition raised concerns about the role of the port of Cairns in terms of trade and logistics, tourism and defence purposes. I have here the petition that was tabled in this House in September of this year by the Clerk on behalf of 6,000 people from Cairns and Far North Queensland. This petition makes it very clear that those people of Far North Queensland are concerned about the potential for this legislation to have a negative impact on the local economy, business confidence and employment opportunities.

The Minister for State Development and Minister for Natural Resources and Mines responded to the petition on 16 October 2015, stating that the government would not divert from the elements of the bill that form part of the Reef 2050 Plan consistent with the commitment to UNESCO by the Queensland and Australian governments. We know how much the minister meant what he said in that response to the petition, because only two months later the minister announced that he would move compromised amendments in consideration in detail of this bill to move away from those principles of not allowing any capital works at a non-priority port off the east coast of Queensland adjacent to the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage area. Now we will have capital works confined to the four priority ports as per the agreement with UNESCO plus we will have just a little bit on the side in Cairns, and perhaps the minister and the government have all of their collective fingers and toes crossed that UNESCO will not mind.

My question of course to that proposition, as I mentioned earlier, is, if Labor believes that UNESCO will not mind just a little bit on the side for one priority port, why would it mind just a little bit on the side for other non-priority ports in Queensland adjacent to the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage area? So members can see that we have this walking, talking contradiction of a government policy tripping over their own political shoelaces about the arrangements they will make for the port of Cairns under this legislation. The members of this House from Far North Queensland who should have an interest in the port of Cairns—members like the member for Cairns, members like the member for Barron River, members like the member for Cook and the member for Dalrymple—should be more than comfortable in supporting this amendment to the second reading debate which will simply defer consideration of this bill.

I reiterate to all members of the House that this amendment does not propose to change anything in terms of the form or the substance of the bill before the House. It will merely defer its consideration until we have a clear picture of the impact that it will have on the port of Cairns, even with the compromise amendments, until the EIS is finalised. In fact, I put it to you, Mr Deputy Speaker Elmes, that those MPs from Far North Queensland should be very keen indeed to make sure that they have the full picture before they vote, in view of the very strong views expressed by their constituents during the course of the committee's inquiry and the 6,000 signatures submitted through the petition to this parliament. This is not an unreasonable proposal.


This is in fact a sensible and responsible course of action to ensure that members of this House are fully informed and that the decision of this House is made knowing all the material and relevant facts about the issue that we are being asked to vote on. In fact, I put it to you, Mr Deputy Speaker

Elmes, that it would be irresponsible and set a very poor example in terms of public policy to make legislative arrangements for the port of Cairns before we know what the outcome of the current EIS process is. That process is potentially live until 31 March 2016 and we should certainly defer the consideration of this bill until after that date. It is the only prudent and responsible course of action.

Pursuant to standing order 141, I move—

That the question be amended by omitting all words after 'be' and inserting the following words—

'read a second time after 1 April 2016, by which time the current environmental impact assessment of the port of Cairns is scheduled to be completed.'

 **Mr NICHOLLS** (Clayfield—LNP) (4.49 pm): I rise to speak in support of the amendment moved by the member for Hinchinbrook. In doing so, I am very cognisant of the importance of this bill to many people in North Queensland and to many people more broadly who are concerned about the welfare and protection of the Great Barrier Reef. Indeed, having spent considerable time on the reef in many and varied recreational activities, enjoying the benefits of the reef, I am one of those people. But I am also very cognisant of the importance of the development of the port of Cairns to the people of Cairns and Far North Queensland. I have been cognisant of that since before 2012, since before the commitment of the then opposition to the cruise ship terminal and the development and further enhancement of the port of Cairns. I have been cognisant of it most recently when I visited Cairns two or three months ago and spoke to concerned residents, concerned business owners and representatives of various interest groups about what impact this bill will have.

It is true that, previously, the ports bill introduced by the member for Callide as Deputy Premier provided that the port of Cairns would not be a priority port. But it is also the case that at that time there was a live EIS process, supported by the government, that was looking at protecting the economic development of the port of Cairns and ensuring that the people of Queensland and Far North Queensland had some economic hope for the future, that their port would not be completely sterilised from future development, that the port would, through that EIS process supported by the then government, be able to be developed in a way that was mindful of the environmental heritage and the environmental prospects of the Great Barrier Reef whilst also, if you like, trying to take advantage of those prospects by making Cairns a more attractive destination for tourists and, in particular, cruise ships.

Cruise ships already visit the port of Cairns. They already travel the channel, but the reality that we have to face is that cruise ships are getting larger, that they require more room, particularly more swing basin room, and that there is a very strong desire among the people in Cairns to see those cruise ships able to enter through the inlet—not to moor off Yorkeys Knob and not to at this stage engage in mooring off a floating platform and transshipping but coming into the harbour.

Earlier this year, that EIS process was in many respects cruelly cut short when the member for Mulgrave, the Treasurer, announced that the EIS did not have the support of the government. He took \$40 million that had been put in the budget to meet the initial costs of developing the port of Cairns and providing funding to Ports North and signalled very strongly to the community up there that the government did not support the EIS process. We know subsequently that there has been local furore about it, that there has been concern about what has been going on in terms of the government's commitment to the development of the port of Cairns. There is now something that we know euphemistically as a recalibrated process, but we do not know the detail of that recalibrated process. We do not know what is intended. We do not know what the government's intention is. It has not been clear, certainly publicly, what is intended to occur there. There is no clarity about how far the EIS will go and there is certainly no clarity about how much support the government will be providing in relation to that EIS, no matter what might come of it.

The amendment that has been moved simply defers the passage of this bill until after the outcome of the EIS is known. I acknowledge that the passage of the bill does not stop the EIS process. That has been the clear case—it was the case under the previous legislation introduced by the previous government—but, under the previous government, there was a clear and certain policy process in place. The people of Cairns understood what was being put forward, the people in the broader community knew what was going forward, the people in business circles knew what was going forward and people were able to plan around it. Currently, that level of certainty is not in place.

At the moment, what we seem to have in place is horsetrading. The member for Hinchinbrook has outlined the internal inconsistencies in the government's position. Having said that there will be no capital dredging in any port that is not a priority port, it now proposes to allow up to 50,000 cubic metres in any single project to a cumulative total of 150,000 cubic metres over four years within the inner harbour area of the port of Cairns.

Mr Rickuss: It would be a bit like being half pregnant.

Mr NICHOLLS: I take the interjection from the member for Lockyer. There certainly seems to be no science around it. The minister prides himself on working on an evidence based process. I would think that, by allowing an EIS process—which involves science, evidence and consultation to occur in the broadest possible way—we would have a situation where that would be the underlying rationale behind the amendments that are being proposed. Who knows what it might be?

Because I am concerned about this bill, I have spoken to representatives of the WWF. I want to thank them for their presentations and the information that they have provided, because I think we in this House all have an important, shared goal and that is to preserve the majestic beauty of the Great Barrier Reef. But it is equally important for the people of Cairns and Far North Queensland that they have economic hope for the future, that their port is not sterilised and that they can have a clear pathway for the next period of time.

But the scientific evidence has not been provided to say that this decision made by the government to allow a limited amount of dredging is the right amount. Fifty thousand cubic metres and 150,000 cubic metres sounds like a lot, but when we consider what happens in the port already under maintenance dredging it is not a great deal in toto. But it sounds like a lot. Whether it is the right amount and the impact that it will have are unknown. Should it be over five years that the cumulative amount is totalled? Or should it be over three years that the cumulative amount is totalled? We have no evidence about this. We have no science behind it. What we seem to have is some horsetrading going on—what might be acceptable to parts of the environmental movement, which legitimately has a concern in this; what might be acceptable to the business community of Cairns, who have a legitimate interest in it; what might be acceptable to the council, which has a legitimate interest in it; and, obviously, the government's policy prescription.

When considering this issue—and the member for Hinchinbrook has put this forward very clearly—this is not defeating the bill. This is not objecting to the philosophy behind the bill, because indeed it was a philosophy that started with the LNP. It is a philosophy that started back in 2012 when we were elected with the concern to protect the Great Barrier Reef. Members will recall that the port of Abbot Point had an approval in place that was going to see something in the order of 38 million cubic metres of spoil removed and dumped at sea. In 2011, the 'Battlestar Galactica' of coal ports was being created by the Labor government. That was what Labor in 2011 bequeathed the people of Queensland.

Mr Rickuss: That's 30 million cubic metres—38.

Mr NICHOLLS: Thirty-eight million cubic metres. The other thing that happened is that UNESCO then decided that it was going to take an increased level of interest in the protection of the reef. So the first thing that we had to do was stop that development. Then it became evident, as the member for Hinchinbrook has no doubt highlighted to the House, that more action needed to be taken. So it was the LNP government and the member for Callide, together with the member for Glass House, who put in place a strategy to restrict development to the four priority ports and to limit those works. They then did a year's worth of consultation to come up with legislation and that then led to the introduction, after a further three months of discussions after the strategy, of the ports bill, which was introduced in November 2014 to preserve and protect the environmental values and heritage of the Great Barrier Reef whilst still allowing a review in 2022 of the port of Cairns.


The reasons for deferring the passage of the bill until after the EIS on 31 March, some 4½ months away, are simply to give the people and the business community of Cairns greater certainty about the outcome. They will know what the EIS is, they will have an appreciation of what the government's position is, it will give the government time to come to a settled and reasoned conclusion, they will know where the money is coming from for whatever might be decided—all or nothing; we do not know what the outcome of the EIS will be—and it will be backed up by scientific and technical evidence, something that we do not know about the current decision in relation to the dredging limits. There is no evidence behind the proposals that have been put forward—at least none that has been made publicly available.

I acknowledge that the minister is in a difficult position. He is in a bit of a cleft stick at the moment. He has to consider the legitimate interests of people who want economic advancement and the legitimate interests of those who want to preserve the reef. This deferral simply allows for the better consideration and better reconciliation of those legitimate interests with science based evidence on board and with a clear policy prescription from the government. It is their right to put that policy in place, whatever it might be, in relation to the EIS around the port of Cairns. But all we have at the moment in relation to the port of Cairns is a government that did not support the previous proposals, that took \$40 million away and that does not yet know what the recalibrated ports strategy is for the port of Cairns

but is, without science or evidence, proposing an arbitrary limit of 50,000 cubic metres per incident to a cumulative total of 150,000 cubic metres over four years. I would simply say that waiting for the conclusion of the EIS process on 31 March is a prudent, sensible and cautious way to go to reconcile those different interests.

It may be that Ports North will seek an extension of time to the Coordinator-General's determination of the EIS. That is something that the Coordinator-General, as an independent statutory office holder, will have to make an assessment about in all the circumstances, including, no doubt, government policy and the debate in this House and the evidence that is presented to him about the activities that have been going on. It is not unreasonable. The process can continue on. Ports North has the capacity to do it. They have done the preliminary work on it. They can recalibrate. They just need some guidance from the government about what it is they want to do.

This is a simple and prudent process, an amendment that should be supported, to give the people of Cairns and Far North Queensland some economic hope, to provide some clear guidance as to what the future of the port of Cairns is, to provide some clear guidance about the funding that will be made available to it and that will, in any event, protect the Great Barrier Reef which is something that I think we all value and prize highly and certainly led to the consultation and the introduction of these bills in the first place by the former government.

 **Hon. AJ LYNHAM** (Stafford—ALP) (Minister for State Development and Minister for Natural Resources and Mines) (5.03 pm): I rise to oppose the deferral motion moved by the member for Hinchinbrook. To defer this bill until after the Cairns Shipping Development Project environmental impact statement process is completed is, quite simply, reckless and opportunistic. I will not speak at length about the content of the bill but instead will be addressing my speech to the deferral motion moved by the member, but I will say that the bill does achieve what those opposite could not achieve and that is a balance. I refer to the member for Hinchinbrook and also the member for Clayfield talking about the disparity between protecting the Great Barrier Reef and the development of Cairns port. It was like it could not be done. How would the minister achieve this? Well, we have done it. Advance Cairns, the Cairns Chamber of Commerce and the World Wildlife Fund support the balance we have achieved in allowing the port of Cairns to grow, as Cairns will naturally grow into the future, while also protecting the valuable asset of the Great Barrier Reef. Do not forget that the Great Barrier Reef brings over \$6 billion per year to the Queensland economy. Cairns is the gateway to the reef. Jeopardising the reef in Cairns jeopardises the future of Cairns. In this way Cairns grows, the port grows and more and more people will get to enjoy the pristine wonder of the Great Barrier Reef.

The deferral motion moved by the member for Hinchinbrook is reckless because it puts at risk the agreement that the Queensland government made in Bonn to the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization's World Heritage Committee in June 2015. More than that, it puts in jeopardy the Australian government's commitment to this as well. Do not forget the joint Queensland and Australian government commitment to UNESCO to protect the Great Barrier Reef. We committed to pass this bill before the end of 2015. I stand here to oppose this deferral motion because we promised the world that we would act before December 2015 and here I am acting to protect the Great Barrier Reef.

The contents of and policy behind the bill were integral to the committee's unanimous decision not to place the Great Barrier Reef on its World Heritage in-danger list. In regard to the previous government's legislation as referenced by the member for Hinchinbrook, which I will address later in speaking to the bill itself, who knows where we would have been today? Would the Great Barrier Reef be on the in-danger list as we stand here today? Passing the bill with all ports in the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage area is essential to meeting our commitment to UNESCO and sends a strong message to the community of Queensland, Australia and the world that ports development can be managed in the Great Barrier Reef.

Secondly, the member for Hinchinbrook's deferral is opportunistic because the opposition know that the Cairns Shipping Development Project is outside the purview of this bill and therefore it is not appropriate to delay these important protections for the reef and the certainty that this bill brings to our ports and the industries that rely on our ports by playing politics. It will bring certainty not only to industries in our four priority ports but also to industries up and down the coast of Queensland.


The opposition are seeking to override the independence of the Coordinator-General by forcing his hand through amendments to this bill. It was interesting to hear the member for Clayfield talk about the independence of the Coordinator-General and yet here they are overriding the Coordinator-General and disrespecting the independence of the Coordinator-General. It is a clear attack on the

independence of the Coordinator-General. Labor values the independence of the Coordinator-General. We respect the Coordinator-General's decision. The Coordinator-General must consider government policy in his consideration of the EIS. An EIS is an EIS. It is a due and transparent process. To place a date—1 April 2016—on an EIS without any consideration that Ports North may want an extension on this EIS is beyond reproach. Those opposite are putting conditions on the independence of the Coordinator-General. They have not learnt from the past. They have not learnt about consultation, balance and the independence of the Coordinator-General.

We recognise that the port of Cairns is critical economic infrastructure to the city and the region, its people and its businesses. That is why we have made it clear that this government supports the Cairns Shipping Development Project and we have allowed it to continue under the transitional arrangements under this bill.

Further, the government has recognised that the port of Cairns requires the ability to develop in a way that does not impact negatively on the Great Barrier Reef, hence the amendments to this bill, which we need to have passed as soon as practicable to provide certainty to the people of Cairns as well. It is also important that we pass this bill to enable the four priority ports to commence their master planning process. It is important that those ports go through a defined master planning process with due public consultation as outlined under the bill. The bill is enabling legislation that coordinates decision-making to ensure state interests are consistent in a master planned area. No approvals are given under this bill.

Work is already underway on the program of port master planning, commencing at the Gladstone port, and it requires this bill being passed as soon as practicable. This is to ensure that those processes may continue in order to optimise the use of existing infrastructure and address operational, economic, environmental and community relationships, as well as supply chains and surrounding land uses at the critical priority port, as well as that of other priority ports: Townsville, Hay Point-Mackay and Abbot Point. In 2013-14, those four priority ports, which need the master planning project to progress, represented to this state trade worth \$32 billion and 77 per cent of the total throughput of all Queensland ports. That is why those four ports were nominated as priority ports. Accordingly, I argue strongly that this bill should proceed today and not be deferred to a later date yet to be determined. I do not support this deferral motion. I look forward to addressing this bill for a second time and my colleagues look forward to speaking to this bill after this deferral motion is defeated.

 **Hon. SJ MILES** (Mount Coot-tha—ALP) (Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection and Minister for National Parks and the Great Barrier Reef) (5.11 pm): I rise to also oppose the motion of the member for Hinchinbrook, which seeks to defer consideration of this very important bill. I rise to oppose it because we on this side of the House and I as minister for the Great Barrier Reef will do what needs to be done to protect the reef. We will stand in support of the 69,000 Queenslanders who rely on the reef for their livelihoods. We will stand and defend the very substantial economic contribution that the reef makes to our state.

As it stands, this bill is a very sensible outcome and I commend the minister for his efforts. It is a sensible outcome that should be dealt with today. I commend the Cairns business community and the conservation organisations that have worked with the minister to get this bill to a state where we can consider it tonight. This bill demonstrates our commitment to UNESCO to protect the Great Barrier Reef and it demonstrates to the people of Queensland that we on this side of the House will implement our commitments. We will do what we said we would do at the election, and that is introduce a sustainable ports bill. The bill should be passed today, because it has been through the appropriate process: it has been to the committee, the public has been consulted, the initiatives in the bill were in the long-term sustainability plan and, as the minister said, we committed to passing the bill by the end of 2015.

The member for Hinchinbrook and the member for Clayfield have given no good reason why Queensland should say to the international community that our word is worthless. They have given no good reason why we should not implement our commitments. I stood at the World Heritage Committee meeting with the Deputy Premier and the Commonwealth environment minister, Minister Hunt. I stood there when we repeated those commitments to the member countries. They took us at our word and they agreed not to list the Great Barrier Reef as in danger. I will never forget when the Deputy Premier said that Queenslanders love the reef; they love the reef so much they elected a government to protect it. And there was applause—the first applause of the World Heritage Committee meeting.

Let us not forget that just a few months ago we learnt the extent that those opposite went to in an attempt to hoodwink the Queensland community into believing that they actually cared about the reef. We learnt about their \$2.5 million Reef Facts campaign and the hundreds of thousands of dollars they spent on polling and research. We now know that that polling told them that the people of

Queensland did not trust them when it came to the reef. The people of Queensland are pretty smart; they should not have trusted them and they were right not to trust them. They were right not to trust them because, on the one hand, the member for Hinchinbrook and the member for Clayfield walk in here and say, 'This was our bill.' Let us not forget that the member for Callide interjected when the minister introduced this bill to say that it was his. So on the one hand this is their bill, but on the other hand they oppose it. On the one hand they introduced it last year, but on the other hand they do not want to debate it until next year. On the one hand you have the Leader of the Opposition tweeting that the UNESCO decision was recognition of all of his good work, but on the other hand they do not want to do what the long-term sustainability plan—the plan that they claim was theirs—committed them and us to doing. It was right of the people of Queensland to not trust the LNP. Their research and polling on that point was good.

I nearly fell off my chair a little while ago when the member for Clayfield stood and talked about evidence based policy. That is a notion that was foreign to them for three years, but now they are all interested in evidence based policy. The member for Hinchinbrook wanted to see the science, which is something that he was never interested in as the minister for natural resources. Here is the evidence: dredge spoil, especially capital dredge spoil, can travel great distances. Dredge spoil clouds the water, blocking light that is important to creatures that need light to survive. In addition, the sediment itself settles on coral and seagrass, literally suffocating them. The turbidity caused by the dumping of capital dredge spoil directly affects tourism operators. One only needs to talk to a dive operator and hear what turbidity means for their business to know how important it is that we debate and pass this bill. The dredging itself re-enlivens sediments and nutrients that had otherwise settled, doubling their impact. Once that sediment settles, storms can whip it up again, increasing all of those impacts.

The people of Queensland were right not to trust the LNP on the reef. Their behaviour today only serves to reinforce why the people were right not to trust them. As the Minister for the Great Barrier Reef and as a member of a government elected on a platform to protect the reef, I am opposing this amendment. When we are successful, we will support the passing of this bill today.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Furner): Order! Before I put the motion, I welcome to the chamber today the young leaders from the Ahmadiyya Muslim community in Stockleigh, in the electorate of Logan.

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

AYES, 43:

LNP, 41—Barton, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Costigan, Cramp, Crandon, Cripps, Davis, Dickson, Elmes, Emerson, Frecklington, Hart, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Mander, McArdle, McEachan, McVeigh, Millar, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, Perrett, Powell, Rickuss, Robinson, Rowan, Seeney, Simpson, Smith, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stuckey, Walker, Weir.

KAP, 2—Katter, Knuth.

NOES, 43:

ALP, 42—Bailey, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Byrne, Crawford, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Donaldson, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Hinchliffe, Howard, Jones, Kelly, King, Lauga, Linard, Lynham, Madden, Miles, Miller, O'Rourke, Palaszczuk, Pearce, Pease, Pegg, Power, Pyne, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Stewart, Trad, Whiting, Williams.

INDEPENDENT, 1—Gordon.

Pairs: Pitt, Watts.

The numbers being equal, Mr Speaker cast his vote with the noes.

Resolved in the negative.



Mr PEARCE (Mirani—ALP) (5.24 pm): I am pleased to rise in this place today as chair of the Infrastructure, Planning and Natural Resources Committee to make a contribution to the Sustainable Ports Development Bill 2015, which was referred to the committee by the parliament on 3 June. The policy objective of the bill is to effect the government's commitments made in the *Reef 2050 long-term sustainability plan*. The intent of the bill is to protect greenfield areas by restricting new port developments in areas adjoining the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage area to within current port limits and by restricting capital dredging for the development of new ports or the expansion of existing port facilities to within the regulated port limits of Gladstone, Hay Point in the Mirani electorate, Abbot Point and Townsville.

This bill will prohibit the disposal of material into the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage area. The bill allows for the mandating for the beneficial re-use of port related capital dredge materials such as land for reclamation or for disposal on land where it is environmentally safe to do so. There is also a

requirement for master plans at the long-established major bulk commodity ports of Gladstone, Hay Point-Mackay, Abbot Point and Townsville. It is clear that the bill is about optimising the use of existing port infrastructure and addressing operational, economic, environmental and social relationships as well as the supply chains and surrounding land uses.

After receiving extensive feedback from the community and industry groups through submissions, including from the Australian Marine Conservation Society, the Environmental Defenders Office of Queensland, Ports Australia, the Queensland Ports Association, the Queensland Resources Council and the World Wildlife Fund, the committee submitted 13 recommendations to the minister for consideration. Recommendation No. 12 has probably caused some heartache for the minister and departmental officers. After hearing evidence in Cairns from a number of submitters it was clear to the committee that there was a high level of support for the port of Cairns to be designated as a priority port. There was also a suggestion that the port of Mourilyan be given the same consideration.

There was concern that a ban on capital dredging for those ports would prevent future growth to accommodate the government's strategy of developing the north of Australia. While there was no way I or other committee members would support development that would require the dumping of dredge material in close proximity to the reef, we were strong in our belief that it would also be morally unacceptable for recommendation 12 to stand as written without some reservations as to the future development of Cairns. There was a realisation that, given the attraction of Cairns to tourists and the number of cruise ships visiting the area, it would be improper to absolutely remove any opportunity for the port of Cairns to continue catering for cruise ship facilities.

I am certain that the minister, in his summing-up, will explain to the House what the Palaszczuk government has done to continue to support the cruise ship industry in Cairns, which, as we all know, is about job security and the future development of the area. As a government we must, where possible, continue to listen to people, to hear what they are saying and to be prepared to make adjustments in the interests of the people.

That is what the committee did. We went there with an open mind. The committee maintains its independence and does what it was set up to do, and that is to get out and talk to the community and talk to stakeholders and make decisions based on what we think is fair and reasonable. I personally believe that we had to do a bit more to help Cairns rather than completely shut the gate on any development opportunities.

We have heard some interesting debate in the last half an hour or so. What came through to me immediately I heard the amendment was that there is something wrong here. Somebody has forgotten just how close Cairns is to the reef itself. I have a bit of an understanding of what happens when we put dredge spoil into the ocean or into river systems. The sediment drifts. Given that Cairns is only about 20 kilometres away from the reef, I believe, I can understand why people are concerned that sediment might drift out to those areas where important marine life lives and flourishes.

I believe without any doubt that the committee has done the right thing in raising those issues and being prepared to say that we do not want to shut the gate on the people of Cairns. We just want to leave it open a little bit so if there are opportunities to do things that are within the guidelines to enhance the growth of the city and ensure that people have jobs—which is what Labor is about—then those opportunities can be taken by using land based dumping, which is the big step forward. I think we have made the right decision.

In terms of the independence of the committee, it is very important that we make those decisions based on the feedback that we get from the community. I go back to the point again: I believe we have done the right thing. I did not want to leave that place with the knowledge that I was going to sit with the committee and make a decision that would completely—and I go back to this point—shut the gate on Cairns for its future development. I feel quite comfortable with the position that the committee took. The minister responded by taking on board what the committee has said and has given some recognition to that and will make some amendments to the legislation as it goes through this place today. I congratulate the minister for understanding where the committee was coming from but, most importantly, for understanding the people of Cairns and their concerns about their future development.

As I said, there is no doubt that the port of Cairns makes an important contribution to the economy of Far North Queensland. It supports a variety of industries including defence, fishing and tourism. It is also a gateway for bulk and general cargo including petroleum, sugar and fertiliser. It would be just outrageous if we were to shut the gate on that community to the extent that they are not allowed to make decisions about future development.

Amendments to the bill to allow limited capital dredging within the inner harbour of the port of Cairns will give this region the flexibility to respond to commercially viable development opportunities in the future. What is wrong with that? That is what we should be about. That is a good thing for Cairns and a creditable thing for the minister to do in making a common-sense decision.

The port of Cairns will be subject to the prohibition of the sea based disposal, and complying project applications would be subject to assessment under relevant legislation and, if approved, subject to appropriate conditions. There will be constraints around dredging at the port, including volumetric limits, confirming the general agreement that the port of Cairns will not become a major bulk port—and that is just not going to happen. Some tough conditions will be put in place, but the important outcome here is that the port of Cairns is not completely locked out, as I have said on several occasions.

Under the bill, the port of Rockhampton—which includes Port Alma in the Fitzroy River delta in the Mirani electorate—and Keppel Bay in the Keppel electorate have been excluded from the proposed master planned boundary for the port of Gladstone which was released for public consultation in June 2015 and amended following consultation in October. This approach ensures that any increase in port capacity is confined within the existing port of Gladstone.

This bill is about the protection of the Great Barrier Reef, and we should never forget that. The Great Barrier Reef World Heritage area is one of the most important—not landmarks, as it is not a landmark, is it? It is an icon.

Miss Boyd: A natural wonder.

Mr PEARCE: It is a natural wonder of the world. It is one of the great wonders of the world and we must as a nation, as a country, as a people, do everything we can to protect it not just for ourselves but for future generations. It is a beautiful place. I have been there on a couple of occasions. I even felt like diving.

Miss Boyd: Did you go?


Mr PEARCE: No. I do not like the water that much. Somebody said to me that I would not need a snorkel. I was deeply offended by that and decided that I would not go swimming.

In summary, the bill proposes the following: master plans and port overlays for the four priority ports; restricting capital dredging for the development of new ports or expansions of existing port facilities to within the regulated port limits of the priority ports—that is common sense; prohibiting sea based disposal of port related capital dredged material; and mandating the beneficial re-use of port related dredged material, such as land based reclamation or disposal on land where it is environmentally safe to do so.

In closing, I want to make reference to an issue of importance to the people—that being the proposal for a future transshipping project out of Hay Point. Transshipping refers to the transfer of a commodity from one vessel to another while at sea. Coal or other bulk commodities are loaded onto a barge and then moved out to sea where the commodity is transferred to a much larger vessel or ship before it is transported to the country that has purchased the material.

It is an issue for the people living at Hay Point. I took a stand before the election that I would support that community in not agreeing to transshipping in the area. I am very thankful that it is not going to be accepted as part of this legislation with regard to protecting the reef. I understand that there may be some reference made to it in other legislation which is yet to come before the House. But I want to make it very clear that I will be supporting the argument of the people of Hay Point that there be no transshipping arrangements put in place for that area. The government has been made aware of how everybody feels about transshipping. I know there is a long way to go and there is a lot of work to be done. I have made my position clear.

I thank everybody for their involvement—from the committee to the support staff we have. We cannot talk about them all the time; we know how good they are. But I think it is great that we have such wonderful people working for us. We have a very good committee that gets along really well. We do not always agree but we can talk through it, and this is what the government have done in the case of Cairns. They have gone to the community, talked and been prepared to make some adjustments which suits, to some extent, the thinking of the people of Cairns.

 **Mr BUTCHER** (Gladstone—ALP) (5.38 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Sustainable Ports Development Bill 2015. I would also like to take the opportunity to thank my fellow committee members on their efforts in reporting on this bill, and I thank our secretariat and Hansard who travelled with us on our journey particularly to Cairns to have a look at what was happening up there. It was time away from their families to come and support our committee.

Mr Rickuss: It would have been a tough trip.

Mr BUTCHER: It was a tough trip; it sure was. I take that interjection. We were only there for a couple hours but it was great to go to Cairns and see what a wonderful part of the world it is and why they need to protect it.

A government member: There's a good local member in Cairns.

Mr BUTCHER: I take that interjection: there is a good local member in Cairns. The recommendations of our committee were very fair and were a good representation of the many public hearings and concerns that were raised with us in regard to this bill. I thank the minister for taking on the responsibility of implementing most of the recommendations that we have made. As the previous speaker, the member for Mirani, said, I believe it is a fair balance between the recommendations that we made and what is actually being delivered. It is good to see that the port of Cairns can be worked on and still progress with the way that they run business in Cairns.

I would like to concentrate on a particular part of the bill, and that is master planning. This bill will implement the government's commitment made in the Reef 2050 Long-Term Sustainability Plan to require master plans at the long-established major bulk commodity ports of Gladstone, Hay Point, Mackay, Abbot Point and Townsville to optimise the use of existing port infrastructure and address operational, economic, environmental and social relationships as well as supply chains and surrounding land uses. Port master planning will be guided by the National Ports Strategy 2012 and the 2013 independent review of the port of Gladstone, which is in my electorate. This review, undertaken on behalf of the Australian government, recommended the development of comprehensive port master plans incorporating environmental considerations and aligning with planning for port areas beyond the port boundaries.

Port master planning will consider boat marine and land based impacts including port and supply chain capacity and connectivity, and environmental and community values. The regulation of port planning in Queensland has historically been limited to land use planning for land owned, or regulated by, a ports corporation. Planning for the priority ports will extend beyond traditional port boundaries, with master planned areas to include local government areas regulated by a local government authority, state development areas regulated by the Coordinator-General, and priority development areas regulated by the Minister for Economic Development Queensland.

These regulatory authorities will be the key participants in an open and transparent government led master-planning process including the preparation of port overlays. Adopting a coordinated approach to port planning will increase transparency and rigour in planning for priority ports, of which Gladstone is one; integrate planning instruments across a master planned area; maintain the autonomy of existing regulatory authorities while ensuring the state retains control of key aspects of port planning to safeguard state interests; and provide potential benefits to proponents including greater planning certainty.

Extending the boundary of a master planned area will require the impacts of port development to be considered in all planning decisions in a master planned area and provide more strategic consideration of the best use of a priority port. This will bring all the existing planning jurisdictions in a master planned area together to ensure there are no inadvertent land use conflicts and that future development decisions reflect a coordinated approach to land use planning. Through master planning we will better manage areas needed for the effective operations and development of the port including, road, rail, electricity and gas pipeline corridors now and for the long term while protecting community and environmentally sensitive areas.

The bill, as a facilitating piece of legislation, will rely on existing planning jurisdictions and processes under current legislation. While planning instruments must, in time, reflect the requirements of a port overlay, it is essential to note that regulatory authorities will retain their autonomous decision-making power and will continue to be responsible for the preparation and approval of their existing planning instruments including port authorities for land use plans; local government authorities for planning schemes in a local government area; the Coordinator-General for development schemes in a state development area; and the minister for economic development for development schemes in a priority development area.

Master planning will set a clear pathway for growth in and around Queensland's priority ports to deliver sustainable regional development and protect our reef. In my electorate of Gladstone, we are uniquely placed to attract large-scale projects and investments in the state of Queensland with 30,000 hectares of serviced and unencumbered State Development land. Port master planning will help better manage the impacts of port operations and port development on adjacent land and marine areas.

With this bill, Gladstone will be designated one of the four priority ports in Queensland, and for that I am glad. The Gladstone port will benefit from a master plan which will optimise infrastructure and address operational, economic, environmental and social relationships as well as supply chains and surrounding land uses. This is particularly relevant in my electorate given the size of State Development land that sits with direct access to this wonderful port facility.

The port of Gladstone handles over 30 different products which are exported to 30 different countries. The 2014-15 financial year saw a record throughput of over 100 million tonnes across the three ports of Bundaberg, Gladstone and Rockhampton, a two per cent increase from the previous year and a record-breaking achievement in our port's 101-year history. I am proud to say that I stand here as the member for Gladstone who helped save that port from being sold. A total of 99.3 million tonnes is transported through the Gladstone port alone.


The past year has also seen the completion of a \$30 million tug base in the port of Gladstone and the first shipments of liquefied natural gas, as I spoke about earlier today. Despite the downturn in the coal market, the Gladstone port—

An opposition member interjected.

Mr BUTCHER: I will take that interjection. It is not sold, yet you keep saying that it is being leased. I find that ridiculous. It was to be sold. The Gladstone port maintained record level exports thanks, in part, to QCLNG commencing exports of LNG in December 2014 following the completion of its first train facility. LNG exports totalled 1.6 million tonnes in 2014-15. The LNG trade is forecast to grow significantly in the 2015-16 financial year, with all LNG proponents—QCLNG, GLNG and APLNG—either commencing operation and/or bringing their second trains into production.

The Gladstone Ports Corporation forecast tonnage for LNG exports for 2015-16 is approximately 12 million tonnes. The community benefit delivered by the Gladstone Ports Corporation cannot be undersold. This has been, and remains, a port corporation with a vision for the community—one I am pleased to say will now be captured in this new master plan. This past year has seen the opening of the East Shores stage 1A community development and the announcement that cruise ships will dock in the port of Gladstone from March 2016. In May this year, the Gladstone Ports Corporation marina was awarded the prestigious title of Best Public Boat Harbour in Australia in the Marina Industries Association's Marina of the Year Awards. This government is committed to the sustainability of the Gladstone port, investing \$62 million in the RG Tanna Coal Terminal. Not only did this government stop this profitable government owned corporation's assets from being sold; we are now investing in infrastructure and upgrades which will generate jobs and prosperity in our region and our state now and into the future.

As I said, this government is committed to the sustainability of not just the Gladstone port but all major bulk commodity ports in Queensland. Committing to master plans that incorporate environmental considerations and align with planning for port areas beyond the port boundaries will see effective and efficient investment in the future of these assets. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr CRAWFORD** (Barron River—ALP) (5.49 pm): I rise tonight to speak in support of the Sustainable Ports Development Bill 2015. The port of Cairns makes an important contribution to the economy of Far North Queensland, supporting a variety of industries including defence, tourism and fishing, and it is an important gateway for bulk and general cargo, including petroleum, sugar and fertiliser. Some sectors of the Far North Queensland region have called for Cairns to be designated a priority port. The government has considered this and correctly decided that we will not divert from the elements of the bill which form part of our Reef 2050 Plan.

Amendments to the bill to allow capital dredging within the inner harbour of the port of Cairns will give it flexibility to respond to commercially viable development opportunities in the future as they arise, without posing a risk to the Great Barrier Reef. The government consulted with stakeholders on the proposal to amend the bill, which has the general support of stakeholders including Ports North and environmental groups. I have spoken with a number of those environmental groups, Ports North as well as the business community in Cairns a number of times over recent months. These amendments will mean that the Cairns military marine industry can compete for contracts like the multimillion dollar Pacific Patrol Boat Replacement Project currently up for tender by the Department of Defence. The port of Cairns will be subject to the prohibition on sea based disposal, and each complying project application would be subject to assessment under relevant legislation and, if approved, subject to the appropriate conditions.

Constraints placed around dredging at the port, including volumetric limits, confirm the general agreement that the port of Cairns will not become a major bulk port. It is vital that the port of Cairns be recognised for the significance that it has. Visit there and you will see a unique and diverse port, with a


heavy emphasis placed on tourism related reef boats and ferries, but behind the reef fleet terminal and the cafes and boardwalks are a myriad of small, medium and large port businesses which operate without fanfare and often out of sight of the general public. These businesses include HMAS *Cairns*, a thriving Navy base, a thriving commercial fishing precinct and, importantly, a very busy commercial precinct whereby small to medium ships are constructed, maintained and overhauled. To be absolutely clear, the government is supportive of the Cairns Shipping Development Project and therefore has allowed it to continue under the transitional arrangements under the bill.

The key to the port of Cairns is achieving the balance of meeting our needs towards the Great Barrier Reef on the one hand—our lifeline of tourism injection in Cairns—and the need to maintain a port that services Far North Queensland, Papua New Guinea and the Pacific Islands, with the barge services, the defence and the maintenance weighed up on the other hand. The government's proposal to review these provisions after four years demonstrates this government's commitment to ensuring those provisions are achieving a balance between economic development and the protection of the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage area.

These amendments will not impact on the ability of the port of Cairns to proceed with its environmental impact statement for the proposed Cairns Shipping Development Project. However, consistent with the government's commitment to ban the sea based disposal of port related capital dredge spoil in the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage area, dredged material from the project must be disposed of on land or beneficially reused. This is a discussion that we need to have but not today, not as part of this bill. The Cairns Shipping Development Project needs to be analysed separate to the Sustainable Ports Development Bill. It is an important discussion, a sensitive and divided conversation that Cairns will need to have.

I want to thank the minister and his staff for the work that has gone on behind the scenes over many months. There has been extensive consultation in Cairns throughout the business community as well as the environmental protection community. The amendments meet the needs for Cairns and provide for a vibrant and successful future at an important port in Far North Queensland. I commend the bill.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Furner): I call the member for Burleigh and remind you that at six o'clock we will be moving to the next order of business.

 **Mr HART** (Burleigh—LNP) (5.53 pm): I had written quite a comprehensive speech to give tonight on the Sustainable Ports Development Bill, but I have decided to ditch that and I am just going to talk about some of the issues that were raised in the committee's report and some of the things I have heard here tonight from the government because we have heard some interesting things. I thought the member for Hinchinbrook moved a great motion to help Cairns along, and that was one of the major issues we did hear on our trip around when we were looking at the ports in Queensland that are affected by this particular bill. I will come back to that after dinner, Mr Deputy Speaker.

It is important for members here to recognise that an original version of this bill was introduced by the LNP in late 2014. The bill that is before the House tonight is not much different to what the LNP proposed in 2014. There are only a couple of differences—one is that there is no review period in 2022, and the other is that there is to be no sea dredge disposal, which is something that we were looking at anyway. In hindsight, I guess you could say that the bills are not that different really. I was quite surprised when I heard the minister start his speech in this second reading debate by saying that he had read through the recommendations of the committee—and there are 13 of those—and he was accepting every recommendation, because one of those recommendations states—

The committee unanimously recommends the Minister considers declaring the Port of Cairns as a priority port following a considered assessment of:

- the environmental impacts on the Great Barrier Reef
- the economic benefits to the Cairns region, and
- the government's commitments made to UNESCO and under the Reef 2050 Long-Term Sustainability Plan.

I thought for a second we were going to see Cairns as a priority port, and that would have been as all members of the committee had agreed and recommended very strongly. We got to that decision after listening to various members of the Cairns community on our visit there. But the Labor members on the committee actually put in a statement of reservation about our own report. They said—

Government Members of the Committee in support of recommendation 12—

which is to make Cairns a priority port—

wish to make it clear that we do not want the future economic development of Cairns to be shut down.

They are the words that the Labor members on the committee used—that they did not want to see the port of Cairns shut down. They came away from our discussion in Cairns thinking that this particular bill, apart from the Cairns Shipping Development Project, may well shut down the port of Cairns, and I will talk briefly about that later in the night.


In the few minutes I have left before we go to the next item of business, I want to cover some of the things that were said by the minister in his response to the motion. The member for Hinchinbrook, in moving that motion, put forward a date of 1 April for deferring that bill. That date was used because that is what is on the government's website for the finalisation date of the EIS for the Cairns Shipping Development Project. Through you, Mr Deputy Speaker, to the minister, that is where that date came from, so that is not a very constructive argument at all. The argument about having to delay the port master planning is just rubbish really. At the end of the day, there is nothing to stop any of these ports from moving forward with their master planning. Nothing stops them at all. They could have got on quite well with that.

The argument from the Minister for National Parks and the Great Barrier Reef is that we are protecting the Great Barrier Reef with all of this legislation, but just yesterday we had the minister for ports in here telling us about the massive expansion in Townsville. So on one hand members of the Labor Party are very concerned about the reef, but in certain circumstances that all goes completely out the window because it is okay to massively expand one port that is right in the middle of all of that. I really think it is a little bit hypocritical to put those particular arguments up.

Debate, on motion of Mr Hart, adjourned.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Ethanol Industry

 **Hon. MC BAILEY** (Yeerongpilly—ALP) (Minister for Main Roads, Road Safety and Ports and Minister for Energy and Water Supply) (6.00 pm): Today in question time there was some consternation that I may have been contravening standing orders when it came to talking about the pathways options paper that the government is proposing. It certainly was not my intention in any way to contravene the standing orders. I offer my apologies to the chair if in any way I may have contravened the standing orders in question.

MOTION

Organised Crime Commission of Inquiry

 **Mr WALKER** (Mansfield—LNP) (6.00 pm): I move—

That this House:

1. notes that the Queensland Organised Crime Commission of Inquiry held no public hearings during its investigations and deliberations, despite assurances to the contrary;
2. notes that the commission received 75 submissions, issued 105 requests for written information, issued 43 requests for the provision of documents, issued nine summonses for attendance at a hearing, held six in camera hearings and issued 25 requests for attendance to be interviewed;
3. notes that none of the information is publicly available; and
4. requests the Premier as the commissioning minister to provide submissions and testimony from the Queensland Organised Crime Commission of Inquiry to the parliament, for the information of members of the parliament and the Queensland public, except for that information that is deemed by the commission or Crown Law to be either confidential or information that could compromise the operational abilities of state and federal law enforcement agencies.

We have just seen the conclusion of a commission of inquiry into one of the most significant issues that faces this state: the issue of organised crime. The Queensland community is not unfamiliar with commissions of this kind nor of their relative rates of failure or success. Obviously, in recent history the Fitzgerald inquiry was one of the most significant and successful. During that inquiry Mr Fitzgerald held 238 days of public hearings as to matters that went to corruption in relation to the police force and politics in this state. It was an uncomfortable report, but it was an important one. The very holding of public hearings and the throwing of light onto the activities of police and politicians led to Mr Fitzgerald's conclusions being accepted by the public of Queensland because they had seen for themselves the hearings; they had listened in, they had followed what happened, they had seen the testing of evidence and they knew that there was a ring of truth about Mr Fitzgerald's conclusions.

When the current commission was appointed we were very optimistic that it, too, would hold public hearings. It was not our mere supposition; the commissioner, Mr Byrne, is reported as saying in a report by Sarah Elks in the *Australian* on 1 May 2015—

While whistleblowers and victims of organised crime can apply to give evidence anonymously or in private, the commissioner insisted he wanted the work of the inquiry to be open and transparent, with most hearings to be held in public.

I table that report.

Tabled paper: Article from the *Australian*, dated 1 May 2015, titled “It’s all on the table’ in crime inquiry’ [1614].

That is not unusual. Most people would expect such hearings to be in public. Clearly, there are elements of the commission’s work that would need to be in private. That is quite sensible and understandable. But why we have not had a proper hearing of these matters in public is a matter of concern to the opposition and, I believe, to the people of Queensland. The debate of the last week or so has shown that clearly.


Mr Bob Bottom is an expert in criminal matters and in these sorts of inquiries. Mr Bottom said this in an article—

“I have been involved in 18 royal commissions since the ‘60s and I have never known a royal commission to be held without some public hearings,” ...

“It’s unbelievable. I can’t imagine why they would have the first inquiry in 30 years and keep it secret. It doesn’t add up. And it is a total contradiction of what the Premier, Byrne and the Attorney-General said it would be at the outset.

If we do not have open and accountable hearings, we will inevitably have the sort of debate that we have had over the past week or two about Mr Byrne’s report, which came with some controversial findings about current political issues of debate which were not tested in the light of public hearing. In particular, the claim that the former government diverted resources from one area to another in fighting crime is not made out in Mr Byrne’s report. Mr Byrne points out on one page of his report—somewhere in the 400s; I cannot remember the exact number—that 20 people were moved from the fraud squad to the bikie squad. There is no other evidence on the face of Mr Byrne’s report that the alleged behaviour happened. Of course, the former government maintains strenuously that it did not, that the police and the CCC were given all the resources necessary to cover the important areas of organised crime in this state.

We believe that the light of day and fresh air should come in. We are concerned that the same thing is going to happen with Mr Wilson’s report into the bikie laws. The Attorney-General conceded during estimates that that is an inquiry into not whether the bikie laws should go but how the bikie laws should go, and the first term of reference that Mr Wilson has is to that effect. He is not holding public hearings. None of these inquiries sees the public light of day and the people of Queensland are excluded. We should rectify that by having this material presented to this parliament so we can all see it well and clear.

 **Hon. YM D’ATH** (Redcliffe—ALP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Training and Skills) (6.05 pm): As the Premier and I have already outlined in the House, the Queensland Organised Crime Commission of Inquiry report that has been handed down is very concerning. Mr Byrne’s report deals with serious issues affecting this state: organised crime and financial crime, child exploitation, outlaw motorcycle gangs and illicit drugs. But instead of analysing this comprehensive report and dealing with the significant issues raised, those opposite come into this House to specifically overrule the decisions of the independent commissioner and the way he chose to exercise his power and conduct the commission. In asking this parliament to overrule the decision of the independent commissioner, those opposite are attacking the reputation of a highly regarded criminal lawyer.

Michael Byrne QC is one of Queensland’s top criminal lawyers. I understand he was first called to the bar in 1977 and took silk in 1993. He has broad experience including significant trial work. His career has also included Acting Judge of the District Court, Deputy Director of Public Prosecutions and the Vice-President of the Queensland Bar Association. I have to say that it is sad that the member for Mansfield would undermine a respected member of the legal profession in this way.

After the election many people in the legal profession had hoped dearly that we had seen the end of the LNP approach to the legal profession that was personified by the member for Kawana. But, unfortunately, what we have come to realise with the member for Mansfield is that we have here a case of ‘Bleijie ja vu’—same old, same old—attacking the legal profession instead of dealing with the facts. I say to the member for Mansfield that those members of the profession are not angry, they are just very—

Mr Cramp interjected.

Ms Davis interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Member for Gaven, you are now warned under standing order 235A. I urge you to cease your interjections. Member for Aspley, you are getting close to getting a formal warning. I would urge you to cease your interjections.

Mrs D'ATH: The members of the profession are not angry with the member for Mansfield; they are just disappointed. They expected better than an attack on such a highly respected legal professional.


In relation to the exception made in this motion, it is just an attempt by the shadow Attorney-General to protect himself from criticism. The fact is that the commissioner has already deemed the information to be confidential and that is why it has not been released. If those opposite want to read the information from the commission that is suitable to be released, perhaps they could read the 600 pages of the comprehensive report.

Let me offer another reason why the member for Mansfield and those opposite cannot be taken seriously on these important issues and certainly on this motion before the House. Section 9 of the Commissions of Inquiry Act 1950 sets out clearly that anyone who published any evidence given before a commission or any of the contents of a book, document, writing or record produced at the inquiry which a commission has ordered not to be published shall be guilty of contempt.

Here we have the LNP specifically asking the Premier to release material that could well be in contempt of the commission. We have the shadow Attorney-General calling on the Premier to act against legislation of this state. I appreciate that the shadow Attorney-General, who is moving this motion, would probably be willing to release such information, but as the first law officer of this state I will not be recommending to the Premier that she risk committing contempt under a law of this state. The Commissioner made the reasons why he did not release this information very clear when he spoke at the release of this report. He stated—

It was the intention of the commission, as I publicly stated when it commenced, to hold public inquiries to expose what was being done. It became apparent to us that was neither an effective nor efficient way to carry out the task entrusted to the commission.

The reasons for that are several. The first is that, quite properly under the terms of the reference, the commission was not to divulge intelligence-gathering matters, they were not to expose persons to risk and they were not to interfere with ongoing investigations or court proceedings. In a number of submissions—and many submissions came in and many interviews were conducted—there were requests for confidentiality, which was found to be understandable. Those opposite are all about attacking the person as opposed to looking at the policies and the intent. There is no regard for the independence of the court and no regard for the independence of the commission. This motion should be opposed by this parliament.

 **Mr LANGBROEK** (Surfers Paradise—LNP) (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (6.10 pm): I rise to support the motion moved by the shadow Attorney-General, which provides the government with an opportunity to show how open and transparent they truly are. I want to refute what the Attorney-General said in her speech when she suggested that we are casting aspersions on Michael Byrne QC. On behalf of the shadow Attorney-General and those on this side of the House, I want to reiterate that what we are concerned about is the government's political use of this report, and that is what we have expressed in this motion.

The Attorney-General also suggests if we had read all 600 pages of the report we would not have come to mistaken conclusions and that therefore some aspects of this motion should be rejected. The bottom line is that those four members—the Attorney-General, the Premier, the Minister for Education and the Minister for Child Safety—have all supposedly read the report and come up with the politicisation of it which we saw in the media two weekends ago. Once it was made clear to them that their reflections on the report did not reflect the information it contained, they hastily ran away. Yesterday morning I said that it was Acting Commissioner Ross Barnett who pointed out that the conclusions they had made over that weekend, which were clearly a politicisation, were ones that he rejected on behalf of the Police Service. They also reflected on the ability of the Police Service to do things about paedophilia and fraud, when it was obvious from the extra resources that had been given to the police by the former LNP government that the focus on organised crime did not lead to increasing issues in other areas.

The shadow Attorney-General has very clearly made the point that no-one on our side is asking for information that is deemed by the commission or Crown Law to be either confidential or information that could compromise the operational abilities of state and federal law enforcement agencies. I refute


what the Attorney says in her gross generalisations, which are typical of the politicisation that we have seen by this government. The point is that this Premier promised to lead a government of consensus and consultation, but all we have seen—as we saw today in question time—is a government that values politics over policy and spin over substance. They try to get on the six o'clock news to 'rub out' the main issues of the day that Queenslanders really want them to focus on. They will say and do anything to achieve their goal which, as we know, is to repeal and replace the criminal gang laws that were implemented by the former LNP government.

Taxpayers have paid approximately \$3 million for a report that is being used by this government to do nothing more than roll out the red carpet to criminal gangs in this state—people with no regard for the law, the police, or innocent Queenslanders who are caught in the crossfire. Nowhere is that better exemplified than my city of the Gold Coast and the very tragic shooting of policeman Damien Leeding. People were caught up in crossfire at Robina shopping centre, shot on the streets outside Kurrawa Surf Club and found dead on Hooker Boulevard, yet former ministers Paul Lucas and Neil Roberts said there were no problems at the Gold Coast. After we came into government and that incident happened in September 2013 we knew that something had to be done, but we made sure that the police were provided with the resources that they needed and we supported them unequivocally. The education minister should apologise to the hardworking Queensland men and women in blue for her outrageous slur against the work that they do to keep Queenslanders safe from harm. She said—

We feared all along that just looking at bikies could lead to other types of organised crime flourishing, and now we have it in black and white. This is the second major fail by the former government when it comes to protecting our children after the botched implementation of the child abuse reporting system in September 2013.

What a shameless attempt to politicise not just the OneSchool reporting system but also the organised crime inquiry report. We have heard the experts from QUT say that we should be very careful about statistics, but it is obvious that this motion should be supported in the interests of integrity and accountability. I commend the motion to the House.

Mr SPEAKER: Before calling the Minister for Police, I urge the Minister for Main Roads not to persist with his interjections or I will warn him in a similar way that I indicated I may warn the member for Aspley.

 **Hon. JR MILLER** (Bundamba—ALP) (Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Services and Minister for Corrective Services) (6.15 pm): I rise to speak against the motion. The whole debate is moot, because it is not for this government to decide what evidence or material relied upon by the commission should be released. That was quite properly a decision of the independent commissioner, and to do otherwise would risk acting in contempt of an act of this parliament. The Commissions of Inquiry Act 1950, particularly section 9, talks about contempt of a commission. I table this act for the benefit of the opposition.

Tabled paper: Extract of Commissions of Inquiry Act 1950, ss 9-10 regarding contempt of a commission [[1615](#)].

The commission of inquiry report of the eminent Michael Byrne QC has provided all Queenslanders with a deeper understanding of serious organised crime in this state. The motion before the House obviously reflects the opposition's unwillingness to talk about the real issues at stake in this report. The report provides an insight into organised crime with a focus on illicit drugs, online child offending and child exploitation material, financial crimes, money laundering and corruption.

Organised crime is serious. Everybody in this chamber knows this, and the Palaszczuk government is very serious about tackling organised crime in this state. Throughout my working life I have been made aware of the persistent threat of organised crime no matter where it is, and this includes my time working at the Criminal Justice Commission, my appointments on the Parliamentary Crime and Corruption Commission and in my role as Minister for Police. These experiences have impressed upon me the importance of allowing commissions of inquiry and other crime bodies to carry out their work unhindered and in the true spirit of independence.

This motion is a distraction that turns the attention of our parliament from the critical matters at the heart of the commission of inquiry, and that is keeping Queenslanders safe. Our Palaszczuk government remains committed to ensuring the safety of Queenslanders by giving our police and emergency services the resources that they need to get on with the job that they do best.


In my portfolio of Police, Fire and Emergency Services, more than \$2 billion is being invested in public safety this financial year to fund extra police on the beat, police vehicles and new equipment for Fire and Emergency Services. Some \$28 million is being spent on the delivery of 266 new police over

the next year. Unlike the previous LNP government, we will ensure that our police are properly resourced to help them keep Queenslanders safe, no matter where they live in this state. In a further boost to safety, around 1,000 new and replacement police vehicles will be out and about on our roads as part of the Palaszczuk government's commitment to ensure our police have access to the resources they need.

Also, an extra \$20 million will be invested over four years to help police tackle specifically organised crime, alcohol fuelled violence and the drug ice. Many parents right throughout Queensland have told me—I visit a lot of communities in both city and rural areas—about the effects of that terrible drug ice. Too many young people's lives are being ruined by this scourge on our society and our families. Of course, the commission of inquiry shone a light on ice and the issues resulting from ice in this state. Our investment will give the police the extra resources they need to help track down and take action against people who are manufacturing and peddling such a dangerous drug. These funds will also ensure that police maintain momentum in their crackdown on outlaw motorcycle gangs across Queensland.

We are also investing in the safety of those who keep us safe—our police officers—with more than \$6 million being spent over three years for the rollout of body worn video cameras. Today I was on the Gold Coast talking to police officers on the beat. They like the fact that we have rolled out 300 body worn video cameras in that area.

Our government has also put money into Taskforce Orion—\$3.2 million—to help the police in relation to child exploitation material. I am against the motion.

 **Mr BLEIJIE** (Kawana—LNP) (6.21 pm): I support the motion moved by the member for Mansfield and spoken to quite positively by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. I support it because this is about transparency, openness and accountability—accountability of the highest order. One would expect accountability and openness in this parliament, in this great place that we serve our constituents. One would also expect openness and transparency in a royal commission. Not too many royal commissions across Australia have been held in such secret, private circumstances. The commissioner, Mr Byrne QC, said at the outset that he intended to hold open hearings. Did conversations take place between the government and Mr Byrne? Did they tell him to silence the commission? Where is the evidence? Where is the testing of the evidence? How do we know who appeared before the commission?

Mrs D'ATH: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

Mr BLEIJIE: We do not know, because the government did not let anything out. It was held in silence.

Mrs D'ATH: Mr Speaker, a point of order.

Mr BLEIJIE: Nothing happened.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Kawana, one moment.

Mrs D'ATH: I find the comments of the member for Kawana personally offensive and he should withdraw.

Mr BLEIJIE: I did not refer to the member.

Mr STEVENS: Mr Speaker, on the point of order, there was no personal reflection. The member referred to the government.

Mr BLEIJIE: I did not refer to the member by her title.

Mr HINCHLIFFE: Mr Speaker, on the point of order, questions were raised about whether the government sought to influence the commissioner. It is quite clear that the first law officer, the Attorney-General, would be the first person engaged in such a relationship. While the member for Kawana may have used the general term 'government', the implication of his insult and offence is clear and I understand why the member for Redcliffe, the Attorney-General, takes offence.

Mr SPEAKER: There is no point of order. My ruling is that there was not a specific reference to the Attorney-General.

Mr BLEIJIE: This commission of inquiry handed down its report a couple of weeks ago. As the shadow Attorney-General said, there were no open hearings and no debate about it. Earlier the Attorney-General stood up and outlined the CV of Mr Michael Byrne QC. I acknowledge that he has great respect within the legal community. One thing she left off his CV is that he was the chair of Greyhound Racing Queensland. One thing she left off his CV was that they ended up sacking the board and having a separate royal commission into greyhound racing in Queensland.

We saw the police minister stand up in this place. Yesterday I asked, 'Where is the police minister? Nothing to see here. No support for our police,' and today she ran down to the Gold Coast, in the electorate of Surfers Paradise, to hold a press conference—to show that she is out there supporting the troops. I can give the minister the feedback I got from her trip this morning. They certainly were not saying the things the minister was just telling this House. I can tell the police minister what the grassroots members she met this morning said to me about her.

The police minister has the hide to stand up here and talk about things being mute. We have not heard a lot from the police minister in the two weeks since this report was handed down. We have heard no support from the police minister for police men and women in this state, but today she ran down to the Gold Coast to talk about body worn cameras and so forth. With the allegations made this morning by the honourable member for Mount Ommaney, about which she is writing to the Speaker, the police minister will have to walk around wearing her own body worn camera—to make sure the offences she possibly commits are captured, to protect honourable members in this House on that most serious matter.

The police minister also talked about the ice epidemic. The royal commission report talked about the huge ice epidemic. It also stated that criminal motorcycle gang members represent such a small proportion of organised crime, yet ice is such an epidemic—and the police minister just talked about it. She cannot have it both ways. She cannot rely on a little bit of the report, pick and choose another piece of the report and then say that bikies have nothing to do with crime in Queensland, yet they bear the major responsibility for the ice epidemic in the state of Queensland. The government cannot have it both ways. The Attorney-General said on 612ABC on 2 November—

Yes, the report is very scathing because it talks about the focus in legislation ... in the outlaw motorcycle gangs when in fact the criminal activities made up only 0.52 per cent of the crimes in this state.

In an article in the *Courier-Mail* dated Wednesday, 4 November Mark Lauchs says—

... we should be careful about statistics. The QOCCI report criticised sending resources to Taskforce Maxima because bikies only commit 0.5 per cent of offences. But they are only 0.0001% of the population and are, therefore, offending at 50 times the average rate.

A criminal motorcycle gang member offends against the people of this state at 50 times the average rate of a Queensland citizen, yet the government takes a blinkered approach: 'Nothing to see here.' It is just like this royal commission. It has a closed-door attitude: 'Nothing to see here.' There is no discussion—end of story. Yet we are to rely on this government to protect our citizens?

I laugh at the Attorney-General and at the police minister when they stand in this place saying, 'We are doing everything we can against criminal gang members. We are doing everything we can to protect the citizens of this state.' They have sat on their hands for nine months. They have done nothing but roll out the red carpet to criminal gang members in this state.



Mr RYAN (Morayfield—ALP) (6.28 pm): I oppose the motion. It is a pleasure to speak—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr RYAN: Just wait and listen. The member for Kawana was saying that he laughs at the contributions of other members in this place. Well, we laugh because the member for Kawana is the reason we are on this side of the House. We enjoy that. It is a real pleasure to support the Attorney-General and the police minister in this debate—

Mr Bleijie: Where have you been for three years?

Mr RYAN: Holding you to account—

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock.

Mr RYAN:—for all those lawyers around Brisbane that could not stand you at all.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Kawana, you had a good go. I would ask you to listen to the member for Morayfield in silence unless you are provoked.

Mr RYAN: Thank you, Mr Speaker, because what I have to say is pretty important and they might just learn something if they listen. I wanted to touch on two things that we have seen in the opposition's contributions tonight, and the first is a selective, cheap and politicised reading of not only Commissioner

Byrne's report but also the terms of reference and the act itself—the Commissions of Inquiry Act. If we turn to the motion, points 3 and 4 of the motion say that none of the information is publicly available and calls for information that the commission or crown law deems is not confidential. There is a 600-page report. There is a 600-page report that refers to all of the matters that—

An opposition member: Have you read it?

Mr RYAN: I have read the majority of it, and it is a good read in fact. It is a good read, because it touches on those critical issues which our state faces in respect of organised crime. I certainly bet those opposite have not read it, because if they had read it they would not have moved this motion in the House. There is 600 pages of information that has been thoroughly considered by the commission and presented to the people of Queensland as a road map for addressing the challenge of organised crime in this state. If those opposite had also not had a select—

(Time expired)

Opposition members interjected.

Mr RYAN: No. I am happy to start again, Mr Speaker.

Mr SPEAKER: No, I think we have all had enough. The question is that the motion—

Mr HINCHLIFFE: I rise to a point of order, Mr Speaker. That was clearly not five minutes. There was some error.

Mr SPEAKER: The advice I have received is that under the standing orders it is a maximum 30-minute debate. I will seek further advice from the Clerk. Members, I will allow the member to continue.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Members, there have been a lot of interjections. How much time have you got left?

Mr RYAN: Five pages, Mr Speaker.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: No. Member for Morayfield, I am informed you had two minutes on the clock. You have two minutes left and then we will proceed to a vote.

Mr RYAN: Thank you, Mr Speaker.

Mr SPEAKER: Please do not provoke the opposition.

Mr RYAN: In the two minutes remaining I want to touch on two other little things. The first one is the selective reading of—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr RYAN: No, this is still the same point, Mr Speaker. I refer to the selective reading of the act, because not only does section 9 of the act say that it could be a contempt—and of course this motion tries to persuade the Premier to commit a contempt—but section 16A—

Honourable members interjected.

Mr BLEIJIE: I rise to a point of order, Mr Speaker. I ask that you please put the member out of his misery. He obviously has nothing to say—

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Kawana, you have had a pretty good go today. I have made a ruling. The member has time left on the clock and then we will proceed to a vote. I would ask the member for Morayfield not to provoke the opposition.

Mr RYAN: Mr Speaker, we see the cheap political attacks continue. We have also seen throughout this debate the cheap political attacks on the independent commissioner—the independent commissioner, Mr Michael Byrne—and I am sick of it. I am sick of hearing the attacks on Mr Byrne—the political attacks. Mr Byrne is one of Queensland's most respected legal minds. He is a barrister of high standing, he is a Queen's Counsel and he is well qualified to be the commissioner in respect of this inquiry. As a lawyer myself, I am keenly aware of the damage that those opposite wrought on our legal system during their three-year reign. Everywhere I turned during the last three years when I spoke to legal practitioners around Brisbane they were sick of how the LNP treated the legal profession and our justice system, and I see those attacks continue tonight in this debate. I am sick and tired of the

opposition attacking the independence of the commissioner, Mr Byrne's good name. If those opposite have any evidence at all that Mr Byrne was not independent and that the commission did not conduct its work independently, then they should produce it; otherwise they should accept his recommendations as an independent report and work together with the government to tackle organised crime in Queensland.

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

AYES, 41:

LNP, 41—Barton, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Costigan, Cramp, Crandon, Cripps, Davis, Dickson, Elmes, Emerson, Frecklington, Hart, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Mander, McArdle, McEachan, McVeigh, Millar, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, Perrett, Powell, Rickuss, Robinson, Rowan, Seeneey, Simpson, Smith, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stuckey, Walker, Weir.

NOES, 42:


ALP, 42—Bailey, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Byrne, Crawford, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Donaldson, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Hinchliffe, Howard, Jones, Kelly, King, Lauga, Linard, Lynham, Madden, Miles, Miller, O'Rourke, Palaszczuk, Pearce, Pease, Pegg, Power, Pyne, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Stewart, Trad, Whiting, Williams.

Pairs: Pitt, Watts.

Resolved in the negative.

SPEAKER'S RULING

Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House by a Minister; Referral to Ethics Committee


 **Mr SPEAKER:** I refer to the statement made by the Minister for Main Roads, Road Safety and Ports and Minister for Energy and Water Supply this morning on the ethanol industry. During the minister's statement the Leader of Opposition Business rose to complain that the minister's speech was anticipating a bill before the House in contravention of standing order 231. The minister gave me an assurance that the matter being canvassed by the statement was separate to the bill. Later the member for Clayfield took a further objection on the grounds that the minister's speech was anticipating a bill before the House in contravention of standing order 231. Again I relied on the minister's earlier assurance to me. I have now had the opportunity to study the bill and read the *Record of Proceedings*. The bill seeks to establish an ethanol mandate. The bill also establishes a mechanism, by regulation, to increase the mandate. The minister's statement was about possible pathways for increasing the mandate. It appears to me that the minister's statement can be described as anticipatory of the bill. Without the bill passing there is no mandate. Without the mandate there is no need for a pathway.

I am very disturbed by the minister ignoring standing order 231, but I am gravely concerned that the minister led the chair into error. The chair must be able to rely on the undertakings given by ministers. As I explained earlier today, the chair is not all knowing and must be able to ask and rely upon members' assurances as to whether a matter is sub judice, anticipatory, before the Ethics Committee or otherwise in breach of standing orders. I also note the minister's apology provided half an hour ago. The minister may not have fully understood the rule in standing order 231 and may not have deliberately intended to give an assurance that has led the chair into error, but I think that the minister should explain his conduct to the Ethics Committee. I therefore refer the minister under standing order 268 to the Ethics Committee for giving an assurance to the chair that the statement did not offend standing order 231 when it in fact did.

Sitting suspended from 6.42 pm to 7.42 pm.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT


Alleged Contempt of Parliament by a Minister

 **Hon. JR MILLER** (Bundamba—ALP) (Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Services and Minister for Corrective Services) (7.42 pm), by leave: I wish to address a matter arising out of yesterday's debate. I seek to clarify my intention in making a gesture that appears to have caused offence. During a robust debate I gestured and requested the member for Mount Ommaney to silence

her repeated interjections, nothing more. If the member for Mount Ommaney misunderstood the gesture and the words I used and has taken offence, I regret any distress this may have caused. It was never my intention to do so.

MOTION

Order of Business

 **Hon. SJ HINCHLIFFE** (Sandgate—ALP) (Leader of the House) (7.43 pm): I move—

That government business order of the day No. 1 be postponed.


Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

COUNTER-TERRORISM AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

Resumed from 16 September (see p. 1878).

Second Reading

 **Hon. JR MILLER** (Bundamba—ALP) (Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Services and Minister for Corrective Services) (7.43 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a second time.

The Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee has examined the Counter-Terrorism and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2015 and tabled its report on 2 November 2015. I would like to take this opportunity to thank the committee for its consideration of the bill and for the excellent work undertaken by the committee. The committee made four recommendations in its report. The government has considered those recommendations and I now table the government response to the committee report.

Tabled paper. Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee: Report No. 13, 55th Parliament—Counter-Terrorism and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2015, government response [\[1616\]](#).

The government supports all the committee's recommendations. I will now address each recommendation in turn. Firstly, the committee recommended that the bill be passed and I thank the committee for its support of the bill. Secondly, the committee recommended that the bill be amended to provide that the Minister for Police must provide a stand-alone report to parliament within six months of the use of powers under the Terrorism (Preventative Detention) Act. The government supports this recommendation.

Currently, the Public Interest Monitor, as part of the monitor's annual report, reports on the exercise of powers under the Terrorism (Preventative Detention) Act during the previous financial year. The monitor's report is subsequently tabled in the Legislative Assembly. Whilst not diminishing the value of the monitor's report, depending on when the powers are utilised, this report may be prepared some 16 months after a person has been detained under a preventative detention order. This government believes in accountability and is of the view that parliament should be informed of the use of such powers within a timely manner. At this time I indicate that I will be moving amendments during the consideration in detail stage of the bill. These amendments will be circulated in my name and accompanied by explanatory notes. I will be moving amendments to insert new reporting requirements into the Terrorism (Preventative Detention) Act. I will be proposing to require the Commissioner of Police within three months after an application for a preventative detention order is made to report to the minister of the day stating whether the preventative detention order was granted; whether the preventative detention order was an initial or final order; whether the person was detained under the order and, if so, for how long the person was detained; if the commissioner is aware of any complaint made to the Crime and Corruption Commission or to the Ombudsman about the person's detention and, if so, particulars of the complaint; any legal challenge to the validity of the preventative detention order and, if decided, the decision of the court; any criminal offences the person was subsequently charged with; and the use of prohibited contact orders. This report may be incorporated into a report made by the commissioner in relation to the exercise of terrorist emergency powers under part 2A of the Public Safety Preservation Act.


A further provision will require the minister of the day within six months after an application for a preventative detention order is made to enable a report in the Legislative Assembly, including information provided in the commissioner's report. However, this report will not include information that could be reasonably expected to prejudice any investigation; prejudice a prosecution; prejudice the effectiveness of a lawful method or procedure for preventing, detecting, investigating or dealing with contraventions of the law; enable the existence or identity of a confidential source to be ascertained; identify or lead to the identification of the person who is being investigated; or endanger a person's life or physical safety.

Although the committee recommended that the report was to be a stand-alone report, there is merit in enabling the minister to incorporate the information as part of the minister's report in relation to the exercise of terrorist emergency powers under part 2A of the Public Safety Preservation Act. This will enable this House to be provided with a complete picture with regard to the Queensland Police Service's response to a terrorism incident. At recommendation No. 3, the committee recommended that the bill be amended to require an independent review to occur within two years of the commencement of the amending act with a report to the Legislative Assembly within three years.

Clause 14 of the bill, which inserts new section 83A into the Terrorism (Preventative Detention) Act, currently requires the minister of the day to commence a review of the need for, and effectiveness of, the act within four years after the commencement of the new section. The section further requires the minister to table a report on the outcome of the review within five years of the commencement of the section. The government supports this recommendation and I will be moving amendments during the consideration in detail stage of the bill to require the commencement of the review within two years of the commencement of new section 83A and the report of the outcome of the review to be tabled within three years of the commencement of that new section.

The committee's recommendation No. 4 sought my advice to this House on whether the government is progressing further work with local government authorities in respect of improving fire safety regulation in budget accommodation. The Palaszczuk government continuously examines initiatives to improve the safety of persons residing in budget accommodation. This government will work with the Queensland Fire and Emergency Services and local government authorities to ensure that fire safety in budget accommodation is of the highest standards.


This government understands that the threats to community safety are forever evolving. We must all, on both sides of this House, join together and work to ensure that existing measures to protect Queenslanders are continuously reviewed and any deficiencies are identified and rectified. We bear a great responsibility to protect all members of the community from the threat of terrorism and to ensure that our police and our emergency response agencies have the necessary tools to uphold the peace and contain emergent threats. This bill forms part of the Palaszczuk government's ongoing commitment to Queenslanders to ensure community safety whilst achieving an appropriate balance with the rights of individuals. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr BLEIJIE** (Kawana—LNP) (7.52 pm): The opposition will not be opposing the bill. This is an extension of a 10-year sunset clause which expires in the middle of December. What I am surprised at is the Minister for Police talking very much about how the government wants to keep Queenslanders absolutely safe. We are in the second-last sitting of the year and the government realised at the last minute that this legislation had to be pushed through, so it introduced it not that long ago. I would submit to the minister that for the last 10 years the legislation was always going to expire in the middle of December so the minister could have, at any stage in the last eight months whilst they were in government, put this through without pushing it through in the second last sitting week.

We know this legislation was as a result of terrorist bombings around London in 2005. All Australian states and territories combined their terrorist legislation to ensure that the preventative detention regime was in place. It means that people can be detained for a short period of time if there was the imminent threat of terrorist activities against Queensland citizens. All jurisdictions around Australia are debating and introducing these laws. I note the comments from Premier Mike Baird and the federal Attorney-General George Brandis with respect to lowering the age of the preventative detention in terms of to whom it applies. This legislation says 16 years of age. Mike Baird, the Premier of New South Wales, is advocating for 14 years of age. Can the minister indicate whether the government considered below 16 years of age for preventative detention, particularly in light of the incident in our southern states where it was a 15-year-old who committed the terrorist activity?

The opposition will not be opposing the legislation. The opposition supports the committee recommendations. The opposition supports the amendments moved by the minister. As the minister said, in this House we always must make sure that there is legislation in place to protect citizens,

particularly in this new global environment of terrorism and Isis and the atrocities that these sick individuals are committing against not only Australians but other people around the world. The opposition has no objection to this bill and will be voting for it.

 **Mr FURNER** (Ferny Grove—ALP) (7.53 pm): I rise this evening to speak in support of the bill before the House, the Counter-Terrorism and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2015. I thank the minister for her consideration of the four recommendations that were put to the government. As chair of the committee, I believe they are sensible recommendations that will enhance the operation of the bill and make sense in the current climate that we face in our communities. This is an omnibus bill that deals with a number of objectives. I do not intend to go to each and every one of those. There was a provision in the bill that provided preventative detention powers up to three nautical miles. That will be extended to 200 nautical miles. That is consistent with the combined effect of the Queensland and Commonwealth acts in respect to crimes at sea.

In relation to fire safety, the bill amends the definition of 'occupier' in the Fire and Emergency Services Act 1990 to ensure all providers of accommodation provide a fire-safe environment. There was evidence provided to the committee whereby committee members expressed concerns about the current situation dealing with fire safety. We support those provisions. The committee heard from witnesses who gave evidence and responded to questions on the bill at public hearings on 14 October. The committee recommends that the bill be passed. The committee put forward four recommendations that will be dealt with this evening, including proposing statutory review time frames.

I thank the submitters to the bill, particularly the participants at the committee's hearings. I also thank the Public Safety Business Agency, the Queensland Fire and Emergency Services and the Queensland Police Service for their support and the expert evidence that they provided to the committee. I also thank the committee members. At times we dealt with controversial issues. There was bipartisan support for this bill. The committee supports the recommendations across-the-board and also the passage of the bill through the chamber. I also put on record our thanks to the Parliamentary Library for the research services it provided and also the secretariat staff for their commitment to our committee.

I want to touch briefly on some of the evidence provided to the committee. Deputy Commissioner Barnett spoke about the current threat of terrorism that is not only faced by Australia but also faced around the globe. He stated that the security situation facing Australia is not likely to improve in the near future and the security implications of the Syrian and Iraq conflict will likely impact on Australia for a number of years. So it is not just purely imminent situations; it is beyond. This bill is about forecasting support and protection for our community beyond the inception of the bill. Nationally, since September this year there have been three terrorist attacks and a further six planned attacks that have been prevented. The commissioner said—

We must engage with the vulnerable to build resilience to the propaganda and grooming undertaken by terrorist groups and supporters. We must also assist vulnerable persons and those who have been radicalised to disengage and deradicalise from violent extremism.

While the preventative detention legislation has never been used in Queensland, it remains a valuable tool for police in response to imminent and recent terrorism attacks. Conversely, Mr Keim from the Bar Association of Queensland, also in response to that issue, gave evidence that the Commonwealth provisions have been used six times but perhaps four times in the last six years. One can see a build-up to the particular issues that have been identified by the evidence that was provided to the committee.

In respect to fire safety, Superintendent Nunn, the executive manager of the Investigation and Compliance Section of the Queensland Fire and Emergency Services, indicated that in July of this year the Queensland Fire and Emergency Services Commissioner won a Supreme Court injunction to shut down a budget accommodation building in the Lockyer Valley. The building had housed six itinerant fruit pickers. An inspection of the building revealed that it had no smoke alarms or emergency lighting and travel distances to exits were of such a length that, in the event of a fire, residents would have had difficulty in escaping the premises. The injunction was made permanent, preventing the potential serious injury or death of persons using that accommodation. That is another rational objective of the bill, backed up by evidence before the committee.

When asked why it is necessary to extend the complementary preventative detention laws for 10 years in Queensland when the Australian government is only seeking to extend its legislation for two years and other jurisdictions are seeking to extend theirs for lesser periods, Deputy Commissioner Barnett said—

Obviously the first issue on our horizon, apart from the deteriorating national and international security environment, is the Commonwealth Games—

a real and present concern for Queenslanders and this nation—

which will be with us in April 2018. That is our next significant challenge. If you read all of the general expert analysis about our current serious and deteriorating situation it is generally accepted that the situation is unlikely to improve in the next five years, and people are saying that it is up to a decade or longer that we will be in this current state.


Notwithstanding the evidence of the Police Service, Ms Pink from the Law and Justice Institute Queensland also suggested that the current laws are covered by our police powers. She stated—

One of the most compelling arguments against the continuation of this law is that our existing police powers and criminal laws provide sufficient scope for dealing with the threat of terrorism and again this is supported by the fact that these laws have not been used in the last 10 years.

Notwithstanding that point of view, we do not go out there and create laws or staff a police service on the basis of not knowing where crimes may be committed. Putting those powers in place is a preventive provision, as is the staffing of the Police Service to prevent crimes such as these.

In my previous career in the Senate and as chair of the defence and law committees, I received high-level briefings about real and present threats to our world. Unfortunately, the general public is not made aware of those threats. I am sure that if people knew of the issues that are out, they would have serious concerns about them. Of course, another reason that that information is not readily available is the sensitivity around the intelligence that is provided in those briefings.

Regardless of the evidence the committee heard at its hearings and in submissions received, since the Bali bombings and 9/11 no-one could argue against the fact that our world has really changed. We must provide our communities with all available protections from the threat of terrorism, whether perceived or real. This bill clearly demonstrates the government's commitment and our position as being tough on crime. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mrs SMITH** (Mount Ommaney—LNP) (8.02 pm): I rise to make a contribution to the debate on the Counter-Terrorism and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2015. I will focus mainly on recommendation 2 in the committee's report. Today the world is a different place to what it was in 2005 when, in good conscience, the Terrorism (Preventative Detention) Act 2005 was invoked. Let us cast our minds back to when the London bombings were displayed across our televisions and newspapers. Following the London bombings in 2005, on 27 September 2005 a special meeting of the Council of Australian Governments, COAG, was held to consider a range of counterterrorism measures to more effectively deal with threats and acts of terrorism. In Queensland, legislation was passed that included the implementation of preventive detention orders to enable a person to be detained for up to 14 days to prevent an imminent terrorist attack or to preserve evidence following a recent terrorist attack. That was in line with federal jurisdiction laws and was put in place for our safety.

In our ever-changing world, it is imperative that the security of the people of Queensland and, indeed, all of Australia is paramount. No longer will a wait-and-see approach or a just-in-case approach work. In Queensland, in the field of counterterrorism and protection our front-line services work tirelessly to be ahead of the game in an effort to keep our state safe. It is my belief that all and any resources called for by those agencies should be considered. At the public briefing, Deputy Commissioner Ross Barnett said—

... I believe it is a situation where it is better to have them and not need them ... We do not want to find ourselves ... in the middle of a crisis where we are looking for such an authority and not to have it, than the other way around.

Deputy Commissioner Ross Barnett gave a very professional and thorough overview on the necessities of extending the sunset provision. I am sure that my fellow committee members will agree that his conduct and professionalism should be commended. In this area his knowledge and his expertise were invaluable.

It is incumbent upon us in this House to give the men and women who work in those front-line agencies every tool available to allow them to continue the great work that they do. As I said before, there was a 10-year sunset clause on the Terrorism (Preventative Detention) Act 2005, which was put into place when there was uncertainty about what would unfold. Looking at reality now, we find that most definitely that sunset clause needs to be extended. The bill does that by extending the sunset clause for another 10 years, but with more regular reporting on whether the laws are keeping us up to the current trends. The bill puts in place the following: an extension of the sunset provision of the Terrorism (Preventative Detention) Act 2005; an extension of the extraterritorial application of the Terrorism (Preventative Detention) Act 2005, which will make it consistent with the combined effect of Queensland and Commonwealth acts in respect to crimes at sea; and an extension of various emergency powers under the Terrorism (Preventative Detention) Act 2005 so they may be exercised in other jurisdictions.


We also have to remember that 10 years ago social media was not used as prominently as it is now. In the briefing, Deputy Commissioner Barnett highlighted how social media is being used by so-called terrorist groups. When I asked Deputy Commissioner Barnett how the introduction of social media has impacted on our terrorist laws, he said—

Certainly I understand the question. The impact of social media is only a reasonably recent phenomenon in the counterterrorism space, but we are seeing that it is becoming increasingly influential and in some ways becoming more difficult to fight. The terrorist use of social media as means of propaganda and outreach to people in this country from overseas, particularly theatres of war, is having significant consequences for sections of the Australian community. There is no doubt about that.

In the last 18 months here on Australian soil, we have seen terrorist related crimes such as occurred at Martin Place and, only a few weeks ago, at the Parramatta police station. That cannot be ignored. While some submissions outlined concerns about these laws being extended, we have to remember that to date no-one has been detained under these laws, so the powers have not been abused.

Clause 11 of the bill replaces existing section 6 'extraterritoriality of terrorist acts no barrier' with new section 6 'extraterritorial application of the act'. This amendment, in addition to replicating the current application, extends the application of the act beyond Queensland's coastal waters to the same area to which the substantive criminal law of Queensland is applied under the crimes at sea cooperative scheme. This is achieved through applying the TPDA in the adjacent area for Queensland as defined in the Queensland act.

I would like to thank the secretariat for their hard work on the report. I certainly gained a much greater insight into counterterrorism. The extension of this sunset clause should be welcomed by the people of Queensland as it was by the Queensland Crime and Corruption Commission in its submission to the committee where it stated that we need to remain vigilant and heed the advice of our law enforcement agencies and, if they come to us in 12 months time and say that it is time to relook at this law, time to strengthen the law, time to create some new laws, then we should listen carefully. At least now under this bill we have the opportunity to do that. I support the bill.

 **Ms HOWARD** (Ipswich—ALP) (8.10 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Counter-Terrorism and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2015. Recent events and the high national terror alert provide a cogent argument for the examination of our current counterterrorism laws. Over the last decade we have seen a variety of terrorist events at home and abroad.

I, as the member for Ipswich, with the largest operational Air Force base just a few kilometres outside of my electorate—the RAAF base at Amberley—that employs over 5,000 uniformed and civilian personnel, many of whom live in my electorate, and all members of this House must be cognisant of this threat. Accordingly, we must carefully consider how far and how wide the special powers we give to police and law enforcement should be in order to meet this threat.

An important part of this bill is aligning police powers in legislation with contemporary operational environments. In addition to extending the application of the preventative regime in the Terrorism (Preventative Detention) Act, the bill will extend its extraterritorial application. The bill will similarly extend the extraterritorial application of the Public Safety Preservation Act.

The Terrorism (Preventative Detention) Act and the Public Safety Preservation Act currently are limited in their operability in the maritime environment to within Queensland's coastal waters. That is from the low-water mark to within three nautical miles seaward of the territorial sea baseline.

Whilst the crimes at sea cooperative scheme applies, the substantive criminal law and law of criminal investigation, procedure and evidence offshore out to a distance of 200 nautical miles seaward of the territorial sea baseline or to the end of the continental shelf where it extends further, the operation of the Terrorism (Preventative Detention) Act and the Public Safety Preservation Act are not similarly extended by the scheme. The bill will extend the extraterritorial application of the Terrorism (Preventative Detention) Act to the same area to which the crimes at sea cooperative scheme extends Queensland's substantive criminal law and law of criminal investigation, procedure and evidence.


This extraterritorial application will enable the use of the Terrorism (Preventative Detention) Act powers where the Queensland Police Service interdicts a vessel within the adjacent area. This will also include circumstances where the Defence Force was handing back control of the incident to police following its interdiction of the vessel.

The bill also extends the extraterritorial operation of the Public Safety Preservation Act so that it applies outside Queensland to the full extent of the extraterritorial legislation power of the parliament. This includes powers relating to emergency situations, terrorist emergencies and chemical, biological

and radiological emergencies. This will enable police to exercise the emergency management powers necessary to effectively deal with the emergency to protect Queensland citizens, even though the origin of the emergency is outside Queensland.

This bill will also enable the declaration of a motor vehicle or vessel as a declared area for a terrorist emergency prior to the arrival of the motor vehicle or vessel within the state. The ability to interdict vessels outside of Queensland's coastal waters creates a significant buffer to protect Queenslanders from acts of terrorism. The amendment will also ensure that the declaration of a motor vehicle or vessel as a declared area for a terrorist emergency continues despite the motor vehicle or vessel departing from Queensland for a short period.

While technical in nature, these amendments better align police powers to responsive police practice in the event of a critical incident or emergency. We should hope that they are not required ever to be used, but we must be prepared for when they may need to be. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr PERRETT** (Gympie—LNP) (8.15 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Counter-Terrorism and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2015. As an omnibus bill it also incorporates, in addition to counterterrorism measures, a number of unrelated amendments. These include: changing the definition of an occupier to ensure all providers of accommodation provide a fire safe environment; providing civil liability protection for Police Service reviews; and reflecting changes in Australian government arrangements by defining an officer of customs in the Australian Border Force in respect of the possession and use of weapons in performing their duty.

In relation to this bill, I would like to confine my remarks to the proposed counterterrorism measures. They are part of Australia's continual redefinition and refinement of measures introduced since the attack on the Twin Towers in 2001. This bill aims to extend the sunset provision of the Terrorism (Preventative Detention) Act 2005 which had a sunset clause until December this year. It will also extend the extraterritorial application of that bill from three nautical miles to 200 nautical miles, and extend various emergency powers so they may be exercised in other jurisdictions.

This legislation is about implementing a recommendation from the Council of Australian Governments, COAG, in October 2014. It recommended that the 'states agreed to introduce legislative amendments to their parliaments to safeguard the national laws underpinning our ability to arrest, monitor, investigate and prosecute domestic extremists and returning foreign fighters'. This is Queensland's response to the COAG agreement.

No-one in this place comes here willingly intending to remove the rights and liberties that citizens in Queensland have. In fact, when the original legislation was passed in 2005, this apprehension led to the implementation of a 10-year sunset clause. During that debate the Leader of the Opposition noted this sentiment when he said in the debate—

... a bill such as this ... potentially it can impact significantly on the rights and liberties of individuals. They always must be the supreme consideration of this parliament—that the action which we are taking to protect the broader community is more justifiable than any of the individual liberties which may be constrained as a consequence of the laws that we pass through this place.

Our security has been increasingly under threat in the last 15 years. Authorities now have to deal with the challenge of cyber security, the use of social media to incite violence and recruitment, the threat of lone terrorist attacks and the threat of large-scale mass casualties and infrastructure attacks. Of special concern is residents who now pose a security risk as a result of the volatile and worsening situation in the Middle East. More and more residents are having to be monitored and are under investigation. As the minister said—

The number of persons travelling overseas to participate in the conflict, the number of residents prevented from participating in the conflict and known supporters are all increasing.

Queensland is not alone here. While all other jurisdictions have legislation complementary to these measures, a COAG review in 2003 noted that there are differences between the jurisdictions, particularly in the area of safeguards.

The committee recommended that the bill be amended to provide for the minister to report to the parliament within six months of the use of powers regarding issues surrounding preventative detention orders, complaints to the Ombudsman and the Crime and Corruption Commission and review timing. As would be expected, submissions regarding this bill were concentrated around the administration of these PDOs.

Fears are based on hypotheticals or on who has the right to issue them, recourse to compensation in the case of wrongful detention and the practical utility of the legislation. I remind the chamber that this is not about a movie script. This is not about the latest blockbuster. A person detained

under a preventative detention order already has some rights. They have the right to be treated humanely, to contact a lawyer, to contact family members and employers, to not be questioned, to be given a copy of the PDO which summarises the reasons for the order, and to have an interpreter.

Despite fearmongering, children under 16 cannot be detained. If they are between 16 and 18 they must be detained separately from adults and they can have a parent or guardian visit them. Despite these concerns, a balance must be considered between individual rights and liberties, community safety and practical application: 'it is better to have them and not need them, than to need them and not have them'.


While it is preferable for the PDO regime to remain, it is prudent for a review to be conducted in a more timely manner than originally proposed by the bill. The committee therefore recommended—

... the Act be amended to require an independent review to occur within two years of the Act's commencement, with a report required no later than three years of the Act's commencement.

The threat to Australia, domestically and offshore, from those committed to terrorist activity endures. Terrorists planning and activities have occurred in Australia, terrorists have attacked Australians and Australian interests overseas. Over 100 Australians were killed in terrorist attacks in Bali, Jakarta, Mumbai, Istanbul, London and New York. Threats of terrorism can come from extremist groups or from an individual. In particular, individuals committed to a violent jihad ideology continue to regard Australia and Australian interests abroad as legitimate targets. The threat posed by this form of extremism is ongoing, pervasive and persistent.

Police, law enforcement and intelligence authorities are continually conducting investigations and responding to a large number of counterterrorism leads. Concern has been expressed as to the rise in the number of Australians who wish to support acts in Australia or travel overseas to obtain training or undertake their own particular form of jihad. As ASIO's submission to the review into counterterrorism laws identified, 'This is not an abstract or offshore threat; it is real and it is amongst the community.'

Australia remains a target for a small range of individuals and groups who would promote their belief systems and seek to destroy our democratic way of life in a violent and irreversible way. Of course, we accept at the same time that the threat of a terrorist attack in Australia should not be overstated or exaggerated. The fact that there have only been isolated attacks on Australian soil should not give us any great comfort, nor should it allow complacency and inertia to dilute our vigilance. In the interests of our national security and the safety of all Australians, I support the Counter-Terrorism and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2015.

 **Mr RYAN** (Morayfield—ALP) (8.22 pm): I rise to contribute to the debate on the Counter-Terrorism and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2015. From the outset, as a member of the committee, I would like to thank my fellow committee members for their cooperation and diligence in the consideration of this bill. I would like to thank all of the witnesses who appeared before us and the submitters and also the secretariat staff for their guidance and support throughout our consideration of the bill.

As we have heard from previous speakers, the committee made four recommendations in its report. I am pleased to hear that the minister and the government have thoroughly considered those recommendations and will be making amendments to support those recommendations and to give effect to them. Before I address those individual recommendations in turn, I would like to look at some of the background that has led to this point.

Many people do not know where the word 'terrorism' originated. It actually dates back to the French Revolution during the reign of terror and the Jacobins who participated in a reign of terror throughout France during the French Revolution. From there the term 'terrorism' was coined. Ever since then terrorism has always been at the forefront of nation states and governments—how they can get the balance right between preservation of the state and public safety and maintaining protections for individuals' rights and liberties. Whenever there is an intrusion on people's rights and liberties, there needs to be adequate safeguards in Westminster democracies to ensure that, wherever possible, those intrusions are limited but also that there are protections and checks and balances to make sure that the nation state does not overstep the boundaries when it comes to those intrusions.

There are extraordinary powers for extraordinary times. We have seen over the last decade or two the need for us to have these extraordinary powers with adequate safeguards in place to ensure that, wherever possible, the rights and liberties of individuals are maintained to their fullest. Whilst it is important in Westminster democracies to always limit those excessive legislative intrusions on individuals' rights and liberties, where the state considers such intrusions to be justified for public safety purposes, then we must make sure that there are adequate safeguards in place to accompany those intrusions.

I am very pleased that not only in the original act but also now in the amendments to that original act the safeguards contained in that original act will be enhanced through the recommendations considered and adopted by the government. I think it is very important for us to touch on some of those safeguards. Firstly, when a preventative detention order is made, that order must be made by a senior officer in the Queensland Police Service and is only valid for 24 hours. After that period of time a preventative detention order can only be enforced and effected with the order of a judge. That period of time is for a maximum of 14 days. So there is an appropriate check and balance on that power. During that time of preventative detention, there is also the right of the individual to have contact with a lawyer, to have contact with the Ombudsman, to have contact with the CCC and also to ensure that there is adequate questioning about health and safety and the condition of that individual. So that is another safeguard in place to ensure that the rights and liberties of individuals are maintained wherever possible.

In addition to all of those safeguards, there is also a restriction on the law enforcement officers to not be able to question that individual in respect of any criminal matter during a period of preventative detention. Of course, those law enforcement officers may be able to exercise those questioning powers at some other point outside of the preventative detention period, but during the period of preventative detention there must be no questioning of the person detained. Again, there are adequate protections in place to safeguard individuals' rights and liberties but at the same time there are adequate measures in place to ensure that the nation state is able to take appropriate action to maintain public safety in our community.

I also wanted to touch on a couple of recommendations that the committee made which enhance the safeguards contained in the act. Those recommendations are, firstly, recommendation No. 2, which suggests that the minister provide a report to parliament within six months whenever a preventative order is made. This shortens the period from the current 12-month requirement but, as we heard from the minister during her contribution, given the timing of the use of the powers and the reporting period, often that time period may be quite a bit longer than 12 months. So to have a requirement that there is a six-monthly report is an appropriate additional safeguard and provides additional oversight and transparency in respect of these preventative detention powers.

The other recommendation which enhances the safeguards contained in the act is recommendation No. 3, which suggests that there be a review of the act that commences within two years and must be completed within three years of the commencement of the act. Again, that is an appropriate additional safeguard to ensure that not only these are necessary laws to maintain public safety in our community but also there are adequate safeguards to ensure that individuals' rights are protected wherever possible.

I also wanted to touch on upon some comments made by some of the witnesses made during the committee's consideration of this bill. I think this epitomises the challenges that nation states always have. It was a statement by the Deputy Commissioner of the Queensland Police Service, Ross Barnett, if I am not mistaken. He said—

... it is better to have them and not need them, than to need them and not have them.

The deputy commissioner went on to say that he considered that the police had the appropriate suite of powers and laws at the moment to combat any challenge that they may face in respect of community safety challenges. He did make a very important point about ensuring that our law enforcement officers have appropriate powers in respect of law enforcement, but I think the additional point is that those appropriate laws are within an adequate and appropriate safeguard framework for the rights of individuals. As I have already mentioned, this bill, with the recommendations which the government has adopted, will enhance the safeguards in the original act and that overall is a good improvement.


The committee's recommendation No. 4 is in respect of the fire safety regulations. It is very important that we touch on that recommendation briefly because it could get lost in the broader scheme of this amending bill. Currently in the Fire and Emergency Services Act there is a definition of 'occupier'. For the purposes of the record, it is important that I mention that definition. The definition of 'occupier' for the purposes of that act is—

... used with reference to any premises, means the person in actual occupation or, if there is no such person, the owner.

Over time the fire service has found it has been limited in its ability to take enforcement action, particularly in respect of boarding houses and people who might not necessarily fit that definition, because, firstly, they are not the owner and, secondly, they are not occupying the premises. It could be instances of people who are subletting premises, or it could be instances where there is an employment

arrangement, they are the original renter and they are letting workers stay in the premises. It is important that that definition is as broad as possible so we can ensure the person who is most able to minimise fire risks, particularly in boarding houses, takes the appropriate safeguard measures to ensure that those safety practices and measures are in place.

This is about saving lives and minimising fire risk. It might seem pretty simple to just change a definition, but that definition will mean so much when it comes to ensuring that there are the appropriate deterrents in place for people who are in control of premises to ensure that fire safety measures are in place. Let us hope that that saves lives overall. This is necessary amending legislation. I am pleased to see that there are additional safeguards in place to protect individuals' rights and liberties, but I also note the comments and the advice of the Deputy Commissioner of Police that these are necessary laws for extraordinary times. I commend the bill to the House and encourage all members to support it.


 **Mr BOOTHMAN** (Albert—LNP) (8.32 pm): I rise tonight to make a very brief contribution to the debate on the Counter-Terrorism and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2015. I thank the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee for its review of this legislation and for making some very thoughtful recommendations. It is certainly sad that we live in a world that has been forever changed as a result of terrorist acts. Unfortunately, even in this wonderful country of ours—a country with modern cities, free health care, freedom of religion and freedom of speech—there are those among us who wish to destroy our way of life. We saw that in December 2014 when a lone gunman entered the Lindt cafe in Martin Place and laid siege to not only the coffee shop but also our way of life. We all know that he held other human beings hostage for 16 hours. I am sure none of us will forget that this man's acts of fear and terror cost the lives of two innocent people. This year, a 15-year-old boy shot and killed an unarmed police civilian finance worker outside his work in Parramatta.

Our law enforcement agencies do their utmost to protect our way of life and the freedoms we hold so dear. With a heavy heart, we must consider the liberties of freedom of individual choice and respect other people's opinions whilst not at the expense of people's rights. This is a fine line we, as elected members of parliament, must tackle when we pass laws in this chamber. The safety of the broader community must be the highest priority.

We are experiencing terrorism recruitment in a whole new frontier, a frontier of bits and bytes, data encryption and social media. To quote from a *Daily Mail* article of 19 March 2013, an internet minute consists of 639,800 gigabytes of data. This article also predicted that by 2015 the number of network devices will be double the world's population. This has created a new set of dilemmas for our law enforcement agencies. The sheer scale of the internet and the data transferred per minute is beyond comprehension.

We have been lucky that Queensland's preventative detention legislation and terrorist emergency powers have never been used, but these powers are necessary in preventing or minimising the potential impact or loss of life from a terrorist act. This leads me to thanking most profusely our local law enforcement agencies, our local police, for their diligence in keeping our community safe. Under this legislation, the Terrorism (Preventative Detention) Act 2005 will expire at midnight on 16 December 2015. This bill will roll it over to allow it to continue for another 10 years.

I will not go into the details of the recommendations. The member for Morayfield and the member for Gympie were thorough in their explanations. I support what this bill is trying to do in trying to keep us a free nation—a nation where we can minimise attacks from individuals who want to destroy our free nation and our way of life.


 **Mr de BRENNI** (Springwood—ALP) (8.37 pm): I rise to speak to the Counter-Terrorism and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. I express my support for the bill and the maintenance of the powers contained in the Terrorism (Preventative Detention) Act 2005. We all have to be conscious of the heavy burden that these laws place upon persons and members of this House. I believe the safeguards suggested by the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee and relevant stakeholders are appropriate in maintaining citizens' liberty, upholding community safety and the institutional integrity of this parliament.

As the minister has stated, this bill also provides an important boost to the operations of the Queensland Fire and Emergency Services. As has been mentioned, there is no place for exploitive housing in Queensland. Our firefighters do great work in identifying unsafe accommodation, working with police and other intelligence sources to crack down on potential fire traps in our community. Members of this House will recognise the danger illegal or inappropriate accommodation can provide, as outlined by the member for Morayfield, including those in which some of Queensland's most vulnerable people and visitors reside.

This bill meets part of this evolving challenge, providing an important amendment to the definition of 'occupier' in the Fire and Emergency Services Act 1990. Members may be aware that the Fire and Emergency Services Act places many obligations on the occupier of a building or premises including those related to maximum occupancy, maintenance of fire safety equipment and smoke alarms. However, the current definition of 'occupier' does not provide for prosecution against people who might be described as absent occupiers, rent masters—that is, lessees who sublet to multiple persons and often exceed safe occupancy levels, as often occurs in communities where fruit picking is a key employer—and managers of illegally unsafe rental accommodation. The amendment therefore extends the definition of 'occupier', ensuring that persons who profit from the budget accommodation industry cannot place financial gain above maintaining the safety and welfare of tenants.

These issues have been highlighted in a number of recent court cases, in particular by a recent Magistrates Court decision in Bundaberg where the occupier of a budget accommodation building was found not guilty of four complaints relating to fire safety installations in the building. In July 2015 the Queensland Fire and Emergency Services Commissioner won a Supreme Court injunction to shut down a budget accommodation building in the Lockyer Valley. That building was housing six itinerant fruit pickers. An inspection of the building revealed no smoke alarms or emergency lighting and travel distances to exits were of such length that in the event of a fire residents would have had little or no chance of escaping. The injunction was made permanent, preventing the potential for serious injury or death to occur to persons using the accommodation.

These examples just go to show how important these amendments are. They also demonstrate the importance of ensuring that our firefighters stand the best chance of preventing injury. I know that we can rely on our brave and professional firefighters to exercise these responsibilities in the best interests of all Queenslanders, including those who visit this state. I would like to thank those fireys who I know personally. I take this opportunity to thank Shane, Paul and especially Kristian for the work they do on a day-to-day basis. This bill will keep them and us safer. I commend the bill.

 **Dr ROWAN** (Moggill—LNP) (8.40 pm): I rise to address the Counter-Terrorism and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2015. Whilst Queensland's preventative detention legislation and terrorist emergency powers have not had to be used during the last 10 years, they are still an important means of preventing and reducing the risk of terrorist acts in our state. There is no doubt that the threat of terrorism in Queensland and Australia is increasing due to the espoused radical views of some and the online recruitment of extremist terrorist sympathisers and supporters within our sovereign borders. The potential undetected return of individuals who have been fighting alongside terrorist groups in the Middle East and other parts of the world is also cause for great concern.

I want to take this legislative opportunity to address the very important and related public policy matters of education, security and terrorism, given there is bipartisan support for this legislation. We need to further prepare our young people to be well-informed citizens, engaged in public debate and contributing to our democratic institutions, freedoms and way of life. The primary objective of formal education for our young people must be to inspire a sense of community service and to develop loyalty to Queensland and Australia, whilst also allowing for open-minded inquiry to develop and with the purpose of awarding formal qualifications being beyond just what is needed for vocational employment.

Fostering citizenship entails an evolving sense of love and respect for one's country and its culture. Future economic and social development needs can only be addressed by sound public policy as it pertains to education. Education is the cornerstone of achieving political, social and economic stability. The further evolution of global terrorism and the radicalisation of young Queenslanders and Australians is not only deeply disturbing but also very tragic. Stopping the spread of extremist agendas and insular ideologies can only be addressed through engaging the disenfranchised, the disaffected and the marginalised from a very young chronological age. Developing strategies and practical programs to address social, economic and educational disadvantage must be a top priority of successive governments in Queensland.


Prisons can be a particularly susceptible breeding ground for the recruitment of individuals to extremist ideology. Providing access to literacy programs and enhancing mental health treatment options as well as increasing the availability of and access to drug and alcohol rehabilitation services in Queensland correctional facilities would be a prudent and wise measure. Social media platforms continue to evolve with the internet, in particular the hidden darknet, also becoming more problematic for law enforcement and intelligence agencies. There are international and local crime gangs collaborating with global terrorist organisations, manufacturing and distributing illicit drugs as well as participating in other illegal activities, such as money laundering, fraud and sex offences, in order to do

our state of Queensland and our nation harm. Ongoing strategies to prosecute both direct supporters and sympathisers of terrorist organisations and criminal gangs who profit for their own gain must be further prioritised by our state government.

It is only through comprehensive primary, secondary and tertiary educational opportunities for our young people that we can truly hope to address further security risks in Queensland over the longer term. In order to provide those opportunities, Queensland needs a real economic plan and proper debt reduction strategies which will have a realistic chance of success.

We need strong action against those people, whether Australian born citizens or otherwise, who follow and promote transnational terrorism. I certainly support the suspension of a person's privileges, including the right to vote or receive social security or other governmental entitlements, if they are convicted of terrorism related offences. A reintroduced death penalty for certain or specified terrorist acts should also be considered, in my view. With a number of overseas terrorist incidents involving transport networks and the United States and British intelligence agencies indicating that there is credible evidence that ISIS planted a bomb on the ill-fated Russian Metrojet that exploded over the Egyptian desert killing all 224 people on board, it is a timely reminder that we must pay particular attention to the security of our own infrastructure here in Queensland. On Remembrance Day 2015, as we recognise the formal ending of the hostilities of World War I at the 11th hour of the 11th day of the 11th month and recognise the service and sacrifice of all in our armed forces, it is timely to reflect on both past and current challenges facing our state and nation with respect to international diplomacy and security.

We all deserve to continue to enjoy the great freedoms and opportunities that this state and country offers. We must not allow a new form of darkness to dampen the spirit and hope of the next generation of young Queenslanders in the 21st century whose aspirations and dreams must continue to be cherished and respected. I commend the Counter-Terrorism and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2015 to the House.


 **Mr STEWART** (Townsville—ALP) (8.45 pm): I rise this evening to speak to the Counter-Terrorism and Other Legislation Amendment Bill before the House. Perhaps as a newcomer to this parliament, I am oblivious to some of the history and reasoning behind some of the legislation that exists in our society. However, I am acutely aware of the justification and reasoning behind the Terrorism (Preventative Detention) Act 2005, which is the aspect of the bill I wish to speak to tonight. Ten years ago the then premier of Queensland, Peter Beattie, stood in this House and introduced the Terrorism (Preventative Detention) Act in response to the 7 July 2005 bombings in London. We have heard the stories already of that event, of how 52 civilians were killed and over 700 more were injured in those attacks. It was the United Kingdom's worst terrorist incident since the 1998 Lockerbie bombing, as well as the country's first ever Islamic suicide attack.

My family and I have lived in Townsville for almost 17 years now, and our house is less than one kilometre away from Lavarack Barracks, which is the largest Defence barracks in Australia with approximately 6,500 Defence personnel working there every day. In that 17 years, we have seen the impact of the 9/11 terrorist attack. In that 17 years, we have seen our Defence friends get posted to Timor Leste, Iraq and Afghanistan. Our neighbour, a captain in the Army, completed two tours of Afghanistan as a Chinook chopper pilot and recounted the number of times he would return back to base with numerous bullet holes riddled in his aircraft. My daughter's partner is also a captain who served two tours in Afghanistan, first in the Combat Signals Regiment and then in intelligence. He does not speak about what he saw over there or what went on during his tours. The impact on these two men I hear again and again with the women and men who serve our country.

But why do they do it? Why do they put their lives on the line every time they go overseas with the Defence Force? They do it to fight the war on terror. They do it to defend our country and our freedoms and to keep the innocent safe. Given today we acknowledge Remembrance Day in our calendar, the debt that we owe our men and women of the Australian Defence Force can never be repaid. Our police do exactly the same. They put their lives on the line every day they go to work to protect the vulnerable and to keep our community safe. I thank the police for their role, whether they are protecting us from the threat of terrorism or they are protecting us from other forms of crime and violence.

As members of this House, we should be under no illusions as to the threats that terrorism presents in our communities and our state. The national terrorism alert level is high. However, there is no specific threat to Queensland, which is comforting. Both domestically and abroad, we have continued to see serious incidents of terrorism in a wide variety of forms. None of us will ever forget the recent murder of the New South Wales police worker Curtis Cheng, which was a callous and disturbing act. Similarly, I am sure members of this House can remember the siege at the Lindt cafe and the number

of terrorism related operations occurring throughout Australia and, more specifically, in Melbourne recently. We are thankful that we have never had to exercise these powers that were introduced 10 years ago. However, I am satisfied that recent terrorism links across Australia warrant the extension of these powers in Queensland. I hope and pray that we never get to use these in any circumstance. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr LAST** (Burdekin—LNP) (8.50 pm): I rise to speak to the Counter-Terrorism and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2015. There can be no doubt that we live in a vastly different world from that of 10 years ago. As a former police officer, I know full well how important effective legislation is to enable police officers to effectively perform their duties. When our safety and the security of our state is under threat it is imperative that our police officers have the tools in the form of legislation to deal with that threat in a timely manner. There can be nothing more frustrating for a police officer than to watch a criminal walk free or to fail to prevent an offence from occurring because they do not have the necessary legislative powers. As members of the Queensland parliament it is our obligation to ensure that our police officers have the required powers to effectively perform their duties.


We are not talking about minor offences here. We are talking about offences which potentially could cause large-scale loss of life or damage to property. I have coordinated large-scale community events involving up to 80,000 people and have been responsible for the protection of dignitaries from the Governor-General and Prime Minister to the Premier of our own state of Queensland. I cannot tell honourable members the pressure police officers are under at these events to ensure the safety and wellbeing of community members.

On a daily basis we witness terrorism related events occurring around the world and never has the security of our country been under greater threat. I think it is imperative that legislation such as this bill is in place to meet the threat of international and domestic terrorism. Our safety and security should not be compromised because police officers have insufficient powers when investigating an offence. This particularly applies to terrorism related incidents. We know that there have been two terrorist attacks in Australia and a further six planned attacks disrupted by authorities. Whilst Queensland's preventative detention legislation and terrorist emergency powers have never been used, the fact that we have those powers in place is crucial going forward.

The prevention of terrorist attacks is difficult and in many cases extremely complex. We know that terrorist organisations throughout the world are becoming increasingly sophisticated and that Australia can no longer think it is immune from these attacks. We now have credible evidence that high-risk Australian citizens are returning from conflicts in the Middle East, posing a significant threat to our domestic security. As a parliament it is important that we give our law enforcement agencies the capacity to respond to an incident in circumstances where the Commonwealth does not have the ability to respond in time or where they require the state to assist. Whilst Queensland police have the powers under the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act and the Public Safety Preservation Act, there are limitations in terms of extraterritorial application. The bill provides a broader extraterritorial application of the Public Safety Preservation Act to ensure that, in addition to the maritime environment, the various emergency powers under the act may be exercised in other Australian jurisdictions.

It would be nice to think that our police officers may never need to exercise their powers under the counterterrorism legislation, but unfortunately there will come a time when they will be required to do so. Having this legislation in place will give comfort not only to our police but to the broader community, and we should not shy away from the fact that the powers in this act will allow our police officers to detain potential terrorists in order to prevent a possible terrorist attack.

I know that every law-abiding citizen in Queensland will support us in approving these amendments tonight to ensure that our safety and security and that of our children and their children will be protected into the future. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Ms FARMER** (Bulimba—ALP) (8.54 pm): I rise to speak briefly also to the Counter-Terrorism and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2015. Australia is facing the most significant ongoing threat from terrorism in our nation's history and this is not likely to change in the foreseeable future. Since September 2014, nationally there have been three terrorist attacks and a further six planned attacks disrupted by authorities. The Terrorism (Preventative Detention) Act is set to expire at midnight on 16 December 2015. This bill extends the operation of the sunset provision of the Terrorism (Preventative Detention) Act for a further 10 years.


The increasing threat of low-tech terrorism is significantly harder for police and intelligence agencies to detect. The advice and experiences from our police suggest that radicalised individuals will often self-initiate and self-determine the location and the target of the attack. There is often limited time elapsing between the conception and the completion of the terrorist attack and little or no visibility of planning. The insidious nature of terrorist attacks has forced police to adopt new strategies to

apprehend offenders and reduce the risk of critical incidents. I would like to compliment the police in this state, who have worked so hard and are facing an entirely new set of challenges in their working environment. I think all of us are so grateful for the efforts that those people make and the way they put themselves on the line. I know they do it behind the scenes, but I think we were all so proud during the G20 summit to see the challenges that were faced by our police and other personnel and how they rose to those challenges on the world stage. They could see just what our police men and women here in Queensland are made of.

Police will need to intervene early to prevent a terrorist attack or act on less information than is the case in more traditional policing responses. The necessity for early disruption of a terrorist attack does come at the cost of police being able to secure sufficient evidence for a successful prosecution. Whilst the Terrorism (Preventative Detention) Act has not been used in Queensland, it remains a valuable tool for police to prevent an imminent terrorist attack or to preserve evidence following a terrorist attack. Our highest and first duty as lawmakers is to provide for the safety of our citizens. Members should be aware that this legislation is just one tool that the Queensland Police Service will utilise in scanning the current threat environment.

The extension of preventative detention powers for a further period must be matched with appropriate technologies, policing methods and intelligence. Again, I commend the Queensland Police Service for their efforts in this regard. Currently, the bill requires the minister to review the need for, and the effectiveness of, the Terrorism (Preventative Detention) Act within four years of the extension of the sunset clause with a report on the outcome to be tabled in the Legislative Assembly within five years. As the minister has advised, the bill will be amended to require the review to occur within two years of the extension of the sunset clause with a report required to be tabled in the Legislative Assembly within three years. The minister has also advised that the bill will be amended to require the minister to provide a report to parliament within six months of the use of powers under the Terrorism (Preventative Detention) Act. These safeguards will provide an appropriate framework for the use of these powers.

I commend the committee for their hard work on this very important bill and the minister for her work in getting the bill to this House. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mrs STUCKEY** (Currumbin—LNP) (8.58 pm): I rise to contribute to the debate on the Counter-Terrorism and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2015, which seeks to update several acts, most prominently the Terrorism (Preventative Detention) Act 2005. I would like to add my support for this bill and in particular its intention to update the Terrorism (Preventative Detention) Act, which is due to expire on 16 December 2015. Provisions include extension of the sunset provision, extension of the extraterritorial application of the TPDA and Public Safety Preservation Act 1986, and extension of various emergency powers under those acts so they may be exercised in other jurisdictions. Given the very real current and foreseeable global terrorism threats and disturbing homegrown radicalisation element, it is important to ensure that this act is extended into the future to enhance a number of personal security measures for the protection and safety of Queensland citizens.

When the Terrorism (Preventative Detention) Act 2005 was introduced in 2005, then premier Peter Beattie expressed the hope that we would not require these laws into 10 years. Roll forward to 2015 and, sadly, nothing could be further from the truth. Australian citizens and their families across the globe and on home soil have been tragically and innocently killed or scarred for life because of terrorist activities since 2005. These deadly crimes show no sign of abating, and today's ready access to social and news media keeps us informed every second of the day of further grisly deeds and atrocities on a scale not even witnessed in fictional horror movies.

As highlighted by the recent tragedy involving the downing of a Russian passenger flight from Egypt in the Sinai desert by a suspected luggage bomb, terror lurks where you least suspect it. Rather than live in fear of these monsters, we must adopt proactive measures that give our police and judges powers to deal harshly with perpetrators and their associates. As communities, we must educate young and old to stand together as a nation against extremism and terrorism in all of its forms. As has already been mentioned, it is fortunate that this legislation has not been exercised to date, but its presence ensures heightened security for major events such as the Brisbane G20, which was expertly managed without incident. This legislation ensured that the Queensland Police Service had the power to act swiftly and in a preventative manner if a plot was imminent.


The Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee handed down four recommendations, including a call for an independent review to occur within two years of the act's commencement and a report to be handed down no later than three years. A key comment from the committee on page 15 of their report states—

The committee considers that although untested and unreviewed, the PDO regime should remain in place ... considering the balance between individual rights and liberties, community safety, and practical application.

The committee further stated that it is better to have them and not need them, than to need them and not have them, whilst reinforcing that a review is required in a more timely manner than proposed by the bill.

Large-scale carnivals, festivals and sporting events can be viewed as potentially tempting targets for high-impact broad-publicity attacks, and this bill adds strength to protection measures to ensure the safety of all involved from attendees to organisers. The Gold Coast hosts a significant number of major events, and I see some Gold Coast folk in the gallery tonight. Our Gold Coast does host many events, particularly the upcoming 2018 Commonwealth Games. That is why in the previous government I introduced the major events legislation that would streamline processes and increase screening and safety initiatives for spectators and participants alike. As the member for Currumbin for almost 12 years I am genuinely connected to a community that I proudly represent, and I am 100 per cent dedicated to the safety of the people who live in, and visit, my electorate.

I applaud the efforts of our police and other law enforcement agencies who put their lives on the line to protect our citizens, and today being Remembrance Day do not let us ever forget the sacrifices that were made to keep our country free and safe. The passage of this bill will reassure our citizens and visitors all across Queensland and will send the very strong message that not only are we vigilant in our attempts to thwart terrorism, but we will do so in a very orderly manner.

 **Ms LINARD** (Nudgee—ALP) (9.02 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Counter-Terrorism and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2015. The objectives of the omnibus bill in relation to the Fire and Emergency Services Act, Weapons Act and Police Service Administration Act have been outlined already, so I will keep my brief comments to the specific objectives of the bill as they relate to counterterrorism and the Terrorism (Preventative Detention) Act 2005.

The current Terrorism (Preventative Detention) Act is designed to protect the Queensland community from imminent or recent terrorist attacks while achieving an appropriate balance between individual rights and freedoms. It is intended to strike the right balance between necessary restrictions and safeguards. I recall the original consideration of the bill back in 2005, when significant debate occurred regarding its operation and the protection of individual liberties and freedoms—and rightly so. The bill included unprecedented powers which enabled police to detain persons for up to 14 days to prevent an imminent terrorist attack or for preserving evidence following a recent terrorist attack. In her introductory speech the minister referenced comments made by the then premier Peter Beattie during the debate of the original bill that he hoped these laws would not be needed in 10 years time. Of course, as members are aware, the current national terrorism alert level is high, and these laws are still needed today perhaps now more than ever as Australia experiences the most significant ongoing threat from terrorism that it has ever faced.


Since September 2014 alone, nationally there have been three terrorist attacks and a further six planned attacks that have been disrupted by authorities. Queensland, like other Australian jurisdictions, has residents who are considered a security concern and who are the subject of investigation. The number of individuals travelling overseas to participate in conflicts and their known supporters are increasing, as is the threat of low-tech lone-actor terrorist attacks domestically, such as was experienced in New South Wales recently with the tragic murder of police employee Curtis Cheng. The advice and experience of our police and intelligence agencies suggest that radicalised persons will often self-initiate and self-determine the location and target of attacks, making it much harder to detect and therefore prevent.

While the Terrorism (Preventative Detention) Act has not been used in Queensland, it remains a valuable tool for police to prevent an imminent terrorist attack or to preserve evidence following a terrorist act should it be needed. Due to a sunset provision, the act is set to expire at midnight on 16 December 2015. The bill before the House seeks to extend the operation of the act. Preventative detention legislation remains a valuable tool to aid the police response to an imminent or recent terrorist attack. The government is appreciative of the fine line that such legislation walks between protecting individual liberties and protecting the community.

I believe that the bill is a timely and balanced response to the threat of terrorism in Queensland, ensuring that the Queensland Police Service continues to have a broad array of powers to address these issues. As the minister has advised, the bill will be amended to require a review to occur within two years of the extension of the sunset clause and a report is required to be tabled in the Legislative Assembly within three years, striking an appropriate balance. There is no better example of successful counterterrorism operations in Queensland than the efforts of the Queensland Police Service during the recent G20. Their professionalism, training and expertise was put under immense pressure and on show for literally the world to see. It was no small praise when the acting head of the United States Secret Service praised our Queensland Police Service for their handling of the summit. I take this

opportunity to thank our police for their efforts in keeping our community safe, whether from the threat of terrorism or other forms of crime and violence. They do an extraordinary job, often in extraordinary circumstances, and they are a service to be proud of.

I would also like to acknowledge and thank the Public Safety Business Agency for their efforts and expertise in reviewing this important piece of legislation. I note that the bill has bipartisan support now, as it did in 2005. I commend the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee for providing a thorough report into this legislation, and in closing I echo the Deputy Police Commissioner's words that were referenced earlier by the minister, my colleague and member for Morayfield and many other colleagues in the House that the current threat level means that, when it comes to the Terrorism (Preventative Detention) Act, it is far better to have it and not need it than need it and not have it. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Ms PEASE** (Lytton—ALP) (9.06 pm): I rise to speak to the Counter-Terrorism and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2015. Every government and every parliament, state or federal, is charged with upholding the safety and security of its constituents. The Queensland Police Service has a wide variety of powers under various pieces of legislation in recognition of its longstanding presence in the state and its integral role in counterterrorism.


In 2005 the 51st Parliament of Queensland deliberated extensively over the Terrorism (Preventative Detention) Bill 2005. Former members rightly provided extensive commentary on the active provisions of the legislation. The legislation was a product of its time and was introduced by the former premier Peter Beattie as part of the first group of Australia's counterterrorism legislation. Unfortunately, in the 10 years since that debate the nation's exposure to terrorism has sadly increased. Critical trends have begun to emerge that are challenging governments and law enforcement and security agencies around the world, and Queensland does not stand alone in facing these challenges.

Since September 2014, nationally there have been three terrorist attacks and a further six planned attacks disrupted by authorities. While the threat of large-scale mass casualty and infrastructure attacks remains, there is also an increasing threat of low-tech and lone-actor terrorist attacks. This reflects the best available advice of the Queensland Police Service and other security agencies. We cannot be blind to these threats.

The Terrorism (Preventative Detention) Act is set to expire at midnight on 16 December 2015. It is imperative that this bill be passed in order to preserve the current arrangements. This bill will provide the policy and legislative backing that police and emergency services require to perform their most difficult duty: stopping political violence that cuts at the heart of our community. I express my support for the bill and the maintenance of the powers contained in the 2005 act. I understand that the bill also incorporates technical amendments to ensure that interagency arrangements for related public safety legislation will continue to function.

This bill represents a continuation of Queensland's preventative detention regime. As the minister has advised, the bill will be amended to require the review to occur within two years of the extension of the sunset clause, with a report required to be tabled in the Legislative Assembly within three years. The minister has also advised that the bill will be amended to require the minister to provide a report to parliament within six months of the use of powers under the Terrorism (Preventative Detention) Act. This is a significant mechanism. Members of the House are rightly concerned that ordinary citizens of our state should not be subject to undue coercion. The parliament is a powerful sovereign body and provides an important oversight function, and this provision enhances this oversight function.

I commend the committee for its thorough examination of the bill, and I thank the Queensland Police Service and all of our law enforcement agencies for the role they play in upholding rights and building safer and better integrated communities. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Hon. JR MILLER** (Bundamba—ALP) (Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Services and Minister for Corrective Services) (9.11 pm), in reply: The safety and security of Australia and Queensland are paramount. As MPs we must act in unity. We must legislate in unity. We must ensure that whatever preventative mechanisms are needed are put in place in unity. We must always put the security of Australia and our great state of Queensland at the forefront in our community—unity for our community, unity for the safety of our community and unity for Queensland and Australia.

I have taken a great interest in terrorism nearly all my life. It is incredible to think that the international threat has been around us for now decades. After 9/11 I accompanied Jim Pearce and other then members of parliament to New York for a trade mission. I can remember Jimmy and I being outside the Twin Towers area in New York. It affected us from that point on. In fact, if my memory serves me correctly, parliament was sitting on the day the Twin Towers were flattened to the ground and then premier Peter Beattie adjourned parliament as a mark of respect to those who had lost their

lives in New York. I can remember that there were three people in this House who were crying—one was Pat Purcell, one was me and the other was Vince Lester—but that event really affected every single member of this parliament.

I recall going back to New York a couple of times and visiting the churches that miraculously remained untouched. They held remembrances from police officers and firefighters from around the world. They sent their colours and messages of support to the fireys who fought the good fight to try to save people in the Twin Towers. Visiting those churches touched my heart forever.

I can also remember the Bali bombings and seeing then foreign affairs minister Alexander Downer on TV looking just ashen. He was saying that there were so many people who were believed to be killed. That particular number kept on rising and rising throughout the day.

Earlier the member for Kawana referred to the 15-year-old male involved in the tragic death of Curtis Cheng outside Parramatta police headquarters. That was just a shocking terrorist attack on our doorstep. I was so moved that I rang Troy Grant, the Deputy Premier and Minister for Police in New South Wales, and said that if there was anything we in Queensland could do to assist we certainly would. Last week I was in Canberra with other ministers for police. I think we stand united across Australia in fighting this terrorism threat.

In relation to this particular bill, I thank all members of the House for their contributions to the debate. Of course, I thank the opposition for its bipartisan support for the bill. Few could argue that the threat of terrorism is now greater than it was when the Terrorism (Preventative Detention) Act 2005 first came into effect. It is indeed a credit to the Queensland Police Service that the extraordinary powers contained within that act have not been used to date. However, our close neighbours New South Wales and Victoria have had cause to use their preventative detention powers. This reminds us all that we cannot be complacent about the potential for acts of terrorism to be planned or to occur in our great state.

I also add my personal thanks to Deputy Commissioner of Police Ross Barnett, who assisted the parliamentary committee with his deep understanding and knowledge of the perils of terrorism that face this state. I acknowledge the tireless efforts of police and the particular challenges faced by the Queensland Police Service in detecting these threats at the earliest possible stage.

I also acknowledge the continuing efforts of the Queensland Fire and Emergency Services in ensuring that Queenslanders are sheltered in safe accommodation. In June of this year the Imperial Hotel in Gatton was shut down by a Supreme Court injunction. At the time the hotel was providing accommodation for six itinerant fruit pickers. The hotel had no smoke alarms or emergency lighting, and travel distances to exits were so lengthy that escape in the event of a fire was virtually impossible. Tonight I commend the Queensland Fire and Emergency Services for its action in protecting the lives of those workers. The amendment to the definition of 'occupier' within the Fire and Emergency Services Act supports the good work of the QFES by ensuring that the providers of budget accommodation who do not comply with fire safety standards will not escape prosecution.

I will now address some of the specific issues raised by members in the context of this debate. The government has been well aware of the expiry of the Terrorism (Preventative Detention) Act in December of this year. The only delay in extending the act has been due to the government following proper processes of development and scrutiny of the legislation through the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee. As for other possible amendments to preventative detention legislation, whether it be the age of persons who can be detained or otherwise, this government will not entertain such amendments without due consideration and, of course, consultation with the Commonwealth government and other state jurisdictions, because we need to do this together.

The priority of this bill is to extend the sunset clause of the Terrorism (Preventative Detention) Act to place into effect the agreement of the Council of Australian Governments. The reporting and review mechanisms contained within the act will allow analysis of the effectiveness of the provisions and the interplay with the Public Safety Preservation Act and the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act. It is after this analysis that any enhancements to the preventative detention legislation can be properly considered.

Queensland has the great privilege and responsibility of hosting the Commonwealth Games in 2018, an event which will showcase our state on the world stage. This bill will ensure our state can effectively prevent and respond to emergency situations and terrorism threats at that time and beyond. I commend the bill to the House.

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

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a second time.

Consideration in Detail

Clauses 1 to 12, as read, agreed to.

Insertion of new clause—



Mrs MILLER (9.20 pm): I move the following amendment—

1 After clause 12

Page 10, after line 12—

insert—

12A Insertion of new pt 6A

After section 76—

insert—

Part 6A Reporting requirements

76A Application of part

This part applies if an application is made to the issuing authority for a preventative detention order for a person.

76B Commissioner to report to Minister

- (1) Within 3 months after the application is made, the commissioner must—
 - (a) prepare a report under this section; and
 - (b) give the Minister a copy of the report.
- (2) The report must state—
 - (a) whether a preventative detention order was made for the person on the application; and
 - (b) if a preventative detention order was made for the person—
 - (i) whether the preventative detention order was an initial order or a final order; and
 - (ii) whether the person was taken into custody under the preventative detention order and, if so, how long the person was detained for under the order; and
 - (iii) if the commissioner is aware a complaint was made to the Crime and Corruption Commission or the ombudsman about the person's detention under the preventative detention order—particulars of the complaint; and
 - (iv) if the person brought a legal proceeding challenging the validity of the preventative detention order—whether the court decided the order was invalid; and
 - (v) any criminal offence with which the person has been charged since the preventative detention order was made; and
 - (vi) whether an application was made for a prohibited contact order in relation to the person's detention under the preventative detention order.
- (3) Also, the report may include any other information the commissioner considers appropriate.
- (4) If the application was made in connection with a terrorist emergency declared under the *Public Safety Preservation Act 1986*, the report may form part of the commissioner's report about the terrorist emergency.
- (5) In this section—

commissioner's report, about a terrorist emergency, means the report about the terrorist emergency the commissioner must give the Minister under the *Public Safety Preservation Act 1986*, section 8R.

Note—

See also the *Police Powers and Responsibilities Act 2000*, section 743 for the PIM's obligation to report to the Minister on the use of preventative detention orders and prohibited contact orders.

76C Minister to report to Parliament

- (1) Within 6 months after the application is made, the Minister must—
 - (a) prepare a report under this section; and
 - (b) table a copy of the report in the Legislative Assembly.
- (2) The report—
 - (a) must include all the information in the report given to the Minister under section 76B; and
 - (b) may include any other information the Minister considers appropriate.

- (3) However, the report must not include information that could reasonably be expected to—
- (a) prejudice the investigation of a contravention or possible contravention of the law in a particular case; or
 - (b) prejudice a prosecution or another matter before a court; or
 - (c) prejudice the effectiveness of a lawful method or procedure for preventing, detecting, investigating or dealing with a contravention or possible contravention of the law; or
 - (d) enable the existence or identity of a confidential source of information, in relation to the enforcement or administration of the law, to be ascertained; or
 - (e) identify, or lead to the identification of, a person who has been, is being, or is to be, investigated for a contravention or possible contravention of the law; or
 - (f) endanger a person's life or physical safety.
- (4) If the application was made in connection with a terrorist emergency declared under the *Public Safety Preservation Act 1986*, the report may form part of the Minister's report about the terrorist emergency.
- (5) In this section—
Minister's report, about a terrorist emergency, means the report about the terrorist emergency the Minister must table in the Legislative Assembly under the *Public Safety Preservation Act 1986*, section 8S.

I table the explanatory notes to my amendments.

Tabled paper: Counter-Terrorism and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2015, explanatory notes to Hon. Miller's amendments [1617].

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 13, as read, agreed to.

Clause 14—



Mrs MILLER (9.20 pm): I move the following amendments—

2 Clause 14 (Insertion of new s 83A)

Page 10, line 22, '4'—

omit, insert—

2

3 Clause 14 (Insertion of new s 83A)

Page 10, line 25, '5'—

omit, insert—

3

Amendments agreed to.

Clause 14, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 15 to 17, as read, agreed to.

Third Reading

Hon. JR MILLER (Bundamba—ALP) (Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Services and Minister for Corrective Services) (9.21 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. JR MILLER (Bundamba—ALP) (Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Services and Minister for Corrective Services) (9.21 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



Hon. SJ HINCHLIFFE (Sandgate—ALP) (Leader of the House) (9.22 pm): I move—

That the House do now adjourn.


Mount Coolum National Park, Facilities

 **Ms SIMPSON** (Maroochydore—LNP) (9.22 pm): The stink over the lack of loos at the Mount Coolum National Park is growing stronger, but environment minister Steven Miles is pooh-pooing the desperate cries of the public for relief, and it is not the only thing that is getting up their noses. Minister Miles has responded negatively to the petition of local residents and visitors which I presented to this parliament—a petition which he has rejected—with their requests for toilets at this iconic and popular national park. He can try to wash his hands of responsibility to act, but the local residents cannot so easily wash away the problem, as record visitors to the park unfortunately answer the call of nature in residents' frontyards and around the national park itself. The exploding number of visitors, which have nearly doubled to about 10,000 a month in the last couple of years, means that this is a public health and environmental issue. The environment minister's response is that the management plan's direction and purpose include that visitor access will be confined to pedestrian use only and that no toilets will be provided. That is a policy position and it is easily changed if the minister agrees, and there is no valid reason that I have heard yet to justify holding on to a failed policy—and it is a failed policy—and a lot has changed since that 1998 management plan made that statement. I table the management plan and, as far as I am aware, it has not been substantially updated since it was conceived in 1998.

Tabled paper: Department of Environment: Queensland Parks and Wildlife Service – Mt Coolum National Park Management Plan, May 1998 [1618].

That plan also says that development on the park will aim to lessen degrading impacts caused by visitor use. I would suggest that an environmentally and aesthetically appropriate toilet facility would lessen the negative impact of visitor use and enhance conservation outcomes. I said a lot had changed in the last few years. Well, 10,000 visitors—nearly a doubling in the last few years—is a significant impact. Conservation outcomes are not supported by having people leaving unwanted deposits in the national park because there are no public facilities available and the closest are quite a long way away. The management plan does need to be revisited. I would also like the environment minister to visit the national park. I have issued that invitation but am yet to have a positive response. I would be delighted to show him this beautiful and iconic location that we want to keep iconic and make pristine again, because we want to see people enjoying the great outdoors but not answering the call of nature while they are there.

Pine Rivers RSL, Memorial Gates


 **Mr KING** (Kallangur—ALP) (9.25 pm): Tonight I rise to bring to the House's attention a recent event which occurred in the electorate of Kallangur. On Saturday, 31 October the memorial gates at the Pine Rivers Sub Branch of the RSL on Anzac Avenue at Kallangur were rededicated and reopened after a lengthy and expensive refurbishment project. The rededication service included a touching speech from Mr Stewart Cameron, the Queensland RSL State President, and was well attended by Kallangur locals and military representatives. After the formalities when the gates were opened, the first people invited to walk through were the descendants of the original fallen soldiers the gates were erected to honour. Proudly standing as a guard of honour on each side were students from Undurba State School. These gates were originally erected as honour gates at the Lawnton showgrounds to commemorate the fallen from World War I back in 1923. Although I was not there at the time in 1923, I have it on good authority that when His Excellency the Governor Sir Matthew Nathan officially opened the gates he said the following words—

A gateway is an appropriate symbol of the war through which Australia entered into nationhood, and her soldiers passed to a foremost place into manhood of the world.

On each of the stone pillars are marble tablets and one of these tablets bears the names of 28 of our district's fallen soldiers. Over the years the gates were painted on several occasions and they fell into a state of disrepair. In 1980 the gates were moved to their current location in Kallangur and additional plaques were added to commemorate the fallen of World War II and those who served in Korea, Malaya and Vietnam. It was discovered that the paint used to protect them had caused the stonework to rot which initiated the need for the improvement works. As part of the 100-year commemorations of the start of World War I, the Pine Rivers RSL Sub Branch decided to have this important local monument restored. The cast-iron gates were also repaired during this project. The project also called for new marble plaques to acknowledge the Iraq and Afghanistan wars. Generous donations from Moreton Bay Regional Council, various businesses and a grant from the Queensland government helped to contribute to the restoration of these gates and hopefully they will be around for another 100 years as a proud monument facing Anzac Avenue to remind all who visit of the history our area played in the world's conflicts, although it would be nice if no more marble plaques have to be

added. I have mentioned before that we have a series of war memorials along Anzac Avenue from Petrie through Kallangur and into Mango Hill and they are really a touching tribute to the memory of those who have served.

Stolen Wages Taskforce, Documents

 **Mrs SMITH** (Mount Ommaney—LNP) (9.27 pm): Members will recall that last sitting I tabled documents concerning the nomination process for the appointment of the Stolen Wages Taskforce. For the benefit of members of the House, I will highlight one of my many concerns contained in this two-page document. First of all, the document is very poorly professionally done if it is a government document given that it has different fonts and everything else on it. The first page sets out all of the personal details that nominees need to fill in. On the second page—and this is the interesting part—the nominee has to fill out more personal details such as their CV et cetera but then it asks the nominee to post it. Where do members think it needs to be posted to? Let me read out the postal address—

Nominations should be sent to Lara Watson, Queensland Council of Unions, Level 5, 16 Peel Street, South Brisbane

Or, of course, nominees could email it as well.

Mrs Frecklington: To the unions?

Mrs SMITH: To the unions.

Mrs Frecklington: A government document?

Mrs SMITH: And a government document. So why are nominees passing their personal details on to the Queensland Council of Unions? This begs the question: how much say do the unions have in running this Labor government? By all appearances the answer must be: in complete control of the cabinet. It makes an absolute mockery of every word of denial that has been regurgitated from across the chamber over the past nine months.


Back in my address in reply speech in this parliament, I made the comment that the boys are back in town, that it was the unions running the show and that this Labor government was beholden to them. I was howled down by the members opposite. However, based on this situation, I do not think that we or the Queensland public can be left in any doubt about that statement.

During the estimates hearing I asked the minister—

Does the Queensland Council of Unions get access to people's personal details or information?

Firstly, Minister Pitt said that he was absolutely floored by the question and then he said—wait for it—'it has no relevance'. Furthermore, the minister said that he thought what I was suggesting—that there is somehow undue influence by the Queensland Council of Unions—was cheapening the process. I ask members: what do they call nomination forms being emailed to union headquarters? Would the minister like to rethink that comment about undue influence? There are a lot more questions to be asked and I can assure this House that I will continue to seek answers for Queenslanders from a Labor government that expresses the virtues of integrity, transparency and accountability.

Ipswich Electorate, Australian Honours System

 **Ms HOWARD** (Ipswich—ALP) (9.30 pm): Tonight, I rise to recognise the hundreds of Ipswich citizens who have been bestowed with an Australian honour since 1975. The Australian honours system began in 1975 with the creation of the Order of Australia to recognise service to the nation or humanity. Since the inception of the honours system, Australia has created additional awards to replace those areas of service that were recognised previously by the British system and to acknowledge additional areas of service valued by Australians.

Might I say how delighted I was to hear that, only last week, the newly appointed Prime Minister of Australia has done away with the anachronistic knighthoods, famously revived in 2014. The old imperial honours were originally ditched by Gough Whitlam in 1975. Gough believed that it was time Australia stood on its own merits. His dream was to see an egalitarian, autonomous system of honours with our very own flavour. The Australian honours system recognises extraordinary commitment to the community, brave conduct, contribution to the emergency services—police, fire and ambulance—as well as contribution to public service. The highest honour is the Medal of the Order of Australia.


I am delighted to advise that every year, as a community, Ipswich is well represented in the Australian honours list. In fact, over the years over seven people in every 10,000 Ipswich residents have been recipients of prestigious awards. Some of those recipients are household names, such as Neville Bonner, Australia's first Indigenous parliamentarian; Sir Llew Edwards, a former state treasurer,

deputy premier and CEO of World Expo in 1988; David Hamill, a former state transport minister, education minister and treasurer and now Chair of the Australian Red Cross Blood Bank; and George Hogg, founder of the Ipswich Orpheus Chorale.

Other awardees are not so well known outside my community, but in Ipswich they are loved and honoured as great citizens. Take for example the most recent recipient of the Order of Australia medal in the General Division, Mr Peter McMahon. Mr McMahon was one of six locals who was recognised for their outstanding service and dedication to the community of Ipswich in the 2015 Queen's Birthday Honours in June. Peter is well known locally because of his extraordinary and lengthy commitment to his community. Many people would know Peter as the friendly face at McMahon's Swim Factory who taught them how to swim. Peter's passion for swimming also led him to establish Swim Australia, the peak industry body for 600 swim schools around Australia. Peter was born and bred in Ipswich. He began his volunteering career as a member of the Ipswich Show Society in 1971. He has continuously served as the chairperson of the Ipswich Hospice Care Board since 2008. Peter is also a proud member of the Rotary Club of Ipswich City. There are no signs that Peter is slowing down. In September, I had the great privilege to represent the Premier at Government House when Peter McMahon received his honour. I congratulate Peter and his lovely family and commend him and the many thousands of Ipswich residents—

(Time expired)

Cleveland Electorate, Road Infrastructure

 **Dr ROBINSON** (Cleveland—LNP) (9.34 pm): Mount Cotton Road is a significant arterial road into Cleveland and the Redlands. However, for many years it has been a constant headache for locals owing to the many accidents that occur along it because of dangerous sections of the road. During peak times the road suffers constantly from congestion. Mount Cotton Road needs upgrading and duplication urgently.


I welcome the recent \$6 million worth of road upgrades that have taken place to sections of Mount Cotton Road. This work came as a response to lobbying by me and the member for Mansfield while we were in government and, more recently, with the assistance of Matt McEachan, the member for Redlands. The upgrades include road widening and resurfacing works, which will provide a much safer trip and ease of congestion for many Redlanders who travel daily to work in the city. It is estimated that something like 60 per cent of all Redlanders leave the council region every day for work in other parts of the city.

Of that \$6 million in funding, \$2 million was spent on safety improvement works and on widening the centre lines, providing more room between inbound and outbound traffic. Resurfacing has finished now on the Mount Cotton Road and Redland Bay Road roundabout and along Mount Cotton Road between Moxon Road and Priest Gully, Alperston Road and Tingalpa Creek Bridge, and Valley Way and Lakeside Drive. The total cost of the resurfacing, including one other area of the Redlands, came to \$4 million.

Why are these upgrades so important? There are too many accidents on Mount Cotton Road owing to speed and the narrowing of the road in various sections. As I live not far away from that part of Mount Cotton Road, I hear many collisions. Unfortunately, from time to time I see accidents that result in people being badly hurt. Further steps are needed to be taken to make this road even safer. These recent measures really go only part of the way to fixing the problem.

A duplication of the road between Mackenzie and Sheldon is really needed. That is a longer term project, but one that needs to be undertaken. Along with my fellow state member for Redlands, Matt McEachan, I believe that more has to be done to Mount Cotton Road. On behalf of Redlanders, we will continue to fight for, most importantly, a safe but speedy journey in and outbound along this section of road. I welcome the work that has been done recently and maintain my commitment to continue campaigning for the full duplication of Mount Cotton Road.

Crush Festival Bundaberg

 **Ms DONALDSON** (Bundaberg—ALP) (9.37 pm): The Crush Festival Bundaberg has grown from strength to strength and is a true celebration of my electorate's regional arts and cultural experiences. This October, the festival celebrated seven years of showcasing high-quality arts and culture as well as exhibits from an amazing array of local food producers and creative talents.

From its humble beginnings, this year the Crush Festival was on course—and did meet—its target of attracting in excess of 30,000 people. I am sure that the member for Burnett would agree, if he were here, that it was a pleasure to welcome that many people to our magnificent part of

Queensland. This year, the month-long celebration included a curated 10 days of new and innovative offerings to accompany some of the other month-long events. One of those unique experiences was the Red Dirt Degustation. This magical night of fine dining and entertainment was held at a secret location within a local cane field. I was very fortunate to be given an early reminder not to wear pointy heels. The night included a sumptuous five-course meal, all sourced from our great local producers and created by our local culinary talents. Entertainment included circus performances, a sneak preview of *The Crushing Opera* written by local playwright Rod Ainsworth with music by Peter Rankine and music by the local band the Sugar Daddies.

A now regular of the Crush Festival is the Carinbundi Kids Crush Day. This year, the fun day was themed around the circus and included special workshops by CIRCA as well as a wide range of workshops for children in creative writing, textile, fine art and music.

Bundaberg was also host to the biggest rum and music festival anywhere in the Spirit of Bundaberg Festival as part of Crush. This day saw a celebration of our superb local rum products, rum flavoured food delicacies and an array of local and visiting musical talent. Patience Hodgson of Queensland's own The Grates even went into the crowd during her set to be a part of a big Bundaberg group hug. Bundaberg is also blessed with one of the best and most committed amateur players groups in the state with the Bundaberg Playhouse Theatre. As part of Crush they performed the Australian play *Hotel Sorrento* written by Hannie Rayson about three sisters living in a small seaside town called Sorrento. It is directed by Lili Thompson and it starred locals Michael Dart, Karleigh Auguston, Jenny Duffy, Michael Cull, Kurt Munckton and Sara Gibbs.

Lastly, on the eve of the recent community cabinet in Bundaberg, our Post Office Lane closed just prior to sunset before coming alive with street art, live music, pop-up cafes and bars, fun activities and market stalls with the ReSTAMPED Place Activation Project. I would like to thank everyone who was involved in putting it on the map.

Australian Transgender Support Association of Queensland




Mr MINNIKIN (Chatsworth—LNP) (9.40 pm): As is the case for so many of my city colleagues, my electorate is diverse, with a real cross-section of society, and it is a true honour to be able to represent every single one of them in this great House. I rise tonight to lend my support to the Australian Transgender Support Association of Queensland. I am proud to mention two strong and aspiring women who are integral to the foundation and success of ATSAQ who reside in the Chatsworth electorate. I first met the ATSAQ president, Ms Gina Mather, and secretary, Ms Kristine Johnson, at the inaugural Chatsworth volunteer Christmas function I instigated when I was first elected back in 2012. Since then I have built a strong working relationship with these ladies. Both Ms Mather and Ms Johnson have been members of ATSAQ since its inception in 1990.

The association was established to provide essential assistance to the transgender community. It aims to provide emotional and moral support for people with gender identity disorder, as well as their family and friends, in addition to providing information on medical and health services available to transgender people. Recently I was asked to write a column for the monthly ATSAQ newsletter, one which my office proudly helps to produce. In it I wrote about one of the reasons why I joined the LNP, which was its deep philosophical commitment to fight discrimination and to ensure maximum opportunity for all individuals to reach their potential. After all, it was an LNP government in the 1990s that established the Queensland Anti-Discrimination Commission and at the same time introduced the state's first ever LGBTI police liaison officers in every single police region of the state. Furthermore, it was an LNP government which continued to engage with the transgender community through the commission to confront the challenges of transgender members gaining meaningful employment. Our commitment to the transgender community has become a part of our DNA. We had foresight in the early 1990s and we continued our efforts in recent years to create awareness and provide access to important services.

I truly believe there is an opportunity for government to play an important and leading role in generating greater awareness and understanding of this societal group. We need to ensure that we, our children and our children's children are educated about the challenges transgender people face, both personally and in society. We are a far more enlightened society than we were years ago, but tolerance and understanding are the cornerstones of a truly democratic society. I commend the hard work of Ms Mather and Ms Johnson on leading the efforts in Chatsworth to change the way local communities view the transgender community. They continue to stand up for what they believe in and provide as much support as their resources permit. I look forward to learning more about the transgender community, their hopes and aspirations and have confidence that the LNP will continue to work hard to represent this group.


Boyne Valley Lions Club

 **Mr BUTCHER** (Gladstone—ALP) (9.43 pm): The Boyne Valley Lions Club was chartered on 18 April 1979 with 30 members. The club currently has 19 members. Boyne Valley is a small rural community with a population of approximately 150 people. When the ratio of members to population in country clubs is compared to city clubs, you will find that there is a lot more community commitment in rural areas. One of the first projects of the club in 1980 was to build a barbecue area at Ubobo. It has recently been rebuilt by the club to provide a first-class barbecue area for the community. The loyal members help out at many functions held in the valley by different groups, often running the bar.

Recently I attended the first ever Q4 District Lions Convention hosted by the Boyne Valley Club held outside a city in the wonderful town of Ubobo. The event was a fantastic opportunity to showcase the fabulous Boyne Valley region. The facilities that were set up for this convention were equal to any facility that can be provided by a big city. The Ubobo Discovery Centre and staff have really come on in leaps and bounds to provide a venue that the whole region can be proud of. As with many service clubs, Lions are the grassroots of an international organisation that supports its local area with projects that enhance its community. Many have benefited from local Lions projects such as picnic tables at various locations including Nagoorin, Ubobo and Builyan; the Lions barbecue area adjacent to the Ubobo hall; renovations to the historical society cottage; and help with developing the discovery centre. Boyne Valley Lions support local residents in times of personal need offering a helping hand or a chat. I saw this firsthand after the devastating floods in the Boyne Valley area. The way that that small community came together was absolutely fantastic. They also assist other organisations with their events, providing volunteers and facilities including their mobile coldroom.

Their commitment goes beyond their community, raising more than \$14,000 for prostate cancer through their annual Poets' Breakfast. It is a hardworking and enthusiastic club. Their supporters are generous, with many businesses and individuals donating prizes and trophies to support the club's many fundraising efforts. Boyne Valley Lions hold a famous golf day called the Rock and Thistle which last year raised funds towards their own Lions Medical Research Personality Quest entrant, Heidi Hughes. Heidi raised more than \$10,000 for medical research throughout the quest. Heidi and the club are to be congratulated for this large contribution from such small beginnings. I would like to congratulate the Boyne Valley Lions Club on presenting a convention of this calibre in my electorate.

Mount Isa Electorate


 **Mr KATTER** (Mount Isa—KAP) (9.46 pm): Earlier this week parliament played host to BUSHkids, which is celebrating its 80th year of service recognition. This is a significant milestone for the group, which offers a wide range of free allied health services and early intervention programs to children and families living in rural Queensland. Mount Isa is lucky enough to have had such a service since 1996. It works alongside the families and schools in the Mount Isa region. Tackling issues before they become problems in young lives is pivotal in the front-line work that the BUSHkids team does across Queensland. Empowering children and families with the tools they need to better manage such issues before they become a problem is such a valuable service to our area and extremely relevant in the current context. I would like to personally congratulate BUSHkids' general manager, Carlton Meyn, and all of the staff for their commitment to this service and to health and mental health in the bush.

I want to draw the attention of the House to the gas pipeline about which an announcement is due in a few weeks. There has been some talk of the federal government supporting the pipeline going down through Moomba in South Australia. That represents an extra \$400 million cost to the public. I am afraid that there may be some politics being played. If it goes from Tennant Creek to Mount Isa it saves \$400 million because it is about a 400- to 500-kilometre shorter route. In doing that it goes past a heap of mining development in the north-west so there could be trunk lines bolted into that gas pipeline that would come through from the Territory and provide an affordable energy supply to those mines. If we are serious about developing Northern Australia the gas pipeline has to come from Tennant Creek to Mount Isa, not down to South Australia through Moomba which will cost an extra \$400 million to solve issues down in New South Wales and Victoria. If we are serious about Northern Australia that valuable piece of infrastructure belongs there.

Last week we had a visit from the Treasurer to the Hann Highway at Hughenden. This is a nationally significant project. Ninety per cent of the banana industry in Australia, which is worth \$1 billion, is in Far North Queensland. Growers can get their bananas to market eight hours earlier on the inland route. One triple road train going down that route takes two B-doubles off the Bruce Highway, saving traffic and maintenance and is an alternative route, not to mention the benefits to the cattle industry. Absolute top dollar is \$100 million for the 100 kilometres of sealed bitumen. That is a wonderful

piece of infrastructure for the government to invest in. Most of the beneficiaries would be Far North Queensland. However, the road does go through my electorate. It would benefit most of those industries in the Far North and would be a great project for the state government to support.

Beenleigh Town Square

 **Hon. SM FENTIMAN** (Waterford—ALP) (Minister for Communities, Women and Youth, Minister for Child Safety and Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (9.49 pm): Last week I was delighted to kickstart the new heart of my electorate, the newly constructed and renovated Beenleigh Town Square. The town square was officially opened by myself representing the Premier, Prime Minister Malcolm Turnbull, Logan Mayor Pam Parker and local elder Auntie Robyn Williams. I take great pride in what we as a community have achieved in our CBD. The Beenleigh Town Square has been a passionate project for all three tiers of government—local, state and federal—and for the community. The community has been involved every step of the way, commenting on and contributing to the design.

Prior to my election to parliament, for some time I worked on George Street in the heart of Beenleigh's CBD so I know firsthand how eager local businesses and residents were for the extensive facelift and we were all so happy when the day finally arrived. What we all wanted was a fresh and modern commercial hub where residents could go about their business and yet feel connected and really enjoy being part of our vibrant community. That is what this redevelopment has delivered. There is nothing more comforting for businesses looking to start up or for families looking for somewhere to live than a bustling and friendly main street complemented by an open and welcoming town square; a space where commerce can thrive and the community can gather for events and celebrations, because a community is so much more than just an economy.

One of Waterford's greatest strengths is its multiculturalism and we are a community of diverse and rich cultures. It is a place where traditional owners and Australia's most recent immigrants make their mark and the new square will host exciting multicultural festivals, concerts and events throughout the year, as well as regular open-air markets and, of course, the popular Eats & Beats, which people travel far and wide to attend. A well-planned town square such as this one allows everyone in the community to benefit: our small businesses, our community groups, our artists and entertainers, and our families from all backgrounds and generations.

This redevelopment was also the catalyst for the Queensland government to begin \$1.5 million worth of upgrades at the nearby Southern Districts Courthouse. I commend Mayor Parker, Councillor Jennie Breene and the energetic team at Logan City Council for their vision, determination and hard work in seeing this project through. I particularly thank Lawrie Dore and his colleagues at the Beenleigh Yatala Chamber of Commerce for their leadership on this project.

I thank everyone in Beenleigh for their patience during the redevelopment works. Congratulations to everyone involved in making our new town square a reality.

Question put—That the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 9.52 pm.

ATTENDANCE

Bailey, Barton, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Byrne, Costigan, Cramp, Crandon, Crawford, Cripps, D'Ath, Davis, de Brenni, Dick, Dickson, Donaldson, Elmes, Emerson, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Frecklington, Furner, Gilbert, Gordon, Grace, Harper, Hart, Hinchliffe, Howard, Jones, Katter, Kelly, King, Knuth, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Lauga, Leahy, Linard, Lynham, Madden, Mander, McArdle, McEachan, McVeigh, Miles, Millar, Miller, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, O'Rourke, Palaszczuk, Pearce, Pease, Pegg, Perrett, Powell, Power, Pyne, Rickuss, Robinson, Rowan, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Seene, Simpson, Smith, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stewart, Stuckey, Trad, Walker, Watts, Weir, Wellington, Whiting, Williams